

Men's Intimate Partner Abuse and Control: Reconciling paradoxical masculinities and social contradictions

**A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

by

Clare Murphy

BA Auckland, BSocSc(Hons) Waikato, MSocSc(Hons) Waikato



School of Justice

Faculty of Law

Queensland University of Technology

Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

2009

“Manliness, it can be seen, is an eminently *relational* notion,
constructed in front of and for other men
and against femininity,
in a kind of *fear* of the female, firstly in oneself.”

– Pierre Bourdieu, 2001:53

Statement of Original Authorship

The work contained in this thesis has not been previously submitted for a degree or diploma at any other higher education institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made.

Clare Murphy

.....
Signed

.....
Date

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to
all the women who have ever been at the receiving end of
men's intimate partner abuse and control.

May this research contribute towards safety and social justice
for women and men – now and in the future.

Abstract

Intimate partner abuse and control is one of the most common forms of violence against women, and is considered an international problem of social, political, legal and human rights significance. Yet few studies have attempted to understand this problem from the perspective of male perpetrators. This gap is addressed by conducting in-depth interviews with 16 able-bodied men of white European ancestry born and educated in New Zealand or Australia, who have been physically violent and/or emotionally, intellectually, sexually or financially controlling of a live-in female partner.

This thesis extends and deepens the dominant ways of thinking about men's intimate partner abuse by utilising a new theoretical framework compatible with contemporary feminist scholarship. A synthesis of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory is utilised for the purpose of exploring more nuanced, complex understandings of manliness and men's relationships with men, women and social structures.

Through such an analysis, this thesis finds that men's perpetration of power and control over women is driven by a need to avoid the stigma of appearing weak. As a consequence, their desire and ability to show love, care and empathy is suppressed in favour of a presumed honourable manliness, and their female partners are used as weapons in the pursuit of symbolic capital in the form of recognition, prestige and acceptance from real and/or imagined men. This research also uncovers the complex interplay between masculine practices and particular social contexts. For example, the norms of practice encountered from those in authority, such as teachers, sports coaches, police, court judges and workplace management, influences the decision making of the men in this study, to use, or not to use, physical violence, psychological abuse and structural control.

The principal conclusion is that there is a repertoire of paradoxical masculinities and contradictory social messages available to the men in this study. But gender policing by other men, complicit women and those in authority provides little room for legitimate complexity in masculine practices. Perpetrators in this study reconcile these conflicts of interest by generally avoiding subordinated masculinity and possible ostracism, and instead practicing more heroic hegemonic masculinities by abusing and controlling women and particular other men. This thesis concludes that for intimate partner abuse and control to cease, changes in power structures have to occur at all levels of society.

Key Words

Bourdieu; bullying; Connell; domestic violence; habitus; hegemonic masculinity; honour; intimate partner abuse; masculinities; perpetrator; power and control; psychological abuse; subordinated masculinity; symbolic capital.

Glossary

Bullying:	Repeated name calling, verbal abuse, threats, intimidation, damaging possessions, manipulation, coercing victim to do things against their will, taunts, social exclusion – in an environment of power imbalance.
Capital:	Symbolic capital, economic capital, social capital provide men with varying degrees of power, authority and resources dependent on what is required or acceptable in different social situations.
Complicit masculinities:	Condone the hegemonic project and does not actively challenge the gender order. Complicit masculinities are formed around the continuing social subordination of women, therefore benefit by it and may entail similar practices to those of hegemonic masculinities, but do not vigorously display power or domination over other men or women. This ambiguity and overlap of practices sustains the hegemonic project and makes it even more effective.
Doxa:	Unnamed, undiscussed, undisputed fundamental beliefs and assumptions about the social world.
Field:	Rather than seeing society as one-dimensional, Bourdieu considers society consists of semi-autonomous fields. Fields (e.g. school, the pub, sporting arena, workplace, family, homosocial field) have their own sets of logics, regularities, practices, censoring devices, rewards and punishments. These elements shape and constrain men's behaviours.
Habitus:	Skills, beliefs, dispositions, attitudes, embodied know-how, desires, expectations, and so forth. Although men's habitus is developed in early life, all life experiences continue to shape the habitus. Habitus orients behaviours.

Hegemonic masculinities:	Configurations of practice that reflect the contemporary most honoured ways of being a man, but that are deployed variously in different contexts to stabilise hierarchies of masculinities and to ensure men's collective dominance over women continues. Honoured practices can include physical violence, coercive control, psychological abuse, aggression, courage, strength, acts of freedom and independence, acting as a father, protector, provider and sustaining a heterosexual sexual relationship. The maintenance of hegemonic masculinities is supported through ideology, cultural policing, persuasion and institutions that honour these particular practices and denigrate effeminate practices.
Hegemonic project:	Constructing and maintaining hegemonic masculinities is an ongoing gender project that varies according to the relational pattern that occurs at the nexus where habitus, field and capital converge. The aim is always to maintain domination of non-hegemonic masculinities and to ensure the maintenance of men's collective dominance over women.
Heterodoxy:	Challenges to, and dismantling of doxa.
Ideologies:	Ideologies are systems of ideas that set the scene for people to think and act.
Illusio:	<i>Illusio</i> becomes progressively embodied in the habitus over time in the form of specific <i>interests</i> , expectations and hopes that give meaning and direction to <i>investing</i> in and committing to particular social pursuits such as masculine honour and respect. Interests are both presupposed and produced by the functioning of fields. There are as many interests as there are fields.
Intimate partner abuse:	Power and control perpetrated by men against women: physical violence and/or psychological abuse, verbal abuse, structural control and constraints including material deprivations, violation of freedom, restricting women's decision-making, control of women's sex lives, finances, time and social activities, preventing women from getting health care, pursuing education or career, and more.

Masculinities:	There are multiple configurations of practice that constitute particular forms of masculinity. Configurations are shaped at the nexus where habitus, field and capital converge. Each configuration holds a different position on the hierarchy of masculinities that reflects varying degrees of socially bestowed honour or dishonour.
Orthodoxy:	Language that is used to defend and restore doxic beliefs and assumptions, but is open to dispute.
Social capital:	Durable networks of intimate or close acquaintances.
Subordinated masculinities:	Homosexual men – because of practicing so-called effeminate behaviours. And heterosexual men who practice so-called weak, sissy, passive, submissive behaviours deemed to be feminine including practicing anything that resembles stereotypical gay men.
Symbolic capital:	Honour, prestige, recognition, respect, acceptance.
Symbolic power:	Individuals, groups and institutions that have been consecrated with symbolic capital are granted the power and authority to speak and impose their representations of reality.
Symbolic violence:	The impact of social messages exerted by those with symbolic power.

Acknowledgements

My partner Terry Walton supported me in my decision to do a PhD, our decision to move to Australia to do it, then together we discovered that a PhD infiltrates itself forcefully demanding attention as a third entity in a relationship. Terry graciously stepped aside and allowed me to spend most of my time with the PhD while he patiently, relentlessly and unfailingly supported that liaison. Although the research process inspired me every step of the way, none of it would have been entirely meaningful without Terry's magnanimous friendship.

In the beginning when I faltered over the exact topic I wanted to study and the theoretical position I wanted to take, I was fortuitous in meeting Associate Professor Belinda Carpenter. In her I discovered a like-minded woman with a belief in social complexity along with a passion for social justice and standing against the status quo. Belinda wholeheartedly supported studying men and she introduced me to the world of Connell's theory of masculinities. I knew the day I met Belinda I had found a strong woman who was going to support me to the end of my project and that she was going to allow me to be me and not shape me into a supervisor's clone. And so my prediction was fulfilled. As my principal supervisor, Belinda's firm guidance has enabled my determination to conduct quality research and write a quality thesis. I have very much appreciated the ways Belinda cut to the quick and allowed my research and writing potential to flourish.

Then I set about to find an associate supervisor. I was guided by word of mouth to meet Associate Professor Barbara Adkins. During a long chat over coffee it became apparent Barbara had a store of knowledge that was going to inspire me to climb academic heights I had never trekked before. She introduced me to the labyrinth that is Bourdieu's field theory – that used in conjunction with Connell's theory of masculinities – provided a dynamic original roadmap for this research. Under Barbara's guidance I have very

much appreciated how my theoretical and analytical skills advanced from vague foggy notions floundering amidst the swamps under the foothills to breath-taking clarity at the top of cloudless mountains.

I express my gratitude to Kiera Hart who started typing the transcripts, and to Clarissa Rahmat who completed the bulk of the 351,525 words uttered by the men in the 26 interviews I conducted. It was a mammoth task that was not possible for me to achieve. I could not have conducted qualitative in-depth interviews without their brilliant help in transforming the audio-recordings into the typewritten word.

I thank all the staff (there are too many to name) at all the Queensland stopping abuse programmes, anger management programmes and counselling agencies that attempted to help, and those who succeeded to recruit men for this research. My request for their help added to their already under-funded over-worked lives and without their interest, enthusiasm and cooperation this research would never have eventuated. I want to thank the staff who booked and regularly rescheduled the rooms to conduct the interviews. Lastly, I thank the six facilitators and managers who allowed me to interview them about their programme. Every single contact I had – be it via phone call, email, snail mail or face-to-face meeting – was 100% welcoming and everyone unselfishly contributed to my knowledge. I am indebted to all these professionals and have sent a summary of findings to them with the hope that this project will enhance some aspect of the important work they do with men.

I acknowledge the interest shown by all the men who volunteered to be interviewed but did not fit the participant criteria. And finally I thank the 16 men who did participate. I thank them for their time, insights and cooperation. Without the men's contribution, this project would have been impossible. I know some of the men benefited from being interviewed and that some of them volunteered so other men could be helped to stop abusing their partners. May the perceptions offered, as written in these pages, fulfill that purpose.

Table of Contents

STATEMENT OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP	III
DEDICATION	IV
ABSTRACT	V
KEY WORDS	VII
GLOSSARY	VIII
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	XI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	XIII
LIST OF TABLES	XVII
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 IMPETUS FOR THIS RESEARCH.....	1
1.3 HYPOTHESIS, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	4
1.3.1 Hypothesis	4
1.3.2 Objectives.....	5
1.3.3 Research questions	5
1.4 THEORETICAL APPROACH.....	6
1.5 RESEARCH STRATEGIES AND METHODOLOGICAL RATIONALE	7
1.6 TERMINOLOGY	10
1.7 THESIS STRUCTURE.....	11
1.8 CONCLUSION	14
CHAPTER TWO	17
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT MEN WHO ABUSE AND CONTROL THEIR FEMALE PARTNERS	17
2.1 INTRODUCTION	17
2.2 DOMINANT THEORIES AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ABOUT MALE PERPETRATORS	20
2.2.1 Psychological perspectives	20
2.2.2 Sociological perspectives	27
2.2.3 Feminist perspectives	32
2.2.3.1 Gender as a social power structure	34
2.2.3.2 Intersections of diversity and difference	35
2.2.3.3 The organisation of the family	38
2.2.3.4 Sexuality as a key power structure	39
2.2.3.5 Violence as a key power structure	41
2.2.3.6 Cultural representations of masculinity	46
2.2.3.7 The state as a key power structure	49
2.2.3.8 Interventions that focus on men	55
2.2.4 Uniting psychological, sociological and feminist perspectives: An ecological framework	57
2.2.5 Conclusion	59
2.3 RESEARCH FROM MALE PERPETRATORS' PERSPECTIVES	62
2.3.1 Men's perceptions of themselves, others and wider social influences	63
2.3.2 Men's change processes	74
2.3.3 How men account for their violence	77
2.3.4 Conclusion	82
2.4 PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	84
2.4.1 Psychological perspectives	85
2.4.2 Sociological perspectives	88
2.4.3 Feminist perspectives	91

