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Chapter 6. Comparative Analysis of Korean Conscripts and Korean Peacekeeper Masculinities

Introduction

To answer the central research question of the thesis - how does involvement in peacekeeping operations impact on soldiers’ militarized masculinities? - this research adopted a comparative approach that involved in-depth, semi-structured interviews with two groups of Korean men. The first group, as a control group, consisted of ten veterans, who completed military service in Korea but who did not experience deployment to peacekeeping. The second group consisted of fourteen men, six veterans and eight professional soldiers, who were deployed in various types of peacekeeping missions. By engaging with participants’ reflections either following military discharge or in the post-deployment phase, I grasped how they made sense of their experiences of military life including peacekeeping upon return to their home society, and consequently gained insights into the impact of those experiences on the construction of participants’ militarized masculinities.

Comparison of qualitative data collected from those interviews revealed that there were similarities and differences between the two groups as to perceptions of hegemonic masculinity and gender relations, and militarized masculinities that were shaped and reshaped in military life. Based on this, this chapter explains similarities found between the two groups first and then differences. However, there were also differences within each group because of the heterogeneity
of each group. Therefore, the third section addresses internal differences in each group. Finally, a conclusion is made that peacekeeping does contribute to constructing alternative militarized masculinities that are more open to embrace traditionally feminized attributes, which could be more effective at achieving peace, but does not lead to a fundamental challenge to hierarchical gender relations militaries are based on.

6.1. Similarities

6.1.1. Perceptions of Hegemonic Masculinity

Both groups of men regarded the role of good family provider as the most important element to achieve hegemonic status in contemporary Korean society. Although most participants tried to distance themselves from ‘traditional’ men who were stuck in Confucian gender norms, described in chapter 2, and expressed a desire to be more involved with egalitarian family division of labour, the role of man as a successful family provider was still very important to the construction of their masculinities and self-perception. Neoliberal subjectivities such as competitiveness, constant self-development and competence at work were also considered to be crucial to embody hegemonic masculinity in both groups, especially by men in their twenties and thirties. According to Choo, contrary to older generations, to whom employment, dating, marriage, and starting families were easily achievable with a college education, these goals have
become a difficult project for young men. However, instead of expressing anxiety, frustration or insecurity they were facing in the neoliberal era, these young men stressed the need to be equipped with proper qualities to survive in a highly competitive Korean society. Although Choo argues that nowadays more men appear to embrace non-traditional gender norms because the precarity of life caused by neoliberalism makes it more difficult for men to stick to the traditional life path such as the romantic relationship to marriage to male-breadwinner model, most participants tended to internalize heteronormative gender norms in terms of their role in the family. Not only married men but also single men in both groups emphasized the responsibility for supporting their prospective families without monetary problems. That is, embodying neoliberal subjectivity was articulated as a tool for becoming a good family provider.

6.1.2. Construction of Multiple Militarized Masculinities

Another similarity between the two groups was there were multiple militarized masculinities constructed. As the empirical work has revealed, the military was not a site for the construction of a single embodied masculinity. Although participants of both groups agreed that the military is a masculinist institution, characterized by hyper-masculine culture, this did not obscure the fact that multiple, diverse masculinities were shaped and reshaped with reference to the changing circumstances which participants faced during military life. Among various factors that affected
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the extent to which participants internalized military norms and culture, military ranks and roles had a significant impact on the construction of different types of militarized masculinities. With regard to ranks, enlisted soldiers tended to explain the development of their military identities according to the different expectations each ranking encompassed and the degree to which they were able to exert power and authority varying across the ranks. Most conscripts, when they were in the lower ranks, struggled to adapt to military culture that involved strict surveillance, coercive hierarchy, and particular types of gendered culture such as non-physical forms of bullying and hazing, and heavy emphasis on stoicism and physical prowess. However, moving up the ranks, enlisted soldiers got used to military culture and their military life began to go more easily. Regarding this socialization process, K10 called it ‘militarization’ and explained its impact on him. Although K10 found hyper-masculine military culture unfit for his individual identities, he tried to comply with the militaristic norms and values and as a result, he discovered one day that he acted like an aggressive, violent senior of his and treated his subordinates very badly. Contrary to enlisted soldiers, officers in both groups rarely talked about difficulties when they joined the military. Rather, they focused on how they earned trust from subordinates, using power and authority derived from their higher position. At the same time, they tended to claim their masculinities as more mature, self-disciplined, emotionally controlled, and intelligent than their subordinates’. They considered enlisted soldiers as the ones who should be led and disciplined by their guidance and elaborate military rules. According to P11, a senior professional soldier, there would likely be a wide range of misbehaviors between young male soldiers even
in peacekeeping, such as shooting incidents. He deemed young enlisted soldiers to be affected by environmental factors easily and for this reason, he agreed that there would be need of strict rules and regulations during deployment, in order to prevent soldiers from getting involved in any accident or misconduct. This view was generally shared by other professional soldiers.

With regard to military roles, almost all participants referred to this as a marker of diverse military identities and a number of different strands of masculine hegemony emerging across job specialties. As Barrett found in his study, individual soldiers identified with certain masculinities and differentiated themselves from others according to their job. For example, while P3, whose role was military police, stressed physical strength and rapid response to emergencies, P13, whose role was technical engineer, stressed the possession of professional expertise and skilled use of specialist equipment. Both of them served in the Army as conscripts but the qualities they drew upon to construct military identities were quite different. Across the whole range of occupations, for participants who performed combat-related roles in both groups, the association of military roles with self-perception as soldiers appeared to be the most explicit. They tended to embody the hegemony of the warrior model of militarized masculinities. Soldierly attributes such as risk-taking, perseverance, possession of professional skills and expertise, combat-readiness and physical strength were commonly emphasized in their narratives, which set them apart from military members with different occupational specialties. They found their

military service more purposeful than others because they believed that they made a direct
contribution to the defense of the national territory, the core function of the military. In
peacekeeping, although the Korean troops did not engage in combat activities, one liaison officer
(P11), who had many indirect experiences of combat through work with the US military in
Afghanistan, viewed peacekeeping as an extension of the traditional military operation, war-
fighting. He valorized combat and its associated skills and attitudes of the US soldiers.
Generalizations cannot be made about the relationship between soldiers’ roles and the potential
for their constructing peacekeeper masculinity. However, given that participants who performed
combat roles expressed more war-fighting ethos and valorization of the masculine hegemony of
warriors, it could be argued that it would be more difficult for soldiers in combat occupations to
develop alternative militarized masculinities than other soldiers who are less combat involved.

6.1.3. Masculinization of Military Service/Peacekeeping

Both groups masculinized their military life, which was one of the ways to assign meanings to
their military service. Participants in the first group had ambivalent views of military training that
involved numerous strenuous physical activities and psychological difficulties. Particularly during
basic training, as the first experience of being exposed to military socialization, most participants
in the first group felt extremely stressed about adjusting to new norms, languages, and disciplines
and acquiring basic military skills. Common basic training demands included being yelled at or
having a negative interaction with instructors, performing tasks under time pressure or in
physically demanding situations, lack of sleep and privacy, and managing stress and anger at
some perceived unfairness and absurdity. All these things were regarded as something related to backward military culture and psychological stressors, but at the same time, they made participants feel very proud of themselves to endure all the hardships and to pass one of the most important tests of manhood in Korean society. Among various factors, experience of physical hardship was particularly crucial for participants’ transition from civilian to members of the armed forces and for the development of their military identities. That is, through strenuous physical activities, strong bonds between military members were formed, and improved self-perceptions were attained. K7, who was in deep psychological distress in the basic training, admitted that a strong sense of comradeship was built among recruits as they went through hard times together. Physical hardship also tended to be seen as a means to strengthen soldiers’ physical prowess. K6 and K9, who considered physical strength to be very important in their masculinities, enjoyed challenging themselves and proving themselves to be strong through physically demanding training and test. Others, even if they did not prefer more rigorous activities as K6 and K9 did, also assigned meanings to physical training in that they could improve their ability to cope with physical demands, which finally resulted in improved mental endurance. Although military life involved many things that were traditionally considered as feminine such as cleaning and tidying oneself up, many participants saw these ‘feminine’ activities as an
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important part of military life as well for successful completion of military service. In this way, military service was masculinized by participants.

Participants in the second group also masculinized peacekeeping experiences. As many participants noted, the operational environment in deployed countries was quite challenging in comparison of the one in Korea. Serving in the precarious security conditions in fragile states made participants feel tense and sometimes concerned about being fired upon when unarmed. Even though the Korean troops were very attentive to the protection of their own forces and did not partake in combat activities, participants always kept alert to the possibility that they could be attacked, lacking a full range of defense capabilities. For this reason, regardless of occupations in peacekeeping, all participants had a high threat perception during deployment and this led participants to link peacekeeping to being a mission that was much more difficult and tougher than military service in Korea.

In addition to security issues in peacekeeping, participants perceived living and working conditions to be challenging as well. For example, many participants identified a lack of basic facilities such as transport, communications, and power supplies as a difficulty in performing their duty. It was not easy for them to adapt to different climate and food in a new environment. Particularly for participants who did not have many chances to leave the base, feeling of isolation or boredom was another difficulty they had to cope with. One professional soldier (P6) expressed

sadness about the loss of missing key moments in his personal life caused by the deployment away from the everyday experiences of his marital and familial life.\textsuperscript{798} In this vein, participants viewed the ability to endure unfavorable environmental conditions and psychological stress as an important quality to serve as peacekeepers. Participants learned how to persevere and to overcome difficulties through peacekeeping and believed this to be an important asset in their future life.

\textbf{6.1.4. Low-level Internalization of Warfighting Ethos}

Another notable similarity between the two groups was they did not appear to base their militarized masculinities on combat prowess. As mentioned above, for both groups, endurance of hardship and tolerance of harsh conditions of working life lay at the heart of soldierly qualifications as well as civilian masculinities. Warfighting ethos was not dominant in their narratives. This could be partly explained on the basis of the unique historical, social and political context of Korea. According to Son, historically, the myth of “white-clad folks” or “peace-loving nation”, which has not invaded any country in its history spanning thousands of years, is prevalent among the majority of Koreans.\textsuperscript{799} He also argues that with the end of the Cold War, the transformation of Korea’s international security identity from an anti-communist garrison state to a humanitarian power took place, and this, in turn, shaped general public’s attitude towards

\textsuperscript{799} Son, “From a Garrison State to a Humanitarian Power?: Security Identities, Constitutive Norms and South Korea’s Overseas Troop Dispatches”, p. 566
warfighting activities. A vibrant democracy and the growth of civil society in the post-Cold War period also contributed to the rise of anti-war sentiment in Korea.  

Hong argues that the experience of the Korean War constructed Koreans’ general view on war and peacekeeping. The Korean War made the majority of South Koreans believe that it would be their moral duty to help those who are caught in armed conflict by sending troops.  

Besides, given that the complexity of military personnel’s identities emerges not only out of organizational tasks that are commissioned to the military but also out of changes that take place within the wider society, it could be argued that general public’s attitude towards warfighting affected the extent of Korean soldiers’ internalization of warfighting ethos.

