

**ENGAGING MEN IN
ENDING MEN'S
VIOLENCE AGAINST
WOMEN**

Michael Flood



18 – 22 February 2002, University of Sydney, Australia

ENGAGING MEN IN ENDING MEN'S VIOLENCE

AGAINST WOMEN

Dr Michael Flood

PO Box 26, Ainslie, ACT 2602

Tel: (02) 6247 3018

E-mail: michael.flood@anu.edu.au

Abstract

There are empirical relationships between men's violence against women and the social organisation of masculinities at multiple levels of the social order. This paper begins with an overview of such relationships, making the argument that investigating the configuration and meaning of men's practices and relations is critical in accounting for violence against women. While men are the problem, they are also part of the solution. The paper then explores three ways in which men have been engaged in the efforts to challenge violence against women: as profeminist participants in men's collective activism against violence,¹ as the targets of public education campaigns, and as members of programs for perpetrators of violence. In each case, there are important questions of social structure and gendered power at stake. The paper assesses the efficacy of each strategy, in order to improve efforts to prevent and respond to men's violence against women.

¹ A longer version of the discussion of men's anti-violence activism was published previously (Flood, 2001).

Introduction: Men, masculinities and violence against women

Men's physical and sexual violence against women is widely identified as a fundamental barrier to gender equality. This violence harms women's physical and emotional health, restricts their sexual and reproductive choices, and hinders their participation in political decision-making and public life. Men's violence both expresses and maintains gendered power relations. For the past three decades women, women's groups and the women's movements around the globe have sought to critique, respond to and prevent violence against women. Their efforts are complemented by the efforts of small but growing networks of men.

When it comes to violence against women, men are both part of the problem and part of the solution. In terms of the former, men constitute the overwhelmingly majority of the perpetrators of violence against women. In terms of the latter therefore, men's behaviours and attitudes must change if violence against women is to be eliminated. However, physical and sexual aggressiveness is not essentially male. The intimate links between men, masculinity and violence are the product of society and history, not biology. Men's violence against women is not universal: there are cultures in which gender-based violence is absent or exceedingly rare (Heise, 1995 pp 126–128), and at an individual level many men do not use violence. In academic scholarship there is a growing emphasis on multivariate explanations of men's violence against women, in which it is assumed that violence is “a multifaceted phenomenon grounded in an interplay among personal, situational, and sociocultural factors” (Heise, 1998 pp 263–264). Nevertheless, there are empirical relationships between the social organisation of masculinity and violence at multiple levels of the social order.

Violence against women is more likely in cultures in which manhood is culturally defined as linked to dominance, toughness, or male honour (Connell, 1985 p 6; Heise, 1998 p 277). In contexts where “being a man” involves aggressiveness, the repression of empathy and a sense of entitlement to power, those men who are violent are acting out the dictates of what it means to be a “normal” male. At an individual level, men who have hostile and negative sexual attitudes towards women, see violence as manly and desirable, and danger as exciting are more likely to be sexually

aggressive and sexually harassing (O'Neil & Harway, 1997 p 192; Heise, 1998 p 277). Research among convicted rapists and college students finds that sexually violent men identify with traditional images of masculinity and male gender role privilege, believe in rape stereotypes, and see being male as carrying the right to discipline and punish women (Warshaw, 1988; Scully, 1990). Men with more traditional, rigid and misogynistic gender-role attitudes are more likely to practise marital violence (Alder, 1992 p 269; O'Neil & Harway, 1997 p 192; Heise, 1998 p 278). Especially among young men, attachment to male peers who encourage and legitimate woman abuse is a significant predictor of sexual, physical and psychological abuse by men in dating relationships (Heise, 1998 p 277).

At the level of the immediate context in which violence takes place – typically families or other intimate or acquaintance relationships – there are further relationships between masculinity, power and violence. Cross-culturally, male economic and decision-making dominance in the family is one of the strongest predictors of societies showing high levels of violence against women (Heise, 1998 pp 270–71). Wife abuse is more likely in couples with a clearly dominant husband and in societies in which men control the wealth, especially the fruits of family labour (p 271).

