

Redefining Violence against Women and Framing Issues: Women's Movements in the Philippines and Turkey

Dilse Kaygisiz, McGill University*

Abstract

This paper compares women's movements in Turkey and the Philippines, two countries that had similarly strong women's movements yet different consequences on violence against women. I argue that the extent to which these movements could affect policymaking depends on the level of unification within the movements as well as the socio-political climate of each country. Using a most-similar design as a methodology, I investigate the ways in which women's movements formed and pushed the political agenda towards more protection for women against violence. I take the framing perspective of the social movement theory as my conceptual framework to argue that collective identities and the socio-political context were the deciding factors behind the different levels of violence against women in these two countries.

Keywords: violence against women, women's movements, social movement theory, Turkey, Philippines

*Biography: Dilse Kaygisiz is a master's student in the political science department at McGill University. Her research interests include societal attitudes related to violence against women and women's status in society, and the effect of laws on societal attitudes. Her thesis examines laws related to violence against women and attitudes towards domestic violence in Turkey, her home country. Methodologically, she is interested in both qualitative and quantitative methods to understand social and political phenomena. In her spare time, she enjoys reading, hiking, and eating good food.

Biographie: Dilse Kaygisiz est étudiante à la maîtrise au département de science politique de l'Université McGill. Sa recherche porte sur les attitudes sociétales liées à la violence contre les femmes et au statut des femmes dans la société, ainsi que sur l'effet des lois sur les attitudes sociétales. Sa thèse porte sur les lois relatives à la violence contre les femmes et aux attitudes à l'égard de la violence domestique en Turquie, son pays d'origine. Sur le plan méthodologique, elle s'intéresse aux méthodes tant qualitatives que quantitatives pour comprendre les phénomènes sociaux et politiques. Dans son temps libre, elle aime lire, faire des randonnées et manger de la bonne nourriture.

Résumé

Cet article compare les mouvements des femmes en Turquie et aux Philippines, deux pays qui ont connu des mouvements de femmes de la même force, mais qui ont eu des conséquences différentes sur la violence à l'égard des femmes. Je soutiens que la mesure dans laquelle ces mouvements peuvent influencer l'élaboration des politiques dépend du niveau d'unification des mouvements ainsi que du climat sociopolitique de chaque pays. En utilisant la méthodologie de la conception la plus similaire, j'étudie les façons dont les mouvements de femmes se sont formés et ont poussé l'agenda politique vers une plus grande protection des femmes contre la violence. J'adopte la perspective du cadrage de la théorie des mouvements sociaux comme cadre conceptuel pour soutenir que les identités collectives et le contexte sociopolitique ont été les facteurs décisifs derrière les différents niveaux de violence contre les femmes dans ces deux pays.

Mots clés : violence contre les femmes, mouvements des femmes, théorie des mouvements sociaux, Turquie, Philippines

Introduction

Women's movements have played a considerable role in raising awareness and securing women's rights in Turkey and the Philippines. Especially when it comes to violence against women, and especially domestic violence, an issue that continues to victimize an important part of the population, women's movements were able to influence the passing of landmark law reforms (Hega, Alporha, and Evangelista, 2017; Dinçer, 2020). In the Philippines, following the toppling of the Marcos rule in 1986, the blossoming of women's movements led to multiple reforms to fight violence against women. These efforts culminated in the Anti-Violence against Women and their Children Act of 2004. In Turkey, women's movements were at the core of the effort in updating the domestic violence law in 2012 to include all women regardless of their marital status in its protection sphere. Women's movements also put pressure on the government to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, commonly known as the Istanbul Convention. Yet, while domestic violence rates are among of the lowest in Southeast Asia for the Philippines, rates in Turkey represent relatively high and increasing trends (Philippine Statistics Authority and The United States Agency for International Development, 2017; UN Women, 2019a; Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies and Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, 2019; Dahal et al., 2020; UN Women, 2019b).

Previous studies have highlighted the importance of attitudinal and social change in making laws effective in their implementation (Glick et al., 2002; Bilz & Nadler, 2014; Kotsadam & Jakobsson, 2011). Moreover, scholarship on social movements found that one of the drivers of getting demands across the right platforms and being appropriately represented was by framing movements' goals into collective identities (Benford, 1997; Benford & Snow, 2000; Dobrowolsky, 1998). How can framing issues and the socio-political context explain the progress of women's movements regarding violence against women?

I argue that in both countries, women's movements redefined violence against women as a public issue by contesting the state rhetoric that domestic violence was an ungendered family matter, which led to the passing of protective laws against violence against women and more specifically on domestic violence. However, these

movements' attempts in the two countries to affect policy saw different consequences given the unified agenda that they could follow and the political climate in which they could operate. As will be elaborated in the latter half of this paper, social movement theory's framing perspective gives importance to collective identities and the socio-political context in analyzing these movements' appeal and goals over time.

In this paper, I will use secondary sources to analyze the implementation of domestic violence laws in the Philippines and Turkey. To analyze the extent to which women's movements in each of these countries were able to follow a unified agenda or not, I will use the framing perspective of the social movement theory. I will first provide an overview of the concept of violence against women and the conceptual frameworks in which the current scholarship investigates violence against women with a focus on domestic violence. I will then go over the design of this study as a most-similar design by highlighting the characteristics between the Philippines and Turkey that make them comparable for this topic. The following sections will focus on the history of women's movements in both countries as well as the ways in which they redefined violence against women as a public and political matter. I will then discuss the difference in outcomes between the two countries despite the common trend of redefining domestic violence as a public issue by looking at the movements' framing of their goals and demands through social movement theory. Lastly, I will analyze the more recent political climate that differentiated the success in unifying the goals and demands of women's movements in these two countries.

