2018-2019 Global Survey of Women
"How do you define security?"

Analysis of Pilot Survey of WASL Members

SUMMARY

The concept of security has always been defined through the policy agendas of nation-states rather than on a local and personal level. Often, the security agenda is focused on armed defense, state territory, and protection of natural resources. But what of those on the ground who are most impacted? What does security look like through the eyes of women? Security affects us all, from how we make a living to how we vote and how we participate in our communities. It has been shown that empowering women and girls is crucial to creating meaningful and lasting peace around the world. Being inclusive of women's opinions and ideas exponentially increases the probability of successful security-related initiatives, from policing to military action, peacekeeping, and preventing and countering violent extremism. Our Secure Future, the International Civil Society Action Network (ICAN), and World Pulse have conducted a survey to understand how people of different backgrounds define security and how the traditional definition of security has affected the world around them.

Main Findings:
- The cross-country analysis clearly demonstrates an alarming tendency of general fear and concern over personal physical and family safety and lack of protection. In defining security, around 76% of the respondents mentioned security concerns and priorities linked to civil and political rights, with the right to life and personal safety dominating overall in the responses. Another 59% have addressed security concerns falling under the category of socio-economic rights.
- Based on the analysis, 47% of the respondents mentioned sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), 53% mentioned domestic violence and 47% mentioned organized

political violence as types of violence with most significant effect on them. Concerns over women`s rights and protection from gender-based violence have been expressed by the survey participants in relation to feeling secure at home, in community and country, making it one of the most frequently mentioned cross cutting issue.

- According to the 59% of the responses, lack of protection and insecurity in the community and country in general caused by the emergence of phenomenon's like radicalization, violent extremism, state authoritarianism, political Islam, increased targeted securitization and surveillance and reduced or ineffective efforts of public protection contribute to the feelings of insecurity at home as well.
- Responses demonstrate that the concern over extremism based on faith and ethnicity has been ranked as very significant by 59% of the surveyed participants. These responses come from countries with various socio-political, economic contexts and various history of conflict and violence This trend confirms the recognized complex nature of extremism, which cannot be attributed to defined country parameters and is caused by multiple structural and systemic factors.
- The concern over rising economic inequalities was ranked as very significant by 53% of the key informants. Spread of weapons in the respondents` societies was ranked as very significant by 41% and change in global order and rise of authoritarianism was ranked very significant by 29% key informants.
- The survey revealed a clear pattern of polarity between the definition of security on the state decision-making level and the level affected by those decisions with 71% of the respondents expressing disagreement and negative attitude towards the definition of security on the decision-making level. Local perspectives on security defined by the survey participants vary from both the views of their governments and the international community.

According to the 59% of the survey respondent's presence of women in the security sector change behavior of security actors. The reasons in support of this argument are linked to the gender roles and responsibilities women largely play in societies. However, meaningful participation of women is subject to gender sensitivity of the women themselves to avoid contribution to the same stereotypes in patriarchal societies.

The survey was administered among seventeen women respondents with expertise in human rights, gender and peacebuilding, representing 12 countries in Middle East, Africa, South Asia, Central Asia and Europe. Around 53% of the participants are within the age range of 45-64, 29% are within the age range of 25-44 and one participant is 21-year-old.

METHODOLOGY

Within the context of this analysis one can underline two primary reasons for that based on the background of the participants. Firstly, all participants are women and their inclusion in or exclusion from security discussions largely define the outcomes in terms of comprehensiveness. Secondly, all the survey participants represent the larger civil society within their countries through their work in international organizations, academia, non-governmental organizations. Inclusion of civil society as such in security discussions inevitable shapes the priorities through brining perspectives of the affected population to the discussion.

ANALYSIS

Defining Security

In general, security concerns of survey participants seem to be dependent on the current socio-political context of the countries they represent. However, a dominant pattern emerges among the responses in relation to the concern for personal safety and security raised by respondents. This concern has been raised by the survey respondents living in different contexts ranging from conflict settings to countries in transition and authoritarian regimes. The responses demonstrate an alarming tendency of general fear and concern over personal physical and family safety and lack of protection. Regardless of the country context, an explicit mentioning of concern over potential harassment and violence against women has also been raised. One of the participants mention that, *security for her means the ability for the girls in the family to move freely without being harassed*. Another participant shares, *"I need to feel secure as a woman and go out any time of the day without being harassed"*. Respondents from countries with on-going conflict have defined security in close relation to conflict free environment, peace and stability, a life free of threat and fear.