Theoretical accounts of violence against women which make the links between this violence, gendered power relations and social constructions of masculinity have considerably more explanatory power than accounts rooted in biological determinism or essentialism. However, a full account must incorporate the intertwining of gendered violence with other axes of social differentiation and power. Like other forms of social behaviour, men's violence against women is shaped by race, class, sexuality and other social divisions (Segal, 1990 p 241). The prevalence and character of interpersonal violence is constituted in particular historical and political contexts, which may include wars and militarism, colonialism and imperialism (Greig et al., 2000 p 13).

(1) Engaging men as profeminist participants in men's collective activism against violence

In many countries, both developing and developed, groups of men have emerged whose agenda is to end men's violence against women and children. They share the fundamental premise that men must take responsibility for stopping men's violence. Taking responsibility begins with

individual men taking personal steps to minimise their use of violence (Warshaw, 1988 pp 161–67; Funk, 1993 pp 95–111; Kimmel, 1993; Madhubuti, 1993; Weinberg & Biernbaum, 1993). But it goes beyond this, to public and collective action. Anti-violence men's groups engage in community education campaigns, hold rallies and marches, work with violent men, facilitate workshops in schools and prisons and workplaces, and act in alliance with women's groups and organisations.

The best-known example of men's anti-violence activism is the White Ribbon Campaign, a grassroots education campaign which spans at least four continents. The White Ribbon Campaign is the first large-scale male protest against violence in the world. It began in 1991 on the second anniversary of one man's massacre of 14 women in Montreal, Canada, and it has now spread to the U.S.A., Europe, Africa, Latin America and Australia. The idea of the White Ribbon Campaign (WRC) is very simple; to encourage men to show their opposition to men's violence against women, by purchasing and wearing a white ribbon. In pinning on the ribbon, men pledge themselves never to commit, condone or remain silent about violence against women. Alongside this international campaign, there are men's groups in at least a dozen countries that share the goal of ending men's violence against women, including Australia (Fuller & Fisher, 1998 p 3).

Men's anti-violence groups and organisations have adopted strategies of both violence prevention and violence intervention. Prevention aims to lessen the likelihood of men using violence in the first place by undermining the beliefs, values and discourses which support violence, challenging the patriarchal power relations which promote and are maintained by violence, and promoting alternative constructions of masculinity, gender and selfhood which foster non-violence and gender justice. Boys and young men in schools are a particularly important target group for anti-violence efforts, and both men's groups and government agencies have developed programs for the school setting (Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998 pp 222–251; Cameron, 2000). In terms of violence intervention, some men's anti-violence groups work with male perpetrators.

Men's anti-violence activism is significant in at least two ways. First, it symbolises the growing recognition that violence against women will only cease when men join with women to put an end to it. Second, the existence of men's anti-violence activism demonstrates that men *can* take collective public

action to oppose men's violence. The campaigns I have described represent successful attempts to create among men, albeit sometimes small numbers of men, a public response to men's violence. More broadly, men can and do organise and agitate in support of gender justice. There are historical precedents in men's organised support for women's suffrage and equality in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Strauss, 1982; Kimmel & Mosmiller, 1992; John & Eustance, 1997). In addition, contemporary men's anti-violence groups are one expression of a wider network of profeminist men's activism. Thus, 'it is not a question of whether men can take action but how' (Pease, 1997 p 76).

Men's collective mobilisations on gender issues are a delicate form of political activity, as they involve the mobilisation of members of a privileged group in order to undermine that same privilege. Most if not all contemporary societies are characterised by men's institutional privilege (Messner, 1997 p 5), such that men in general receive a 'patriarchal dividend' from gendered structures of inequality (Connell, 1995 pp 79–82). The danger therefore is that by mobilising men collectively as men and thus drawing on their shared interests, activists will inadvertently entrench gender privilege (ibid: 234-238). This potential has been realised among the 'men's rights' and 'fathers' rights' groups in the conservative wings of the men's movements, who are energetically engaged in an anti-women and anti-feminist backlash (Flood, 1997; 1998). It is not surprising therefore that some women are nervous about men's participation in campaigns against violence.