2.4.4 Ecological framework	96
2.4.5 Conclusion	96
2.5 CONCLUSION	97
CHAPTER THREE.....	101
A NEW THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	101
3.1 INTRODUCTION	101
3.2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONNELL AND BOURDIEU	102
3.3 CONNELL'S THEORY OF MASCULINITIES	106
3.3.1 Multiple masculinities and collective masculinities	107
3.3.2 Hierarchy and hegemonic masculinity	110
3.4 BOURDIEU'S FIELD THEORY	120
3.4.1 The formulation of field, habitus and capital	121
3.4.1.1 Field.....	121
3.4.1.2 Habitus	123
3.4.1.3 Capital	127
3.4.2 The convergence of field, habitus and capital	128
3.4.3 Power relations.....	134
3.4.4 Mechanisms that enable change	140
3.5 CONCLUSION	144
CHAPTER FOUR	149
THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND GUIDING METHODOLOGICAL RATIONALES	
.....	149
4.1 INTRODUCTION	149
4.2 SELECTION.....	151
4.3 COLLECTION	168
4.3.1 Test interviews	170
4.3.2 Second interviews	171
4.3.3 Interview techniques	172
4.4 ANALYSIS	174
4.4.1 Ricoeur's triple mimesis	176
4.4.2 Narrative analysis.....	177
4.4.3 Burke's grammar of motives	181
4.4.4 Strategies used in the logic of discovery.....	182
4.4.4.1 Stage one of knowledge discovery	182
4.4.4.2 Stage two of knowledge discovery	185
4.4.4.3 Stage three of knowledge discovery	187
4.5 ENTERING THE FIELD	189
4.5.1 Recruiting volunteers.....	189
4.5.2 Arranging and re-arranging interviews	190
4.5.3 Ethical considerations	191
4.5.4 Safety strategies	191
4.6 CONCLUSION	192
CHAPTER FIVE	193
MEN'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN	193
5.1 INTRODUCTION TO NEW KNOWLEDGE ABOUT PERPETRATORS	193
5.2 INTRODUCTION TO MEN'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN	194
5.3 SUCCESSFUL MASCULINITY	196
5.3.1 School and sports.....	197
5.3.1.1 Honourable masculinities	197
5.3.1.2 Semi-honourable masculinities	198
5.3.1.3 Dishonourable masculinities	201
5.3.2 Workplace	202
5.4 POSITIONING ON THE HIERARCHY OF MASCULINITIES	204
5.4.1 Men know their position	204
5.4.2 Modifying the definition of successful masculinity.....	206
5.5 DETERMINING WHAT CONSTITUTES A HIERARCHY	208

5.5.1	<i>Peer pressure regulates hierarchies</i>	208
5.5.2	<i>Authorities regulate hierarchies</i>	209
5.5.3	<i>Political and cultural policing of weakness</i>	211
5.5.4	<i>Aspiring to recognition</i>	215
5.6	THE NEED TO MAINTAIN POSITION	217
5.6.1	<i>Rewards at the top</i>	218
5.6.2	<i>Force as a necessary evil</i>	222
5.6.3	<i>Strategic position-taking</i>	225
5.6.3.1	Guidelines for reasonable use of abuse	225
5.6.3.2	Guidelines for when to retaliate with violence	226
5.6.3.3	Guidelines for initiating violence	227
5.6.3.4	Weighing up the surest options that clear the path to the top	228
5.6.3.4.1	The most appropriate target	228
5.6.3.4.2	The most appropriate tactic	231
5.6.3.4.3	The most appropriate location	232
5.6.3.5	Forming alliances	234
5.6.3.5.1	Obtaining alliance with offsiders	235
5.6.3.5.2	Offsiders pursue affiliation	237
5.6.3.5.3	Associating with violent places	238
5.7	DISRUPTING HIERARCHIES	241
5.7.1	<i>Changing fields changing practices</i>	241
5.7.2	<i>Costs of popular masculinities</i>	244
5.7.3	<i>Empathy for victims</i>	245
5.7.4	<i>Caring amongst boys and amongst men</i>	247
5.8	CONCLUSION	251
CHAPTER SIX		255
MEN'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH WOMEN		255
6.1	INTRODUCTION	255
6.2	EXPECTATIONS WHEN MOVING IN WITH A WOMAN	257
6.2.1	<i>Building a life-long partnership with a woman</i>	257
6.2.2	<i>Unwritten master/slave contract</i>	264
6.3	CARE AND LOVE	270
6.3.1	<i>Caring for women</i>	270
6.3.2	<i>Loving women</i>	273
6.3.3	<i>Hopes and dreams for women</i>	277
6.3.3.1	Hopes and dreams at the start	278
6.3.3.2	Hopes and dreams now	281
6.3.4	<i>Tough façade obliging men to care less</i>	283
6.4	MEN CONTROLLING WOMEN	288
6.4.1	<i>Any control is better than no control</i>	289
6.4.2	<i>When control is above suspicion</i>	292
6.4.3	<i>How control wounds women</i>	295
6.4.3.1	Control scars women	295
6.4.3.2	Women aren't affected, they're accustomed to being controlled	298
6.5	WOMEN IN AUTHORITY	301
6.6	CONCLUSION	305
CHAPTER SEVEN		309
WHERE HABITUS MEETS FIELD: CHANGING MASCULINE PRACTICES		309
7.1	INTRODUCTION	309
7.2	SOCIAL MESSAGES	311
7.2.1	<i>Social messages endorsing abuse of women</i>	312
7.2.1.1	Bad boys get the girls	312
7.2.1.2	Other men encourage non-physical abuse and control of partners	317
7.2.1.3	Acquiescing to others' encouragement to abuse and control partners	321
7.2.1.4	Challenging other men's encouragement to abuse and control partners	325
7.2.2	<i>Social messages against abusing women</i>	329
7.2.2.1	The domestic violence legislation	329
7.2.2.2	Boys don't hit girls	333

7.3 MASCULINE POSITION-TAKING IN RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTIONS	341
7.3.1 Responding to media campaigns.....	341
7.3.2 Responding to legal interventions.....	343
7.3.3 Responding to bystander intervention	345
7.3.4 Resisting the Child Support Agency.....	349
7.4 MEN’S SUPPORT SEEKING	356
7.4.1 Desiring the freedom to be vulnerable	357
7.4.2 Men’s respect for being challenged.....	359
7.4.2.1 Respect for group facilitators	360
7.4.2.2 Respect for group members	364
7.5 CONCLUSION	369
CHAPTER EIGHT.....	373
CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	373
8.1 INTRODUCTION	373
8.2 MAJOR THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL FINDINGS	373
8.3 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS	377
8.4 FUTURE RESEARCH	380
8.5 CONCLUSION	382
REFERENCES.....	385
APPENDICES	429
APPENDIX ONE: REQUEST TO RECRUIT RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS.....	429
APPENDIX TWO: STATEMENT OF CONSENT – THE ORGANISATION.....	432
APPENDIX THREE: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET.....	433
APPENDIX FOUR: STATEMENT OF CONSENT – PARTICIPANTS.....	435
APPENDIX FIVE: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – THE ORGANISATION	436
APPENDIX SIX: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE PARTICIPANTS’ FIRST INTERVIEW	437
APPENDIX SEVEN: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE PARTICIPANTS’ SECOND INTERVIEW.....	441
APPENDIX EIGHT: TYPIST INFORMATION SHEET	445
APPENDIX NINE: TYPIST’S CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT	447
APPENDIX TEN: METHODOLOGICAL STRATEGIES	448

List of Tables

TABLE 1: PARTICIPANTS' CULTURAL, RELIGIOUS AND SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND	156
TABLE 2: PARTICIPANTS' CURRENT SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	157
TABLE 3: PARTICIPANTS' SCHOOLING	159
TABLE 4: PARTICIPANTS' AGES	160
TABLE 5: PARTICIPANTS' AGGRIEVED PARTNER	161
TABLE 6: PARTICIPANTS' MENTAL HEALTH, DRUG AND ALCOHOL ISSUES	162
TABLE 7: PARTICIPANTS' CRIMINAL HISTORY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ORDERS	163
TABLE 8: PARTICIPANTS' CHILDREN	165
TABLE 9: PARTICIPANTS' HELP SEEKING	167

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This thesis argues that some men who perpetrate abuse and control of their live-in female partners also have the ability, and desire, to empathise, love and care for others. And they desire change. But face-to-face, ideological and institutional representations of masculinities pressure some men to avoid appearing weak and to pursue symbolic rewards, in the form of honour and acceptance, from real and/or imagined men. These understandings emerged from qualitative in-depth interviews with white heterosexual men, using nuanced feminist theoretical approaches. The theoretical framework proposed by this thesis captures complex and multidimensional relationships between the personal and the political, the social and the interpersonal, and the historical and contemporary dynamics that shape perpetrators' normative frameworks and logic of practice. Normative frameworks were explored in three key contexts: the participants' relationships with other men, their relationships with women, and their response to broader culturally mediated messages (such as media campaigns) regarding male violence and coercive control in relation to women.

1.2 Impetus for this Research

Men's abuse and control of female partners is an international social, legal, political, and human rights problem. Intimate partner abuse is one of the most common forms of violence against women (United Nations: Division for the Advancement of Women, 2006:2), and is the main cause of death for women aged 15-44 (Amnesty International Australia, 2008:11). The lifetime

prevalence for women's experience of physical violence by their male partner is believed to be 25% in USA (Tjaden, 1998:2), 29% in Canada (Watts & Zimmerman, 2002:1234), 33-39% in New Zealand (Fanslow & Robinson, 2004:1) and is 33% in Australia (Amnesty International Australia, 2008:11). About 33-50% of battered women are raped by their partners (Bergen & Bukovec, 2006:1375) and it is argued that 62% of men have used psychological abuse against their female partners in their lifetime (Leibrich, Paulin, & Ransom, 1995:145).

The cost of domestic violence to the Australian economy is argued to range from \$8.86 million to \$1,525 billion per annum (Laing & Bobic, 2002:60, 62) and it is a main cause of homelessness for women (Australian Government, 2008:4). Other costs to women include a wide array of chronic physical and psychological illnesses (Campbell, 2002:1331-1334), loss of material wealth and loss of friends and status (Murphy, 2002:62, 65, 142).

An extensive review of the domestic violence literature found that feminist approaches assert that gender, power and social supports are central to an understanding of male-to-female abuse and control. But it became apparent that feminists had almost entirely ignored researching the problem from male perpetrators' perspectives. This enables the psychological and sociological perspectives to dominate explanations of perpetrators. The propensity in the psychological approaches is to ignore gender, power and society and to argue that a few deviant monsters, who have psychological disorders, impulse control disorders and alcohol abuse problems perpetrate violence. The sociological approaches acknowledge society's role, but tend not to apply a gender analysis or wider socio-political analysis to risk factors such as younger age, men of colour and poor men. Finally, although feminist theories have moved away from arguing that all men are real or potential villains to arguing men and masculinities are complex and relational, the main focus has been on understanding women as victims of domestic violence, as it is presupposed male perpetrators are already understood.

The domestic violence field is prone to engaging in paradigm wars, yet on their own, none of the dominant theories is able to explain the depth and breadth of men's perpetration of intimate partner abuse. Rather than one or other theory being right, the ecological framework was developed to integrate psychological, sociological, gendered and socio-political risk factors for men's violence against women. But as a research tool, this framework does not provide concepts capable of capturing in fine detail the manner in which men as individuals and wider social power structures interconnect across each layer of the social ecology. This leaves a theoretical gap in the domestic violence literature. This thesis proposes a new theoretical framework that bridges the chasms between psychological, sociological and contemporary feminist insights.

There is also a major methodological gap in understanding perpetrators. Psychological, sociological and feminist approaches all use quantitative studies and feminist approaches also gain knowledge about perpetrators from clinical observations of male perpetrators or from women's stories about male perpetrators. There is a small growing body of qualitative in-depth work from these three theoretical approaches that interviews perpetrators from their own perspectives. Whilst some of this work attempts to theoretically account for complexities and contradictions in men and society, the tendency generally is to report complexities and contradictions in the empirical data, but not to account for them theoretically which leaves some of this work susceptible to replicating prior theoretical conclusions. The current study attempts to strengthen and extend this body of work.

The third gap in the literature reveals a striking lack of research into non-physical forms of abuse and control. Research from the psychological and sociological perspectives almost exclusively focuses on physical violence. Yet non-physical tactics of power and control were discovered to be a reality in many women's lives when, in the 1970s, feminists began documenting the experiences of women abused by their husbands. Despite these findings, feminists who conduct qualitative research with perpetrators also tend to exclusively focus on physical violence. This thesis will be the

first study to theoretically focus on men's non-physical controlling behaviours from perpetrators' viewpoints.

The majority of studies with perpetrators focus on men's relationships with women, but there are three exceptions to this. These studies found that male peers and male family directly or indirectly condone men's physical violence against live-in female partners and encourage men to maintain dominance over women (Anderson & Umberson, 2001; Hearn, 1998a, 1998b; James, Seddon, & Brown, 2002). Although there is research that explores patriarchal male peer support for physical violence and sexual abuse against women in settings such as college campuses, there is a major gap in understanding how such support is operationalised in the lives of men who abuse and control cohabiting female partners. This thesis will address this gap by exploring the role men's relationships with men have in their motivations to use non-physical forms of abuse and control against cohabiting female partners.