Participants’ lower internalization of warfighting ethos could be also attributed to the Korean military system, conscription. Korea falls into the hardcore conscription countries where the percentage of conscripts exceeds two thirds of the armed forces and the issue of recruiting young men to the army has always had various meanings and influences at the military, social, and national levels. In this study, three participants (P1, P11, and P12) went to Korea Military Academy for the purpose of becoming professional soldiers and the rest of participants were
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conscripted in their twenties, regardless of their current military status. Fransen, who examined the coherence between the US Army’s recruitment advertisements and the enlistment motivation among American soldiers,\(^{805}\) noted that ‘some men volunteered, or rather enlisted before being drafted’ when the military service was mandatory in the US. He explained that volunteers were able to have some influence on their choice of service and time period, and benefits, “rather than leaving themselves at the mercy of local draft boards”.\(^{806}\) This means that in the conscription system, even when men volunteer, their enlistment motivation could be affected by the avoidance of being conscripted. With this, given that there has been the apparent uncontroversial and unbreakable public consensus on the necessity of male conscription in Korean society,\(^ {807}\) conscription could be seen to be inextricably intertwined with the construction of Korean men’s masculinities, for both conscripts and professional soldiers. Despite the significance of conscription and its effect on individual soldiers, however, it was difficult to investigate to what extent the conscription affected Korean soldiers’ masculinities, particularly warfighting masculinity. According to Parmak and Tyfa, the relevance of conscription as a research topic has been easily dismissed or research into conscription has been considered outdated. Recently, some studies have emerged discussing the influence mandatory military service can have on state military affairs and public support for armed conflicts, but the everyday lives of individual conscripts and


\(^{806}\) Ibid., p. 181

\(^{807}\) Kwon, “A Feminist Exploration of Military Conscription”, p. 28
the construction of their military identities are surprisingly understudied.\textsuperscript{808} Despite the limitation, however, combining an analysis of participants' narratives about military life and recent studies about experience of conscripts and their views on national defense and military service enabled me to see that for the participants who were conscripted, warfighting ethos was not a dominant element for the construction of their military identities.

The concept of citizen-soldier, who has dual identity as a citizen and soldier, could explain the participants’ lower internalization of war fighting ethos as well. A citizen-soldier is distinguished from his professional or semi-professional counterparts in two ways.\textsuperscript{809} Regarding the motivation for military service, while volunteers enlist for various reasons such as economic benefits, prospect of unemployment in civilian life, patriotism, and the chance of adventure,\textsuperscript{810} conscription generally takes places involuntarily and can be perceived as unwanted by the recruited individuals. There is little choice whether to accept or not based on the individual’s personal preference or life perspectives.\textsuperscript{811} Regarding the citizen-soldier identity, Cohen argues that he is fundamentally civilian. However much he may yield to the exigencies of military life, however he may become

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{808} Parmak, Merle and Tyfa, David A. (2022), “The Link Between Conscription Experience and Conscripts’ Attitude Toward National Military Service at the End of Training: An Example from Estonia”, \textit{Armed Forces & Society}, Vol. 00, No. 0, p. 2
\textsuperscript{810} Fransen, “Selling Military Service During Wartime: U.S. Army Recruitment Advertising and Enlistment Motivation During the War Against Terror”, p. 179
\textsuperscript{811} Parmak and Tyfa, “The Link Between Conscription Experience and Conscripts’ Attitude Toward National Military Service at the End of Training: An Example from Estonia”, p. 5
\end{flushright}
proficient in military skills, in the core of his being, he is a member of civil society. As revealed in the perception of military service by conscripted soldiers in both groups, Korean men usually linked military service to a chance to learn skills useful in a civilian life, rather than focusing on military-specific skills. What participants placed an emphasis on in making military life masculine had more to do with endurance of physical and mental hardship. Some participants (K6, K9, and P3) explicitly desired to be physically fit and strong, but they did not relate this to wish for experiencing combat in brutal violence or fighting the enemy face-to-face.

Kosonen et al. and Adler et al. examined Finnish conscripts’ ambivalence towards conscription and their roles in national defense, and mental health training provided to NATO nations, respectively. According to Kosonen et al., the dual identity of Finnish conscripts made them question the legitimacy of combat and the act of killing others. From this, the authors suggested that the resistance to participation in war fighting could be stronger for conscripts than for professional soldiers. The authors concluded that in a situation with low risk of military threat to Finland, conscripts viewed military service as a waste of time for an individual citizen. Similarly, according to my participants, although the Korean government and military experts have stressed the ever-present North Korean threat and disadvantageous locations with
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continuous disputes or security threats by larger surrounding countries,\textsuperscript{816} many conscripts remained skeptical about military service. Adler et al. also showed that conscripts had different interests and concerns to volunteers. While the main concern of occupationally oriented volunteers was military-specific skills and good performance, conscripts were more interested in adjusting to the military service and managing negative feelings.\textsuperscript{817} This finding was consistent with experiences of my participants who were conscripted. First, due to the shorter service period compared to the All-Volunteer Military Service (AVMS), it was difficult for conscripts to fully master combat skills.\textsuperscript{818} Second, conscripts could not see explicit links between military knowledge and skills and personal benefits for their career and this made them more interested in non-military, civilian vocations.\textsuperscript{819} They focused on cultivating qualities such as leadership and management that could benefit them later in civilian jobs. Except for one conscript (K10) who expressed a personal willingness to participate in combat after the experience of military threats to national security during his service, for the rest of the conscripts, themes like combatant function or armed battle rarely emerged. Most participants including professional soldiers tended to interpret a socio-normative burden created by the obligation to complete military service as

\textsuperscript{817} Adler, A.B. et al., “NATO Survey of Mental Health Training in Army Recruits”, pp. 764-765
\textsuperscript{819} Parmak and Tyfa, “The Link Between Conscription Experience and Conscripts’ Attitude Toward National Military Service at the End of Training: An Example from Estonia”, p. 17
part of the maturation process and a means of achieving full membership in society. As P5 noted, military service was meaningful because it helped adjust to ‘militarized organizational culture’ in Korean society after discharge from the military, not because participants became ‘real’ soldiers through it. Therefore, it could be said that Korean conscripts’ dual identity as civilians and as soldiers made warfighting ethos less significant in their militarized masculinities.

In varying degrees, professional soldiers in the second group mentioned distinct characteristics that civilians would not possess such as the ability to handle the rigors of a military lifestyle, keeping up with physical fitness routines, and managing a lack of privacy. However, the linkage between their soldierly qualifications and warrior function was not explicit, as in the narratives of conscripts. There was only one officer (P11) who valorized warfighting activities and wanted to have more combat experiences. For him, peacekeeping was viewed as a field where military training could be put into practice and military strength could be improved. The rest of the officers, whose occupations were potentially comparable to a civilian equivalent such as lawyers and medical doctors, emphasized how they could apply their professional skills and expertise properly for the sake of military objectives including peacekeeping missions. This could be because they had no experience of real combat that could involve loss of close comrades during operations. Duncanson explains that British soldiers’ attitude towards their mission changed from idealism to cynicism when they experienced fearful events such as witnessing their comrades’
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death. In this case, soldiers’ warfighting ethos became stronger.\textsuperscript{821} Contrary to this, participants in this research, including senior officers who served in the military for years (P7 and P11), did not have those experiences. In addition, in line with Korea’s norms for dispatch of troops overseas, all professional soldiers consented to sending non-combat troops for humanitarian work as they did not see warfighting as legitimate activities for peacekeeping. For this reason, contrary to my expectations that professional soldiers would be more into enemy-centric warfighting approach and practices,\textsuperscript{822} Korean professional soldiers in my study did not valorize combat activities much or support using force for resolving conflict.

6.1.5. Perceptions of Female Soldiers

The most remarkable similarity between the two groups was the perception of female soldiers. Given that masculinist military culture inscribes gender differences as natural and positions masculinity both in opposition to and superior to femininity,\textsuperscript{823} comparison of participants’ perception of female soldiers was very important to see whether peacekeeping reinforced or challenged the dominant discourse of gender in the military. Since the UN adopted a gender perspective in all peacekeeping processes with a view to achieving gender equality\textsuperscript{824} and the

\textsuperscript{821} Duncanson, \textit{Forces for Good? Military Masculinities and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan and Iraq}, pp. 141-142


\textsuperscript{823} Weitz, “Vulnerable Warriors: Military Women, Military Culture, and Fear of Rape”, p 165

\textsuperscript{824} Jenne and Bisshopp, “Female Peacekeepers: UNSC Resolution 1325 and the Persistence of Gender Stereotypes in the Chilean Armed Forces”, p. 135
proportion of women in peacekeeping has steadily increased for both military and police
divisions,\textsuperscript{825} it was expected that the second group would show more gender egalitarian attitudes
towards female soldiers. However, there was no big difference between the two groups.

Stereotypical views on female soldiers were dominant in both groups. They focused on benefits
to military/peacekeeping operations from inclusion of women, rather than gender equality as a
goal in itself. First, the gendered division of labor was justified on the grounds of gender
essentialism both in national armies and peacekeeping. Women’s weaker physical condition was
seen as the biggest barrier for female soldiers to perform combat related roles. Both groups of
men noted that physical fitness was an uncompromising requirement of combat soldiers and for
this reason, female soldiers must be as capable of fitting in as their male colleagues to conduct
combat activities. In this vein, some participants thought that implementing gendered physical
affiliation tests would make the whole military less competitive.\textsuperscript{826} P11’s statement about female
officers epitomized the general view of most participants on female soldiers. P11 thought that
female soldiers received extra support from their male colleagues and because of this, they could
work in almost every sector in the military. Despite saying that lifting restrictions on women’s
role in the military was desirable, what P11 implied was women, as the other, needed to be

\begin{footnotes}
\item Karim, “Reevaluating Peacekeeping Effectiveness: Does Gender Neutrality Inhibit Progress?”, p. 822
\item Koeszegi et al., “The War against the Female Soldier? The Effects of Masculine Culture on Workplace Aggression”, p. 231
\end{footnotes}
treated differently. In peacekeeping, participants took women’s roles of care and support and the gendered protection norm for granted. A common assumption of participants in the second group was that women are inherently kind, gentle, empathetic and nonthreatening and because of these feminine attributes, female soldiers were seen to be able to make a unique contribution to peacekeeping. However, was paradoxical in a sense that military women’s participation in peacekeeping was legitimized by a discourse that advocated the exclusion of women from the military.

Second, most participants in both groups did not question or problematize the institutionalized gender hierarchy embedded in the military and peacekeeping. Some participants in the first group were aware of women’s position in the masculinist institution but they considered women’s difficulties as inevitable since the military was originally one of the most male-dominated sectors. Many participants in the first group also consented to the need of increasing the number of women in the military. However, the main reason behind their argument was men would not be available in sufficient numbers in the low-birth and hyper-aging demographic cliff era, not that they considered women to be equal in terms of soldierly qualification. Regarding the peacekeeping context, almost all participants in the second group were not aware of how
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peacekeeping operations could be structurally, culturally masculinized. They said that the proportion of women soldiers in peacekeeping was much lower than their representation in the Korean armed forces, ranging from a mere one to five percent of the military personnel. As pointed out in the previous studies on peacekeeping, the Korean peacekeeping troops were also largely staffed by men. Therefore, given the fact that male numeric dominance in the military reinforces masculine culture that pervades the military function, it can be claimed that male-dominant peacekeeping is a masculinized space as well. Despite this, however, no participants paid attention to how this gendered culture in peacekeeping would affect the performance of female soldiers’ tasks or overall effectiveness of peacekeeping. This all showed that participants in both groups held gender stereotypes.