In general, the concerns fall under two categories encompassing socio-economic and civil-political rights. As such, responses rage from 59% addressing concerns in relation to socio-economic rights and 76% of the respondent's address issues pertaining to political and civil rights, with the right to life and personal safety dominating overall among the responses. These numbers are indicative of emergence of identical patterns when doing cross-country analysis. The existing threat to security of women`s organizations and women peacebuilders due to the nature of their work has been addressed in other relevant reports as well, suggesting that by

taking a stand, these women put themselves at risk. They have to navigate the difficult threats and increasingly restricted public space, which makes the demand of the work unsustainable.[1]

The mentioned concerns include availability of peaceful environment, operational, just and fair political systems, feelings of protection, adequate housing, health care, food and education, gender equality, dignified life. When asked to list personal security concerns, one of the key informants mentioned that *security means people are able to live their life free of judgement and threat.* Another informant underlines that "*when thinking about security, a dignified life, a feeling of protection comes to mind*". "*Protection of the rights of me and my family members, as well as the rights of people under the Constitution*" is how other informant describes security. As it appears, predominantly words such as protection and feelings associated with fear and threat are repeated by key informants from countries with diverse socio-economic and political background. In terms of socio-economic concerns, key informant states that "*Second priority is the health and nutrition of my family members, do they have access to adequate health services and have enough food*?" '*A considerable number of households nowadays struggle to provide the basic necessities for their families due to unemployment and the low salaries*" mentions another informant in the context of personal security concerns and the concerns of the family.

These concerns echo the current grievances experienced by representatives of the different country contexts which has not been met because of the political transition, have been jeopardized by dictatorships and authoritarian regimes or have not been achieved due to active wars or past experience of conflict. Considering the role civil society plays in the surveyed countries and the nuanced knowledge the key informants possess about security issues these findings demonstrate common security concerns and reservations faced by communities in those countries. To further examine factors contributing to feelings of insecurity, respondents were asked to rank on a scale the significance of the following threats in their lives:
   a) Climate change
   b) Raising economic inequality
   c) Extremism based on faith or ethnicity
   d) Spread of weapons in their societies
   e) Change in global order and raise of authoritarianism
   f) Other threats

---

[1] Sanam Naraghi Anderlini et al. (2016), "Uncomfortable Truths, Unconventional Wisdoms: Women's Perspectives on Violent Extremism and Security Interventions".

The analysis demonstrates that key informants have ranked more than one of the above-mentioned threats as very significant. Thus, responses to the scaling demonstrated that the concern over extremism based on faith and ethnicity has been ranked as very significant by 59% of the surveyed participants. As in the analysis of personal security, these responses come from countries with various socio-political contexts and history of conflict and violence including countries affected by the Arab spring and countries with authoritarian regimes. This trend shows the reality of threat caused by faith and ethnicity-based extremism which is present in countries with diverse background. It also confirms the recognized complex nature of extremism, which cannot be attributed to defined parameters, such as particular political regime, on-going or past conflict, existence or lack of active civil society and strive for transition but is caused by multiple structural and systemic factors.

Very close in ranking to threat of extremism comes the concern over rising economic inequalities which was classified as very significant by 53% of the key informants. The concerns over extremism and raising economic inequalities named by most participants as significant security threats are shared globally and the nexus between economic inequalities and violent extremism has becoming a focus of researches and discussions. ICAN analysis of the nexus between economic policy, violent extremism and gender suggest "while a minority of people become violent, economic conditions pertaining to social exclusion and thwarted aspirations are recognized as contributing factors to their radicalization".[2] UNDP's report, *Preventing Violent Extremism through Promoting Inclusive Development, Tolerance and Respect for Diversity,* identifies limited opportunities for upward mobility and inequality as two of the drivers that can lead to radical behavior and result in violent extremist action.[3]

Spread of weapons in the respondents` societies was ranked as very significant by 41%. Change in global order and rise of authoritarianism was ranked very significant by 29%. Climate change as a threat but was classified as very significant only by one survey participant. Among other threats were named the ongoing crisis in Yemen, widespread weapons and political discord in Libya, gender inequality, authoritarianism and dictatorship, state extremism, political exclusion of the majority, youth unemployment and corruption, enforced disappearances, threats to freedom of speech, impunity, increased militarization, internal and interstate conflicts.