1.3 Hypothesis, Objectives and Research Questions

1.3.1 Hypothesis

Most research about perpetrators stems from psychological and sociological approaches, and despite 40 years of feminist intervention and theory development there is no actual feminist theory that can explain in fine-grained detail the male perpetrator and his relationships with other men, with women in general and with wider social power structures. This thesis hypothesises that a more nuanced feminist approach would help understand the complex relationship between gender and power, and the influence of social, cultural, political and legal factors on men's subjective perceptions and practices regarding their control and abuse of their intimate live-in female partners.

1.3.2 Objectives

This research is guided by the following objectives:

- Identify socio-cultural influences that contribute to men's masculine meaning systems and how these might differ according to context.
- Understand ways other men encourage or discourage perpetrators' abusive and controlling behaviours.
- Investigate men's patterns of masculinity and how these relate to masculine practices in relation with female partners.
- Excavate men's perceptions of non-physical practices of abuse and control.
- Examine men's motivations and resistance to changing masculine practices.

1.3.3 Research questions

The following research questions are explored in interviews with men:

With what socio-cultural framework do male perpetrators enter a committed live-in relationship with a female partner? Specifically:

- In what ways do male peers and authority figures encourage men to develop and use abusive and controlling behaviours?
- What meaning do hierarchies of masculinities have in perpetrators' lives?
- How do men's notions of non-physical forms of abuse and control compare with women's?
- What does love and marriage mean to perpetrators?

How do men respond to formal and informal interventions and how proactive are they in seeking help to change?

1.4 Theoretical Approach

This thesis utilises a nuanced feminist approach by synthesising two complementary theories, namely Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory. Connell's framework proceeds beyond dominant psychological, sociological and feminist assumptions about men and power by recognising multiple masculinities and the complex, multitudinous, hierarchical relations between men and women, and amongst men. By recognising that dynamic configurations of masculinities are constructed in relations between men as individuals and social structures, this allows for an exploration of motives and influences that shape and constrain the construction of abusive and controlling practices on the one hand and caring, loving and empathic practices on the other.

Although gender was not Bourdieu's primary project and his theory has been criticised for failing to account for nuanced understandings of masculinity, his overarching theory offers a powerful explanatory model that will be used to augment Connell's. Bourdieu's field theory will excavate fine-tuned social mechanisms that produce various patterns of gendered power relations, including the notion of capital which provides a conceptual tool to enhance understandings of men's motivations to, or not to, practice abuse and control (Bourdieu, 1986b).

Central to the two theories, is a focus on the interweaving of men's practices at the intersections where individuals and social fields converge. Along with a focus on the societal enablers and constraints that encroach into the logic of masculinities, dependent on the censoring devices inherent in any given social context, Bourdieu's framework argues against conceptualising society as a whole. Instead, he recognises an array of semi-autonomous, sometimes interconnected social spaces that he calls fields. Bourdieu's notion of field permits an exploration of the lives of perpetrators outside the family. Much psychological and sociological research focuses on the influence of the family of origin, then leaps into men's future, by focusing on their new adult

family and intimate relationship. In contrast, Bourdieu's framework enables a theoretical exploration of the ways masculine practices might vary according to social context across a lifetime, and the ways societal relationships variously influence men's abuse and control of women, depending on the logic in a given field. This thesis investigates men's repertoire of masculine practices during their school years, in the sporting arena, the pub and the workplace (Bourdieu, 2000a:144; Wacquant, 1989:39).

Bourdieu's notion of habitus permits a deep understanding of how men's minds and bodies are inculcated with social structures, and explains why many men are so influenced by social messages and face-to-face encouragement to abuse women. Bourdieu's notion that masculine practices *only* occur at the nexus where habitus, field and capital meet, means that men have a great deal of influence over the field and can choose to care and love instead (Bourdieu, 1986a:110; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:126).

Related to this, notions of time and history are central to both theories. Unlike some feminist views that because men generally benefit from the gender order they would be resistant to change, these theories enable an exploration of how change is always possible. Bourdieu's emphasis on the relational patterns that occur at the nexus where habitus, field and capital meet, means the array of possible practices is infinite, albeit within socio-historical bounds (Bourdieu, 1977:83, 1990a:9, 1990b:55). It is this nexus that will offer a powerful tool to explain perpetrators' normative framework of masculinities.

1.5 Research Strategies and Methodological Rationale

Qualitative in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with 16 white able-bodied heterosexual male perpetrators. The men were accessed, using a theoretical sampling approach (Mason, 2002:121; Silverman,

2005:130-138), from six stopping abuse group programmes in South East Queensland. Follow-up interviews were conducted with ten of the men after the initial interviews had been analysed. This ensured a more thorough and expanded questioning to achieve the research objectives.

There is a dearth of knowledge from perpetrators' perspectives, thus this is an exploratory study, using an abductive research approach. Abductive reasoning (Boje, 2001:51-52; Mason, 2002:180; Wirth, n.d.; Yu, 1994) together with theoretical sampling allow for the incorporation of ideas at every stage of the process (Mason, 2002:180; Silverman, 2005:130-138). Knowledge utilised stems from personal and professional experience, previous empirical findings, literature on related topics, Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory as well as men's narratives. Abductive reasoning and theoretical sampling guide the simultaneous selection of participants, development of questionnaires, data collection, ongoing theoretical development and data analysis.

Most feminist research on intimate partner abuse focuses on women's perspectives. While some feminist research has nevertheless been conducted *on men by* male and female researchers they tend to ignore heterogeneity among women and men (Flax, 1987:642). By not adhering to complexities of gender and power associated with men, some researchers have experienced dangerous outcomes (Gadd, 2004:388; McKee & O'Brien, 1983:158; Taylor, 1996:112). Consequently, following advice of previous interviewees, a research strategy was devised to cope with potential problems, including safety as a woman interviewer (Ellsberg & Heise, 2002:1601; Harne, 2005:182; Hearn, 1993:10; Social Research Association, 2002:6; Taylor, 1996:115).

Many feminists fear men's knowledge is not credible or legitimate, given the benefits to be gained by holding onto knowledge that upholds their interests (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:115; Connell, 2000a:217). Nevertheless the current research does not set out to seek the "truth". Rather

this research is guided by a constructionist approach, which assumes men's narratives are re-presentations of their current ways of making meaning drawn from "available cultural resources" (Silverman, 2006:144). This thesis does not seek to excavate men's biographical timelines, rather focuses on the current ways men make meaning of specific topics and the relevance those topics have for them – such as love, care, marriage, violence and coercive control. In the process of discussing "facts about details of experience" interviewees constructively add to, take away from and transform the facts and details (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997:117 cited in Silverman, 2006:129). Men speak from particular positions in social space, therefore men's re-presentations of their perspectives are already partial (Ricoeur cited in Riessman, 2002:257; Verhesschen, 2003:461). Different positions reflect varying degrees of power, variations of interest in seeking and maintaining power, variations in what can and cannot appropriately be said and variations in meaning-making (Bourdieu, 1990a:32, 1993:91; Connell, 2005:34).

The purpose of the current research is not to measure the "truth" about men's abusive and controlling behaviours – they already had to admit to being abusive and/or controlling of their partners before participating in the research. This admission was the basis for selecting those participants for the research project. Rather than reducing the focus to the individual level, the objective of this research is to broaden the view by exploring men's normative frameworks about gender and power, their vocabularies of motive, their sense of the way the world works, and how they see themselves and others in that world. This thesis is interested in hearing men's descriptions as re-presented in an interview venue, with a woman interviewer that would draw certain information from men that might otherwise differ if interviewed by a man (Arendell, 1997:348; Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:99; Owen, 1995:260; Schwartz, 2000:825; Williams & Heikes, 1993:281). The ultimate objective of this research is based on the principle underlying the logic of theoretical sampling (Mason, 2002:121; Silverman, 2005:130-138), which is to build a theoretical framework – which in this

thesis, explains the normative framework of masculinities that supports perpetrators' behaviours.

Interviews were conducted with an open mind, and men were listened to from a post-modern feminist perspective and from an extensive knowledge of abused women's experiences. Bourdieu (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) argues that although many men, consciously or unconsciously, choose misogynist attitudes and choose to abuse and control women, their dispositions mirror historical and/or current social structures that enable such attitudes and behaviours. One objective of this research is to excavate men's perspectives of the socio-cultural structures that shape their choices and masculine practices. Gaining such insights is deemed more important for building theory and effecting long-term change, than is challenging men for having such knowledge.

1.6 Terminology

The definition of intimate partner abuse determines how perpetrators, victims, and those in authority each respond to it. Others use the terms "domestic violence", "family violence" or "intimate partner violence". However, given that those men who abuse and control their partners use multiple tactics that never entail physical violence, and that the focus of this research is men's relationships with their intimate partner, the term *intimate partner abuse* will be used and interchanged with the term *intimate partner abuse and control*.

Because most research renders non-physical tactics of abuse and control invisible, it is important to clearly note which behaviours are being discussed. This thesis will refer to *physical violence* when discussing violence and will use various terms to describe *non-physical abuse* including *psychological abuse*, *emotional abuse*, *verbal abuse* and *mental abuse*. Stark (2007:11) argues that further clarification should be made between psychological abuse and structural control. This thesis agrees with

Stark's definition of *structural control* which includes "concrete deprivations and structural constraints" (Stark, 2007:11) including men's control of women's sex lives, finances, time and social activities, along with other tactics, such as preventing women from getting health care, pursuing education or career (Murphy, 2002:18-27).

There is also debate in the domestic violence field about what label, if any, should be given to men who abuse and control their partners. Popular labels include "perpetrator" or "batterer". The term batterer will not be used because this connotes the use of physical violence, and renders invisible men's non-physical tactics. Arguments against the use of any label include the fact that the issue under investigation is men's behaviour – their perpetration of abuse and control – yet those men also engage in a range of non-abusive, non-controlling behaviours. To call them perpetrators is reductionist. Nevertheless this thesis will discuss the topic of men, *per se*, at length. In some cases this will involve a discussion of men who are not deemed to be perpetrators of abuse and control. It will be important to make explicit which man is being discussed, so the term *perpetrator* will be used.

This research entails an exploration of men's abuse and control of women with whom they have lived in a marital partnership or committed marriage-like relationship. Where it is known men are married, the term *wife* will be used. However most of the time the term *partner* will be used when discussing the women men abuse and control. Men will be asked to discuss their expectations about marriage. Whilst the term *marriage* will be used in the thesis, it will always include men's understandings of marriage-like relationships.

1.7 Thesis Structure

This thesis is laid out into eight chapters. Chapter two provides a literature review of the three most dominant explanations for men's abuse of their female partners. First it shows that psychological explanations are generally

individually based and tend to deem perpetrators to be psychologically sick, driven by alcohol, lacking in communication skills, deviant monsters. Second, it shows that whilst sociological explanations highlight social risk factors that lead younger poor men of colour to be more likely to use violence than older white rich men, these approaches do not explain how gender and power are operationalised in those broad social categories. Third, whilst feminist theories have evolved from dichotomous notions of gender towards more complex understandings of gender and power there is no actual feminist theory capable of understanding the mechanisms underpinning complexities and contradictions in male perpetrators' lives. Finally, it will be shown that, whilst the ecological framework attempts to fill this gap, the qualitative research reviewed in this chapter shows minimal use of theories that can capture links between psychological, sociological and socio-political patterns that emerge in men's narratives, nor do any theories capture the complexities and contradictions in men's narratives.

Chapter three discusses a new theoretical framework proposed by this thesis to guide the current research. It describes the conceptual elements underpinning Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory and outlines how a synthesis of the two will deeply enhance current knowledge. It will do this by conceptualising a fine-grained understanding of the interweaving of masculinities with society.

Chapter four outlines the theoretical sampling research process utilised to excavate paradoxical masculinities and contradictory social influences across multiple fields. This includes the analytical techniques and the methodological rationales underpinning each stage of the research strategy. Methodological rationales are guided by Ricoeur's triple mimesis (Verhesschen, 2003), Riessman's (2002) narrative approach and Burke's (1969) grammar of motives. These methodologies are utilised because of their compatibility with the epistemological viewpoints of Connell and Bourdieu.

The purpose of chapters five, six and seven is to discuss the empirical data from the current research. It will do this by quoting men's narratives in a manner that respects the meaning men intended, and by using Burke's (1969) grammar of motives to excavate complex logics underpinning patterns in those narratives. A synthesis of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory is applied to analyse and interpret the findings. Interwoven throughout this discussion are findings from previous in-depth research with perpetrators, which serve as counterpoints, or support, for the development of theory about men's repertoire of masculinities in the current research.