However, men can be and are motivated by interests other than those associated with gender privilege. There are important resources in men's lives for the construction of non-violent masculinities and forms of selfhood, such as men's concerns for children, intimacies with women, and ethical and political commitments. Furthermore, given the intersection of gender with other social divisions, men share very unequally in the fruits of gender privilege (Messner, 1997 p 7) and men's material interests are multiple and complex.

Men's anti-violence efforts should be done in partnership with women. Most of the men's groups and organisations I have described conduct their efforts in alliance with women and women's groups. More radically, many profeminist men's groups position themselves as accountable to feminist constituencies: they consult with women's groups before initiating their campaigns, do not

compete with women's groups for funding or other resources, and build strong lines of communication and trust (Funk, 1993 pp 125-126,132-134).

Men's partnerships with anti-violence women's groups are critical. They enable men to learn from existing efforts and scholarship rather than 'reinventing the wheel'. They lessen the risk that men will collude in or be complicit with dominant and oppressive forms of masculinity. They are a powerful and practical demonstration of men's and women's shared interest in stopping violence. Men's partnerships with women are an inspiring example of cross-gender collaboration, a form of activism which reaches across and transforms gender inequalities.

(2) Engaging men as the targets of public education campaigns

In Australia, there have been three government-run education campaigns on violence against women which are directed at men or include addresses to men. The first was the national campaign "Stop Violence Against Women" by the Commonwealth government's Office of the Status of Women in 1993-94. The second, in 1998, was the West Australian Government's "Freedom From Fear" campaign, aimed at male perpetrators of domestic violence and men 'at risk' of perpetrating domestic violence. The third, which began in 2000, is a New South Wales government campaign directed at 21-29 year old men, titled "Violence Against Women – It's Against All the Rules." These campaigns share similar goals: to increase the unacceptability of violence against women and to encourage men's understandings of violence against women.

The national and NSW campaigns both use the strategy of drawing on aspects of masculine culture and male identity in attempting to shift men's attitudes and behaviours. The OSW campaign used posters which speak particularly to a male audience, stating that "Real men don't bash or rape women". The appeal to "real men" both colludes with men's investments in maleness and attempts to re-define their meaning, such that to be truly male is to be non-violent. Both campaigns use prominent men in their print materials, and particularly sportsmen. The NSW campaign goes further, targeting men through sporting organisations with a high membership of men and in its print materials adopting language which plays on the rules of popular masculine sporting codes. It borrows common sporting terms in ways

which lend support to the idea that violence against women is unacceptable. Rugby league player Laurie Daley is shown alongside the words, "Force a woman into touch? That's sexual assault." Cricketer Michael Slater says, "Sledging a woman? That's abuse." Soccer player Mark Bosnich says, "Mark a woman, watch her every move? That's stalking." And Australian Rules player Dale Lewis says, "Striking a woman? That's assault."

Sport is a domain widely identified as masculine and masculinising (Bryson, 1990). It is precisely this significance which informs the anti-violence campaigns. As the NSW campaign materials state, "sport provides the community with many positive masculine role models... all-round 'good blokes'" (Violence Against Women Specialist Unit, 2000 p 4). Such role models:

can change other men's attitudes. They can show that a man can be aggressive, strong, competitive and tough without being violent... sports role models can show that a masculine man is not a violent man (Violence Against Women Specialist Unit, 2000 pp 4,24).

However, the masculine character of sport also poses real contradictions for anti-violence work. Sporting culture is one social force among many which contributes to the construction of violent masculinity as a cultural norm. The "combat sport subculture" of games such as rugby melds athleticism, manliness, and violence. Sport has been an important site for teaching boys and men some of the key values associated with dominant constructions of masculinity, such as extreme competitiveness, aggression, dominance and power-over. Through the ideological and bodily practices of sport, boys and young men are taught to be tough and to bear pain and they receive direct training in power and forcefulness (Bryson, 1990 p 179; Schissel, 2000). Violence is normalised, naturalised and rewarded in sport (Messner, 1992), and media representations of sport routinely glorify the "legitimate violence" of male athletes (McKay, 1996).