Violence against women: An overview

Violence against women is defined as "any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life" (United Nations, 1993, p. 2). Domestic violence is defined as "all acts of physical, sexual, psychological or economic violence that occur within the family or domestic unit or between former or current spouses or partners, whether or not the perpetrator shares or has shared the same residence with the victim" (Council of Europe, 2011, p. 3). As mentioned in the above definition, domestic violence can take several forms from physical to non-physical forms (Alkan, Özar, and Ünver, 2021).

Domestic violence, also referred to as intimate partner violence, has been deemed a human rights and public health issue that has nevertheless been mostly studied in the Global North, although research on the Global South has been growing (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006). The literature specific to domestic violence has been growing in the world from research on the correlates of domestic violence victimization among refugees (Um, Kim, and Palinkas, 2018) to the role of female autonomy in diminishing intimate partner violence (Bengesai & Khan, 2021; O. Yilmaz, 2018). Domestic violence is not limited to physical uses of force and can include different types of violence. The literature has increasingly focused on understanding the other types of violence and their impacts from economic violence (Alkan, Özar, and Ünver, 2021) to psychological violence (Domenech del Rio & Sirvent Garcia del Valle, 2017; Glick et al., 2002).

The current scholarship overall takes two different approaches to better understand violence against women. The feminist approach focuses on the gender roles and power dynamics that lead to violence against women (Lerner, 1986; Perrin et al., 2019; Sikweyiya et al., 2020; McCarthy, Mehta, and Haberland, 2018). The family violence approach, on the other hand, looks at socioeconomic characteristics as the center determinants of violence against women (Tolan, Gorman-Smith, and Henry, 2006; National Clearinghouse on Family Violence (Canada), 2008; Sartin, Hansen, and Huss, 2006). The concept of domestic violence has been studied using both approaches. The framing of family violence has nevertheless been criticized by feminist scholars, especially as the concept neutralizes gender in the study of all forms of abuse (Ellsberg and Heise, 2005). There is increasing consensus that domestic violence as well as violence against women in general are a gendered phenomenon that should be studied separately for men and women given the assumptions of women's subordinate role in society that often lead to violence against them. This increasing consensus also led to the change in Turkey's domestic violence law in 2012 in which all women regardless of their marital status were included, shifting to a certain extent the previous discourse that the law was to protect the family rather than the woman herself. It also led to the criminalization of marital rape in the Philippines. This growing shift of perspective can also be seen by looking at the types of journals in which studies on domestic violence were published. While previous studies on the issue got published on journals such as "The Journal of Family Violence" or "The Journal of Family and Marriage" (e.g., Akar et al., 2010; Amoah, Tenkorang, and Dold, 2021; Anderson, 1997), a growing number of

studies are in journals of criminology, sociology, and interpersonal violence (e.g. Bull, Carrington, and Vitis, 2020; Kelebek-Küçükarslan, and Cankurtaran, 2020; Perrin et al., 2019). Having gone over the scholarship around violence against women, this next section will now provide a more in-depth description of the two case studies of this paper and how the most-similar design method applies to this study.

Case studies: Turkey and the Philippines

As this paper is comparing women's movements and the relative successes of domestic violence laws, it is noteworthy to go over the similarities between the Philippines and Turkey that make the use of the most-similar design plausible.

Turkey and the Philippines are different countries on the face of it. The former's population is mostly composed of Muslims while the latter recognizes Christianity as its national religion. The Philippines has a colonial background delimited by multiple countries throughout time while Turkey was part of the Ottoman Empire and founded a republic in 1923. Despite these differences, these two countries have socio-political characteristics that make their women's movements comparable through a most similar systems design.

First, the evolution of women's movements and the acquisition of some fundamental rights have been similar in both countries. Women acquired the right to vote in 1937 in the Philippines following a struggle led by the country's first feminist organization the *Asociación Feminista Filipina* formed in 1905 to obtain the right to vote for women. Women in Turkey obtained the right to vote in 1934 following both Atatürk's agenda to include women in the public sphere but also the Turkish Woman's Union (TWU) (Dinçer, 2020). Women's movements also faced repression in both countries, although this was the case at different periods of times. TWU, which played the role to bridge women's movements that went back to the Ottoman times with republican women's movements, had to shut down in 1935 due to restrictions imposed on non-governmental organizations during the one-party rule (Dinçer, 2020). The restriction of women's movements came later in the Philippines. The Martial Law under Marcos also restricted women's movements in the Philippines until 1986. Women's movements in both countries also had similarities in their contents and composition. Both movements were influenced by the Western feminist political activism school of thought of politicization of the everyday life of women and women's movements in both countries

used messages such as the “personal is political” or “private is political” in relation to this influence (T. M. L. Lee, 2007). Scholars such as Dobrowolsky (1998) looked at the rise of feminist political activism as a sort of emancipatory politics for women’s rights and liberation in which their main goal was to seek representation in the public sphere. Scholars have also argued that women’s movements played a unique role in the process of re-democratization following military rule both in Turkey and the Philippines (Arat, 1994; Marlay, 1999). As will be argued later in this paper, collective identities were primordial to the concept of representation and played a role in distinguishing women’s movements’ respective successes in the Philippines and Turkey. It is also important to mention that the contents of women’s movements in both countries were not always “feminist” per se, especially prior to the increasing influence of demands from women’s movements of the second wave of feminism. The mass-based women’s organization formed in 1937 in the Philippines believed that women should restrain from getting involved in politics (Hega, Alporha, and Evangelista, 2017). Dinçer (2020) also argues that in Turkey some women’s organizations that were promoting gender equality were actually raising the issue of gender equality in an “anti-feminist” fashion.