Specifically, chapter five explores men's relationships with men, including an examination of the place that hierarchies of masculinities have in perpetrators' lives at school, the sporting arena, pub and workplace. It explores the logic of masculinities used in decision-making to use physical violence and psychological bullying, dependent on the logic of the specific social field including the influential norms of authoritative figures they encounter. It shows that men practice multiple and sometimes paradoxical configurations of masculinities depending on their vested interest in gaining particular forms of capital, and in avoiding social stigma.

Chapter six explores men's relationships with women. This uncovers definite internal complexities. It shows configurations of masculinities motivated by contradictory masculine desires to share love and care in a life-long partnership with an intimate partner, whilst simultaneously desiring freedom, independence and approval from real and/or imagined men. This chapter argues that, although male perpetrators practice hegemonic masculinity in the form of using power and control over women, the logic underlying such practices leads to the pursuit of symbolic capital by avoiding the stigma associated with practicing love, care and empathy – which are considered subordinated masculine practices.

Chapter seven explores men's responses to an array of contradictory, changing social messages and domestic violence interventions. It shows

paradoxical masculine logics underpinning why some men hide and deny physical violence against women, whilst proudly displaying non-physical control over women. It also highlights the effect that a lack of safety and trust amongst many men has in preventing some men from seeking help to change masculine practices. It describes how, depending on the perception of the position taken by the intervener, some men will defend their hegemonic position, whilst others see no need to. Finally the chapter shows which social elements inspire some men to willingly engage in a process of reducing or stopping their physical violence.

Chapter eight presents the principal theoretical findings of the current research and discusses the ways in which these findings confirm the hypothesis, meet the objectives and answer the research questions. It relates the findings back to the dominant theoretical explanations and discusses how the synthesis of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory usefully advance a deeper understanding of male perpetrators' normative framework of masculinities and the influence this framework has on their abusive and non-abusive behaviours. Practical implications emerging from the findings are considered and recommendations for future research are explored.

1.8 Conclusion

This chapter has argued for a qualitative in-depth study of perpetrators from men's own perspectives, utilising theoretical sampling guided by a nuanced feminist theoretical approach that permits a more fine-grained, complex understanding of perpetrators' repertoire of masculinities. This research will build on the small, but growing, body of existing qualitative research about men, but will extend it by focusing strongly on men's understandings of non-physical forms of control so that the central core of men's abuse of women will be addressed. This chapter has argued for a broader exploration into men's lives by researching the meaning love and marriage have within men's configurations of masculinities, researching men's relationships with

men and how those might influence men's masculine practices in relation with women, and by researching the logic of masculine practices in social fields beyond the family. Such explorations will enable a greater understanding of men's perceptions of the ways in which contradictory societal relations at the face-to-face, ideological and institutional levels influence their habitus and masculine practices. Finally, the overarching aim of this thesis is to make a contribution to understanding the logics, tactics and strategies of normative frameworks of masculinities that support perpetrators' behaviours.

CHAPTER TWO

Knowledge about Men who Abuse and Control their Female Partners

2.1 Introduction

The literature on domestic violence is complex, large in quantity, and contradictory in its theoretical motivations and empirical findings. The aim of this chapter is to sketch a map of the dominant theoretical – psychological, sociological and feminist – and empirical features that represent the evolution of knowledge about men who abuse and control their live-in female partners.

However, there is a tendency in the domestic violence literature to engage in “paradigm hostility”, which is a problem that fragments and hinders the domestic violence scholarship on men (DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:881; Dwyer, Smokowski, Bricout, & Wodarski, 1995:191; Gelles, 1994; Goldner, 1992:60; Gondolf, 2007:645). This is especially problematic since other strands of the domestic violence literature have developed models to unite the psychological, sociological and feminist perspectives: specifically an ecological model which accounts for the risk factors for men’s violence across all levels of society; and a collaborated community response driven by feminist interventions to keep women safe and hold men accountable.

This chapter is mapped out into three sections. The *first section* reviews the three explanations that compete for dominance in any understanding of men who abuse their cohabiting female partner. Psychological, sociological and feminist perspectives dominate the literature. They offer three different, and sometimes overlapping, ways of thinking about male perpetrators that range

from viewing men as individuals devoid of social contexts, to viewing men as members of particular social groups, to viewing men as part of wider socio-cultural political power structures.

More specifically, psychological perspectives focus on disorders and skill deficits to explain violence. Many strategies proposed to effect change centre on men as individuals without addressing historical, social and political contexts.

Sociological and feminist perspectives draw on resource theories to explain why men with greater or lesser levels of resources, compared with their wives, are motivated to use violence. These two perspectives focus on ways society shapes the benefits and costs that influence men to, or not to, beat their female partners. The major difference between these two perspectives is that feminists broaden the sociological approaches by applying a gender and power analysis to the same issues.

There is a major methodological gap in the literature. There is a lack of qualitative in-depth research from male perpetrators' perspectives within all three theoretical approaches. Knowledge about male perpetrators mostly stems from quantitative studies, or from clinical observations of men, or from female victims' perspectives. However, a small but growing number of researchers have engaged with qualitative methods to interview men in-depth. *Section two* will explore some of this literature for its potential to extend insights from the three dominant theoretical traditions.

Given the influence of the ecological framework that argues for links to be made across the three dominant perspectives, the lack of analysis of gender and power within the psychological and sociological literature is a problem. The *third section* shows how an application of gender and power can strengthen, rather than negate, the psychological and sociological perspectives. This application will be made from the feminist perspective given that this is the central theory that links all levels of the social ecology of domestic violence. However, such a merging of feminism with

psychology and sociology demonstrates the lack of complexity in these three theoretical traditions, and the subsequent silence whenever contradictions emerge – whether that occurs in quantitative or qualitative in-depth research. This points to an underlying theoretical incoherence.

Many feminist researchers continue to rely on early feminist dichotomous distinctions between men and women and men and social structures as their explanation of men's narratives. Given the lack of application of fine-grained contemporary feminist work in explanations of male perpetrators' perspectives within qualitative studies, two theoretical gaps become apparent. First, contemporary feminist work that is capable of capturing conflicts and contradictions, has never been devised to specifically explain male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. Second, the ecological approach fails to provide conceptual links between early feminist and contemporary feminist work. As a consequence, feminist perspectives will be critiqued through the lens of contemporary feminist scholarship in an attempt to better capture the fine-grained processes and logics and full sets of relations male perpetrators engage in.

However, this latter evaluation will not resolve the problem that the ecological approach is devoid of the conceptual devices necessary to capture the nuanced mutually reinforcing interplay between individual men and social power structures within a changing gender order. The domestic violence field faces continual feminist backlashes at the individual and state levels. Social discourses are both sexist and honouring of women, many men continue to beat, rape and control women, the state both holds men accountable and also fails to do so, some groups of men encourage each other to maintain power over women and children, whilst other groups of men actively engage each other to stop men's violence against women. In this complex post-modern environment, it is time for a new theoretical framework. Such a consideration will form the basis for discussion on theory in chapter three.

2.2 Dominant Theories and Empirical Research about Male Perpetrators

This section explores the dominant theoretical approaches – psychological, sociological and feminist – used by researchers to explain their data when researching male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. These approaches will be discussed in three parts followed by a discussion that unites the three perspectives into an ecological framework. This section will culminate in a conclusion that discusses assumptions, disparities and links between the three perspectives.

2.2.1 Psychological perspectives

Psychological perspectives represent the oldest framework used for understanding male perpetrators (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 2004:579; Nelson, 2007:85; O'Leary, 1993a:1). During the late 19th century and early 20th century it was believed wife beating was in part due to consuming excessive alcohol or uncivilised brutish and criminal behaviour (Dobash et al., 2004:579; Koss et al., 1994:15; Nelson, 2007:84). By the 1920s and 1930s psychoanalytic approaches explained men's violence by seeking answers in women's psyche such as having a masochistic enjoyment of violence (Dobash et al., 2004:579; SafeNetwork: California's Domestic Violence Resource, 1999). During the interwar years male perpetrators were considered to have a mental illness that required medical treatment (Nelson, 2007:84), then in the 1970s when feminists drew domestic violence to public attention, mental health practitioners were among the first to offer programmes for men convicted of domestic violence (Mankowski, Haaken, & Silvergleid, 2002:169).

Psychological theoretical and empirical perspectives dominate knowledge about male perpetrators, thus it is this framework that has most permeated the public consciousness (O'Leary, 1993a:1). Contemporary psychological theories used to explain male perpetrators include developmental and cognitive theories, social learning theory and social psychology. Although

men are influenced by experiences in the family of origin or by wider community exposure to violence, the defining feature of theories and research in this section is the individual man's resulting thoughts, feelings and behaviours. Research cited here mainly uses quantitative methods to compare violent men with non-violent men, or to compare violent men with each other with the aim of finding distinct psychological characteristics that might explain why some men use higher levels of violence than others.

When comparing perpetrators with non-violent men, some contemporary studies find that perpetrators have lower levels of self-concept (Ragg, 1997:19) and self-esteem (Prince & Arias, 1994:131-132) and less awareness of their emotions (Umberson, Anderson, Williams, & Chen, 2003:201). They find higher levels of borderline personality disorder, antisocial personality (Dutton & Bodnarchuk, 2005:7; Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates, Smutzler, & Sandin, 1997:67), depression, anxiety, anger, stress, narcissistic and passive aggressive personality characteristics (Allison, Bartholomew, Maysless, & Dutton, 2008:143; Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:67; O'Hearn & Margolin, 2000:204-205; O'Leary & Murphy, 1992:36; Tweed & Dutton, 1998:227). The more severe the violence, the more likely there will be an associated personality disorder (O'Leary, 1993b:25).

On the other hand, other studies comparing violent and non-violent men find no significant difference in diagnosed character disorders (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:118-119) and others note that not all perpetrators are psychopathic (Bograd, 1988a:17). "In fact, only about 10% of abusive incidents are caused by mental illness" (Gelles, 1993:41; Saunders, 1992:219). Likewise less than 10% of court-mandated men are screened out of the Duluth abuse intervention programme because of mental illness and are referred for treatment to mental health agencies instead (Paymar & Barnes, 2006:9). It is also argued that there is insufficient evidence to prove that large numbers of perpetrators have borderline personality disorder (Gondolf, 1999:13-14).

Some studies that compare violent with non-violent men, find that perpetrators have skill deficits. This includes having lower levels of assertiveness (Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986:113) which leads to a lower ability to take initiative and make requests (Saunders, 1992:219). Perpetrators have lower levels of emotional intelligence (Winters, Clift, & Dutton, 2004:259) as well as poorer problem solving and conflict resolution skills (Anglin & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1997:310-312). Consequently, it is theorised that men's high need for decision-making power, paired with insufficient assertiveness skills, may result in the use of violence to gain control (Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:81).

Reviews of the skill deficit literature also reveal inconsistent findings (Gondolf, 1988:188), for example when perpetrators are compared with non-violent men, some studies find no difference in assertiveness skills between the two groups. While other studies find perpetrators are less able to make a request of someone else, but more able to refuse someone else's request (Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:75; Saunders, 1992:219). Nevertheless, where skill deficits are a problem, interventions entail, for instance, emotional awareness training, conflict resolution training and assertion skills training (Dwyer et al., 1995:195).

The most often cited skill deficits perpetrators are said to have are an inability to control their anger, or to control being violent when they are drinking. Results, from an extensive review of the literature, show that violent perpetrators, compared with non-violent men, have higher levels of anger, hostility, contempt and resentment (Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:70-72). A later meta-analytic review of 85 studies found that anger, hostility and alcohol use were moderate risk factors for intimate partner violence (Stith, Smith, Penn, Ward, & Tritt, 2004:89).

The "drunken bum" theory has permeated understandings of perpetrators since the temperance movement (O'Leary & Murphy, 1992:35) and the taken-for-granted disinhibition theory assumes that alcohol overrides inhibitors in the brain that generally suppress violence, therefore alcohol

allows violence to arise (Galvani, 2004:358; Gelles & Cavanaugh, 2005:176; Heise, 1998:272; James, 1999:7; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000:726). Consistent with this theory, men who use alcohol, and who hit their partners, are found to be violent more frequently and with more severe consequences than men who do not use alcohol (Heise, 1998:273; Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:74). Findings from a comprehensive review of the literature show that higher alcohol abuse is a consistent risk factor for violence to occur (Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:73; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:111).