One possible explanation for this could be the ways gender was taken up in gender training delivered to soldiers both in the national armies and peacekeeping. All participants received gender training for prevention of sexual assault of both women and men within the military during their service in Korea. What was problematic was gender in training was typically reduced to equivalent difference between men and women, heavily focused on the issue of sexual violence, and was framed as something that could be addressed through problem-solving frameworks. The Defense White Paper in 2016 represented this limited understanding of gender. According
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to it, the Korean military ‘has established a gender equality center in each service, employed
gender equality officers in division-level units, and implemented comprehensive measures to
stamp out sexual violence’. Despite being called a ‘gender equality center’, its training material
heavily centered on prevention and eradication of sexual violence in the military. For example,
there is mandatory education for sexual violence prevention provided to field officers and higher-
ranking officers and a criminal punishment as well as disciplinary measures for sexual offenders.\textsuperscript{832}

There was no consideration of how differences between men and women are constructed and
perpetuated and how soldiers’ internalized understandings of gender impact the way they create
and view gendered culture in the military. Rather, gender related issues were believed to be
solved by appropriate skills and capabilities. That is, in the extant gender training, there appeared
to be the repetition of a narrative that argues that sex as biological is natural and unchangeable
in opposition to gender as cultural phenomenon that can and does change.\textsuperscript{833} Therefore, the
view of military women as ‘the other’ was not challenged.

For the peacekeeping group, pre-deployment gender training was conducted in a similar way.
Except for one participant who was in charge of gender training (P6), the second group received
only short gender training like a single classroom-based workshop as a part of peacekeeping

at
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\textsuperscript{833} Laplorge, "The Absence of Masculinity in Gender Training for UN Peacekeepers", p. 94
training. The response of the participants revealed the same problem addressed by feminist scholarship. That is, there was a lack of enforcement and accountability between what the UN recommends and mandates and the discretion of TCCs about how they conduct the training.\textsuperscript{834} Gender was viewed as a soft issue by the Korean troops and thus, it was generally covered in the cultural training as a way of understanding the culture in the peacekeeping country. For example, what would be (un)acceptable behavior in front of Muslim women was one of the main themes covered. This simplistic and tokenistic approach prevented soldiers from reflecting on their own behavior and peacekeeping practices and reinforced the perception that gender is women’s business and of little concern to men.\textsuperscript{835} As a result, there was almost no room for peacekeeping soldiers to consider gender equality or masculine culture in peacekeeping.

6.1.6. Perceptions of Softer Masculinities

The last similarity was participants in both groups showed positive attitudes towards the potential for the construction of softer masculinities. All participants acknowledged the need of developing softer forms of masculinities in contemporary militaries, stressing that all types of malicious behaviors and cultures in barracks should be eliminated. Many participants in both groups, through (in)direct experiences in the military such as bullying, aggression, verbal and psychological abuse, came to realize that malign militarized masculinities needed to be replaced.

\textsuperscript{834} Carson, “Pre-deployment ‘gender’ training and the lack thereof for Australian peacekeepers”, p. 287

with softer masculinities. For some participants, this thought was reinforced through the interaction with new types of men in the military who displayed traditionally feminized attributes such as empathy, cooperation, equality, and respect. Most participants, particularly younger males, saw men who tried dominating and exerting power and authority over others very negatively.

Peacekeeping affected some participants’ attitudes towards hyper-masculine military culture as well. P12 described military culture of some Western peacekeeping troops as ‘more professional’, ‘more caring of their own servicemembers’, and ‘highly task-oriented, not power-oriented’. This description based on P12’s subjective experiences and interpretation may not be consistent with previous findings of studies on Western military culture.\textsuperscript{836} However, this showed the type of cultures and masculinities P12 viewed as ideal in the Korean military. Particularly, young professional soldiers (P1, P12) emphasized that all individual soldiers should be treated in a more humane way that would recognize the value of each person and ensure their dignity and rights. Many participants admitted that it would be very hard to challenge the dominant military culture but thought that as a way of resolving issues such as military suicide and harmful customs in barracks, different types of militarized masculinities would need to be constructed.

However, as shown in participants’ perceptions of female soldiers, a model of softer masculinities did not fully challenge traditional gender norms militaries have been based on. That

\textsuperscript{836} Dunivin, “Military Culture: Change and Continuity”, p. 542
is, softer masculinities were not fully open to equality with women and non-heterosexual people.

Regarding this, as suggested in other studies, it could be argued that as long as deeply entrenched masculine ideologies govern military culture and soldiers’ life, it would be very hard for individual soldiers to challenge the institutionalized practices of normative masculinities in the military, even if military values do not fit soldiers’ own conceptualizations of gender. Some scholars refer to hybrid or softer masculinities as ‘inclusive masculinities’ and argue that they challenge and change the symbolic boundaries between masculinity and femininity. For example, acceptance of homosexuality, respect for women, and emotional intimacy among brothers could decrease levels of cultural homophobia and thus more fluidity could be present between socially constructed genders. Considering that both groups did not make any comment on gay servicemembers or non-heterosexuality except for K1 who had a distorted image of gay men as potential sexual offenders, participants’ binary concept of gender did not seem to be disrupted, despite their positive attitude towards softer masculinities. Regarding this, critical scholarship of hybrid masculinities argues that these types of masculinities are highly likely to conceal systems of power and inequality, rather than challenge them. However, as Connell and Messerschmidt note, gender relations can be democratized since they are always
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arenas of tension and contestation.\textsuperscript{841} Based on this, Duncanson suggests that the softening of hegemonic masculinity, as a transitory stage, could lead to more progressive changes.\textsuperscript{842} In line with this, I tried not to dismiss the instances where participants in both groups constructed softer masculinities as ‘a superficial change, masking the retention of power and the creation of new hierarchies’.\textsuperscript{843}

Through comparative analysis, I found out that there were six similarities between the two groups: perception of hegemonic masculinity; construction of multiple militarized masculinities; masculinization of military service/peacekeeping; low-level internalization of warfighting ethos; perception of female soldiers; and perception of softer masculinities. This showed that military service offered participants unique resources for the construction of shared masculine identities.\textsuperscript{844} However, despite many similarities, peacekeeping experiences did make significant differences between the two groups, in terms of the potential for constructing alternative militarized masculinities. Therefore, the next section discusses differences between the two groups and suggests possible explanations for these differences.

\textbf{6.2. Differences}
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6.2.1. The Extent of Being Critical of Hegemonic Masculinity

Although both groups associated hegemonic masculinity with the role of good family provider, there was a variation in the extent to which two groups were critical of hegemonic masculinity. Most participants in the first group identified masculine norms and thought that they needed to try to meet these norms. Although some participants (K2, K4 and K10) expressed negative feelings about ‘living as a man in Korean’ due to many responsibilities and obligations imposed on men, they did not want to be alienated from mainstream society. Contrary to this, four participants in the second group (P2, P6, P12, and P13) did not want to define what ideal men would be like or how men should behave. They clearly stated that they were reluctant to conform to ideal dominant masculinity, problematizing the oppressive impact of traditional gender roles on their identities and lives. P4 and P14 did not explicitly express their resistance to follow hegemonic masculine norms but accepted a gap between hegemonic ideals and their own self-conceptualizations, which was not considered to be filled.

Regarding this difference, it could not be argued that there was always a causal relationship between having peacekeeping experiences and becoming more critical of the hierarchy of masculinities or marginalization of nonhegemonic masculinities. Given that a wide range of factors including religion, age, class, sexuality, and occupation intersected with one other and
constructed social differences in men and masculinities, peacekeeping could not be seen as the only factor to make those participants mentioned above question and challenge the dominant forms and practices of masculinity. Despite this, however, participants in the second group were required to have certain qualities as peacekeepers such as cultural sensitivity and diplomatic behavior, which were quite different from the conventional requirements in traditional military training. These qualities were not stressed evenly by all participants in the second group but the first group never had training or education to become ‘multifunctional’ or ‘hybrid’ soldiers, who can be warriors as well as policemen, diplomats, and armed global street workers.

Besides, there was a big difference in the overall working environment between military service in Korea and peacekeeping. As addressed in many studies on military culture, most participants in both groups agreed that the Korean military culture was prone to bullying through the potential abuse of authority by superiors and included a high level of aggression and a strong differentiation of deviant soldiers. On the contrary, according to participants in the second group, the culture of peacekeeping troops was less hierarchical and less abusive, focused more on the cooperation with other soldiers and civilian organizations. P14’s statement showed the difference peacekeeping could make in men’s attitudes towards hierarchical relationships in
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organizational life. He said that without peacekeeping experiences, he may have done what he was told by superiors without questions or critical thinking even in the workplace since this was the typical military culture that most Korean men got used to. However, in peacekeeping, he was able to care much less about coercive hierarchy and group pressure for conformity. This eventually enabled him to build relations of equality with other colleagues in lower positions in his workplace after discharge from the military. From this, peacekeeping experiences could be seen as one of the elements that led some participants in the second group to challenge hegemonic masculine norms that were associated with militaristic culture.

### 6.2.2. Views on Military Service

When it comes to views on military service, while the first group tended to focus on practical calculation on the individual level, the second group placed a particular value on peacekeeping experiences. Most participants in the first group had contradictory views on military service. On the one hand, due to the interruption to their studies or careers, except for only two participants (K3 and K8) who considered their military service to be carried out in a productive manner, the other eight tended to view their military service as ‘wasted’ or ‘lost’ time in a critical period of their life. On the other hand, however, they made personal meanings out of military service in a sense that they learned important skills for their socio-economic life such as leadership, the way to interact with people from diverse backgrounds, and appropriate behaviors towards superiors in hierarchical organizations. Regarding a connection between completing military service and getting adult manhood, more than half of the participants (K1, K2, K3, K4, K5, and K7) disagreed
with this. Rather, they thought that military service could promote the construction and the performance of toxic militarized masculinities and men could get mature manhood through different life experiences. However, given that successful completion of military service was very important to claim masculine status in Korean society, for all participants, military service was a crucial means to prove themselves to be normal, appropriately masculine, and well-prepared for future socio-economic life.

Participants in the second group attached special meanings to their peacekeeping experiences, which made a big difference from the first group. All participants considered their role in peacekeeping itself as very valuable and meaningful because they believed that they contributed to helping people who suffered from conflicts and reconstructing their societies. Even participants, whose motivation for peacekeeping was to escape the military life in Korea (P3) or who was ordered to take part in the mission by his commander due to his specialty (P13), felt proud of and fulfilled about what they did as peacekeepers. Apart from deployment to peacekeeping, however, the military life of the second group was very similar to that of the first group. Some participants had difficulties when they returned to Korea for various reasons. P5 and P13 got post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms as they experienced war or a quasi-state of war in peacekeeping operations. P3 was extremely stressed about having to return to oppressive barracks life. P11, as a professional soldier, expected that he would get promoted quickly after deployment but it did not happen. Despite these difficulties, all participants acknowledged the positive impact of peacekeeping on their worldview and personal growth. Besides, given that
only a small number of Korean men have the chance to serve as peacekeepers, I expected that
peacekeeping experience could bring practical advantages for employment or higher education
to participants who served as enlisted soldiers and this would be one of the important
motivations for peacekeeping. However, most participants did not experience nor pay much
attention to this kind of advantage. P14 said that peacekeeping was a good chance to reflect on
himself and broaden his perspective, despite not gaining practical advantages in his career. In
the same vein, P9 viewed peacekeeping as a transformative experience in his life because he
could protect civilians who were not protected by their country, although his current job had
nothing to do with his role in the mission. From this, it was seen that participants in the second
group attached special meaning to their roles in building peace and security for others, rather
than focusing on achieving certain qualities or benefits for personal lives, which often emerged
in the first group.