Moreover, gender norms are present in both countries, even though they are projected in different socio-cultural contexts. In both countries, traditional gender norms and attitudes towards the role of women in society influence the opportunities that they get as well as what they are expected to do. Acts of violence against women in both countries often arise due to traditional, social gender norms in which the perpetrator justifies the act of aggression based on what the woman ought to do (Enrile and Agbayani, 2007; Glick et al., 2002).

Both countries have had a similar progression in their political scene even though the events did not happen in the same timeline. For one, both countries experienced martial law. The Philippines has been under nationwide martial law in 1898, between 1944 and 1945, and between 1972 and 1981. Moreover, some provinces such as Maguindanao and Mindanao have been under martial law in 2009 and 2017 respectively. Turkey was under martial law between 1960 and 1961, between 1971 and 1973, and between 1980 and 1983.

Lastly, both countries are currently governed by figures that have been widely studied given the strong and populist character of their respective leadership (Curato, 2017; Thompson, 2016; Teehankee and Kasuya, 2020; I. Yilmaz, 2018; Aytaç and Elçi, 2019;

Selçuk, 2016). Although Erdogan's presidency has been longer than Duterte's so far, their relative influence over the population is comparable. Given that Erdogan's presidency and hold on the country's institutions have been longer than Duterte's, women's movements had a freer political climate to defend their demands and ask for accountability on social reform policies in the Philippines compared to Turkey. This will be one of the arguments that led to different outcomes in the women's movements' respective successes and will be elaborated on in the latter half of this paper.

Brief history of women's movements in the Philippines and Turkey

The first part of this paper's argument looks at the similar way in which women's movements in the Philippines and Turkey were formed and redefined crucial misconceptions about women's role in society. The following section gives an overview of the accomplishments of women's movements in both countries and how they were able to influence social reform in different areas concerning violence against women.

In the Philippines, the first feminist organization emerged in 1905 while the country was under Hispanic colonial rule. The *Asociación Feminista Filipina* was engaged in women's struggle for the right to vote, which was obtained in 1937. While other women's organizations appeared after 1905, the mass-based women's organization *Samahang Makabayan* caught some attention in 1937. This organization was however not exactly feminist as it believed that women should restrain from participating in politics. The Second World War turned out to be devastating for women and their rights in the Philippines. Rape, sexual slavery, and the increase of "comfort women" to Japanese soldiers were some of the issues that women's movements brought forward, and ultimately these movements became central to the revolution against Japanese occupation (Lanzona, 2009). Following the 1969 elections, the number of social movements, including women's movements increased. These movements often rose along Marxist-inspired lines. The first two women's movements that explicitly focused on women's issues and particularly gender-based violence were founded in the 1980s. The *Philippine Women's Movement (PILIPINA)* in 1981 and the *Organization of Women for Freedom (KALAYAAN)* were the first two groups to focus on the fight against gender-based violence. They also supported women who got abused during the Martial law. *PILIPINA* and *KALAYAAN* can be

differentiated with one key element. PILIPINA focused on private issues of women that intersected with the public realm, which included domestic violence, and fought for women's liberation both from sexual and domestic violence. On the other hand, KALAYAAN focused on issues of national importance but also led a movement influenced by the Western feminist politics of the "personal is political" which will be elaborated in the next section on feminist thought. KALAYAAN was also a direct predecessor of the largest women's network alliance in the Philippines' contemporary history: GABRIELA. Founded in 1984, this organization was the first attempt to unify women's organizations around a feminist agenda. The evolution of women's movements in the Philippines thus led to the establishment of different alliances that regrouped broad common goals such as gender-based violence.

In Turkey, networks were formed as well; however, especially before the 1980s, they were mostly dominated by a single ideology. As will be seen in the later sections, the emergence of other feminist ideologies affected the movement's unity. Before going in-depth into the lack of unity that emerged, it is important to explain the evolution of women's movements in Turkey as well. In Turkey, women's movements go back to the Ottoman empire; however, women started gaining equal rights as men when the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923. The adoption of the Swiss civil code with the foundation of the Republic granted women equal rights in divorce, inheritance, and custody over children as men. In the late 1920s, a female activist named Nezihe Muhittin founded the first political party that focused on women's right to vote. Like the Philippines, women's movements were repressed at some point in Turkey; however, the repression was in the 1920s in the case of Turkey. Muhittin's party was later shut down given that multi-party politics were still not on the table for the current government at the time. The party was nonetheless replaced by the establishment of the Turkish Women's Union (TWU). Efforts by the TWU eventually led to the acquisition of the right to vote for women for municipal elections in 1930 and for general elections in 1934. Like the Philippine case, the 1980s represented the second wave of feminism in the Turkish context. By suppressing left-wing movements and imprisoning male activists, the 1980 military coup in Turkey left a vacuum that was covered by the feminist movement and consequently gained momentum. It is at that time that domestic violence was brought to the public's attention as an issue that needed to be dealt with politically (Diner and Toktaş, 2010). The increasing presence of women's organizations led to a campaign to reform the Civil Law and contest forms of assault on the female and the female body, more

specifically domestic violence (Dinçer, 2020). Pressure on the government led to the signing of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). In 1987, the first mass feminist protest took place in Istanbul. The issue of focus was violence against women, especially domestic violence, as well as the elimination of discriminatory laws. This is also the period in which other strands of feminism started to appear which, as will be argued later in this paper, affected the unity of the feminist movement in general.