However, the link between alcohol and violence is not straightforward. Some studies reveal that the link is mediated by a combination of individual characteristics, interpersonal situations and socio-cultural factors (Martin, 1992:236) such as attitudes that approve of aggression and control over partners (Field, Caetano, & Nelson, 2004:252; Johnson, 2000:736), plus avoiding coping in positive ways with relationship problems (Margolin, John, & Foo, 1998:337; Snow, Sullivan, Swan, Tate, & Klein, 2006:279). The assumption that anger and alcohol problems cause violence, leads to proposing interventions such as anger management and alcohol counselling or group therapy. However, such interventions can be problematic if they do not address the man's violent behaviour (Dwyer et al., 1995:191; Edmiston, 2005:233; Gondolf, 2007:648; James, 1999:7).

Some researchers who compare perpetrators with other perpetrators create specific typologies aimed at explaining and changing behaviour. The most commonly cited study is Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's (1994b) review of 15 typology studies. From their summary they propose three typologies for violent men – family only, dysphoric/borderline and generally violent/antisocial. Later Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan and colleagues (2000:1014) conducted a study revealing a fourth type which they label low-level antisocial. Of these types, dysphoric/borderline and generally violent men are more prone to recidivism than family-only and low-level antisocial men (Saunders, 2004:1390). It is argued that psychopaths are more violent generally and more prone to recidivism than non-psychopaths (Jolliffe &

Farrington, 2004:443), whereas Gondolf and Heckert (2004:620, 2005:17) argue that psychopathic perpetrators of intimate partner abuse are no more likely to re-assault women than men with other psychological problems. Indeed some researchers experience a significant inability to fit the same combinations of characteristics into each typology every time (Gondolf, 2007:651; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000:50; Widiger & Mullins-Sweatt, 2004:1398).

The main drive behind research into perpetrator typologies is to match perpetrators to the appropriate treatment in order to ensure success (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994b:476; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000:37; Saunders, 1996:395; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Whereas, White and Gondolf's (2004:607, 2000:483) analysis of personality profiles of men from four stopping violence programmes that use the cognitive behavioural model, shows that, with the exception of men with severe antisocial disorders, the treatment suits all types of men. Gondolf (1988:190, 2004:622) argues that no conclusive perpetrator profile exists, but that moderate to severe levels of violence may correspond to normative patriarchal contempt of women rather than distinct typologies.

Social psychology and social learning theory have been employed to explain male perpetrators' psyches by noting wider social influences, for example some studies that use psychometric scales based on normative standards find that male perpetrators have low levels of moral reasoning (Buttell, 2003:234) and empathy. This can be explained by repeated exposure to real-life or media representations of violence that may desensitise boys and men to the consequences of violence and may blunt their ability to empathise (Funk, Baldacci, Pasold, & Baumgardner, 2004:26). A meta-analysis of studies that explores links between empathy and violent offending shows that violent youth have less ability to understand others' emotions than do adult men, however this risk factor may also be connected to low levels of intelligence and socioeconomic deprivation (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004). Another study of men who use violence shows that the form that empathy takes is directly linked to the form of abuse expressed. Men who use higher

rates of physical violence tend to have a good ability to take on others' perspectives, but are poor in their ability to tolerate others' negative emotions. Whereas men who use psychological abuse have difficulty taking on others' perspectives and difficulty dealing with others' emotions (Covell, Huss, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2007:172). Thus the complexities involved in developing empathy and moral reasoning need to be accounted for in empathy and morality training.

Cognitive psychological theory explains that attitudes based on social messages contribute to men's processes of moral reasoning and ability to empathise (Funk et al., 2004:26). For example, research shows that men who have misogynist or hostile attitudes towards women, or men who adhere to strict gender roles and have adversarial attitudes towards women, or approve of violence towards female partners, are more likely to use violence against their partners (Flood & Pease, 2009:126; Heise, 1998:279; O'Neill & Harway, 1997:191-192). A meta-analytic review of 85 studies found that attitudes that condone violence, in particular, was a strong risk factor for intimate partner violence (Stith et al., 2004:89). Whereas men who believe in gender equality and non-violence are shown not to hit their partners (Field et al., 2004:252; Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:78-79; Margolin et al., 1998:334; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996:27-30).

However, these findings are challenged by others who compare partner abusive men with non-violent men and find that intimate partner perpetrators' sexist attitudes are no more sexist than non-violent men (Date & Ronan, 2000:1149; Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:79; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994a:100). Attitudes towards rape and violence against women are shaped by age, race, ethnicity, class, exposure to violence in different neighbourhoods and communities and by different national and cultural values (Flood & Pease, 2009:129-131; Nayak, Byrne, Martin, & Abraham, 2003) and some male peer groups (DeKeseredy, 1990; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1993). Although certain attitudes do represent a risk factor for men's intimate partner violence, the link is not straightforward. Moreover, some studies show that men with hostile

attitudes towards women may also make “covertly and even overtly benevolent references to women” (Herzog, 2007:223).

Developmental and social psychology and social learning theory may all be used to explain that some perpetrators with histories of abuse, or dysfunctional parenting, in their family of origin are found to experience psychological damage and poor skill development (Ehrensaft et al., 2003:741-742). For example, some men with this personal history are found to have post-traumatic stress disorder and problems with dissociation, which lead to abuse towards their partners, more so than non-violent men in research control groups (Rosenbaum & Leisring, 2003:18). Some scholars utilise attachment theory to explain that perpetrators who were rejected, or did not bond with their parents, are found to have higher rates of fearful, insecure or preoccupied styles of attachment (Allison et al., 2008:143; Lawson, 2008:100) compared with non-violent men (Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:69; Mauricio & Gormley, 2001:1070). Some studies find no difference in attachment issues (Buttell & Jones, 2001:382), whilst others show that some men with attachment problems are preoccupied with purposefully dominating and controlling their partners, as opposed to being fearful and insecure (Tweed & Dutton, 1998:226). Whereas, a review of the small number of studies that have attempted to discover risk factors for men to use psychological aggression/abuse against their partners, found that men with fearful attachment toward their partners and relationships that entail “wife demand/husband withdraw and husband demand/wife withdraw patterns” represent moderate to strong risk factors for men to use psychological abuse (Schumacher, Slep, & Heyman, 2001:266).

Although men’s experience of abuse in the family of origin does show a risk of using violence against an adult intimate partner, this factor does not predict whether a man will repeatedly do so in the future (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2005:161). In fact a longitudinal analysis of men’s aggression towards their partners found that some men became less aggressive as time went by, despite having experienced child abuse in their family of origin. The authors explain this by suggesting that if men experience anxiety

disorders as a result of early child abuse, this anxiety may lead to a flight response, hence avoiding using violent behaviours (Lorber & O'Leary, 2004:336). Additionally, witnessing or experiencing childhood abuse does not prove that large numbers of perpetrators have post-traumatic stress disorder (Gondolf, 1999:13-14).

2.2.2 Sociological perspectives

Sociological analysis was evident in the early 1970s “at last giving social factors more weight than individual psychopathology” although male authors placed very little emphasis on gender, power or broader socio-political structures (Edwards, 1987:14). It is argued that sociological explanations of intimate partner abuse are undeveloped (Loseke, 2005:42), yet, like psychological explanations, they hold sway in media discourses which have a strong effect on commonsense understandings of family violence (Berns, 2001:264-276; Kozol, 1995:646-665; Sims, 2008:380). Most of the empirical research reported in this section stems from quantitative studies.

The first, and most well known sociological perspective concerns the intergenerational transmission of violence, an explanation that has existed since the middle of the 20th century (Dobash et al., 2004:579) and was popularised by Straus and colleagues in the 1970s (Bevan & Higgins, 2002:224; Rosenbaum & Leisring, 2003:7). Social learning theory is used to explain this phenomenon by assuming that violent behaviour and beliefs that approve of violence are learned through observing significant role models and through positive reinforcement from families of origin where violence was perpetrated (Bevan & Higgins, 2002:225; Fergusson, Boden, & Horwood, 2008:747; Heise, 1998:268; James, 1999:6; Markowitz, 2001:207; Michalski, 2004:658; Murrell, Christoff, & Henning, 2007:524; O'Neill, 1998:462; Rosenbaum & Leisring, 2003:17-19; Tencheff et al., 2008:239). Some studies that compare perpetrators with men from the general population find that perpetrators are more likely to have a history of witnessing parental abuse and being abused themselves (O'Hearn &

Margolin, 2000:159), while an extensive review of the literature notes that witnessing parent abuse is a far more consistent risk factor than being abused themselves (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:120). But a meta-analytic study found that there is a weak to moderate relationship between childhood experiences of abuse and abusing an adult partner (Stith et al., 2000:648).

While physical violence may be reproduced as a result of witnessing or experiencing abuse as a child, other studies find that such childhood experiences do not represent risk factors for men's *controlling* behaviours (Gondolf, Heckert, & Kimmel, 2002:310) or for psychological aggression (Schumacher et al., 2001:263). Results from an Australian multivariate analysis highlight particular nuances of such experiences. Specifically, it is found that being subject to physical abuse as a child does not correlate with physically, or psychologically, abusing a partner, and that what is more significant is experiencing neglect as a child, and/or witnessing family violence (Bevan & Higgins, 2002:239-240).

Although witnessing or experiencing abuse as a child are major risk factors, these experiences do not *directly* cause men to go on to abuse their partners. When multiple factors are controlled for, socially-derived issues such as attitudes that approve of violence against women, attitudes that are hostile towards women and expectations that women should maintain "traditional" sex roles must be factored in to understand intergenerational transmission of violence. Moreover, it is men and non-whites who are more likely to hold such attitudes, than women or whites (Flood & Pease, 2009:131; Hanson, Cadsky, Harris, & Lalonde, 1997:203; Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates et al., 1997:88; Markowitz, 2001:215; O'Hearn & Margolin, 2000:168-169).

It is important to note from other studies, that the majority of men who experience and learn abuse as children do not go on to exhibit abusive behaviours towards their partners (Flood & Pease, 2009:131; O'Hearn & Margolin, 2000:160). In Scutt's (1983:59, 120) Australian study she notes perpetrators come from childhoods that are loving, caring, spoilt and abusive. Consequently this commonsense theory, when applied to male

perpetrators, is neither simple nor deterministic. Nevertheless, in cases where intergenerational transmission of violence is an issue, recommended forms of treatment include family or couples therapy (Dwyer et al., 1995:195) or cognitive behaviour therapy to help men change their attitudes and behaviours.

The second sociological explanation draws on subculture of violence theory to explain why men's intimate partner abuse is spread unevenly across social categories. Quantitative surveys find that risk factors for men to abuse their partners are men aged 18-30 (Anderson, 1997:655; Bowker, 1998a:xvii; Edwards & Hearn, 2004:43; Gelles, 1993:31; Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler, & Bates, 1997:286; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:114; Stets, 1990:505), and men who are non-white, unemployed, have low status jobs, low incomes and low levels of education (Anderson, 1997:655; Di Bartolo, 2001:332; Di Bartolo & Carpenter, 2001:360; Edwards & Hearn, 2004:51; Gelles, 1993:33; Heise, 1998:274; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000:953). Impoverished living conditions and knowledge that it was particularly "degenerative working-class men" who beat their wives have been acknowledged risk factors for wife beating since at least the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Dobash et al., 2004:579; Nelson, 2007:84).

Subculture of violence theory assumes that physical violence predominantly occurs in the above groups because they hold values that justify the use of violence, they lack resources, have fewer life chances, greater frustration and stresses due to poverty, and they lack skills which lead to a greater possibility of being violent, that then spills over into the home (Cunradi, Caetano, & Schafer, 2002:386; Di Bartolo, 2001:337; Gelles, 1993:33; Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler et al., 1997:288; Markowitz, 2001:206; Michalski, 2004:658; O'Neill, 1998:465; Stets, 1990:505).

These explanations, however, are not straightforward. Although Hotaling and Sugarman's (1986:113) meta-analysis reinforces these findings, they also note that two large representative studies did not find education and occupational levels to be significant risk factors. A later meta-analytic

review of 85 studies found that of five risk factors – unemployment status, income, age, education and career/life stress – only career/life stress emerged as a moderate risk factor for intimate partner violence (Stith et al., 2004:89). Other studies tend to show that rates of violence amongst lower and middle-class husbands are higher than those of upper-class husbands, with rates of severity being highest amongst lower socioeconomic classes (Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler et al., 1997:287). Nor is the link between violence and race straightforward. Research from the USA that relies on self-report data shows that non-whites report lower levels of violence against spouses and children compared with whites, although the evidence found non-white men use more severe violence (Markowitz, 2001:215).