There are more direct associations however between men, sport and violence against women. Athletes are over-represented among the men who commit acts of sexual assault and domestic violence. An American university study found that while sports team members make up less than 2 percent of the campus population, they comprise 20.2 percent of the men involved in sexual assault or attempted sexual assault (Frintner & Rubinson, 1993). A similar study found that while athletes made up just 3.3 percent of the student body, they were responsible for 19 percent of all sexual assaults reported to

campus authorities and 35 percent of reported batteries (cited in Demause, 2000). Another found that athletes report significantly greater agreement with rape-supportive statements than men in general (Boeringer, 1999). One factor here is male homosociality;

Like other tightly-knit competitive male groups (e.g., military units, gangs, college fraternities), sport often produces 'groupthink' – a mindset that makes men incapable of believing that there is anything wrong with their abusive or violent behaviour toward women (McKay, 1996)

Another factor is male athletes' sense of entitlement: many have been told that their sporting prowess puts them above the law and above scrutiny and their abusive behaviour has been tolerated or hushed up (Demause, 2000). More generally, cultures of misogyny and violence which foster violence against women have been documented in such sports as ice hockey (Robinson, 1998; West, 1996), American football, and rugby (Schacht, 1996).

It seems dangerous therefore to use masculine sporting culture to foster non-violence. Despite drawing on feminist analyses of violence, background documents for the NSW campaign are remarkably silent about the gendered and violence-supportive character of sport (Cheetham, 2001 p 10). Some may argue that the campaigns tackle this directly, by simultaneously shifting sporting culture as they shift the attitudes of men in general, and the NSW campaign does involve sporting clubs, training of sportsmen as educators, sports sponsorship and other activities (ibid: 18). In fact, some American violence prevention programs focus on training male athletes as peer educators in violence prevention (Katz, 1995). Evaluations of the NSW campaign are not yet available, but it will be interesting to see what kind of effect it has had. I would be delighted if I were proved wrong: if the evaluations demonstrate that this sports-based campaign has had a substantial effect on men's attitudes and behaviours.

The West Australian "Freedom From Fear" campaign uses a different kind of appeal to men, shaped by its target audience not of men in general but of male perpetrators and men 'at risk' of perpetrating domestic violence (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 1998, 1999a; Donovan, Patterson & Francas, 1999; Donovan et al., 2000). What is striking about the "Freedom From Fear" campaign is its reliance on health promotion and social marketing insights, and particularly the extensive process used to assess which messages were most likely to motivate such men to change their behaviour. The campaign organisers had to craft a message which simultaneously was

personally relevant to men and encouraged them to seek help, challenged their behaviour and said that they are accountable for their violence, and which did not have negative consequences for other audiences such as women and children.

The “Freedom From Fear” campaign tested a variety of messages and themes with both perpetrators and general men in the community, and found that the most powerful and motivating theme was a focus on the damaging consequences of the perpetrator’s behaviour for their children (Paterson, 1998). Initial evaluations of the campaign’s effect up to mid-1999 found that it has been effective in communicating to men that domestic violence has damaging consequences for children and that help is available, and in encouraging men to call the Domestic Violence Helpline (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 1999b; Paterson, 2001 pp 77-80).

Efforts to reach men on gender issues through community education face an enormous challenge given the current organisation of masculinity and gender relations. In particular, they must negotiate a tension between two necessary elements: between speaking to men in ways which engage with the realities of their lives on the one hand, and challenging the patriarchal power relations and gendered discourses which are the fabric of those same lives on the other. An ambivalent strategy of complicity and challenge appears to be the increasingly common response to this tension. In directing one’s message of anti-violence to “real men” and in using ‘real men’ (sportsmen and other male role models) to voice their message, the OSW and NSW campaigns are complicit in the common constructions and preoccupations of masculinity. In effect they try to ‘use masculinity against itself’, drawing on forms of masculine identity and culture in order to challenge the violent practices and discourses which themselves have been associated with dominant masculinity. This strategy is evident too in overseas efforts, such as the American campaign “My strength is not for hurting” by Men Can Stop Rape, which encourages men to practise consent and respect in their sexual relations. This campaign does not speak of ‘real men’, but it does attempt to reconfigure a trait traditionally associated with masculinity, strength, such that it now embodies non-violence and moral selfhood.