Pressure on appropriate institutions led to the passing of different laws related to domestic violence, and different unions and networks were formed in both countries. As will be detailed in the sections below, this unity in the main goals that led to the formation of unions and networks can be seen as a necessary characteristic to pressurize for social reform.

Theorizing women's movements through social movement theory

This next section first elaborates on the social movement theory's framing perspective that will be used to unfold the arguments of the rest of this essay and then looks at the way in which women's movements redefined violence against women as a public matter.

Social movement theory is a broad inter-disciplinary study that seeks to understand why social actors mobilize and how social movements are formed and function. Within social movement theory, the framing perspective focuses on the "issues of grievance construction and interpretation, attributions of blame/causality" in understanding how social movements frame their demands and act upon them (Benford, 1997, p. 410). Social movements within the framing perspective are involved with the state and the media in which the frame they have adopted guides their action with local and national institutions (Benford and Snow, 2000; Meyer, Whittier, and Robnett, 2002). Particularly looking at women's movements, Dobrowolsky (1998) highlights the importance of collective identities in framing and seeking representation in a larger sphere. She argues that feminist movements, while they seek to accomplish various social, political, economic, and cultural goals, mobilize based on collective identities. These identities can include "gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, language, age and ability, among others" (Dobrowolsky, 1998, p. 716). Naples (2002) calls this a "materialist feminist approach"

in which the socio-political context can impact both the appeal that some women's movements gain as well as how over time their original goals can be countered by different movement frames. Overall, looking at the framing perspective through a materialist feminist lens provides two main contributions in analyzing women's movements: 1) framing issues through collective identities is crucial to have concrete demands and take actions to realize them, and 2) the socio-political context is an important determinant in analyzing the success or failure of goals promoted by women's movements. The section below looks at the necessity to frame issues in analyzing the redefinition of violence against women, and the ways in which the lack of a unifying frame impacted the Turkish women's movement's recent trajectory. Furthermore, the following section analyzes the difference in outcomes between the two countries by focusing on the second contribution related to the socio-political context.

Framing issues: The personal is political

The way in which women's movements redefined violence against women committed in private spheres as a public matter is a clear illustration of the advantages of framing issues within a movement into a broad collective goal. Issues regarding violence against women were ignored until women's movements presented it as a major problem in the vision for social change. The statement "the personal is political" or the "private is political" was a defining slogan during the second wave of feminism in the 1960s. This slogan recaps the argument that various women's movements were putting on the table at the time. The argument was that issues portrayed as "personal" women's problems are often not so personal as in they represent political issues that need to be dealt with in order to grant women their full rights (Hanisch, 2006). As such, while the first wave of feminism consisted of giving women equal rights, including the right to vote and hold property, the second wave of feminism took up the challenge to liberate women from different kinds of oppression (Thornham, 2001). These forms of oppression included instances that were previously seen as "personal" or "private" such as instances of domestic violence. While the second-wave feminist movement was not entirely homogeneous, and, even in the West, gathered criticism from other feminists who did not identify with the movement (Bhavnani and Davis, 1989), issues such as domestic violence were overall embraced by women's movements.

This emphasis on the public and political aspects of private or family issues surrounding women was especially important in the

eyes of women's movements when it came to domestic violence. Indeed, an important part of the scholarship around domestic violence saw the phenomenon as an issue of family violence. This scholarship took an ungendered approach in understanding domestic violence, which meant that gender roles and norms surrounding domestic violence were often ignored (Anderson, 1997; Izmirli, Sonmez, and Sezik, 2014). The feminist critique of this approach aimed at putting gender at the centre of violence against women as the abuse of women stemmed from "women's subordinate status in society with regard to men" (Ellsberg and Heise, 2005, p. 11). As future research proved that while men were more likely to get killed in combat or by a stranger, women were more likely to get killed or abused by an intimate partner, an increasing consensus started describing domestic violence as a form of gender-based violence in academia (Ellsberg and Heise, 2005).

The influence of Western feminist thought on women's movements in the Philippines and Turkey can be seen first and foremost through the appropriation of discourses around highlighting the ways in which the personal is political. In both countries, laws and policies around domestic violence were often under the framework of family violence. The discourse around domestic violence was centred around family violence and the reforms to combat said violence was focused on the need to protect the institution of the family. For instance, in the Philippines prior to 1997, marital rape, a form of domestic violence, was considered a crime against chastity instead of a crime against the person (Hega, Alporha, and Evangelista, 2017). This specific way of characterizing rape dated back to the Hispanic colonial era and prevented the effective prosecution of rape crimes. It is only with the creation of a coalition of thirteen women's organizations in 1992 called the Collective Initiative of Women for the Transformation of the Laws and Society that the new Anti-Rape Law was proclaimed in 1997 in the Philippines. This new law found itself among the landmark achievements of the Philippine women's movement as it was not only able to change the way rape was seen in society and bring back the focus on the women who have been victimized by it, but it also made marital rape a public issue that needed to be dealt with.