6.2.3. Potential for Constructing Alternative Militarized Masculinities

Both groups acknowledged the need to replace toxic masculinities with softer ones in the
military and showed positive attitudes towards incorporating some attributes traditionally
associated with femininity. However, regarding how possible it would be to construct alternative
militarized masculinities, I identified that to varying degrees the second group was more
suggestive of the potential for change in the dominant model of militarized masculinities. There
were two crucial factors that appeared to lead to this result. Participants in the second group
could have chances to expand their own perceptions of the roles of the military and soldiers and
to interact with the host population, while participants in the first group barely had these chances during their service in Korea.

Participants in the second group, though not all of them, thought about or experienced a new type of military and soldier, and as a result, they showed the possibility to develop a cosmopolitan view on security. For the first group, regardless of meanings they attached to personal military life, the military’s function tended to be more narrowly defined as the defense of the national territory, and soldiers as the nation-defender. According to Kaspersen, the type of nation-defender is morally obliged to defend the nation from external and internal threats, willingly takes orders and accepts a hierarchical authority to protect the nation and uses necessary force to fulfill his or her purpose.\textsuperscript{848} K9, who fitted the type of nation-defender the most across all participants, kept emphasizing the importance of national security, mentioning the disastrous effect of the Korean war. K10 viewed rigid hierarchy and collective, anti-individualistic military culture as inevitable for successful performance of national defense. Kaspersen also argues that the nation-defender would dismiss international operations, as well as preventive or preemptive war, where the necessity for military action to prevent threats could be questioned.\textsuperscript{849} Regarding this, how participants in the first group viewed non-traditional military tasks was not shown clearly during interviews as almost no one made a statement about peacekeeping or humanitarian intervention. However, this silence could be interpreted as their limited
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understanding of contemporary soldiers’ roles and security, which might make it harder for these participants to have the capacity for enhanced forms of empathy and for expansion of moral concern to the wellbeing of non-citizen Others.

Contrary to this, some participants in the second group showed an expanded perception of human security, not restricted to military or national ones, and humanitarian sentiments. Many participants in the second group (P2, P6, P7, P8, P9, P11, and P12) considered instrumental calculations of national interest to be important to decide whether to take part in certain military operations since the primary aim of the national armed forces is national defense. However, at the same time, some of them came to focus on the humanitarian aspect of peacekeeping, as a new type of military operations. Before deployment, issues related to war and human suffering were something that were experienced only by far-off Others and of little concern to participants themselves. However, by serving in peacekeeping, they became aware of people’s genuine hardship from war and raised questions about the effects of peacekeeping on the host population or wondered how local people’s life could be restored and improved through peacekeeping. Because maintaining a large number of standing troops and reserve forces was a crucial issue for national defense in Korea, a cosmopolitan view on security or humanitarian aspects of contemporary military operations did not emerge as a dominant theme in participants’ narratives. However, all participants expressed pleasure at and felt fulfilled by conducting tasks
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for the security of people threatened by violent conflict. This appeared to have a significant implication on the construction of non-hegemonic militarized masculinities in that positive feelings and attitudes towards peacekeeping could facilitate soldiers’ valorization of peace and the security of ordinary people in situations of conflict.

The way how participants interacted with and constructed others during their service also made a difference between the two groups. While the first group interacted almost only with in-group members and tended to construct them through relations of domination, competition and indifference, some participants in the second group had chances to interact with the host population in peacekeeping and constructed them through relations of empathy, respect and equality. In the military units in Korea, where the culture of ‘exclusivity’ increase in-group pressure and condone aggression against deviants, many participants in the first group experienced issues with other servicemembers. Verbal abuse from superiors was the most common thing occurring in the military barracks, to ensure dominance-subordination relationships. K10 admitted that he treated his subordinates in the same aggressive way his superiors treated him, with lots of swearing. K10 stated that this was the impact of militarization on him. Competition through sporting activities was one of the important means to build relationships between servicemembers. K6 and K8, as new recruits, experienced bullying but when they showed their physical prowess through sporting activities, their superiors stopped attempts to display
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dominance over K6 and K8. This revealed that under male homosocial circumstances, competition, especially in sports, was tightly related to men's masculine status.\textsuperscript{852} There were other various issues such as dealing with peers who were not motivated (K7) or who failed to comply with military norms (K9) and living with seniors who exhibited hyper-masculinity (K2). One of the most common coping strategies for these issues was to avoid interactions with servicemembers participants had an issue with as much as possible, in order not to get involved in any conflicts. This strategy was adopted by almost all participants, including the ones who did not have certain issues with other servicemembers, in case there was someone in their barracks who had psychological issues or difficulties adjusting to military life. As participants had to live with other men from diverse walks of life in the same domestic sphere of the military barracks, they saw not engaging others who could be ‘disturbers’ as the least risky way to serve in the military without problems, even though they felt sorry for others’ difficulties. That is, the military was not a favorable environment where genuine interactions with others through relations of empathy, respect, caring, and equality could take place.

The characteristics of the interaction with others the second group experienced in peacekeeping were quite different, which led to the disruption of Self/Other dichotomies. Having chances to meet and interact with the host population who had lives at stake due to conflict had a profound impact on the way participants constructed the host nation and its people. For some

participants, there was almost no occasion to build relations with locals, such as having dinner or conversations, in the course of duty. However, having actual encounters with others whose existence had been far away from participants’ reality before peacekeeping made a contribution to breaking participants’ stereotypes of the host population, particularly of Muslims. Due to the influence of the representations of Islam by media, most participants linked Islam to terrorism and threats to international security before deployment. In the reflections of P1, P7, P10 and P12, it was explicitly shown that participants became aware of their own stereotypes and commonalities in human experiences. Discovering common bonds made some participants (P2 and P7) more willing to attempt to understand the complexity of conflicts in the host country from the perspective of ordinary local people, rather than seeing the Islamic nature of the society as the direct reason for conflicts.

Interactions with the host population also enabled participants to empathize with people who suffered from conflicts. Sylvester distinguishes empathy from sympathy. According to her, while ‘sympathy is a self-centered sentiment that allows for little if any slippage, mobility, and hyphenation of subjectivity and identity on the occasion of listening to someone else’ tales’, empathy is an ‘ability and willingness to enter into the feeling or spirit of something and appreciate it fully in a subjectivity-moving way’. Empathy is ‘to take on board the struggles of other by listening to what they have to say in a conversational style that does not push, direct,

or break through to a ‘linear progression which gives the comforting illusion that one knows where one goes’.\textsuperscript{854} Whether what participants expressed was genuine empathy or not was not always clear. P5 felt very sorry about poor living conditions and people’s lives in South Sudan, which seemed much worse than those of Korea in the 1940s. Duncanson views this type of feeling as sympathy, which could imply superiority to local people, thus continuing the hierarchical neo-colonial relationship of Self and Other.\textsuperscript{855} Duncanson also provides examples of false empathy. Some British soldiers deployed the idea of empathy as a tactic in order to meet security objectives. That is, empathizing was used as a means to an end, lacking genuine respect for local people.\textsuperscript{856} However, my participants did not appear to approach local people with a view to achieving mission goals by pretending to see things from ordinary people’s point of view and to empathize with them. For P1, whose role was to collect security information from the host population, communication skills and winning favor with local people were important but this was not his only interest. P1 also wanted to know what kind of difficulties local people were experiencing in a post-conflict environment and how the people’s voices could be reflected in the peacekeeping process. This could not be seen just as an attempt to get the desired results or as a patronizing act with perceiving local people from a position of advantage. Through his motivation to build and maintain security for ordinary people, P1 was able to be genuinely
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empathetic towards people he interacted with in peacekeeping, even if he did not stay empathetic during the entire process of his duty. There was further evidence showing genuine empathy from participants in their statements about what qualifies as good characteristics for peacekeepers. P4 prioritized loving heart and empathy and P10 stressed cultural sensitivity and genuine respect for local culture and people. Contrary to the British military that stresses understanding and empathizing in doctrine and in training for peace operations, according to participants, competence of cultural understanding and empathy were not central themes in pre-deployment training for the Korean troops. Training content such as what is (not) allowed for soldiers in a different cultural context was addressed at a superficial level. Therefore, it was difficult to see that P4 and P10 responded in a way that met the standard of contemporary peacekeeping or sounded relevant as peacekeepers, irrespective of how they really felt in the field. Although genuine empathy is very difficult to encourage, especially in a volatile security environment, some cases of Korean peacekeeping soldiers proved that it was not impossible.

Through comparative analysis, I found out that there were three differences between the two groups: the extent of being critical of hegemonic masculinity; views on military service; and the potential for constructing alternative militarized masculinities. From these differences, it was seen that peacekeeping could make a unique contribution to constructing alternative militarized masculinities. By serving as peacekeepers, participants in the second group came to value peace
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and the security of ordinary people and challenge the exclusive role of the military as a protector of national security. Through the interaction with the host population, they also disrupted stereotypical views of the host country and its people and constructed the host population through relations of respect, empathy, and equality, not of domination and demonization, which was not more common in the traditional military context. Therefore, these differences could be seen as the evidence of the structure of Self/Other binary beginning to be dismantled and of the construction of alternative militarized masculinities through peacekeeping.

Although there were some similarities and differences found between the two groups, it was not that each point of similarities and differences was applied to each participant without exceptions. That is, each group was not homogenous. According to various factors such as individuals’ life perspective, life trajectory, family background, religion, what participants studied, and so on, there was diversity in the military life and in peacekeeping experiences in each group. Therefore, the next section addresses internal differences in each group that demonstrates the heterogeneity of participants.

6.3. Internal Differences

In the first group, there was an internal difference regarding perceptions of female soldiers, according to military branches, which did not emerge in the second group’s narratives. Participants who served in the Air Force, despite their limited understandings of gender and gender equality, tended to show more gender-egalitarian attitudes towards female soldiers than
other participants who served in the Army. They claimed that the workplace culture of the Air
Force was less cruel, less abusive and more rational than that of the Army and this led to more
gender-sensitive and egalitarian military culture. They stated that gender equality would be
generally very difficult to achieve in male-dominated military institutions, but compared to other
branches, particularly the Army, the Air Force was more inclusive of women. One of the grounds
for this argument was that for most professions in the Air Force, physical ability was not as
important as for the Army’s professions. The possession of professional skills and expertise, the
ability to handle and use specialist equipment, and rational processing of complex information
under conditions of extreme stress were considered to be more important than physical strength
to carry out duties in the Air Force. Contrary to this, participants who served in the Army usually
pointed out weaker physical condition as the biggest obstacle for female soldiers’ role in the
military because many professions within the Army required physical ability of its members. Four
participants who served in the Army (K6, K8, K9, and K10) also mentioned that integration of
women into combat units would affect military effectiveness and for this reason, occupational
segregation based on gender differences was considered as inevitable. Other than physical
prowess, being overly sensitive and emotionally volatile was also viewed as one of the feminine
traits that could weaken military bonds. From this, it was seen that an internal difference was
made in the participants’ perceptions of female soldiers according to service branch in the first
group.
There was an internal difference in the second group as well. The current military personnel tended to express more critical views of hegemonic masculinity than veterans did, which deviated from the expected result. While four (P2, P4, P6 and P12) out of eight professional soldiers were against the idea that men should be masculine, only one (P13) out of six veterans stated that he just had moral norms to live as a good person, not masculine norms to become an ideal man. This showed that military personnel were influenced by the change both in wider society and in the military, towards being more gender egalitarian and tolerant of diversity. In addition, these participants, who held elite positions in the military, may not have needed to prove themselves to be masculine enough, which could allow them to practice non-hegemonic masculinities. However, given that the military has a natural resistance to change and it is still seen as an example of a masculine-gendered organization, it could not be said that military personnel experienced a more radical challenge to their perceptions of traditional gender roles than non-military men did. That is, the changing military environment and the elite positions of those military personnel could account for their tendency to have critical attitudes towards hegemonic masculinity but the difference in the extent of problematizing hegemonic masculine norms between current military men and veterans was not explained by those two factors. A closer examination of the intersection of various factors including individuals’ life perspectives, personal

859 Duncanson, “Forces for Good?: Narratives of Military Masculinity in Peacekeeping Operations”, p. 76
860 Dunivin, “Military Culture: Change and Continuity”, p. 539
861 Godfrey, “Military, masculinity and mediated representations: (con)fusing the real and the reel”, p. 205
background, and important life events as well as military-related factors could help gain a deeper insight into the dynamics of this internal difference.