Such strategies run the risk of colluding with and intensifying forms of understanding and practice among men which are already troubling for some feminist critiques, such as men’s investments in notions of manhood and ‘real’

manliness. On the other hand, their appeal to identity may be precisely what helps them work. Stoltenberg, one of the most radical advocates for the deconstruction of male gender identity, is also the author of Men Can Stop Rape's 'strength' campaign. He argues that among young men, "at an age when issues of gender identity are rampant, when masculinity as dominance is normative, when there is no "I" at all apart from manhood-proving acts", the campaign models positive identities based on moral reasoning and selfhood rather than gender-identity anxiety and manhood (Stoltenberg, 2001). Educational approaches which tackle masculinity head on may be less effective in shifting men's violent practices than strategies based on simultaneous complicity and challenge, and at the end of the day, that is what counts.

(3) Engaging men as members of programs for perpetrators of violence

In working with men who have used violence, many behaviour change programs have moved a long way since the first perpetrator programs began in 1983 (NSW Women's Co-ordination Unit, 1991). Early focuses on anger management and the pathologising of perpetrators, and practices of non-accountability and inattention to women's and children's safety, have largely been abandoned in favour of more informed, accountable and integrated responses. However, in assessing the strategy of working with men who have practised violence against women, important questions of effectiveness and social change remain. In the interests of brevity, I will make only two points about men's behaviour change programs.

First, one hears the claim that men's behaviour change programs 'prevent men's violence', but they do not. As Pease writes, "Assisting individual men to stop using violence has little impact on the social context in which violence occurs." (Pease, 2002 p 333) Given that violence against women is borne out of systematic gender inequalities, eradicating these is the fundamental way to end this violence (p 324). In other words, changes at the level of social structures, institutions and cultural processes are necessary, and only they would constitute a substantial prevention strategy. Some practitioners do acknowledge this, situating perpetrator programs as "tertiary" prevention (in preventing the re-occurrence of violence) and "secondary" prevention (in reducing opportunities for violence by supporting males at risk) (Boyle, 2001 p

1). Nevertheless, my concern is that men's behaviour change programs may be seen by governments and human services as the main intervention into men's violence, as 'the solution', while criminal justice interventions and cultural change strategies are neglected (Pease & Fisher, 2001 p 50; Pease, 2002 p 326).

Second, one reads overly optimistic statements from program providers about the effectiveness for example of voluntary perpetrator programs (Pease & Fisher, 2001 p 52). Evaluations of effectiveness are methodologically complex (for example with the evidence that different programs work best with different types of perpetrators), and comprehensive Australian evaluations are rare. Nevertheless, according to the National Crime Prevention review, the existing evidence for the effectiveness of perpetrator programs is inconclusive, and shaped by how further violence is measured, structural features of the program, participant attrition and difficulties in gaining partner reports (NCP, 1991 pp 75-79). There are areas of ongoing controversy, for example over the relative merits of and emphases on mandated versus voluntary programs (No To Violence, 1999; Pease & Fisher, 2001).

There is no doubt that some behaviour change programs, particularly those incorporated in an integrated criminal justice response, make a significant difference to men's likelihood of further using violence against women. Perpetrator programs are not the only strategy, nor even the most vital strategy, but they are an important element in the wider project of eliminating violence against women (Dobash & Dobash, 1996 p 15).

Conclusion

Profound changes in men's lives, gendered power relations and the social construction of masculinity are necessary if violence against women is to be eliminated. If gender-based violence is to be undermined, men themselves will need to take part in this project, by changing their own violent behaviour and by joining with women in challenging the cultural and institutional underpinnings of violence in their communities and countries. Men's participation must be guided by gender justice and gender partnership, as these principles are integral to men's ability to cultivate a lasting legacy of peace.