Similarly, women's movements in Turkey dealt with an environment in which domestic violence was seen as family violence and therefore policies were often around the need to protect the family. The 1998 law against domestic violence for instance was called the "Law to Protect the Family" and only protected married women. Having

the law exclude unmarried, separated, divorced, and even widowed women meant that the law's only objective was to protect the family and prevent it from separating instead of protecting the victims themselves. Like the movement around marital rape in the Philippines, women's movements in Turkey argued that the exclusionary character of the law made the issue about something other than the women who were victimized and thus prevented appropriate protection for them. The 1998 law also only protected women from certain types of violence and excluded psychological and economic violence.

For both countries' women's movements, redefining domestic violence meant two things. First, domestic violence needed to be brought forward and studied as a gendered phenomenon. Second, domestic violence needed to be recognized as encompassing different types of violence. In both countries, women's movements raised awareness of the need to protect the woman herself from different types of aggression that were committed against her with a gender-specific component. The need to protect victims from domestic violence needed to take over the need to protect the family. This nuance in the understanding of protection against domestic violence was primordial because it had prevented in the past the appropriate measures to get the victim away from the perpetrator. Prior to the 1987 protests against domestic violence in Turkey, for instance, a victim of domestic violence, a mother of three and pregnant with a fourth, was not granted her request to divorce her husband because the judge prioritized keeping the family united over the abuse that the husband had committed (Arat, 1994). Moreover, domestic violence did not only encompass physical and visible types of violence as were commonly assumed. For instance, in the Philippines, the common misconception that acts of sexual violence could not be criminalized between married partners and marital rape was often only seen as an act against chastity. As explained above, efforts led by women's movements led to a change in the understanding of marital rape and was concretized by the passing of the Anti-Rape Law.

So far, I have shown that women's movements in both the Philippines and Turkey both had a similar evolution and redefined domestic violence in a way that led to more inclusive domestic violence laws. However, as will be elaborated in the following sections, how women's movements interacted over the years with the state as well as the demands they were able to formulate led to different outcomes concerning domestic violence rates in the Philippines and Turkey.

Difference in outcomes: The importance of having a unifying agenda in women's movements

Despite the common trajectory of women's movements and their aspirations during the second wave of feminism in the Philippines and Turkey, the state of domestic violence and the effectiveness of the domestic violence laws are at different stages in these two countries. In order to understand why this is the case, it is important to look at the composition and demands of these movements through social movement theory. The next section applies the social movement theory's framing perspective to the cases of Turkey and the Philippines.

As highlighted above, the framing perspective within social movement theory gives importance to the adoption of a certain frame by social movements in order to conduct their actions based on this frame. This also influences the way in which they interact with the state and media. Their actions are also influenced by the socio-political context as argued by the materialist feminist approach within the framing perspective. Overall, the framing perspective of the social movement theory is particularly useful in understanding the differences in outcomes in the mobilization against domestic violence in Turkey and the Philippines.

Framing the issues at the heart of women's organizations into a common goal has been challenging in Turkey given the presence of feminist movements with different ideologies. While feminist activism in the 1980s was mainly anti-state and united, women's movements in the 1990s onward started to become more heterogeneous in their composition and demands. The main women's movements who were most closely associated to Western feminist ideas were called Kemalist or secularist feminist movements. While women's movements played a crucial role in the re-democratization of Turkey following the 1980 military coup (Arat, 1994), the 1980s also saw the resurgence in Islamic thought and Islamic feminism, arguably as a result of the military coup, as well as Kurdish nationalist feminism (Leake, 2012). Islamist feminists brought numerous topics to the table including the wearing of the veil in public institutions, a topic that is still pervasive today. Within Islamist feminism, divides also appeared: while some questioned the role of women within Islam, others saw Islam as the only way to guarantee true gender equality. These alternative women's movements and divisions within them grew over time and although similarities in the movements existed, fundamental

differences prevented a united coalition to be created. For instance, while women's movements overall agree that domestic violence is an issue which needs to be brought to the public's attention, they disagree on the ways in which to do so. For instance, while female autonomy and financial independence are seen as crucial for secular feminists (O. Yilmaz 2018; Alkan, Özar, and Ünver, 2021), some Islamist feminists believe that women's participation in the labour market should be discouraged as the latter is seen as a male-dominated abusive environment (Marshall, 2005). In that lens, Marshall (2005) argues that secular feminists and Islamist feminists compete over "who will influence public policy and public opinion regarding the role and status of women" (p. 118).

On the other hand, women's movements in the Philippines were able to be united on some fundamental issues. Although there have been multiple women's movements in the Philippines and that disagreement happened within women's movements, they found common ground in uniting against martial law under Marcos (Honculada and Ofreneo, 2018). In a way, women's movements grew in response to the way in which the Marcos dictatorship treated women and the issue of violence against women. The sexual violence and acts of rape committed during the Marcos era led to a coalition built on the issue of violence against women (L. Lee, 1988). It is in this mentality of unity against martial law and the violence against women that emerged from it that an increasing number of coalitions and collectives of women's movements were formed to increase their size and influence. The Collective Initiative of Women for the Transformation of the Laws and Society was one of these collectives formed that, through its efforts and pressure upon the government, led to the enactment of the Anti-Rape Law in 1997. As discussed earlier, this new law no longer discussed rape as a private matter and put an emphasis on the victim. The passing of this law was one of the earlier landmark achievements of the redefinition of violence against women as a public matter that women's movements in the Philippines as well as around the world were aiming to do.