**Conclusion**

To examine how involvement in peacekeeping operations impacts peacekeeping soldiers’ militarized masculinities, I compared a group of Korean men who experienced deployment to peacekeeping with another group of Korean men who completed military service in Korea but who did not have peacekeeping experiences. When it comes to perceptions of gender differences and female servicemembers, there were more similarities than differences between the two groups. In varying degrees, both groups naturalized gender differences and justified the gendered division of labor in the military and peacekeeping. This confirmed that it would be very difficult to achieve a fundamental challenge to traditional cultural patterns of gender relations. However, peacekeeping played a crucial role in shaping different types of militarized masculinities that entailed the construction of others through empathy, caring, respect and equality, not through hierarchy and dehumanization. Not all participants who experienced peacekeeping valorized the humanitarian aspect of peacekeeping or built relationships with the host population. However, to varying degrees, most participants in peacekeeping valued peace and the security of ordinary people, became aware of their own stereotypes about the host country and its people, discovered similarities as human beings, despite divisions of culture and
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material inequality, and empathized with the host population. From this, although hierarchical relations between masculinity and femininity were not completely dismantled through peacekeeping, a conclusion can be made that peacekeeping contributed to Korean soldiers’ construction of alternative militarized masculinities that were not necessarily dominant over others and were more open to adopt attributes, values and practices which were traditionally associated with femininity. In the following concluding chapter, I reiterate the aims and approach taken in this research and answers to the central research question. Particularly, I emphasize the contribution of this research to theorizing peacekeeper masculinities, drawn from my original empirical focus on Korean soldiers. I also present a summary of the key findings, final conclusions and recommendations for future research.
Conclusion

Introduction

The aim of the thesis was to contribute original research to feminist literature on employing soldiers as actors to build peace and security by examining the impact of peacekeeping on Korean soldiers’ militarized masculinities. Amongst feminist scholars on conflict and peace, there are those who argue that due to militarized masculinities that militaries rely on to produce soldiers prepared to fight for the nation and to kill enemies, soldiers are unlikely to be effective at achieving peace. On the contrary, some scholars argue that involvement in peacekeeping can produce alternative militarized masculinities that embody some important qualities for effective peacekeeping such as empathy, respect, and care. To date, most of this scholarship has relied on studies of peacekeepers in Western political contexts.

In this concluding chapter, I rehearse the aims and approach taken in the thesis and stress the importance of my contribution to the discussion of ‘peacekeeper masculinities’, drawn from my original empirical focus on Korean soldiers. The key findings are reiterated, and final conclusions and recommendations for future research are offered.

Researching Peacekeeper Masculinities from the Korean Case

To accomplish the aim of the thesis, I firstly developed my theoretical framework based on the concept of militarized masculinity. Masculinity is socially constructed, changeable and does not exist as a singular form. Masculinities are multiple, dynamic and contradictory and are not
homogeneous. Therefore, masculinities are likely to be internally divided in the same cultural or institutional setting. This insight also applies to the construction of militarized masculinities. Militarized masculinities are traditionally defined by hyper-masculine values and behaviors, such as physical strength, toughness, stoicism, aggressiveness, and an exaggerated heterosexuality. However, due to the contradictory and ambiguous nature of masculinity, it is likely that multiple masculinities are constructed in militarized settings, rather than a single embodied masculinity. This leaves open the possibilities of change and subversion as well as reproduction in dominant types of masculinities.

I secondly examined the concept of peacekeeper masculinity as suggested by Duncanson. Acknowledging the multiplicity, complexity and dynamism of the construction of militarized masculinities, Duncanson claims that involvement in peacekeeping can lead soldiers to construct different forms of militarized masculinities that disrupt gendered dichotomies in peacekeeping such as masculine war/feminized peace, and superior peacekeepers (heroic, advanced, civilized, and protector)/inferior local people (backward, weak, barbaric, uncivilized, and passive victims of war). Through the analysis of narratives from British soldiers who participated in operations in

---

863 Connell, “Masculinities, the reduction of violence and the pursuit of peace”, p. 36
864 Shields, “Military Masculinity, Movies, and the DSM: Narratives of Institutionally (En)Gendered Trauma”, p. 65
866 Duncanson, “Hegemonic Masculinity and the Possibility of Change in Gender Relations”, p. 237
Bosnia, and in Iraq and Afghanistan, Duncanson suggests that there were instances where soldiers enacted peacekeeper masculinity, even if at a basic level. She finds that soldiers valorized peacekeeping activities, linking them to masculinity and constructed local people through relations of empathy, respect, and equality, not through domination and dehumanization. Based on this, Duncanson argues that despite the dominance of war-fighting ethos in soldiers’ narratives, these instances should not be dismissed as a smokescreen, but should be taken more seriously as they could be a precursor to a fundamental challenge to the gendered hierarchies that underpin militarized masculinities.

Thirdly, before conducting the field research to examine the impact of peacekeeping on Korean soldiers’ militarized masculinities, I conducted a literature review on constructions of militarized masculinities in contemporary Korean society. Through this, it was revealed that to varying degrees masculine ideals in Korean contemporary society have been associated with militarized norms and practices as the popular expectation that all young men should willingly serve in the military has remained uncontested. That is, completion of military service has been considered as a means to prove ‘normal’ manhood in Korean society, which in turn enables successful socio-economic life in men’s futures. Particularly, for young men who are living in the neoliberal era, military service is understood as a site where they can learn how to situate themselves in hierarchical organizations and acquire some important qualities such as leadership, tolerance,
and the proper way to interact with people from diverse backgrounds. In addition, because of the influence of changes in gender relations and masculinities in wider society, hypermasculine attributes and behaviors that traditionally characterize militarized masculinities are seen negatively. This discussion in chapter 2 offered an analytical lens to understand and interpret the results of the field research.

For the field research, I adopted an interpretive grounded theory approach that aimed to develop fresh insights on existing literature on peacekeeper masculinity, particularly from a non-Western perspective. Data collection was conducted from the two-rounds of interviews with two groups of Korean men: the first group consisting of ten men who completed military service in Korea but who did not experience deployment to peacekeeping; and the second group consisting of fourteen men who were deployed in various types of peacekeeping abroad. The first group served as a control group against which alternative militarized masculinities could be identified/analyzed in the second group. Core principles and techniques of interpretive grounded theory were applied to the entire process of data collection and analysis. As a result, four main theoretical themes emerged in the first-round of interviews and five main theoretical themes in the second-round of interviews. As intended in the grounded theory approach, through comparative analysis of those main themes between the two groups, I developed a theory on Korean peacekeeper masculinities. At the core of my analysis is the finding that while involvement in peacekeeping did not fundamentally challenge the gender norms militaries are based on, it
did contribute to constructing different forms of militarized masculinities that were more open to embody traditionally feminized attributes, values and practices.

Particularly, given that the ways in which non-Western soldiers engage with peacekeeping operations remain quite understudied, the outcome of this research not only provides new insight on the construction of Korean-specific militarized masculinities but also contributes to broadening and deepening empirical understanding of peacekeeper masculinities in non-Western contexts. In so doing, this research also reveals the importance of context and context-sensitive analysis in discussions of peacekeeper masculinities. From the field research, it is revealed that while in some respects, the construction of militarized masculinities of young Korean men conforms to existing feminist analysis, e.g., emotional control, endurance of hardships, stereotypical views on female soldiers, there are also significant differences in the way in which their militarized masculinities are constructed. That is, the persistence of good family provider role as ideal manliness and completion of military service as a means to realizing neoliberal success in civilian life play a profound role in shaping the unique ways to produce militarized masculinities in the Korean context, which are not found in other contexts. Furthermore, contrary to existing literature on peacekeeper masculinities from Western soldiers, Korean soldiers generally value the humanitarian aspect of peacekeeping, do not disparage or feminize peacekeeping activities and barely rely on radical Othering in perceiving the host population. A warfighting ethos is not dominant in their military identities. All these findings demonstrate the importance of contextualized discussions of peacekeeper masculinities. The
following sections present a summary of the key findings and recommendations for future research based on the new insights gained from this research. Lastly, I make a final comment on this thesis.

**A Good Family Provider Role as an Ideal Masculinity**

The role of good family provider was a central element for participants in both groups to claim their masculine status. Many participants distanced themselves from the traditional Korean model of patriarchal men who dominated women and exercised power and authority over other family members. Some participants expressed a desire to more actively participate in work in the domestic sphere such as nurturing children and housework, which was mainly assigned to women. Furthermore, two participants (K4 and K10) said that they would not mind reversing gender roles in their family life. However, regardless of how they felt about masculine norms, all participants acknowledged that proving heteronormative middle-class masculinity by becoming a good family provider was very important to determine their social positions in Korean society and because of this, it would be impossible to live outside the prevailing dominant patterns of masculinity.

As a prerequisite to become a good family head, neoliberal subjectivities characterized by constant self-development, competitiveness and competence at work, and personal responsibility for achieving happiness were stressed as well. Particularly, younger men in their twenties and thirties perceived their life in the neoliberal era as more precarious and identified a gap between hegemonic ideals and self-conceptualization. To fill this gap, these participants thought that they
needed to try harder to embody neoliberal subjectivities. However, achieving neoliberal masculine norms was not a goal in itself. Rather, these certain qualities were considered as an important means to become a successful family provider, thus, ensuring higher masculine status in Korean society.

Despite a strong emphasis on the role of family provider for performing hegemonic masculinity, there was a difference in the extent to which participants were critical of traditional gender roles and hegemonic masculinity. While most participants in the first group identified masculine norms and thought that they needed to try to meet these norms, many participants in the second group did not want to define what men should be like. Some participants in the second group explicitly expressed that they were reluctant to conform to dominant masculine norms, problematizing the oppressive impact of traditional gender roles on their identities and lives. I suggested the impact of peacekeeping as one possible explanation on this difference between the two groups. To serve as peacekeepers, participants in the second group were required to equip themselves with certain qualities such as impartiality, cultural sensitivity, and a strong sense of morality, which were very different from the requirements in traditional military training. In addition, there was a big difference in the overall working environment between military service in Korea and peacekeeping. While the military culture in Korea involved coercive hierarchy, and a high level of aggression and a strong differentiation of out-group members, the culture of peacekeeping troops was less hierarchical and less abusive, and more open to cooperation and equality with other members to achieve the goals of peacekeeping. From this, I suggested that
although peacekeeping could not be seen as the only factor to make a difference in attitudes towards hegemonic masculinity between the two groups, it contributed to leading some participants in the second group to challenge hegemonic masculine norms and practices that were associated with militaristic culture.