While variables such as men’s perceptions of financial stress have explanatory relevance (Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler et al., 1997:287), that, also, is not always the case, for example cross-cultural studies show that support mechanisms exist for families that may not be present in western societies (Jewkes, 2002:1422). Additionally, a study that tested for mediating factors in the two waves of American national survey data, found that when a woman makes it known to her partner that she would prefer that he work longer hours, her risk for experiencing violence from him rose by 133% (Fox, Benson, DeMaris, & Van Wyk, 2002:802).

Finally, with the main focus on attempting to explain risk factors that may lead to men’s physical violence against their partners, this ignores risk factors that may lead to men’s psychological aggression/abuse. A review of the small number of studies that exist found that men’s “psychological aggression/abuse may be more difficult to predict than partner physical aggression/abuse” and that socioeconomic variables do not significantly increase the risk (Schumacher et al., 2001:266).

Contemporary best practice guidelines for perpetrators from the above social categories entail screening and referring men to agencies that can address issues underlying their violence including assistance with job search and up-skilling towards gaining employment (Dwyer et al., 1995:191;

Gondolf, 2009:639), whilst others argue that eliminating “men’s poverty is one important domestic violence prevention strategy” (Raphael, 2004:1364).

A third sociological explanation for men’s intimate partner violence focuses on resources. Resource theory assumes that those with power will dominate those with less power (Brownridge et al., 2008:119; Gelles, 1993:37). Men’s power in the home necessitates having superior resources (money, prestige, respect) to their partners, which some men may use to control their partners (Anderson, 1997:656; Choi & Ting, 2008:849; Heise, 1998:271). Conversely, ultimate resource theory posits that when these resources are decreased, absent, or are less than those of their partners’, men will resort to violence as an ultimate resource to gain or regain power (Anderson, 1997:667; Choi & Ting, 2008:849; Jewkes, 2002:1422; McCloskey, 1996:458; Yllö, 1988:31). However cross-cultural studies do not always support these findings (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:119; Jewkes, 2002:1422) and a review of 97 risk factors does not find that perpetrators desire more power than non-violent men (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:119).

A fourth sociological explanation proceeds from Gelles’s (1993:38) application of social control theory with exchange theory. He posits that, before people act, they weigh the potential costs or benefits that may result (Gelles, 1993:38; Loseke, 2005:42; O’Neill, 1998:467). Men abuse their partners because they may gain certain rewards such as tension release (O’Neill, 1998:467). Gelles (1993:36) argues that this draws attention to the role society plays in positively, or negatively, sanctioning abuse within the family. Inherent in the family institution is the cultural ideal that the family should be private, thereby reducing the level of social control over inappropriate behaviours (Gelles, 1993:36; Loseke, 2005:43). Related to this, empirical evidence shows that isolation is both a cause and consequence of intimate partner abuse (Heise, 1998:275; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:120; Walker, 1984). Many perpetrators are loners (Saunders, 1992:219) and have higher levels of social isolation than non-perpetrators (Anderson, 2002; Edin, Lalos, Högberg, & Dahlgren, 2008:233). Also the isolation of rural areas, which is marked by constraints

on professional intervention, is associated with a higher prevalence of intimate partner abuse (Alston, 1997:17-20; Murty et al., 2003:1073). Cultural approval of violence may add to the benefits for men who abuse their partners (Gelles, 1993:38), or men may be deterred from being violent because they fear stigma associated with police arrest (Heckert & Gondolf, 2000:387).

2.2.3 Feminist perspectives

Several historians who explored the background of men's domination of their wives between the 15th and early 20th centuries, by reading law statutes, religious doctrines, and socio-cultural-political records, revealed that men were granted patriarchal ownership over their wives. Women were men's property, which made violence and rape acceptable. Institutional rules meant men were legally mandated to control, use and abuse their property any way they wished, including locking wives in cupboards to prevent them from spending 'his' money. Men had the right to discipline and punish disobedient wives, therefore could kill wives who threatened their husband's authority. Because of the socio-political belief in men's supremacy over women, some men who did not uphold the gender order by controlling their wives, were publicly ridiculed, punished and shamed (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:3-6, 2000:189; Dobash & Dobash, 1981:565-573; Laing, 2000:2; Lees, 2000:57-58; Millett, 1971:33; Paymar & Barnes, 2006:4; Smith, 1990:258).

At the end of the 18th century, feminists began arguing that husbands, should treat wives with more respect (Connell, 1990:512). But it was not until the late 19th century that laws against wife beating were established in America and Britain (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Lees, 2000:58), however these laws were not transplanted into Australia or New Zealand during the colonial period. Rather, British and European settlers brought this patriarchal legacy to Australasia. The masculinised institutions were reinforced and strengthened by the colonial experience (Connell, 1990:521; Olssen, 1999; Phillips, 1996), expressions of masculinity entailed a "disdain

or devaluation of the feminine” (Carrington & Scott, 2008:650) and wife abuse was widely prevalent (Nelson, 2007:83; Olssen, 1999; Ritchie & Ritchie, 1993). However, feminists at this time considered wife beating to be a minor theme (Kelly, 2005:475) among other concerns such as equal rights for women including attempts to gain the vote (Gordon & Hunter, 1998:80).

Then in the 1960s and 1970s when domestic violence was “rediscovered” by feminists, Dobash and Dobash (1979:1) were among the first researchers to conduct hundreds of hours of in-depth interviews with women. Using their understanding of the history of male domination, they were among the first to theorise that men’s domestic violence was a consequence of a patriarchal “expression of the unequal status, authority, and power of marital partners” that had been historically and “widely accepted as appropriate to the husband’s superior position” (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:10).

The following discussion represents a broad brushstroke description of the evolution of feminist theories from the early 1970s through to now. This evolution will show that early feminists understood women’s oppression within the context of dichotomous notions of all powerful men and less powerful women and individuals and social structures. Masculinity was understood to contain fixed character traits such as domination and aggression learned early in life, whereas later feminist understandings see that there are multiple masculinities that men can and do practice, and that men choose from multiple social discourses to help shape those practices. Other contemporary understandings changed early views that men and women relate in predictable ways. Rather, the relational approach to doing gender means masculinity is not pre-formed, but emerges in relation to other people and to social structures.

On the whole, these theories do not specifically focus on domestic violence, nor do they usually focus specifically on men, *per se*. The underpinning of feminist theories has been about women’s oppression in general, sometimes

including theories that explain rape and violence against women in general, and always the focus is on women's experiences (Ashe, 2004:187).

This section on feminist perspectives focuses on a number of conceptual devices used to explain women's oppression set out under the following headings: gender as a social power structure, intersections of diversity and difference, the organisation of the family, sexuality as a key power structure, violence as a key power structure, cultural representations of masculinity, the state as a key power structure, and interventions that focus on men. Feminist theories have become increasingly more sophisticated and complex over time, but it will be shown that they lack nuanced explanations of male perpetrators.

Likewise, the empirical research reported in this section does not focus on men's perspectives, rather stems from quantitative studies, or from reports of clinical observations of male perpetrators, discussions held with women seeking refuge, documents recording women's stories at times of leaving their partners or attempting to protect their children from sexual abuse, discussions with women's advocates and in-depth interviews with abused women (Abrar, Lovenduski, & Margetts, 2000:239; Dobash & Dobash, 1979:1; Hagemann-White, 1998:1; Jones & Schechter, 1992; Kirkwood, 1993:30; Martin, 1976; Russell, 1982; Walker, 1984).

2.2.3.1 Gender as a social power structure

According to Millett (1971:25) one of the principles of patriarchy is that the "male shall dominate female". Schechter (1982:221) noted in her review of early feminist theories that "male domination is the expectation that men will be gratified by women and that they will get their own way". Theoretically then, many early feminists claimed that men were of one class with power over women who themselves were of one class (Schechter, 1982:45; Walby, 1990:3). In their early writing, the Dobash's (1979:22) stated that, "All men see themselves as controllers of women, and because they are socialised into the use of violence they are potential aggressors

against their wives”. These early viewpoints are said to have positioned all men as villains, or potential villains, in an “us versus them” power arrangement with women as real or potential passive victims (Carmody, 2003:201; Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985:552; Hunnicutt, 2009:560).

Dworkin (1981 cited in Barnett, 1997:124; 1981:13-24 cited in Edwards, 1987:25) proposed that male power consisted of seven forms. These are: men’s “metaphysical assertion of self” which gives men, by virtue of their sex, “intrinsic authority”; men’s “capacity to terrorise”; men’s “physical strength” which can be legitimately used to terrorise in order to gain power over others; men’s “power of naming” such as the power of defining a woman’s experience; men’s “power of owning” women, which before marital rape laws were introduced in the 1990s, legally sanctioned men to coerce sexual intercourse against a wife’s will; and finally, men’s “power of money”, therefore the power to control the family finances.

Given such views, it seems fitting that Eisenstein (1984:222 cited in Nes & Iadicola, 1989:14) would argue that: “radical feminism views female nature as superior and that if there is an androgynous view of human life in radical feminism it is that men should become like women, not women like men.” Thus, the collective interests of women was “a fundamental part of early feminist theory” (Walby, 1990:15) and many feminists were of the conviction that they should not spend their energies on men as it was thought this would obstruct the pursuit of autonomy, safety and equality for women (Hanmer, 1990:38).

2.2.3.2 Intersections of diversity and difference

Although there are common features that bind men as a group (Hearn & Collinson, 1994; Pease, 2000:38; Walby, 1990:16), the reality is far from simplistic. The past 40 years have seen ongoing challenges to theories that conceptualise gender as holding two distinct hierarchical positions. Some feminists argue that differences among women and among men are as important as similarities (Schechter, 1982:47). Ignoring differences means

dismissing ways men resist the gender order, dismissing social and historical changes in patriarchal patterns, dismissing ways patriarchal power structures create problems for some men (Hearn, 1999:4) and means dismissing ways men can be different at different stages of their life (Carmody, 2003:201).

Because western feminism originated as a white middle-class heterosexual construct (Ashe, 2004:193; Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence, 2004:30; Walby, 1990:13; West & Fenstermaker, 1995:10), many feminists were not able to explain, for instance, how the intersection of race, class and gender shaped a working-class black homosexual man's abuse of his male partner (Kirkwood, 1993:28-30; West & Fenstermaker, 1995:13; Yllö, 2005:24). Although Millett (1971:36) had noted complexities do exist in the concepts of gender and power stating that, because social status also relied on "economic, social, and educational circumstances of class", it was possible that some women held higher status than some men.

Then in the late 1980s Crenshaw (1989, 1990-1991) proposed a theory of intersectionality to challenge the idea that women represented a homogeneous group based solely on gender, but that there is a complex interaction between gender and race. Since then, the concept of intersectionality has been used to explain that men employ unequal levels of power and control across all social categories aside from race including: ethnicity, socioeconomic class, education, sexuality, physical or mental ability, age, religion, location (rural or urban), nationality and so forth (Bograd, 1999:276; Carmody, 2003:202; Dragiewicz, 2008:123; Edwards, 1987:19; Hanmer, 1990:30; Hearn, 1999:4; Millett, 1971:36; Pease, 2000:29; Walby, 1990:20; West & Fenstermaker, 1995:10-33; Yllö, 2005:20). But not all men in each category have the same experience (Ashe, 2004:193).

Further, by exposing the effects that power structures have on gendered experiences, it can be found that many men *and* women are "simultaneously privileged and oppressed" (Hanmer, Radford, & Stanko, 1989:6). For

example, heterosexual black working-class women may have interests in common with heterosexual black working-class men who are fighting against exploitation as workers (Schechter, 1982:47). Ultimately though a working-class man, for instance, may have less power than his middle-class counterpart, but Millett (1971:36) argues he ultimately has his “manhood to fall back upon”. Scully (1988:202) too has argued that “the gender imbalance of power forms the very core of our social fabric and is the blueprint for all the other power relationships”. Hanmer (1990:29) adds that recognition must be made of the benefits men accrue from patriarchy by virtue of their gender, even though not all men personally desire those benefits.

This conclusion differs from, and is made more complex, by West and Fenstermaker’s (1995:30) theory of “doing difference”. They argue that gender is not separate from race and class, but that doing difference is an “ongoing, methodical, and situated accomplishment”, which means the relevance of each category can only be evident in a particular context. Moreover, doing difference is relational, therefore the accomplishment of gender, class and race will differ according to the relationship between the individuals, and the interactions and accomplishments may have different meanings for each actor (West & Fenstermaker, 1995:32).