Women's movements in the Philippines have by no means been exempt from opposition and counter-movement mobilization, especially by the Roman Catholic Church (Mendoza, 2013). For instance, women's movements have made limited advances when it comes to rights concerning same-sex marriage and abortion. However, women's movements related to violence against women and domestic violence in particular were relatively more united than in the

Turkish case to influence state policy and reform. While the framing is not as straightforward and easy as it was the case during the Marcos era in which social movements were univocally anti-Marcos, women's movements diversified but did not encounter fundamentally different agendas.

Difference in outcomes: The socio-political context

So far, this essay has discussed women's movements in Turkey and the Philippines and how they dealt with and put forward issues about violence against women into the political agenda. The framing perspective of social movement theory mentions the interaction with the state as being a determining element for women's movements (Benford and Snow, 2000). Women's movements often interact with the state and at times cooperate with governmental institutions to accomplish their goals. As such, women's movements are often bound to a certain political atmosphere and attitudes exhibited by the leadership in place that can influence their goals and accomplishments.

In the Turkish case, two main reasons were behind the decrease in the impact of women's movements in the last decade: an increase in state cooperation, and the state control of both governmental and non-governmental institutions. While the 1980s women's movements were mainly anti-state and united, state cooperation started in the 21st century and changed the composition of women's movements as well as which movements held power to influence social reform.

Naples' (2002) conception of the framing perspective in social movement theory as depending on the socio-political context in which women's movements find themselves is especially important in understanding some of the setbacks that these movements saw in Turkey. With the increase of Erdogan's control over institutions and discourse, women's movements alongside different sectors in the country were impacted. The withdrawal of the Turkish government from the Istanbul Convention represented a big setback for women's movements in Turkey. The Istanbul Convention, the event which in many cases led to the updating of the 1998 domestic violence law to include all women regardless of their marital status, sexual orientation, or gender identity in 2012, was a landmark achievement by women's movements. The government withdrew from it recently in 2012 following hints during speeches in the months prior to it that the

Convention steered away from its initial goals. The government's main arguments were that the Convention "normalized homosexuality and encouraged divorces" (Yalcinalp, 2021). This withdrawal as well as the arguments that justified it were criticized both nationally and internationally by women's movements. However, this did not stop the government from withdrawing from the Convention.

The socio-political context in the Philippines has been more prone to establish and then keep up with goals laid out by women's movements. The leadership of Duterte in the Philippines is also similar in some respects to the one of Erdogan in Turkey. They are both seen as "strong leaders" and are supported by a part of the population that supports executive aggrandizement (Thompson, 2021; Elazazi, 2021). However, the time that the current Turkish government spent in power has given them an exponential number of resources and control over institutions.

Duterte's presidency was shorter than Erdogan and thus his influence on this issue was in many ways cut short. Going forward similar trends in the Philippines can be observed, especially when it comes to women's movements' demands. Indeed, Duterte was known for his sexist and misogynist remarks. However, because of the various changes in administration in the Philippines, women's movements were able to unite and ask for social change in the last decade while in Turkey the increasing grip on institutions left little room for demands that were not seen as fit by the Erdogan administration.

Conclusion

Laws concerning violence against women have been established in both the Philippines and Turkey through women's movements that redefined violence committed against women in the private sphere as public issues needed to be prevented through public policy. Women's movements have had common main goals that united them. Whether it is the anti-Marcos rhetoric in the Philippines or the anti-state stance in Turkey, protesting domestic violence and advocating for more inclusive laws were led by independent women's movements. This showed the importance of framing movements through collective identities and goals in order to have a large enough influence to force social reform. The framing perspective of the social movement theory was also able to explain the loss of common goal uniting women's movements as they diversified in Turkey. While women's movements in the Philippines are also plural and do not all

have the same ideology, they agree on the primordial points. Moreover, the state control over the rhetoric that women's movements and social movements in general portray to a larger audience is stronger in Turkey due to the timeframe in which the current government has been in power. In the Philippines, the Duterte administration's use of executive power is reminiscent of Turkey; however, women's movements still have some space to frame their issues and contest the lack of implementation when necessary. In the Turkish case, the withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention showed the extent to which landmark achievements by women's movements can be reversed. Overall, the successful framing of issues was at the core of the widespread goal to bring the issue of domestic violence into the public sphere. Framing issues and the socio-political context were also the relative drivers of a heterogeneous sphere of feminist activism in Turkey relative to the Philippines.

References

- Akar, T., Aksakal, F. N., Demirel, B., Durukan, E., & Özkan, S. (2010). The Prevalence of Domestic Violence Against Women Among a Group Woman: Ankara, Turkey. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(5), 449–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-010-9306-8>.
- Alkan, Ö., Özar, S., & Ünver, S. (2021). Economic Violence against Women: A Case in Turkey. *PLOS ONE* 16(3), e0248630. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248630>.
- Amoah, H. A., Tenkorang, E. Y. & Dold, P. (2021). Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence against Women Who Married as Child Brides in Ghana. *Journal of Family Violence*, 36(4), 455–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00168-y>.
- Anderson, K. L. (1997). Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59(3), 655–69. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353952>.
- Arat, Y. (1994). Toward a Democratic Society: The Women's Movement in Turkey in the 1980s. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 17(2), 241–48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(94\)90030-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(94)90030-2).
- Aytaç, S. E., & Elçi, E. (2019). Populism in Turkey. In Daniel Stockemer (ed.). *Populism Around the World: A Comparative Perspective*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 89–108. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96758-5_6.