References

- Alder, C. (1992). 'Violence, gender and social change'. *International Social Science Journal*, 132.
- Boeringer, S. B. (1999). 'Associations of rape-supportive attitudes with fraternal and athletic participation'. *Violence Against Women*, 5(1): 81- 90.
- Boyle, M. (2001). *Men, violence and change*. Paper to conference "Seeking Solutions: Australia's Inaugural Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Conference", Gold Coast, 5-7 September.
- Bryson, L. (1990). 'Challenges to male hegemony in sport'. In Messner, M. A. & Sabo, D. F. (Eds), *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Illinois: Human Kinetics Books.
- Cameron, M. (2000). 'Young men and violence prevention'. *Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice*, No. 154. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Cheetham, J. (2001). 'NSW Statewide Campaign to Reduce Violence Against Women: "Violence Against Women – It's Against All the Rules"'. Paper to conference "Seeking Solutions: Australia's Inaugural Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Conference". Gold Coast, 5-7 September.
- Connell, R. W. (1985). 'Masculinity, violence and war'. In Patton, P. & Poole, R. (Eds), *War/masculinity*. Sydney: Intervention Publications.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Demaue, N. (2000). 'Punch like a man: Big-time sports' domestic violence problem'. *Village Voice*, March 8-14.
- Dobash, R. E.; & Dobash, R. P. (1996). 'Men's violence and innovative programs focused on change'. Paper to the conference "International perspectives on violence against women: Evaluating new initiatives", Sydney, 29 August.
- Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (1998). *Freedom From Fear: Campaign Against Domestic Violence – Background information document*. Perth: Women's Policy Development Office, WA Government.
- Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (1999a). *Freedom From Fear: Campaign Against Domestic Violence – Campaign Information Sheet No. 3*,

Implementing the Campaign. Perth: Women's Policy Development Office, WA Government.

Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (1999b). *Freedom From Fear: Campaign Against Domestic Violence – Campaign Information Sheet No. 4, Campaign Evaluation Results – Phase 1*. Perth: Women's Policy Development Office, WA Government.

Donovan, R. J.; Patterson, D.; & Francas, M. (1999). 'Targeting male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: Western Australia's "Freedom From Fear" campaign'. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 5(3), September.

Donovan, R. J.; Patterson, D.; Francas, M. & Zapelli, R. (2000). Formative research for mass media-based campaigns: Western Australia's Freedom From Fear Campaign targeting male perpetrators of intimate partner violence'. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 10(2).

Flood, M. (1997). 'Responding to men's rights'. *XY: Men, Sex, Politics*, 7(2).

Flood, M. (1998). 'Men's movements. *Community Quarterly*, 46.

Flood, M. (2001). 'Men stopping violence: Men's collective anti-violence activism and the struggle for gender justice'. *Development*. Special Issue: Violence against Women and the Culture of Masculinity, 44(3).

Frintner, M. P.; & Rubinson, L. (1993). 'Acquaintance rape: The influence of alcohol, fraternity membership, and sports team membership'. *Journal of Sex Education & Therapy*, 19: 272-284.

Fuller, R.; & Fisher, S. (1998). 'A decade of profeminist activism: A brief history of Men Against Sexual Assault'. *Community Quarterly*, 46.

Funk, R. E. (1993). *Stopping Rape: A challenge for men*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.

Gilbert, R.; & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity Goes to School*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Greig, A.; Kimmel, M.; & Lang, J. (2000). *Men, masculinities & development: Broadening our work towards gender equality*. Gender in Development Programme, UNDP: Gender in Development Monograph Series #10.

Heise, L. L. (1995). 'Violence, sexuality, and women's lives'. In Parker, R. G. & Gagnon, J. H. (Eds), *Conceiving sexuality: Approaches to sex research in a postmodern world*. New York & London: Routledge.

Heise, L. L. (1998). 'Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework'. *Violence Against Women*, 4(3).

John, A. V.; & Eustance, C. (Eds) (1997). *The men's share?: Masculinities, male support and women's suffrage in Britain, 1890–1920*. London: Routledge.

Katz, J. (1995). 'Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The mentors in violence prevention project'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(2): 163–174.

Kaufman, M. (1997). 'Working with men and boys to challenge sexism and end men's violence'. UNESCO Expert Group Meeting 'Male roles and masculinities in the perspective of a culture of peace', Oslo, Norway, pp 24–28.