---

[2] Sanam Naraghi Anderlini, Melinda Holmes, & Rosalie Fransen (2017), "From the Ground Up: A Preliminary Dialogue on the Nexus of Economic Policy, Gender and Violent Extremism".
[3] UNDP (2016), "Preventing Violent Extremism Through Promoting Inclusive Development, Tolerance and Respect for Diversity".

The changing realities in the countries that survey respondents represent largely influence their constant feelings of insecurity, however as they mention in the survey there were times when they felt safe and protected. These times are linked to different periods of life, for instance for some the period of past considerable stability in their countries. In other cases, the feeling of being secured is associated with traveling abroad, Scandinavian countries for instance were mentioned by a respondent as a secure place. Employment and economic security were also specified by a survey participant as a factor contributing to feeling of security at a certain period of lifetime. It is noteworthy that some participants associated their feelings of security with their engagement with WASL and the support they receive from this network. Judging by the responses, it appears that despite the impact of conflict, violence and other factors of insecurity, majority of surveyed participants can recall or still have moments and ways to add to their feelings of security. However, it is striking that three respondents mentioned they either cannot recall or have never felt secure in their lives. *"Living for decades under authoritarian regime did not help me to feel secure" mentions one of the respondents in response to this question. "I never felt deeply secure"*, concludes another. All three of the respondents come from countries with on-going or recent conflicts. Direct exposure to violence at the time of the survey or fresh memories and impact of other recent experiences of conflicts might have caused the respondents to completely feel insecure translating that feeling to their lifespan.

Based on the survey results, determining factor of security for the surveyed participants in their home, community and country are generally similar with some minor distinctions. Among shared needs required to feel secure in all the three domains (home, community, country) were named respect for human rights, human dignity, especially in relation to the rights of women. Furthermore, physical safety, respect for fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression and availability of voice and free will. These factors lay the foundation for defining security by the respondents coming in the subsequent section of this analysis. Understanding the survey participants` role within their communities and the ways and dynamics through which community grievances are manifested in the responses of these actors explains the rationale behind defining security more comprehensively embracing the home, community and country settings with all the attached needs and desires. Concluding by the 59% of the responses, lack of protection and insecurity in the community and country in general caused by the emergence of phenomenon's like radicalization, violent extremism, state authoritarianism, political Islam, increased targeted securitization and surveillance and reduced or ineffective efforts of public protection contribute to the feelings of insecurity at home as well. As such, a respondent mentioned that life close to police station or availability of bars on the windows at home is a contributing factor to the sense of security. Other respondents as well mention that threats like burglary and breaks have increased, and police

protection is needed to make people feel safe at home. Another category of contributing factors to the felling of insecurity at home seems to be related to the raise of authoritarianism and limitation of personal freedoms. *"My family members are human rights activists, and our phones are overheard, we are not allowed to live in peace"* expresses her feelings one of the key informants. Another respondent underlines that freedom of expression is required for people to feel secure at home, *"threat free society where I would not be jailed for expressing my thoughts"* concludes the respondent. Around 35% of the respondents explicitly make connections between women`s rights, gender equality and the feeling of being secure at home, linking that with the overall state politics on inclusion and empowerment of women. *"In fact, the rise of political Islam is at the origin of the problems the country has been going through. This political Islam wishes to have women go back home and be a mere housewife and mother of children",* mentions one respondent in this regard. *"I should be respected regardless my gender or opinions that I hold"* mentions another respondent.

Elements of security specifically mentioned only within the home domain include love, respect and harmonious relationships in the family. On the community level, tolerance and the rule of law, safe community space and non-discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity and gender, effective community policing and having a voice in community decision making process were mentioned as factors contributing to feelings of security. Security factors mentioned only within country context include ending corruption, war, terrorism, radicalism and political Islam, good governance and non-persecution on the grounds of views, protection from gang violence and violence coming from security forces. It is worth mentioning that the concerns over women`s rights and protection from gender-based violence have been expressed by the survey participants in relation to both home, community and country making it one of the most frequently mentioned cross cutting issue. As such 47% of the respondents mention different aspects of women rights as conditions to feel secure among their communities. When asked what you need to feel secure in your community, one of the respondents mentions *"There should be a safe environment in my community, so that I will not feel any physical harassment. I should be counted as one of the members of the community regardless of any type of differences such as opinion, ethnicity, religion, gender, social status, education etc. I should be treated equally"*, thus concluding in her statement the general worries and concerns of the rest of the respondents.