Finally, feminist theories suggest that male domination and intimate partner abuse are further complicated by men’s relationships with men. In the early 1980s, Hartmann (1981:18-19 cited in Nes & Iadicola, 1989:15) conceptualised patriarchy as a set of “hierarchical relations between men and solidarity among them which enable them in turn to dominate women”. Because most feminist theories have focused on the role that men’s relationships with women have in perpetuating patriarchy, this has proved to be an obstacle in developing a fuller analysis of how homosocial bonding amongst men may have a role in influencing male perpetrators to abuse intimate partners (Hearn & Whitehead, 2006:45-46; Whitehead, 2005:413). DeKeseredy and colleagues (1990, 1993) devised a peer support theory embedded in this understanding of patriarchy. They argue that socialisation

theory plays a part in other men's support for men to perpetrate intimate partner abuse. Given the importance of this concept for the current thesis, this will be discussed later in this chapter.

2.2.3.3 The organisation of the family

Early feminists argue that in western society patriarchy is deeply entrenched in the social organisation of homes and family (Millett, 1971:25, 33; Smith, 1990:258). The man's position as head of the family "carries considerable power and status for the male in the wider community" (Hanmer, 2000:20). This patriarchal ideology of the home and family creates a seemingly benign environment, which fosters men's intimate partner abuse. If men and women are successfully socialised into their rightful positions as husband and wife, this reinforces the patriarchal hierarchy (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:44; Edwards, 1987:27). The husband's position places him in a materially and ideologically strong position. He is the provider and the protector. The woman is his property and she is dependent on him (Millett, 1971:35; Schechter, 1982:46). During the 1970s this ideology was supported by cultural, social, and religious views that the family should be preserved (Sev'er, Dawson, & Johnson, 2004:567).

Some feminists argue as Millett (1971:36-37) does that romantic love and chivalry serve as ideological techniques to disguise the patriarchal power imbalance. It is as though husbands are positioned on a continuum from protector to abuser. Thus, from this perspective, all women are vulnerable to being controlled and abused by their live-in male partner. Indeed, the husband who uses violence against his wife does so to uphold this patriarchal order. His aim is to ensure the woman adheres to her dependent position, or to bring her back into line if she disobeys (Schechter, 1982:46).

The patriarchal ideology, that had developed by the early 20th century, that family affairs should be kept private (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:7-8), further lays a foundation that fosters domestic violence (Abrar et al., 2000:245). The relegation of women to the inferior social role of unpaid work in the

home and men to the superior social role of paid work in the public sphere, reinforces men's economic and political power and "actually increases women's physical and psychological vulnerability to male attack" (Edwards, 1987:19, 22-23). MacKinnon (1983:657) argues that the "law of privacy will tend to protect the right of men". However such protection operates differentially depending on race, class and geographic location. For example, black poor men are arrested and incarcerated at higher rates than white rich men (Yllö, 2005:26), whilst rural men experience greater protection because in some locations, rural values emphasise the ideology of privacy, hence, in part, accounts for higher prevalence of men's intimate partner abuse in rural and remote areas (Hightower & Gorton, 2002:849).

Although there is greater socio-political tolerance for contemporary alternative marital and family arrangements (Brook, 2002:48), patriarchal ideology that legitimises men's power and authority (Smith, 1990:263-264), serves as an undercurrent that continues to foster men's abuse and control of their female partners (Walby, 1990:4-5). The fact that women are more likely to be abused by intimate partners than by strangers (Kelly, 2005:475) and that domestic violence is endemic to modern western societies, suggests it is normal men (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:23) in "normally functioning families" (Bograd, 1988a:19) who abuse and control their wives. What this suggests is that, to understand men's intimate partner abuse, it is not enough to focus solely on the organisation of family as the crux. Rather, the feminist critique that "the personal is political" underpins the enduring imperative that family violence be analysed in the context of a larger system of patriarchal power structures (Brook, 2002:50; Kirkwood, 1993:25).

2.2.3.4 Sexuality as a key power structure

Social construction of sexuality constitutes one of the key patriarchal social power structures (Edwards, 1987:22; Walby, 1990:127) that lays a foundation for men's intimate partner abuse to occur. In this respect, Dworkin (1981:203 cited in Edwards, 1987:25) argues that "male sexual domination" is a multidimensional phenomenon that functions as a material

system and an ideology. For example, Rich's (1980 cited in Edwards, 1987:23) notion of "compulsory heterosexuality" and Jackson's (1996:24 cited in Brook, 2002:47) notion that marriage is "heterosexuality's central institution" reflect the ideology that maintains the patriarchal family, with men at the head and women underneath.

The sexual double standard (Walby, 1990:21), also works in favour of men. This standard legitimises use and abuse of women sexually in, and outside, of the home. Brownmiller (1975:392 cited in Edwards, 1987:19) argues that sexual access in the form of rape, prostitution and pornography are adjuncts "of male power and privilege".

Rape, in particular, was a major feminist issue in the 1970s. Brownmiller (1975 cited in Edwards, 1987:18-19; Kelly, 2005:475) theorises that rape is the most fundamental form of patriarchal control over women. She argues that, regardless of whether all men rape or not, the ever-present threat of rape by men is an effective mechanism that can control all women alike, anywhere, anytime (Walby, 1990:135). Although Brownmiller (1975 cited in Walby, 1990:135) did discuss variability in rape over time and place, contemporary feminists critique her work by arguing that not all women fear rape (Carrington & Watson, 1996:256) and not all men benefit from a generalised fear of rape (Carmody & Carrington, 2000:347).

Feminists hold different views regarding the "normality" of patriarchal relations of sexuality. Brownmiller (1975 cited in Edwards, 1987:19) sees a distinction between "deviant" and "normal" heterosexuality, whilst Kelly (1987:54, 58) sees patriarchal sexual relations on a continuum from choice, to pressure, to threat, to coercion, to force. From this perspective there is a fine line between normal heterosexual intercourse, sexual harassment of women in the workplace (MacKinnon, 1979 cited in Walby, 1990:103) and rape of women anywhere. Kelly (1987:56) argues that this idea of a continuum provides women with the ability to name whether their experience is abuse or not. Whereas Gavey (1992:329) argues that men's heterosexual power entails "much invisible coercion" in sexual

relationships. She argues that the normality of men's power can make it appear that women's lack of resistance means they want sex.

Whatever the case, the difference in degree between normal heterosexual relations at one end and violation at the other end, leaves women vulnerable to abuse. This is also because, the greater the level of intimacy involved, the less likely a woman is able to define forced sex by her husband as rape (Koss et al., 1994:12). Marital rape is not always physically forced on women, rather, male perpetrators emotionally pressure women, or threaten to withhold money unless she has sex with him (Bergen & Bukovec, 2006:1380). Thus, the dynamics of marital rape are complicated and complex. Dworkin's (1981 cited in Barnett, 1997:124; 1981:13-24 cited in Edwards, 1987:25) notion that men, with their power of naming what is and is not abuse, compounds the issue for women cohabiting with their abuser. Where women may have consented to sex previously, then been raped by their husbands, and consented to sex at future times, all parties concerned, including legal interventions may have difficulty defining where abuse starts and ends (Easteal & Feerick, 2005:196).

2.2.3.5 Violence as a key power structure

Violence constitutes another key patriarchal power structure (Walby, 1990:21) that fosters intimate partner abuse. Hanmer (1978:229 cited in Edwards, 1987:21) argues that "force and its threat ... is the structural underpinning of hierarchical relations". In agreement, Millett (1971:43) states that "control in patriarchal society would be imperfect, even inoperable, unless it had the rule of force to rely upon". This power structure, then, is considered by some feminists to be central to maintaining and reproducing men's intimate partner abuse (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:24; Hanmer et al., 1989:4; Pence & Paymar, 1993). The threat of violence restricts women's lives, therefore many early feminists argue that all men are deemed to benefit from this, whether they beat their wives or not (Bograd, 1988a:14; Kirkwood, 1993:21; Walby, 1990:3). Therefore when it comes to reform, some feminists argue that men would be resistant to

change, given the social tolerance of violence and the privileges and benefits to be gained (Carrigan et al., 1985:581; Gondolf, 2004:606; Robertson, 1999b:68-69).

Hanmer's (cited in Walby, 1990:136) argument that men's intimate partner abuse is an extension of men's power, is the dominant feminist view. She points to wider evidence for this by arguing that the criminal justice system has tended to condone men's violence and the economic system has tended to reinforce women's inability to escape. From this view, men's violence and control has been understood to entail consciously chosen, intentional behaviours aimed at getting their own way (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:24; Hunnicutt, 2009:560; Pence & other contributors, 1984:479; Pence & Paymar, 1993:2, 4; Schechter, 1988:244 cited in Yllö, 1993:57).

Yet, many men fear violence (Hogg & Brown, 1992:9) and not all men benefit from the general threat of violence to women (Carmody & Carrington, 2000:347). The notion that violence is a tactic only used by men against women has been challenged by some feminists since the 1970s (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:9). Men are raped or beaten by intimate gay partners and victimised by intimate female partners (Allen-Collinson, 2009; Bible, Dasgupta, & Osthoff, 2002; Carrington & Watson, 1996:255; Christie, 1996; Dasgupta, Osthoff, & Bible, 2003; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Dobash & Dobash, 2004; McClennan, 2005; Orme, Dominelli, & Mullender, 2000:90; Swan & Snow, 2006).

Feminist theories, policies and practices are continually adapting to explain these patterns of violence (Fitzroy, 2001; McHugh, Livingston, & Ford, 2005; McMahon & Pence, 2003; Paymar & Barnes, 2006:7; Swan & Snow, 2006). Put very simply, same-sex violence is understood to stem from heterosexism and homophobia (Balsam & Szymanski, 2005; National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, n.d.; Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005:44). Feminist theories of women's violence against male partners take into account women's use of all forms of non-physical abuse, women's experience of abuse by their partners, issues of class, race and other

structural power relations, complex understandings of women's agency, and issues such as maternal ambivalence (Fitzroy, 2001:12; Swan & Snow, 2006:1027). Fitzroy (2001:28) argues that because feminists recognise that women's use of violence is linked to women's choices to use violence, then it is important to re-visit feminist assumptions that men's experiences of victimisation cannot be considered when responding to their perpetration of violence.

Since the 1970s, men's groups have been pointing out the detrimental consequences to men as a result of patriarchy and violence including: murder, suicide, other forms of early death, restricted emotionality and impoverished relationships (Carrigan et al., 1985:564; Hearn et al., 2002:395; Messner, 1998:256; Pease, 2000:16). Anti-feminist men's groups, such as fathers' rights groups, continue to fight for their "rightful" patriarchal position in the family, by arguing that feminists want women to divorce (Chung, 2001-2002:13) so they can live "luxurious man-free lives, financed by child support" (Rosen, Dragiewicz, & Gibbs, 2009:518), and by stigmatising single mothers, and discrediting the suffering resulting from violence against women (Chesney-Lind, 2006:11; Connell, 2003:9; DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:876; Dunn, 2004-2005:24). Fathers' rights rhetoric removes the focus from holding men accountable for their violence against female partners and any effect this has on children (Chung, 2001-2002:13). Anti-feminist men's movements encapsulate varying degrees of resistance and tension. Some men believe their masculine identities are being challenged and that they are victims of a changing gender order that entails a loss of male privilege and entitlement (DeKeseredy, Donnermeyer, Schwartz, Tunnell, & Hall, 2007:303; Gough & Peace, 2000:390).

Thus, in theorising men's intimate partner abuse, some feminists are very hesitant to acknowledge any role that men's experience of victimisation may have on their mistreatment of women. Although it is legitimate for marginalised men to claim that they have less power in society than other men, the major fear is that these issues will relieve men of taking

responsibility for their abusive behaviours. Being victimised and having less power do not excuse or justify their abuse of women. However, it is important to find theoretical space to acknowledge this double-edged sword (Gough & Peace, 2000:395; Paymar & Barnes, 2006:7).

Some feminists who work with men in stopping abuse programmes do not describe every man who uses physical force against their partners as a perpetrator. Rather they argue, as the current thesis does, that men's intimate partner abuse is defined by a systematic and continuous pattern of intimidation and coercion (Paymar & Barnes, 2006:3; Pence & Paymar, 1993:2; Yllö, 2005:22, 54), not only through physical violence, rape and sex abuse, but through a wide range of psychological and structural tactics. Also, not all perpetrators use physical violence, nor the threat of physical violence (Chang, 1996; Douglas, 1998; Hoffman, 1984; Lammers, Ritchie, & Robertson, 2005; Murphy, 2002).

