METHODS: SR + CIS

4 scholarly databases: Google Scholar, PubMed, Web of Science, and psychINFO

Systematic review
- Inclusion criteria (8)
- N = 33 articles

Critical Interpretive Synthesis (CIS)
- Theoretical saturation
- N = 38 academic & grey literature sources

Combined: insights in the gender-gap of sexual violence victimization
Life time prevalence SV

PREVALENCE RATES (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevalence SV in past 12 months or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>14,4</td>
<td>17,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>27,9</td>
<td>28,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>39,6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>11,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>44,3</td>
<td>39,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>59,5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>29,2</td>
<td>22,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>22,1</td>
<td>19,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>14,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>21,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>24,8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIGH(ER) RATES FOR MALE VICTIMS

Do overall low(er) rates of male SV victimization represent reality?

OR

Is gender-gap enhanced by

1. Inconsistencies in studying SV
2. Current societal perspectives of male and female gender roles and perceptions of SV?
1) INCONSISTENCIES IN RESEARCH APPROACHES

Studies including high(er) rates of male victimization included:

- Behaviourally specific questions
- Verbal pressure as coercion type
- Taking advantage of the incapacitated state of the victim
2) SOCIETAL PERSPECTIVES & SV PERCEPTIONS

Women
- Sexually passive
- Unexperienced
- ‘gatekeepers of intimacy’

Men
- Strong
- Dominant
- Sexual opportunist
- Sexually active, experienced
- Seduce women
STEREOTYPICAL RAPE SCRIPTS

Women = victims
Men = offenders

High rates

Low rates
COMMON PERCEPTIONS ABOUT SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Female rape myths
– “The victim is lying, deserved the sexual assault or asked for it because of how she was acting or what the victim was wearing”

Male rape myths
– “Real men can defend themselves”,
– “Men cannot be forced to have sex against their will”,
– “Men are less affected by sexual assault than women”, …
CONCLUSIONS

Current perspectives in society shape the way we look at sexual violence and its victims

- Excluding male victims

Influences the way victims look at their own SV experiences

- leading to lower rates of male victims of SV

Along with inconsistencies in studying the prevalence of SV this influences reporting of male SV victimization and its consequences
A NATIONAL POINT OF VIEW: SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN BELGIUM
National prevalence rates

PREVALENCE RATES (%)

Krahé et al. (2015) 10,1
Sexpert(2013) (-18) 10,7
Sexpert(2013) (+18) 22,3
Pieters et al. (2010) (-18) 13,8
Pieters et al.(2010) (+18) 8,9

Men
Women
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STUDIES

Methods
- Self-report online/telephone/PAPI, face-to-face interviews
- Voluntary sampling design or random sample

Definition
- Narrow or broad
- BSQ or non-BSQ

Assessment period
- Since age of consent or life time

Scope of study
- Focus on sexual interactions / sexual health / psychological, physical and sexual violence
CONCLUSION

- Variability in national studies

- Overall lack of nationally representative studies
  - Specifically for male sexual violence
    - 8 representative community samples worldwide
    - From which three at national level (Basile et al., 2007; Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000; Elliott et al., 2004)

- Representative research is needed on a national level taking variability into account
UN-MENAMAIS: UNDERSTANDING MECHANISMS, NATURE, MAGNITUDE AND IMPACT OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN BELGIUM
GENERAL AIM OF UN-MENAMAISS

UNDERstanding the MEchanisms, NAture, MAgnitude and IMPact of SEXual violence on female, male and transgender victims, their peers, offspring, professionals and society in Belgium
HIGHLIGHTED CORE OBJECTIVES

- To map how Belgian citizens and migrant residents in Belgium aged 16 -100 years, with different sexual orientations, frame sexual violence. (what they consider SV, causal mechanisms, acceptance of rape myths)

- To explore to what extent the Belgian population has been (in)directly exposed to sexual victimisation and perpetration since childhood. Intergenerational transmission included

- Establish indicatory pathways of how this exposure impacted the victims’ lives, as well as that of their family and peers and professionals they contacted for assistance
UN-MENAMAIS METHODOLOGY

Mixed-methods methodology:

1) National representative victimization & perpetration self-report study
   - Online questionnaire + face-to-face interviews for hard-to-reach population
   - N = 10,000 + N = 1,200
   - 4 different age groups (16-24; 25-49; 50-69; 70-100)

2) Qualitative study
   - 110 follow-up victim interviews across age groups, sexual orientations and trans/intersex
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