Different Meanings Attached to Military Service

Regarding military service, almost all participants saw hyper-masculine attributes and behavior that characterize a warrior masculinity negatively, and thus, completion of military service was not linked to a rite of passage to gain this form of manhood. Rather, despite their contradictory feelings about military service, there was a shared perception between the two groups that military service was a crucial marker to ensure full citizenship and normative manhood in Korean society. On the one hand, due to the interruption to their studies and career development, some participants referred to military service as a waste of the prime time in their lives. On the other hand, however, due to the significance attached to military service on a societal level, most participants viewed completion of military service as a means to prove their normality and competence for performing socio-economic activities in their future lives. This aspect of military service was more emphasized by participants in the first group. They valued some qualities and skills they acquired through military life such as independence, leadership, ability to endure hardships, and the ways to interact with people from diverse backgrounds. Particularly, learning agentic behaviors to situate themselves in hierarchical organizations, which allowed them to know what attributes and behaviors would be appropriate and desirable within male homosocial
groups, was seen as very important for their life at workplaces. Besides, the homogenizing rhetoric of military service in Korean society, as one of the few experiences the majority of adult men share with one another,\textsuperscript{867} could not be dismissed even though many participants’ individual conceptualizations of identity did not fit militarized masculinities.

Those views noted above were also mentioned by participants in the second group, especially participants who served as ordinary soldiers. However, a notable difference was that the second group assigned special meanings and values to their military life because of their peacekeeping experiences. All of them believed that they contributed to protecting and helping civilians who suffered from conflict and reconstructing conflict-ridden countries. Regarding perceptions of peacekeeping, professional soldiers tended to see peacekeeping as a political or diplomatic strategy for promoting national interest, rather than a genuine commitment to world peace and security. Particularly, continued military confrontation with North Korea was seen to be prioritized in using military forces. In line with this, some professional soldiers made it clear that humanitarianism should not be the basis for the dispatch of the Korean troops as the primary aim of the national armed forces should be the national defense. However, when they conducted peacekeeping activities in the field, regardless of their perceptions of peacekeeping, they felt proud of and good about helping others in need. Some participants serving as ordinary soldiers

\textsuperscript{867} Moon, "Trouble with Conscription, Entertaining Soldiers: Popular Culture and the Politics of Militarized Masculinity in South Korea", p. 72
also had similar experiences. Their motivations for deployment to peacekeeping had almost nothing to do with peace itself (e.g., escape from doing military service in Korea or particular commander’s orders). However, when they performed their duty in the field, they identified with their role as peacekeepers and came to value peace and the security of ordinary people. From this, it could be said that participants in the second group attached special meanings to their military life in terms of contribution to peace and security for others while the first group made personal meaning out of military service in terms of achieving certain qualities for their own lives without much room for thinking about others’ wellbeing.

**Unchallenged Gender Stereotypes**

Despite these differences in understanding their militarized identities, what is striking is that in both groups, participants’ stereotypical views on female soldiers based on innate gender differences remained unchallenged. This was shown in their contradictory views on softness embodied by male and female members in the military and their perceptions of military women’s roles.

With regard to softer masculinities, both groups agreed that toxic militarized masculinities which emphasize hierarchy, domination and aggression should be replaced with softer masculinities. Particularly, performance of softer masculinities was seen as one of the solutions to problems such as military suicide, hazing, bullying, and harassment caused by hyper-masculine military culture and practices. Participants admitted that the military had a natural resistance to
change but did not see the integration of this new model of masculinity into military culture as impossible. This view was reinforced for some participants who had a positive experience of interacting with nontraditional military men. These men were generally described as willing to listen to and help others, empathetic, understanding, cooperative and open to equality, all of which are characteristics traditionally associated with subordinated masculinities or femininities. Through interactions with this new type of men, participants came to realize that different forms of militarized masculinities which were not necessarily hierarchical and were more respectful for others could be constructed in the military. Despite this, however, there was no consideration of non-heterosexual servicemembers. Only one participant (K1) made a comment on gay soldiers, which indicated that heterosexual men could be in danger by the presence of gay men, and the rest of the participants did not mention anything about homosexuality or LGBT people. This demonstrated that heterosexuality was taken for granted in the construction and performance of militarized masculinities among young Korean males.

Participants’ positive views on softness did not apply to female soldiers. That is, femininities embodied by female soldiers were perceived as inferior to masculinities or as barriers to military effectiveness. Except for only two participants (K3 and K4) who came to appreciate women’s professionalism and competence as soldiers, other participants thought that it would be hard for female soldiers to be regarded as equals. Some participants stated that women’s leadership in the military was more communicative, more tolerant of diversity, and more open to equality with others. However, they thought because of these traits, women might have difficulties earning
respect or requiring absolute obedience from male subordinates and be sexually objectified. This was confirmed in one participant’s (P3) experience with a female officer during deployment. According to P3, she was easygoing and not domineering but was often looked at as less professional than her male counterparts. That is, while femininities performed by male soldiers were considered as positive and progressive, women's femininities were considered to lack soldierly attributes or to be a threat to military effectiveness. This conforms to the feminist theory that militarized masculinities have traditionally been defined in terms of hierarchical opposition to women and femininities. From this, it could also be suggested that men’s performance of softer masculinities would be appreciated only if this was seen as acceptable masculinity and not equated with femininity in the military.

Participants’ unchallenged biased views on female soldiers were also reflected in their perceptions of female soldiers’ roles. Most participants in the first group considered restricted assignment of military roles to women as inevitable because of women’s weakness. They said that women could excel men in many areas in the military which did not require physical strength. However, regarding combat roles, a core function of the military, they argued that physical ability was an uncompromising requirement and for this reason, qualification criteria for combat roles should not be lowered. Therefore, to conduct combat activities, female soldiers must be capable
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868 Eichler, “Militarized Masculinities in International Relations”, p. 82; Koeszegi et al., “The War against the Female Soldier? The Effects of Masculine Culture on Workplace Aggression”, p. 230
of meeting male performance standards and fitting into military norms. Participants also said that gender equality was an important value to achieve throughout society but it should not surpass combat effectiveness in the military as military operations were about whether people's lives could be protected or lost. In addition to physical weakness, female soldiers were viewed as psychologically weak as well. While men have to start their military life from the lowest rank as conscripts, women join the military as non-commissioned or commissioned officers. Mentioning this, many participants implied that women would have more difficulties adjusting to military life than men due to lack of experience of 'real' military culture such as coercive hierarchy, absolute obedience to superiors, and sharing of brotherhood. Given that mandatory military service was often compared to enduring hardship in one's life and through this, the ability to overcome difficulties was believed to be improved, it could be said that women soldiers were seen as less able to cope with severe psychological stress and thus, they would need extra support from male colleagues.

Participants in the second group also justified the gendered division of labor based on naturalized gender differences. They tended to limit female soldiers' roles in peacekeeping to care and support as women were seen as inherently kind, empathetic, understanding, and non-aggressive. Some participants placed a particular emphasis on the integration of female soldiers into peacekeeping based on the unique contribution female soldiers could make: interacting with women in local societies where women are prohibited from speaking to men; providing protection and security for women and children who suffered from violence, crime, and sexual
harassment; and making peacekeeping forces more approachable to the host population. These participants appreciated female soldiers’ roles but they focused on the ways women could enhance peacekeeping effectiveness, overlooking women’s right to serve as peacekeepers like male peacekeepers do. In addition to stereotyping women as inherently pacifist, as in the first group, a limited role for female peacekeepers was advocated on the grounds of the gendered protection norm. Most participants considered female soldiers unfit for conducting high-risk activities or deployment in areas associated with danger as women were not seen as strong enough to protect themselves.

In summary, participants’ positive views on and attempts to incorporate certain feminine attributes into their masculine identities did not fundamentally challenge their views on the gender hierarchy between masculinity and femininity. This was confirmed in their perceptions of female soldiers. Contrary to my expectations that the second group would show more gender egalitarian attitudes due to the strong emphasis on the gender-sensitive approaches to peacekeeping by international organizations including the UN, there was no notable difference between the two groups. That is, most participants saw female soldiers through the lens of gender essentialism and this remained unchallenged during and after peacekeeping.

---

The Unique Role of Peacekeeping in Constructing Alternative Militarized Masculinities

Although involvement in peacekeeping did not fundamentally challenge the participants’ preconceived notions of hierarchical gender relations, it did play a significant role in constructing alternative militarized masculinities that were more open to embrace traditionally feminized traits such as empathy, caring, and respect, which could be more effective at achieving sustainable peace. The impact of peacekeeping did not evenly apply to all participants but generally they found peacekeeping experiences very valuable and meaningful, which involved broadening life perspectives, disrupting stereotypes about the host population, and building empathy and respect for the host population. Through these experiences in peacekeeping, participants were able to construct different forms of militarized masculinities.

Firstly, there were many instances where participants broadened their perspectives on war, peace, and peacekeeping missions. Participants who were exposed to war during deployment realized the inhumanity and cruelty of war and its destructive effects on people’s lives and came to genuinely value peace and security. Participants who did not experience serious security threats also gained a better understanding of conflict and its effect and learned the importance of peacekeeping operations. Some participants expanded their perceptions about militaries’ and soldiers’ roles through peacekeeping. They still prioritized the defense of the national territory and its people but at the same time they expressed ethical concern for vulnerable people beyond state boundaries, suggesting a new role of soldiers as protectors of non-citizens. One of the most notable cases was one professional soldier (P1) who gained a totally new perspective on
the conflict with North Korea through peacekeeping. He learned that for conflict resolution, there
would be a need to stop binary thinking such as us/them, and friend/enemy and to attempt to
put ourselves in the place of others while understanding their point of view and beliefs. All these
experiences showed that participants not only expanded their horizons through peacekeeping
but also destabilized the traditional thinking associated with the military’s function and
approaches to conflict resolution. This was evidence of the construction of alternative militarized
masculinities.

Secondly, participants’ disruption of their own stereotypes about the host country and its
people was also significant evidence of the construction of alternative militarized masculinities
through peacekeeping. Due to short period of time for deployment to peacekeeping and
regulations of the Korean troops that strictly restricted soldiers’ movement, only a few
participants had chances to interact with the host population. However, observations of the host
society, participation in civil-military operations, and even a brief encounter with local people
made a significant change in participants’ preconception of the host population, particularly
Muslims. All participants had stereotypes about Islam before deployment, associating Muslims
with violent, aggressive, and extreme terrorists. However, after having actual encounters with
local people, most participants found them kind, gentle, friendly, and peaceful. Particularly,
participants who built relationships with the host population, discovered that ordinary people
were not much different from peacekeepers themselves and aggressiveness was not an inherent
disposition of Muslims. These experiences were clear evidence of the disruption to the discourse
of ‘dangerous brown men’ and the disruption to the gendered binary of superior peacekeepers/inferior locals.