Moreover, around 25% of the key informants link the failure of country level security efforts to lack of inclusion of gender concerns and women in security efforts. Further analysis of the unsuccessful security efforts mentioned by the survey participants reveal other causes as well, including lack of willingness and coordination between different actors, polarity and conflicting

interests, increase in budgetary allocations for militarization of security and avoidance of focus on human security, failure to balance counter-radicalization and respect for the right to religion. Some responses underline interference of regional parties and neighboring countries, geopolitical battels, difference between political and tribal powers and other oppositional groups as causes leading to unsuccessful security efforts. When describing the causes of failed security efforts, 24% of the respondents highlight the importance of holistic approach to security as oppose to militarization. *In my country security mainly means National security and strengthening the military. We have seen that military is expanding its strength and investing in budgetary allocations, but the reports show an increase number of sexual and gender base violence and all foams of violence against women and children. Considering these facts, it is evident that more allocations and investments are made on protecting borders but not the vulnerable people."* shares one of the respondents. *"Main focus was on physically protecting the lands, borders and to control rising of armed groups; security is not only about war it's about human security "*describes another respondent.

Security and Power

Security efforts and responses largely depend on how security is defined which as the survey responses demonstrate varies between the security perspectives of influential figures and people representing the local level. The responses outline a clear pattern of polarity between the definition of security on the decision-making level and the level affected by those decisions with 71% of the respondents expressing disagreement and negative attitude towards the definition of security on the decision-making level. Based on the responses, the primary difference is related to the breadth and depth of security, and what it entails on the broader spectrum of human needs. Based on the survey participants` perspective, influential figures define security solely within the military domain which entails security of national sovereignty and protection from external threats. Some respondents underlined that the limited military implication of security also helps influential figures to gain and preserve power, which explains the rationale behind subsequent security efforts lacking inclusivity. On contrary, the survey respondents highlight other important dimensions of security as well – including economic, cultural, social, emotional, psychological, environmental and availability of fair and just institutions. *"Many influential figures define security as the absence of war, threat of war, or crime. This different from my view. If I cannot put food on the table, I have no reason to imagine that I enjoy security. If I am battered by my husband or son, I certainly do not feel secure. If I cannot participate in decisions that affect my life, I certainly have no security. If in cannot get justice when my husband dies, and my brother in-law wants to take my property which my husband and I have taken long to build, I certainly am not secure",* shares her thoughts one of

the respondents. Others mention that, "They arm whoever they can, I believe that one has to feel secure so that they will not commit crimes because they are insecure", "It's all about war for them, for me there is a wider meaning, it's about human security". It is noteworthy that, in 18% of the responses the key informants agree with the definition of security of influential figures. In both of those cases, respondents underline that the definitions go beyond military concerns and are more holistic. When asked, one respondent mentioned that the definition of security focuses on reconciliation, social justice and reparation, and the respondent agrees with that definition of influential figures. Another respondent underlined that importance of ensuring respect for the rights of minorities as one of the core securities aims of her country has been reflected in the security definition given by an influential figure in her country. Therefore, she agrees with the given definition.

Following, national security is also defined differently by 65% of the survey participants vis-à-vis their governments. Based on the responses, the government defines national security with a priority to secure state agencies, borders, sovereignty of the country, protection of ruling regime through oppressing the opposition, fighting radicalization and terrorism at all costs. The survey participants define national security as a guarantee of decent life and people`s welfare, security of citizens as well as institutions, availability of equal opportunities and respect for human rights, protection from external threat and interference of other states in the internal affairs of the respondent`s countries, protection of the territorial integrity. The respondents mention different reasons for disagreements with their government`s definition of security. Among them corruption within the government structure, traditional approach to security which focuses on state actors and their military capacity, political agenda and response to modern security challenges, such as violent extremism and terrorism. According to the 29% of the respondents, concerns over violent extremism, terrorism, armed violence and fight against rebels is believed to impede realization of other dimensions of security disproportionately moving them to the category of less important issues. *"The government makes terrorism its main target, it automatically neglects all the other problems that are bound to take place. I mean by this: the government neglects what they consider "minor issues", preferring to concentrate on terrorism which is the priority issue"* explains a respondent. *"I think their definition of security revolves around violence, military forces. It is different form mine. They define it this way due to a tunnel vision and traditional thinking of the meaning of security"* concludes another respondent. Another layer of disagreements is observed between the security priorities of the international community and the survey participants. As such, 41 % of the survey respondents mentioned that their views on security priorities does not mirror the priorities of the international community (e.g. United Nations, regional intergovernmental organizations, international non-governmental organizations). Another 35% agree with the security priorities