Kimmel, M. S. (1993). 'Clarence, William, Iron Mike, Tailhook, Senator Packwood, Spur Posse, Magic... and us.' In Buchwald, E.; Fletcher, P. & Roth, M. (Eds), *Transforming a rape culture*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.

Kimmel, Michael S. and Mosmiller, Thomas E. (1992). *Against the Tide: Pro-feminist men in the United States, 1776–1990*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Madhubuti, H. R. (1993). 'On becoming anti-rapist'. In Buchwald, E.; Fletcher, P. & Roth, M. (Eds), *Transforming a rape culture*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.

McKay, Jim (1996). 'Men, the media and sporting heroes'. *XY: Men, Sex, Politics*. 6(2), Winter.

Messner, M. A. (1992). 'When bodies are weapons'. *Peace Review*, 4(3): 28–31.

Messner, M. A. (1997). *Politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. University of Southern California: Sage Publications.

National Crime Prevention (1999). *Ending Domestic Violence? Programs for Perpetrators*. Canberra: National Crime Prevention, Attorney-General's Department

No To Violence (1999). 'Towards integrated community responses to men who use violence towards family members'. *No To Violence Newsletter*, 1(1).

NSW Women's Co-ordination Unit (1991). *Programmes for perpetrators of domestic violence: Discussion paper*. Sydney: Ministry of Education, Youth and Women's Affairs, January.

O'Neil, J. M.; & Harway, M. (1997). 'A multivariate model explaining men's violence toward women: Predisposing and triggering hypotheses'. *Violence Against Women*, 3(2), April.

Paterson, D. (1998). *Freedom from fear: Campaign against Domestic Violence. Communicating the consequences of domestic violence on children as one method of influencing the beliefs, attitudes and behaviour of violent men*. Proceedings of "2nd National Conference on Children, Young People & Domestic Violence", 30 September - 2 October, Brisbane: Domestic Violence Resource Centre.

Paterson, D. (2001). *The research and development of a community education campaign on domestic violence: A case study*. Masters thesis, Public Health, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Western Australia.

Pease, R. (1997). *Men & sexual politics: Towards a profeminist practice*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Pease, R. (2002, in press). *Men and gender relations*. Melbourne: Tertiary Press.

Pease, R.; & Fisher, S. (2001). 'Preventing men's violence: A response to the Victorian whole of government discussion paper on men's behaviour change programs'. *Women Against Violence*. 10, July.

Robinson, L. (1998). *Crossing the line: Violence and sexual assault in Canada's national sport*. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart

Schacht, S. P. (1996). 'Misogyny on and off the 'pitch': The gendered world of male rugby players'. *Gender & Society*, 10(5), October.

Schissel, B. (2000). 'Boys against girls: The structural and interpersonal dimensions of violent patriarchal culture in the lives of young men'. *Violence Against Women*, 6(9): 960-986.

Scully, D. (1990). *Understanding sexual violence: A study of convicted rapists*. Boston: Unwin Hyman

Segal, L. (1990). *Slow motion: Changing masculinities, changing men*. London: Virago

Stoltenberg, J. (2001). 'Re: [PROFEM] Men can stop rape'. Feb. Newsletter. *Profem discussion list* (online). 5 Feb. 2001. profem-l@coombs.anu.edu.au

Strauss, S. (1982). *“Traitors to the masculine cause”: The men’s campaigns for women’s rights*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Violence Against Women Specialist Unit (2000). *Violence Against Women – It’s Against All the Rules*. Sydney: NSW Attorney General’s Department.

Warshaw, R. (1988). *I never called it rape*. New York: Harper & Row.

Weinberg, J.; & Biernbaum, M. (1993). ‘The conversations of consent: Sexual intimacy without sexual assault’. In Buchwald, E.; Fletcher, P. & Roth, M. (Eds), *Transforming a rape culture*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.

West, W. G. (1996). ‘Youth sports and violence: A masculine subculture?’ In O’Bireck, G. M. (Ed), *Not a kid anymore: Canadian youth, crime, and subcultures*. Toronto: Nelson, pp 309–348.