Lastly, disruption of Self/Other binaries led participants to build empathy and respect for the host population who suffered from conflict. Most participants stated that it was a shame that there were still many ongoing conflicts throughout the world and ordinary people’s lives were destroyed. Especially, participants who had families and caring responsibilities lamented the suffering of children caused by war and poverty. One participant (P6) in charge of gender training also felt very sorry for the vulnerabilities of women in precarious situations where there were few alternatives for survival and security except for transactional sex. Other participants also empathized with local people who faced severe hardships including fragile states, economic underdevelopment, food insecurity, and lack of political and economic rights, questioning what they could do more to improve local people’s lives. That participants built genuine empathy and respect for the host population through peacekeeping was clearly represented in their comments on the qualities needed to serve as peacekeepers: loving heart; empathy; respect for local culture and people; and a host population-centric approach. Not all participants in the second group stressed these qualities. However, given that the first group did not place importance on those attributes which were traditionally feminized, it could be said that peacekeeping made a significant change in peacekeeping soldiers’ conception of what soldiers should be like. Therefore, peacekeeping could be considered to contribute to constructing alternative militarized masculinities.
New Insights from Research on Non-Western Peacekeepers

In some respects, the findings stressed above coincide with the ‘peacekeeper masculinity’ theory suggested by Duncanson. The potential for peacekeeping to produce a construction of militarized masculinities more attuned to empathy, respect, caring, and equality has also been found in studies of Western peacekeepers. However, one radical difference emerging from this research is that radical Othering based on the gendered and racialized dichotomies barely emerged in Korean soldiers’ narratives. Existing feminist scholarship on Western militaries critiques that soldiers generally rely on radical Othering in perceiving the host population and this partly leads to the perpetuation of the neo-imperial intentions in peacekeeping.\textsuperscript{870} However, in this research, while most participants had a vague fear of local people, especially Muslims, in the pre-deployment phase, this was not due to the denigration of others based on race, ethnicity, or nationality. This could be associated with the unique history of Korea including the experience of Japanese colonial empire and the division of the nation by the Korean War, which is clearly distinguishable from many Western countries which have a history as colonizers. Despite their middle-upper class backgrounds in Korea, in their few observations of local people’s daily life, some participants saw Korean society and people reflected in the host country and its population, though many years back in time. This identification may have played an important role in Korean soldiers building empathy and respect for the host population.

\textsuperscript{870} Duncanson, \textit{Forces for Good? Military Masculinities and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan and Iraq}, p. 15
Although this is an area where more research is needed, based on this result, I would suggest that non-Western soldiers might have more potential to construct alternative militarized masculinities than Western soldiers. Some empirical studies on non-Western peacekeeping soldiers suggest this potential as well, although their original focus is not peacekeeper masculinity.

In Agyekum’s study, Ghanaian soldiers were greatly influenced by peacekeeping missions conducted on the African continent. Agyekum notes that “Ghanaian peacekeepers’ observations and experiences in the African war theaters brought the effects of violence closer because they are Africans who have seen and interacted with other Africans in distress”. Based on encounters with other Africans affected by war, Ghanaian soldiers not only felt strong empathy for those people but this also shaped their views of the importance of preserving peace and security in their home societies. In Henry’s study on Indian and Uruguayan female peacekeepers, radical Othering barely emerged, particularly in the narratives of Uruguayan female peacekeepers who served in Haiti. Despite Uruguay’s different history of race relations and current attitudes towards its indigenous population, Uruguayan female peacekeepers generally considered themselves to be Southern women, like Haitian women. That is, instead of constructing local women as inferior racialized others, Uruguayan female peacekeepers saw themselves as being ‘better off’ than the Haitian women within their locale, but not significantly different in terms of the
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873 Henry, “Peacexploitation? Interrogating Labor Hierarchies and Global Sisterhood Among Indian and Uruguayan Female Peacekeepers?”, p. 27
geopolitics of race and the desire to protect family. They also showed sympathy for Haitian women's daily struggles because they experienced the same struggles. From my findings and these other studies, it could be suggested that non-Western peacekeepers' shared understandings of history and culture with the host population could promote the construction of alternative militarized masculinities through peacekeeping.

Therefore, future research focused on intersectional identities of non-Western soldiers in the peacekeeping context could contribute to identifying more ways that peace operations can build genuine peace and security, rather than reproduce imperial intentions.

**A Final Comment**

The thesis has demonstrated that involvement in peacekeeping did not fundamentally challenge the gender norms militarized masculinities are based on but peacekeeping soldiers disrupted the Self/Other dichotomies and came to valorize peace and the security of ordinary people in situations of conflict. This implies that reality on the ground is much more complex than some skeptical feminists' argument that peacekeeping always serves as part of the contemporary colonial encounter, relying on radical Othering. Therefore, while not uncomplicated, this research concludes that there is positive potential that service in peacekeeping contexts can
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promote the construction of alternative militarized masculinities which can contribute to achieving sustainable peace and security in conflicted societies.
Appendices

Appendix 1. Ethical Approval Application

1. Title of project

Examining the impact of peacekeeping operations on soldiers’ militarized masculinities: The case of Korean peacekeeping soldiers

2. Purpose of project including academic rationale

Gender studies of militaries and the dynamics of war suggest that ideas of militarized masculinity are central to the creation of soldiers willing to fight and perhaps die in combat. With the rise of involvement in peacekeeping missions, feminist academics have asked whether ‘militarized men’ are the right actors to build peace, or whether involvement in peacekeeping produces new forms of masculinity in armies. The aim of this project is to contribute original research to these questions by examining the impact of peacekeeping operations on Korean soldiers’ militarized masculinities.

This project bases theoretical framework on the concept of militarized masculinity. Masculinity is defined not only as a set of attitudes and practices culturally deemed appropriate to men, but also as a process, an identity that is never complete but always in the making. Masculinity does not exist as a singular form. Masculinities are multiple, dynamic and contradictory and are not homogeneous. Therefore, masculinities are likely to be internally divided in the same cultural or
institutional setting. This is applied to the construction of militarized masculinities. Militarized masculinities are traditionally defined by hyper-masculine values and behaviors, such as physical strength, toughness, stoicism, aggressiveness, and an exaggerated heterosexuality. However, due to the contradictory and ambiguous nature of masculinity, multiple militarized masculinities are constructed, rather than a single embodied masculinity, and open to change and subversion as well as reproduction.

This project particularly focuses on the concept of peacekeeper masculinity, suggested by Claire Duncanson. While many feminist scholars have explained why soldiers could not be effective at achieving peace and security in peacekeeping by employing the concept of militarized masculinity, Duncanson has argued that involvement in peacekeeping can shape alternative militarized masculinities that adopt some important qualities for effective peacekeeping such as empathy, caring, respect, and equality. Through the analysis of British peacekeeping soldiers’ narratives, Duncanson has found several instances where soldiers enacted peacekeeper masculinity and valorized peace and peacekeeping activities.

Remaining attentive to both sides of scholarship on using soldiers for peacekeeping purposes, this project examines how involvement in peacekeeping impacted on the Korean soldiers’ militarized masculinities by carrying out a series of interview with two groups of Korean men: a group consisting of men who completed military service in Korea but who did not experience deployment to peacekeeping; a group consisting of men who were deployed to peacekeeping
operations abroad. The first group will serve as a control group against which to assess the experience of soldiers involved in peacekeeping operations.

3. **Brief description of methods and measurements to be used**

This project uses qualitative research methods. A first step is a desk-based literature review focused on constructions of militarized masculinities in contemporary Korean society. A second phase is field research that involves two rounds of interviews with two groups of Korean men. As a control group, there will be interviews with Korean men who completed military service in Korea but who did not experience deployment in peacekeeping missions. A third phase is conducting interviews with Korean men who were deployed in various types of peacekeeping missions abroad. Data collection and analysis will be conducted based on core principles and practical techniques and methods of grounded theory approach, whose aim is to develop new insights on literature on peacekeeper masculinity from a non-Western perspective.

4. **Participants**

The first round of interviews will take place in Korea. Participants will be recruited from four sources: advertisements posted on social media (Facebook) of Republic of Korea Army; advertisements published on a website of Handong University Alumni Association; snowball sampling; and personal contacts. Inclusion criteria for the project are detailed as: Korean men who completed mandatory military service in Korea after 2000; who hold at least a bachelor’s degree; who work as full-time professionals; and under the age of mid-40s. During the
recruitment contact, the purpose and nature of the project will be explained, questions from the
participants will be answered, and the informed consent process will be completed. The interview
will be conducted at a location of the participant’s choosing with only the lead researcher and
participant present. The interviews will be electronically recorded and then transcribed.
Participants will not be contacted or re-interviewed following the completion of the initial
interview.

The second round of interviews will be conducted online and will follow much the same process
as the first round of interviews – but in order to assess the impact of peacekeeping experiences
on soldiers who involved in peacekeeping missions, there will be some different questions
focused on details about what men did in peacekeeping mission and how this impacted their
masculine identities. Participants will be recruited from four sources: advertisements posted on
social media (Facebook) of Republic of Korea Army; advertisements published on a website of
Handong university Alumni Association; snowball sampling; and personal contacts. Inclusion
criteria for the project are detailed as: Korean men who were deployed in peacekeeping
operations during their military service; who hold at least a bachelor’s degree; who work as full-
time professionals; under the age of 40. Due to the fact that the number of Korean veterans who
participated in peacekeeping is much smaller than that of the Korean men who completed
military service in Korea without PK experience abroad, upper age limit is raised from 40 to mid-
40s. Apart from this, other criteria are the same as the first round of interviews. To see the
difference between the two groups, there will be some different questions focused on details about what men did in peacekeeping mission and how it impacted their masculine identities.

5. Ethical consideration

This research requires that participants will be enabled to make an active choice and informed decision regarding their participation in research. Participants will be informed of the purpose of the study, voluntary nature of their participation, their right to withdraw at any time, including without reason, how findings will be presented and used, and any potential inconvenience linked to participation, against any potential benefits. Respondents will also be offered and assured of anonymity if they decide to participate in the research. There will be the assessment of participant understandings of consent processes before or during the research, through the participant information and consent forms which are included in this application. Participants will be made aware that they can withdraw at any time up to completion of the study, by e-mailing me at chungse@tcd.ie and I will then withdraw their data from the study and destroy any data related to them e.g., interview transcripts.

During the interview, participants could have feelings of stress or distress remembering, analyzing, or discussing their past experiences in the military. To minimize and deal with this situation, I will conduct literature reviews of research with similar populations or those that used similar methods, and consult with experienced researchers who have conducted similar research. I will also ensure that I have referral information for any interviewee who needs psycho-social
support after the interview (for example, referral to military chaplains or professional counselling service, which will be provided in the information sheet).

As a researcher, I could have uncomfortable feelings or experience stress about building rapport with male participants and getting access to resources from their military experiences, which I haven’t gone through in my life. For my personal security, I will not give any contact information to them and work and contact only via e-mail. I will also give a list of scheduled interviews including time and place to my supervisor and family member. In addition, constantly listening to stories about hyper-masculine military culture and practices such as beating, depriving conscripts of sleep and meal-time, cursing, sexual harassment and physical sexual violence could lead to high level of psychological risks including sadness, anxiety, or embarrassment. To minimize this, I can also have counselling service I used to use in Korea face-to-face or online depending on situations during the research. If needed, I will use this service at least once a week or whenever I feel the need for it.

6. Privacy laws

I have completed the GDPR training on Blackboard and confirmed that this research will strictly follow the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in order to protect fundamental rights and freedoms of participants with regard to the processing of personal data and the researcher from a personal data breach. Participants will be informed of rights of the data subject under Articles 15 to 22 of GDPR, which will be explained in the information sheet.
If participants consent to recordings and data storage, they will be treated with anonymity in the recording and handling of data, in the thesis and any publications arising from it. To protect the confidentiality of personal data collected and limit the likelihood of a breach in confidentiality, I will use participant identification numbers instead of participant names on all electronic study documents and hard copy including audio recordings and handwritten field notes. All recordings and typed transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer and all hard copy research records will be stored in locked cabinets, only accessible to the researcher. Unless handwritten documents are only source of data, I will type or scan them and those files will be stored electronically. All research files including signed consent forms will be destroyed after five years by the researcher. Particularly, audio files from interviews will be destroyed at some point before data are placed into long-term storage because these files contain participants’ voices, which can be uniquely identifiable if accessed, and additionally, participants might not want the recording from their interview to be retained for a long time. For this reason, once the typed transcripts are verified to ensure that they correspond with what is said in the audio files, I will destroy all recordings before the maximum retention time period.