of the international community in some cases characterizing this similarity as existing of "common points". Lastly, 18% of the respondents underline that these priorities match sometimes or to a certain extent. Among the reasons for such inconsistencies, the survey respondents mention existing paradoxes in terms of global security priorities verses local human security which is sometimes manifested in interference with internal affairs of certain countries, availability of theoretical framework but lack of implementation mechanism, failure to develop more comprehensive approach to security, development of priorities based on false assumptions, exclusion of women and the gender perspective in the development and implementation of the priorities. *"I feel for so long half of the security needs, what it means to be secure for women or half of the population is ignored by the UN, bilateral and other bodies"* *shares one of the respondents.* According to another respondent, *"The normative frameworks for the Peace and Security have become broader embracing women and youth, their participation and inclusion in politics and the economy, and in getting their voices heard. The only challenge now is getting member states to customize and implement the normative frameworks, but also globally increasing resources for the WPS, and YPS. I think there is unbelievable imbalance between military spending and funds allocated for interventions that promote peace and security"*. However, in some cases, as a respondent mentions, the normative frameworks on peace and security have become broader embracing women and youth but the challenge is to make member states to implement them. The gap in understanding of local perspectives by the international community has been addressed in other reports and analysis as well. One of the reports suggest that, many civil society members think that international actors do not want or are not able to recognize and address their shortcomings. As the report mentions, the civil society organizations are frustrated, because "they can see the immense positive potential of an international presence, but repeatedly witness a lack of coherence, limited understanding of local dynamics, short-term approaches, and competing interests among international actors".[4]

Thus, local perspectives on security defined by the survey participants vary from both the views of their governments and the international community. This is important to note, especially taken the shared cross-country concern on these discrepancies demonstrating a general trend in widening differences between local perspectives on security priorities and approaches vis-à-vis state and international community. This trend as well is manifested in the responses to the question on prioritization of security of some individuals and groups over the communities in large. In the opinion of the survey respondents, individuals and groups who are more secure include politicians, military leaders, representatives of ruling clan, businessmen, financially

---

[4] Sanam Naraghi Anderlini et al. (2016), "Uncomfortable Truths, Unconventional Wisdoms," p. 24.

secure people, religious leaders, elites, gangs, parties affiliated with the government. According to the responses, the privileged position of these groups formed on the grounds of power dynamics make them feel more secure. This power comes through access to resources, weapons, army, authority. Another category of more secured groups was named intellectuals, whose power lays within their knowledge of their rights and ability to claim them. One respondent mentions men in general, who feel more secure due to the gender differences and gender power dynamics. In this context, as one respondent mentions, the wives and children of the elites and powerful authorities fall under the category of less secure, because they can still become victims of gender-based violence. Others in the category of less secure include religious, ethnic and sexual minorities, people living in marginalized neighborhoods.

Security and Representation

Analysis of this section gives a clearer views and explanations on the differences between the government, international community and the local perspectives on defining security, prioritizing security needs and developing security efforts. Representation in the security discussions on the household, community and country level of the survey participants is a crucial determinant of how inclusive and holistic the outcomes of these discussions will be and the level of gap between local perspectives and state prospective. Based on the responses, exclusion of the survey participants from discussions on security of their homes, communities and countries is common and widely practiced. As such, only 11% of the respondents mentioned that their views have been fairly represented, 24% mention that their views have been represented in the discussions about security in their homes while 47% of the respondents mention that their views have been ignored in these discussions.[5] *"There is no real representation for women in these discussions"* shares one of the key informants.