- Benford, R. D. (1997). An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective. *Sociological Inquiry*, 67(4), 409–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1997.tb00445.x>.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A., (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611–39. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>.
- Bengesai, A. V., & Hafiz T. A. K. (2021). Female Autonomy and Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the Zimbabwe Demographic and Health Survey, 2015. *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 23(7), 927–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2020.1743880>.
- Bhavnani, K-K., & Angela Y. D. (1989). Complexity, Activism, Optimism: An Interview with Angela Y. Davis. *Feminist Review*, 31, 66–81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1395091>.
- Bilz, K., & Nadler, J. (2014). Law, Moral Attitudes, and Behavioral Change. In Eyal Zamir & Doron Teichman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Behavioral Economics and the Law*, Oxford University Press, pp. 240-67. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199945474.013.0010>.
- Bull, M., Carrington, K., and Vitis, L. (2020). Gender-Based Violence: Case Studies from the Global South." In Sandra Walklate, Kate Fitz-Gibbon, Jane Maree Maher, & Jude McCulloch (eds.). *The Emerald Handbook of Feminism, Criminology and Social Change*, Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 373-94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78769-955-720201030>.
- Council of Europe. (2011). Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence Convention. Istanbul: *Council of Europe*. https://doi.org/10.1163/2210-7975_HRD-9953-2014005.
- Curato, N. (2017). Flirting with Authoritarian Fantasies? Rodrigo Duterte and the New Terms of Philippine Populism. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 47(1), 142–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2016.1239751>.
- Dahal, M., Khanal, P., Maharjan, S., Panthi, B., & Nepal, S. (2020). COVID-19 AND VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: THE EVIDENCE BEHIND THE TALK Insights from Big Data Analysis in Asian Countries. *Globalization and Health*, 16(1): 84. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00616-w>.
- Dinçer, P. (2020, May). The Potential for Dialogical Transversal Politics and Coalitional Solidarities in the Contemporary Women's Movement in Turkey. *Women's Studies*

- International Forum* 80, 102366.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102366>.
- Diner, C., and Toktaş, S. (2010). Waves of Feminism in Turkey: Kemalist, Islamist and Kurdish Women's Movements in an Era of Globalization. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 12(1), 41–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19448950903507388>.
- Dobrowolsky, A. (1998). Of 'Special Interest': Interest, Identity and Feminist Constitutional Activism in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique* 31(4), 707–42.
- Domenech del Rio, I., & Sirvent Garcia del Valle, E. (2017). The Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Health: A Further Disaggregation of Psychological Violence—Evidence From Spain. *Violence Against Women*, 23(14), 1771–89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216671220>.
- Elazazi, Y. K. (2021). The Case of Turkey under Erdoğan. *American University in Cairo*, 97.
- Ellsberg, M., & Heise, L. (2005). Researching Violence against Women: A Practical Guide for Researchers and Activists. Geneva, Switzerland: Washington, DC: *World Health Organization* ; Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH).
- Enrile, A., and Agbayani, P. T. (2007). Differences in Attitudes Towards Women Among Three Groups of Filipinos: Filipinos in the Philippines, Filipino American Immigrants, and U.S. Born Filipino Americans. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 16(1–2), 1–25.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J051v16n01_01.
- Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A. F. M., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., Watts, C. H. and WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women Study Team. (2006). Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence. *Lancet (London, England)*, 368(9543), 1260–69. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(06\)69523-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69523-8).
- Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., and Aguiar de Souza, M. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism and Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 292–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068>.
- Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies and Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey. (2019).

- Turkey Demographic and Health Survey. *Demographic and Health Survey Program*.
http://fs.hacettepe.edu.tr/hips/dosyalar/Ara%C5%9Ft%C4%B1rmalar%20-%20raporlar/2018%20TNSA/TDHS2018_mainReport_compresed.pdf.
- Hanisch, C. (2006). *The Personal Is Political*, 5.
- Hega, M D., Alporha, V. C., & Evangelista, M. S. (2017). Feminism and the Women's Movement in the Philippines: Struggles, Advances, and Challenges. *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung*, 33.
- Honculada, J., & Ofreneo, R. P. (2018). *The National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women, the Women's Movement and Gender Mainstreaming in the Philippines. Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?* Manchester University Press.
<https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526137494/9781526137494.00017.xml>.
- Izmirli, G O., Sonmez, Y. & Sezik, M. (2014). Prediction of Domestic Violence against Married Women in Southwestern Turkey. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, 127(3), 288–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgo.2014.06.011>.
- Kelebek-Küçükarslan, G., & Cankurtaran, Ö. (2020, July). Experiences of Divorced Women Subject to Domestic Violence in Turkey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, July, 0886260520927503.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520927503>.
- Kotsadam, A., & Jakobsson, N. (2011). Do Laws Affect Attitudes? An Assessment of the Norwegian Prostitution Law Using Longitudinal Data. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 31(2): 103–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irl.2011.03.001>.
- Lanzona, V. A. (2009). *Amazons of the Huk Rebellion: Gender, Sex, and Revolution in the Philippines*. The University of Wisconsin Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.08746>.
- Leake, A. (2012, August). A Brief History of the Feminist Movements in Turkey. *International Relations*, August, 6.
- Lee, L. (1988). The Contemporary Women's Movement in the Philippines. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 3(7–8), 217–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.1988.9961620>.
- Lee, T. M. L. (2007). Rethinking the Personal and the Political: Feminist Activism and Civic Engagement. *Hypatia*, 22(4): 163–79.