In case of a personal data breach, I will notify my supervisor without undue delay after becoming aware of the data breach. If identifying the likeliness of a high risk of the data breach to the rights and freedoms of participants, I will communicate the personal data breach to the involved data subjects, which will allow them to take necessary precautions, and describe to
them recommendations to mitigate potential adverse effects, as well as the nature of the data breach. All these procedures will take place in close cooperation with the supervisory authority.

Information sheet and informed consent form will be provided to participants in translation into Korean.
Appendix 2. Research Participant Information Sheet

1. Research Title

Examining the impact of peacekeeping operations on soldiers’ militarized masculinities: The case of Korean peacekeeping soldiers

2. Researcher – Seungeun Chung (email: chungse@tcd.ie)

This participant information sheet is designed to let you know about the aims of the study, the time commitment required from you, what will happen during the study, your right to withdraw, and how your privacy will be assured. After reading this sheet, if you would like to take part in, you will be asked to sign the attached consent form and return it to the researcher.

3. Research background and purpose

The South Korean military is increasingly involved in various types of peacekeeping around the world including UN mandated peacekeeping missions. For example, South Korean soldiers are currently part of a UN mission in Lebanon and South Sudan. The role of peacekeeping is quite different from the usual tasks that soldiers prepare and train for. Because of this, some scholars have questioned the use of military personnel for peacekeeping purposes, focusing on the concept of ‘militarized masculinity’, which suggests that men have to be trained to be very tough, physically strong and aggressive to become traditional soldiers. However, other scholars have suggested that involvement in peacekeeping can change what it is to be a soldier and shape new forms of militarized masculinity. By examining the impact of peacekeeping on Korean
soldiers’ masculinities, this study will show whether involvement in peacekeeping can contribute
to challenging traditional militarized masculinities and accordingly, to producing alternative
militarized masculinities that embody some important qualities for effective peacekeeping
missions such as care, empathy, and respect of differences.

**Key concept of the research: What is ‘militarized masculinity’?**

The military rebuilds or reframes masculinity as a means of meeting the aims of preparing men
for combat through intense military training and socialization. Through this process, men are
encouraged to embody specific masculine attributes and behaviors, such as strength,
aggressiveness, toughness, and denigration of femininity. Militarized masculinities emphasizing
these qualities can be practiced both inside and outside of the military and transformed into a
more socially desirable form. For instance, military culture characterizing hierarchy, stoicism,
emotional control, and sexual objectification of women is also found in civilian context,
particularly among male groups. There is also a tendency that veterans see non-veterans as less
competent, less cooperative, and more individualistic and women as not willing to make sacrifices
for organizations.

**4. Why have you been invited to take part in?**

(Participants in the first-round of interviews) You have been chosen because you completed
the two-year military service in Korea without deployment to peacekeeping abroad. Later, I will
conduct the second-round of interviews with men who were deployed to various types of
peacekeeping operations so I will be able to compare your experiences to the experiences of those who served as peacekeepers.

**Participants in the second-round of interviews** You have been chosen because you experienced deployment to peacekeeping missions abroad. Later, I will analyze how involvement in peacekeeping influenced your masculine identities, comparing the results of the interviews with men who completed military service in Korea without the experience of peacekeeping to those of you.

5. **Expected duration of participant’s involvement**

If you agree to take part in, I will interview you either face-to-face or online and the interview will last about 60-80 minutes. It will be held in time and a venue of your choosing.

6. **What will happen to participants during the study?**

The interview questions will address issues related to your definition of masculinity (e.g., ‘What do you think important qualities to become an ideal man in Korean society?’), your military or peacekeeping life (e.g., ‘How do you view your military service?’, ‘What was your role in peacekeeping?’), your experiences of and views on female soldiers (e.g., ‘What was female soldiers’ role?’, ‘How did you perceive female soldiers?’), and the impact of military service or peacekeeping on you (e.g., What do you think the positive and negative impacts of your military service/peacekeeping on you?’). If you consent, the interview will be audio recorded and transported to my password protected computer, and then deleted from recording devices.
Audio files will be typed transcribed later by the researcher. You will not be named in the transcript or these but referred to only by a participant number such as K1, or P1.

7. Anticipated risks and benefits to participants

Although participating in this research would not be anticipated to cause any economic, legal and social harms, it could cause psychological discomfort or distress to you if traumatic past experiences came up in the course of the interview. If this happens, I will have referral recommendations for you to connect you with counselling support.

If you are currently serving in the military as professional soldiers, you might feel uncomfortable with frank and open talks because you are working with other service members at the same time. I am very well aware of this and so confidentiality and anonymity will be strictly protected during whole processes of the research.

Please note that you can also benefit from this opportunity to reflect on your experiences and share your views. In addition, you might enjoy participating in this research as a contribution to social science.

8. Rights of the participants

You have several distinct rights conferred by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

- You have the right to be informed about the use of your personal data in a clear manner and be told the actions that can be taken if you feel your rights and freedoms are not being protected.
- You have the right to access to your personal data and additional prescribed information regarding the processing of your data. Following an access request, I will provide you with a copy of the personal data undergoing processing in an electronic form. All emails containing your personal data will be transmitted in an encrypted form.

- You have the right to have your data transmitted to another organization.

- You have the right to rectify your personal data if you find them inaccurate or incomplete. Or you are entitled to insist that your data be retained but not otherwise processed without consent, pending verification of the accuracy of the data.

- You have the right to have your personal data erased and to prevent the processing of your data in circumstances where the processing of data is unlawful, unfair or not transparent, or even if the processing does not cause you any damage or distress.

- You have the right to withdraw consent to this research at any time. If you request a withdrawal by e-mailing me, I will destroy all research files concerning you without any penalty.

9. Confidentiality of collected data

All the information collected during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. You will not be able to be identified or identifiable in any reports or publications. To protect the confidentiality of your data and limit the likelihood of a breach in confidentiality, I will use participant identification numbers instead of participant names on all electronic study documents.
and hard copy, including audio recordings and handwritten field notes. All recordings and typed transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer and all hard copy research records will be stored in locked cabinets, only accessible to the researcher. Unless handwritten documents are only source of data, I will type or scan them and those files will be stored electronically. All research files including signed consent forms will be destroyed after five years by the researcher (this data retention period is based on the College Records Retention Schedule). All paper research files containing personal data will be shredded, as opposed to simply thrown away.

When I need to use case study examples from this research, I will use participant numbers and remove all personal identifiers to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

**10. Direct quotations from participants**

Direct quotations from you may be presented in translation into English in the thesis but you will not be named. Any confidential, personally identifiable information concerning you will not be revealed.

**11. Results of the research project**

Results of the research will be submitted to the School of Religion, Trinity College Dublin, as a PhD dissertation. Other than this, they may be disseminated for conferences and publications inside and outside of the college.

**12. What if something goes wrong?**
If you have any complaint about the research process, feel your complaint has not been handled properly, or find any inappropriate or unethical activity from the researcher, you can contact the Data Protection Officer for the Trinity College Dublin (dataprotection@tcd.ie) or the Chair of the School of Religion Research Ethics Committee, Dr. David Mitchell (damitche@tcd.ie) and report it.

13. Contacts for further information

Lead researcher: Seungeun Chung, PhD Candidate in International Peace Studies in the School of Religion, Trinity College Dublin, E mail: chungse@tcd.ie

Supervisor: Gillian Wylie, Assistant Professor in International Peace Studies and Course Coordinator, PG Dip in Conflict and Dispute Resolution Studies, Director of Postgraduate Teaching and Learning, Trinity College Dublin, E mail: wylieg@tcd.ie, Tel: +353 1 896 4788

14. Available services

As mentioned above, if the interview causes psychological discomfort or distress to you and you need any support to deal with it, you can use these following services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Counselling Center run by the Ministry of Health and Welfare | Tel: +82-129  
Service hours: Monday to Friday, 9:00 ~ 18:00 
This service is only available on phone lines (If you need urgent help, you will be provided... |
| SDU Psychological Counselling Center | Tel: +82 2-2128-3254  
Service hours: Monday to Friday, 10:00 ~ 21:00, Saturday 10:00 ~ 17:00  
Address: 424 Gonghang-daero, Hwagok 6(yuk)-dong, Gangseo-gu, Seoul, South Korea |
Appendix 3. Research Participant Informed Consent Form

Lead Researcher: Seungeun Chung

Research Title: Examining the impact of peacekeeping operations on soldiers’ militarized masculinities: The case of Korean peacekeeping soldiers

I have been invited to take part in this research project as I have served in the Korean military, having completed my two-year compulsory military service and/or served in the Korean military as part of an international force, or UN peacekeeping operations. I have read and understood the participant information form and am willing to take part in the interview for this research.

If you agree, please complete the checkbox below.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I confirmed that I have read the information sheet for this research. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, without my rights and freedoms being affected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. I agree that my data is used for scientific purposes and I have no objection that my data is published in scientific publications in a way that does not reveal my identity.

4. I agree to the interview being audio recorded.

5. I understand that no recordings will be replayed in any public forum or made available to any audience other than the current researcher.

6. I understand my personal data will be stored as de-identified forms and destroyed after 5 years.

7. I understand that my participation is fully anonymous and that no personal details about me will be recorded.

8. I understand that I will not gain any direct personal or financial benefit from the research.

9. I freely and voluntarily agree to be part of this research study, without prejudice to my legal and ethical rights.

Participant’s Name:

Participant’s Signature: Date:

Researcher’s Name:
Appendix 4. Research Questions

First Round of Interviews

1. How do you describe an ideal man in Korean society? What qualities do you think are necessarily achieved to become an ideal man?

2. How do you conceptualize yourself in terms of ideal manhood you mentioned above?

3. Do you think there is a linkage between becoming an ideal man and completing military service in Korean society?

4. How was your experience of boot camp?

5. What was difficulty adjusting to military life?

6. What was your military role and how was it?

7. What were the characteristics of military-specific culture? How did you find military culture, practices, and norms?

8. How was your relationship with other service members?

9. Did you experience working with female soldiers? If so, how was it?

10. Did you experience serving with gay servicemembers? If so, how was it?

11. What do you think about integrating women into all military occupations including combat roles?

12. What qualities do you think are important to complete military service successfully?

13. How the military service impact on your masculine identity?
Second Round of Interviews

1. How do you describe an ideal man in Korean society? What qualities do you think are necessarily achieved to become an ideal man?

2. How do you conceptualize yourself in terms of ideal manhood you mentioned above?

3. Do you think there is a linkage between becoming an ideal man and completing military service in Korean society?

4. What was your motivation for deployment to peacekeeping?

5. How was the pre-deployment and onsite gender training? Do you think it is necessary or unnecessary for effective peacekeeping?

6. Did you experience serving with gay servicemembers? If so, how was it?

7. What was difficulty adjusting to peacekeeping environment?

8. What was different about being a soldier in peacekeeping?

9. What was your role during the mission? How did you feel about your role?

10. Was there any moment you felt powerless, meaningless, incompetent or disappointed?

11. When did you feel good about/proud of yourself during the mission?

12. Did you experience interaction with local people? If so, please describe it in detail.

13. What did you think about female peacekeepers and their roles?

14. What was difference or similarity between female soldiers’ roles in peacekeeping and military units in Korea? What do you think about that difference or similarity?
15. Did you witness or hear about injustices conducted by peacekeepers such as gender-based violence, any type of discrimination, or labor exploitation? What did you think about it?

16. What qualities do you think are important to serve as peacekeepers? Are they different from those for soldiers to defend our nation or not?

17. What was the impact of peacekeeping on your masculine identity/military identity?
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