At the community level, 59% of the respondents mention that their views have not been represented and 36% emphasize that they have been part of the discussion or their views have been fairly represented. One of the respondents explains her feelings this way: *"My ideas, perspectives does not resonate with the masses, not among the liberals, it is taken as too alien or culturally and religiously insensitive. When I express my viewpoint specially on religious or political injustices I and my colleagues are subjected to threats and verbal abuse through social media". "In a society that suffers from civil war, women are the weakest part of the chain. There is no government authority, order and law to be applied in society"* shares another respondent.

---

[5] The researchers suspect that not all the respondents understood the question in the same way. In some cases, it seems that they are talking about security discussions on the state level pertaining to their home security, not discussions within the home setting.

Almost the same pattern emerges when asked about security discussions on the country level, where 24% of the respondents answered affirmatively, and 53% of the respondents mention that their views have not been represented. When explaining, one of the respondents mentions that her viewpoint has not been represented in some cases only, because *"Some policymakers do not recognize that women have a word to say"*. Another respondent suggests that her view has not been represented because of bad governance, exclusive politics, and authoritarianism. *"Even members of Parliament seem to have no voice!"* concludes the respondent.

Based on the responses, one of the dominant reasons affecting their representation in the discussions in all three levels is related to their gender identity and the associated power dynamics. It is important to note that, respondents mention their total exclusion from discussion platforms on security issues at all three levels as a legitimate reason as well. Other factors impeding them from raising their concerns, especially at the country level are corruption, exclusive and clan politics which does not allow meaningful involvement of women and lack of legitimate governmental structure serving as a discussion platform due to on-going war.

The problem of inclusivity is further elaborated through responses on women representation in the security processes, decisions and among security actors in general in the respondents` countries. Majority of the responses and reasons for exclusion are repeated from the section above when respondents explained their personal situations. The vast majority of the respondents mention that women are not represented in the security processes and among security actors. The respondents highlight that most women are enrolled in the administrative roles, not decision making or roles which suggest meaningful contribution into the discussions. As an example, a respondent mentions that women for instance are not included in the Committee in charge of the Sahara dialogue. Other respondents elaborate that despite representation and advancement of some women in the security sector, they do not voice the concerns of women in large, because they are included in the discussions due to affiliation with ruling political party, clan, class or family system. Other reasons for exclusion of women include male dominance of the security sector and patriarchal culture. According to the 59% of the survey respondents, the presence of women in the security sector change behavior of security actors. The reasons in support of this argument are linked to the gender roles and responsibilities women largely play in societies. As such, respondents mentioned that women have the key to society, their presence can deter atrocious behaviors, they bring the lived realities from home and community, decisions made jointly with women are more people

focused. Further strengthening their arguments, respondents mention that these aspects of women effective participation have been recognized by the internationally community and have resulted in the adoption of the SC Res 1325. However, as stressed by the respondents, meaningful participation of women is subject to gender sensitivity of the women themselves to avoid contribution to the same stereotypes in patriarchal societies. Another 29% of the respondents do not think that participation of women can potentially change the behavior of security actors or the change requires longer time, since women are mostly assigned to administrative roles and support tasks. According to this view, for the sector to be inclusive, there should be systemic change and relevant laws in place to deter vicious behavior of security actors. Per the responses, currently in the respondents` country in majority of cases security is defined by political elites and government, military and relevant institutions, such as National Council for Security or ministries.

Security and Violence

According to the survey results, the definition of violence provided by the respondents is comprehensive similarly to the definition of security encompassing physical, emotional, economic, social, cultural, political aspects of lives. As such, violence is largely defined by the respondents as an act, including verbal, physical, mental that results in physical injury, killings, neglect, violations of fundamental rights, psychosocial harm caused to an individual or groups of individuals. In this context, violence against women and children has been explicitly underlined. Furthermore, the definition of violence incorporates oppression of a person's feelings, thoughts, denying him/her the opportunity to take decisions and imposing ideas and believes on persons. It is noteworthy that, in all the responses the source of violence is not fully mentioned, except the cases of family violence.

Further narrowing down the discussion on violence, survey respondents were asked to measure the type of violence that affects them most on a scale of 0 (not at all) to 5 (very significant). Based on the analysis, 47% of the respondents mentioned sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), 53% mentioned domestic violence and 47% mentioned organized political violence as types of violence with most significant effect on them. Next on the scale of most significant affect comes use of force by police mentioned by 35% and use of force by militaries mentioned by 41% of the respondents, which is as well a form of direct violence experienced in the contexts where the respondents reside. In the category of other types of violence with significant effect, regional and international violence in relation to specific countries, violence at workplace, discriminatory speeches, psychological violence have been mentioned.