- Lerner, G. (1986). *The Creation of Patriarchy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heeb.00482>.
- Marlay, R. (1999). Review of *Organizing for Democracy: NGOs, Civil Society, and the Philippine State*, by G. Sidney Silliman and Lela Garner Noble. *Pacific Affairs*, 72(4), 613–14. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2672427>.
- Marshall, G. A. (2005). Ideology, Progress, and Dialogue: A Comparison of Feminist and Islamist Women's Approaches to the Issues of Head Covering and Work in Turkey. *Gender and Society*, 19(1), 104–20.
- McCarthy, K. J., Mehta, R., & Haberland, N. A. (2018). Gender, Power, and Violence: A Systematic Review of Measures and Their Association with Male Perpetration of IPV. *PLoS ONE*, 13(11), e0207091. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207091>.
- Mendoza, D. J. (2013, September). Engaging the State, Challenging the Church: The Women's Movement and Policy Reforms in the Philippines, *September*, 5.
- Meyer, D. S., Whittier, N. & Robnett, B. (2002). *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State*. New York: Oxford University Press, Incorporated. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/mcgill/detail.action?docID=241291>.
- Naples, N. A. (2002). Materialist Feminist Discourse Analysis and Social Movement Research: Mapping the Changing Context for 'Community Control. In David S. Meyer, Nancy Whittier, and Belinda Robnett (eds.). *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- National Clearinghouse on Family Violence (Canada). (2008). *Aboriginal Women and Family Violence*. Ottawa: National Clearinghouse on Family Violence. https://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/phac-aspc/aboriginal_women-e/HP20-10-2008E.pdf.
- Perrin, N., Marsh, M., Clough, A., Desgropes, A., Phanuel, C. Y., Abdi, A., Kaburu, F., et al. (2019). Social Norms and Beliefs about Gender Based Violence Scale: A Measure for Use with Gender Based Violence Prevention Programs in Low-Resource and Humanitarian Settings. *Conflict and Health*, 13(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13031-019-0189-x>.
- Philippine Statistics Authority & The United States Agency for International Development. (2017). Philippines National Demographic and Health Survey. *National Demographic*

- and Health Survey Program.
<https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR347/FR347.pdf>.
- Sartin, R. M., Hansen, D. J., & Huss, M. T. (2006). Domestic Violence Treatment Response and Recidivism: A Review and Implications for the Study of Family Violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*(5), 425–40.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2005.12.002>.
- Selçuk, O. (2016). Strong Presidents and Weak Institutions: Populism in Turkey, Venezuela and Ecuador. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies, 16*(4), 571–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14683857.2016.1242893>.
- Sikweyiya, Y., Addo-Lartey, A. A., Alangea, D. I., Dako-Gyeke, P., Chirwa, E. D., Coker-Appiah, D., Adanu, R. M. K., & Jewkes, R. (2020). Patriarchy and Gender-Inequitable Attitudes as Drivers of Intimate Partner Violence against Women in the Central Region of Ghana. *BMC Public Health 20*(1), 682. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08825-z>.
- Teehankee, J. C., & Kasuya, Y. (2020). The 2019 Midterm Elections in the Philippines: Party System Pathologies and Duterte's Populist Mobilization. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics 5*(1), 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2057891119896425>.
- Thompson, M. R. (2016). Bloodied Democracy: Duterte and the Death of Liberal Reformism in the Philippines. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 35*(3), 39–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341603500303>.
- (2021). Pushback after Backsliding? Unconstrained Executive Aggrandizement in the Philippines versus Contested Military-Monarchical Rule in Thailand. *Democratization, 28*(1), 124–41.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2020.1835860>.
- Thornham, S. (2001). Second Wave Feminism. In *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism*, 2nd ed. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203011010-11/second-wave-feminism-sue-thornham>.
- Tolan, P., Gorman-Smith, D., & Henry, D. (2006). Family Violence. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*(1), 557–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190110>.
- Um, M. Y., Kim, H. J., & Palinkas, L. A. (2018). Correlates of Domestic Violence Victimization Among North Korean Refugee Women in South Korea. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(13): 2037–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515622297>.

- UN Women. (2019a). Ending Violence against Women and Girls. *UN Women | Europe and Central Asia*. 2019. <https://eca.unwomen.org/en/where-we-are/turkey/ending-violence-against-women>.
- (2019b). Facts and Figures: Ending Violence against Women and Girls. *UN Women | Asia and the Pacific*. 2019. <https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/focus-areas/ending-violence-against-women/evaw-facts-and-figures>.
- United Nations. (1993). Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women. Declaration 48/104. *United Nations Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights*. <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/eliminationvaw.pdf>.
- Yalcinalp, E. (2021, 26 March). Turkey Erdogan: Women Rise up over Withdrawal from Istanbul Convention. *BBC News*, sec. Europe. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-56516462>.
- Yilmaz, I. (2018). Islamic Populism and Creating Desirable Citizens in Erdogan's New Turkey. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 29(4), 52–76.
- Yilmaz, O. (2018). Female Autonomy, Social Norms and Intimate Partner Violence against Women in Turkey. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 54(8), 1321–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2017.1414185>.