Among the forms of organized political violence, threatening the personal security of survey participants were named SGBV, marginalization, political thuggery, kidnapping, detention, proliferation of weapons, absence of police and military, shrinking space for freedom of expression, excessive use of force during protests and demonstrations, challenges in accessing justice and fair trail, discriminatory practices and threats to engage in corruption and conform with "reforms". According to the respondents, majority of the above-mentioned forms of organized political violence as well threat their communities` security. In addition, patriarchy, radical religious groups, banditry, various types of robberies, normalization of SGBV and gang violence, police brutality and pressure to conform with unethical compromises, denial of social services to communities or discriminatory decisions regarding communities with views opposing the regime are among the mentioned forms of violence. At the country level, according to the respondents, the security is threatened by police brutality, weak policies, political divide, foreign country`s intervention, politically and religiously motivated assassinations, SGBV, arbitrary arrest and torture, harassment of journalists and opposition leaders, terrorism and extremism. According to the responses, SGBV is practiced and normalized at all levels starting from threatening the responding personally to using SGBV as a mechanism of oppression against selective communities and on the larger scale at the country level. While some of the forms of violence named by the respondents are perpetrated by security actors themselves, it is important to examine the views of respondents on when and how these actors respond to violence. According to the survey participants, the response of security sector actors to instances of violence depends on the forms of violence and the degree of hostility. According to the 52% of the response the response of police and security forces is brutal, and they resort to force and violence. According to the respondents more rapid responses and militarization is noticeable when there is a threat of terrorism. In these cases, as respondents mention, the tactics are usually countering violence with violence. In other cases, police and security forces use tactics like analysis and information sharing, dialogue, controlling public space, being more visible. In terms of effectiveness of the response, the answers vary. Around 24% of the respondents think the response is effective especially in relation to terrorism and organized crime, other 12% stress that violent response might have short term result but is not a long-term remedy and other 41% condone the use of violence and think it is unbalanced and biased. Generally, the respondents form their opinions based on the assumption that the effectiveness and permissibility of a response depends on the situation and types of violence. *"This is not an effective method at all, because it always led to a great tensed situation" shares one of the respondents". "Sometimes it neutralizes the eruptions but does totally remedy it", "They will come and arrest whoever is causing the violence. Yes, it is effective" share other respondents.*

Apart from security actors, survey participants mentioned community actors who as well respond to erupted violence. Civil society, community and religious leaders, organized women, social council and heads of tribes, informal leaders, human rights NGOs were named among them. According to the answers, these actors respond through organizing meetings, putting pressure on the parties, using light weapons and responding violently, using appeals, engaging with both victims and perpetrators to mediate the situation. In some cases, as mentioned by the respondents, these actors can also be engaged in organized crime by taking the law in their hands and attacking people, burning houses and places of worship. According to the respondents, the effectiveness of non-violent responses is long-term and might not be on the surface, since many of these actors are acting behind the scenes.

The effectiveness of responses was also assessed in the survey through examination of the respondent`s perception of female security actors` use of violence in the pursuit of security. According to the survey, 53% of the responses indicate positive attitude towards approach taken by women in pursuit of security and demonstrate the desirability among key informants of involvement of women in security sector to increase effectiveness of the processes. According to the answers, women security actors discuss with people and try to solve problems, they tend to negotiate more and do not resort to arms as oppose to men, who resort to power dominance more due to patriarchal upbringing. Based on the responses, women security actors show empathy, listen, negotiate, their use of language and behavior is less violent, they are more understanding and compassionate. As a respondent mentions, *"I think females opt to create a dialogue than male actors. The patriarchal upbringing of male resort to power dominance than females"*. *"The extent of force differs and what kind of force is used differs and how it is used differs and the strength of the force differs. Women opt for negotiations before embarking on violent means, whereas men see use of force as the only way"* shares another respondent.

However, 12% of the respondents disagree with a statement that women have different approach in pursuit of security. As such, a respondent says that *"They are just as harsh and brutal"*. *"I don't think that gender approach can solve the issue of violence. We need to reorganize all the law enforcement agencies. It is necessary to dismiss people who have been working in these systems since the civil war, for whom violence is the use of the right of force, a way to suppress"* shares another respondent.