Indeed, some feminists argue that physical violence is not necessary to maintain patriarchy, because coercion, controlling women's social lives, restricting their educational and career development, economic exploitation and domestic slavery are all effective mechanisms for oppressing intimate female partners and enabling masculine ascendancy (Hearn, 1999:4; Kirkwood, 1993:44; Murphy, 2002; Stark, 2007). In fact, many women experience these non-physical forms of abuse and control as "a deeper and more central form of abuse" (Kirkwood, 1993:44; Stark, 2007). Bowker (1998b:4) argues that male perpetrators draw on cultural ideologies to effectively control their partners. By calling women a "fat slob" or a "whore", men are drawing on cultural standards, values and ideological representations of reality. Bowker suggests that this form of psychological abuse is only effective in demeaning women *because* it incorporates cultural patriarchal messages.

Various early feminists pointed to the central role ideology plays in perpetuating male domination. Daly (1978:2 cited in Edwards, 1987:21), for example, argued that the "possession of women's minds" was more

important than physical intimidation. Millett (1971:26) stressed that patriarchal ideology is supported through consent by both genders, which occurs through processes of socialisation into the patriarchal system.

Ideology, therefore, is another factor that complicates the claim that violence, and the threat of violence, are central in sustaining and reproducing patriarchy. Others argue that it is only when structures change ahead of ideological change that physical force, or its threat, may be necessary (Carmody, 2003:200; Gordon & Hunter, 1998:79; Gramsci, 1971:168, 276; Hearn, 1999:4; Millett, 1971:36; Smith, 1990:258; Walby, 1990:23). The tentacles of patriarchal ideology continue to have a stranglehold on egalitarianism. It is during times of social transition, when the status quo is challenged, that physical force may be used, where previously non-physical forms of coercion and control sufficed to maintain the gender order (Connell, 1987:184; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832, 846; Jewkes, Levin, & Penn-Kekana, 2002:1613).

The notion that men's violence is a key social structure is also complicated by the fact that not all men dominate or abuse women, nor do all men aspire to (Carmody, 2003:212; Carrigan et al., 1985:592; Connell, 2005:211; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832; Hearn, 2004; Hearn & Collinson, 1994; Hunnicutt, 2009:566; Jefferson, 1994:11; Orme et al., 2000:90; Pease, 2000:15; Walby, 1990:20). Further, the majority of men are non-violent (Carmody, 2003:212; Dutton & Bodnarchuk, 2005:5). Given that all western men are exposed to patriarchal ideologies, some feminists argue that the fact that not all men abuse and control their wives means they have chosen that path (Pence & Paymar, 1993:4). Wolf (1994:26) argues that there is no automatic and straightforward relationship between men and patriarchy, instead some men and some women partake in patriarchal domination over others and some partake in egalitarian relationships. Thus many men have chosen to form or join pro-feminist men's groups. Whilst these men acknowledge costs that patriarchy has for men, they simultaneously attempt to engage men in joining with women to challenge violence against women and to confront patriarchy in general (Berkowitz,

2004; DeKeseredy, Schwartz, & Alvi, 2000; Ferguson et al., 2004; Flood, 2002-2003; Pease, 2008).

2.2.3.6 Cultural representations of masculinity

Cultural representations of masculinity are believed to be one of the most enduring factors that set the foundation for men's perpetration of intimate partner abuse (Heise, 1998:277; Koss et al., 1994:6). Patriarchal ideology permeates cultural beliefs, norms, values, discourses and institutional practices, thereby shaping and constraining representations of reality, standards of behaviour and desired ways of being a man and relating to others (Anderson, 2005:859; Bowker, 1998b:4; Dobash & Dobash, 1979:22-23, 1992:283; Edwards, 1987:22; Koss et al., 1994:7; Millett, 1971:25, 55; Mirchandani, 2006:790; Pence & Paymar, 1993:4; Scutt, 1983:50; Walby, 1990:90-91). It was argued early on that "men who assault their wives are actually living up to cultural prescriptions that are cherished in Western society – aggressiveness, male dominance, and female subordination" (Dobash & Dobash, 1979:24).

Other cultural prescriptions of masculinity that men are said to adopt include being heterosexual, intelligent, effective, quick to take initiative, strong, unemotional, insensitive, autonomous, tough, active, assertive, forceful, violent, militaristic, competitive, heroic, independent and to want mastery over bodies and nature generally (Anderson, 1997:658; Dobash & Dobash, 1979:22; Edwards, 1987:18; Flax, 1987:637; Melzer, 2002:822; Messner, 1998:257; Millett, 1971:26; O'Neill, 1998:472; O'Neill & Harway, 1997:192; Umberson et al., 2003:234; Walby, 1990:91). On the other hand, women are said to adopt cultural prescriptions of femininity including subservience, passivity, acquiescence, ignorance, docility, virtue, ineffectuality, weakness and emotionality (Millett, 1971:26; Walby, 1990:90).

This polarisation of masculinity and femininity leads to an either/or dilemma, by suggesting there is only one way to be a man and a woman

(Flax, 1987:637; Pease, 2000:34; Walby, 1990:93), but it does not explain why men would need to use violence if women are socialised to be subordinate. The idea of socialisation into the western patriarchal system stems from social learning theory, which assumes that men and women passively learn to adopt these pre-set gendered patterns. Social learning theory does not explain the origin of these concepts of masculinity and femininity, it does not explain how socialisation actually occurs, nor does it explain why these constructs have these particular contents (O'Neill & Harway, 1997:193; Walby, 1990:93).

Once individuals have learned how to be boys and girls – usually the family is thought to be the most salient site where such learning takes place – the implication is that learning appropriate gender characteristics is completed at a young age and remains stable for life (West & Zimmerman, 1987:126). However, contemporary feminist understandings of socialisation have moved toward more complex understandings of men's and women's agency. Instead, masculine and feminine subjectivities are formed throughout life. Some men circumnavigate between different modes of masculinity throughout their lifespan, while others adopt different forms of masculinity dependent on the context, and yet other men may alternate across different masculine discourses within the one context over a single day. Men draw from multiple contexts to form their masculine subjectivities (Carmody, 2003:202; Flax, 1987:629; Heise, 1998:270; Millett, 1971:35; Pease, 2000:8, 35; Pence, 1999:32; Walby, 1990:103-104, 2002:542; Weedon, 1987:32-33). For example, some rap music videos are violent and depict women as sexual objects (Zhang, Dixon, & Congrad, 2009), some televised sports shows create “an ideological package of messages” that includes segregating women and using them as sex objects (Messner, 2005:320), Christian texts condone men's violence against female partners (Anderson, 2005:859; Fortune & Enger, 2005:2; Millett, 1971:25; Nash & Hesterberg, 2009; Walby, 1990:102), and popular movies bestow heroic status on men who use violence and rape women (Walby, 1990:134).

Another problem with social learning theory is that it assumes men learn masculinity by virtue of their sex, as if there are clear-cut anatomical sexual categories. However, masculinity and femininity are social constructs, quite distinct from biological sex (Carrigan et al., 1985:595; Dozier, 2005:299; Francis, 2002:40). Thus, men and women can, and do, express both masculine and feminine qualities and behaviours (Ashe, 2004:193; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:847; Dozier, 2005:301; Lovell, 2000:17; Messerschmidt, 2007; Paechter, 2006). It is patriarchal ideology that perpetuates the idea that masculinity and femininity are distinctly mirror opposites stemming from a “simple continuity between biology and the social” (Carrigan et al., 1985:562). Moreover, within this ideology there is no clear definition of heterosexual effeminacy, rather, it is depicted as belonging to gay men’s identities (Carrigan et al., 1985:592). The demarcation of masculinity as men’s prerogative, and demarcation of femininity as women’s prerogative, evades issues of individual men’s power and broader social power structures, thus is an ideology that leaves women vulnerable to abuse by their partners (Walby, 1990:93).

The idea that masculinity and femininity are not the property of individuals, was argued by West and Zimmerman (1987) who developed a theory of “doing gender”. Rather, than consisting of stereotypical traits, masculinity and femininity are achieved in interaction with others and are practiced differentially depending on the specific relationship. Likewise, contemporary feminist scholarship argues that power is not something the individual possesses, rather it only exists in the practice of doing social relations (Hampshire, Hills, & Iqbal, 2005:341).

Thus, contemporary feminist theories have evolved beyond depicting masculinity and femininity as dichotomous and fixed cultural prescriptions. Men do not just learn from a homogenous set of cultural beliefs, norms and values. Rather, competing and conflicting beliefs, norms, values and expectations exist throughout western institutions. This ever-changing conflicting range of discourses is available for men to constitute their subjectivity, to justify their choices and to justify their subsequent

behaviours (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:370, 375; Connell, 2005:72; Francis, 2002:45; Gadd, 2000:439, 2002:70, 2003:346; Hunnicutt, 2009:566; Jones, 2004; Mullaney, 2007:239; Pease, 2000:34-35; Walby, 1990:93; Weedon, 1987:34-35; Wood, 2004:571). Thus, contemporary feminist theories argue that men's subjectivities are conflicted, contradictory and precarious and that the contents of masculinities and femininities are fluid and saturated with ambivalence and ambiguity, struggles and tensions. They are always in a process of construction and reconstruction, in response to, for instance shifts in the gender order (Carmody, 2003:202; Flax, 1987:628, 643; Martin, 2003:344; Pease, 2000:8, 35; Walby, 1990:103-104, 2002:542; Weedon, 1987:32-33).

McNay (2000:58) argues that theories that polarise masculinity and femininity, individual and society make it difficult to account for change. Rather a theory that accounts for men's conflicted and contradictory subjectivities opens the way for "more complex processes of investment and negotiation" which is a vital concept that forms part of the foundation for the current thesis.

2.2.3.7 The state as a key power structure

Since the 1960s the main priority for feminist activists has been to make women safe. In the 1960s and 1970s, this entailed setting up women's refuges, rape crisis centres and autonomous political forums separate from the state (Kenney, 2005:228; Lewis, 2004:204; Walby, 2002:537).

Some early feminist theorists argued that patriarchy was deeply entrenched in the structure of all state institutions (Hanmer, 1978:229 cited in Edwards, 1987:21; Millett, 1971:25; Hanmer & Sanders, 1984 cited in Walby, 1990:135). The reality of this was exposed when feminist activists began widening their networks and started to engage with the state in relation to domestic violence. Sexist biases in key institutional policies and practices entailed minimising women's experience of abuse as "just life" and legitimated men's power and use of violence (Baumgartner, 1993:224;

Edwards, 1987:20; Hanmer, 1990:32; Kenney, 2005:228; Walby, 1990:21, 2002:536-537).

With this evolving understanding of the key role the state plays in controlling women's lives, Walby (1990:143) argues that it is inappropriate therefore to conceptualise violence as *the* basis of men's control over women. She argues that this is because men's violence "cannot be understood outside a context in which the state does not intervene to support a woman's apparent right to name such violence as criminal, and in which access to the material means to escape violence in the home is restricted".

Feminists therefore began to pose questions such as, "Can the state be made to serve the interests of those upon whose powerlessness its power is erected?" (MacKinnon, 1983:644). Several feminists pointed out this paradox, wondering as Summers (2003:91 cited in Murray, 2005:28) did, whether eliminating domestic violence was "an impossibly ambitious plan" (Edwards, 1987:27; Laing, 2000:6; Yllö, 2005:31). Such elimination is made even harder by the notion that the power that sustains patriarchy is the ideology that makes the gender order appear natural (Millett, 1971:58). Therefore, as the Dobash's (1979:44) pointed out, "acceptance of the 'rightful' nature of the order and its inequities ... means that any challenges to it ... will be met by external constraints in the guise of social pressures to conform".

The "pervasive and tenacious" hold that patriarchy has (MacKinnon, 1983:638) led feminists to argue that deep social change is required, entailing deconstruction of hierarchical socio-cultural-political structures and transforming sexist gender relations within all institutions (Abrar et al., 2000:345; Bograd, 1988a:20; Carmody & Carrington, 2000; Dobash & Dobash, 1979:11; Edwards & Hearn, 2004:55; Kelly, 2005:491; Schechter, 1982:47).

In this respect, feminists from all theoretical positions have had a major ongoing influence in effecting deep social change. This has included raising

public awareness of men's abuse of women, challenging ideologies that legitimate intimate partner abuse and influencing changes in legislation and government policies. Feminists have fought for women's autonomy and safety irrespective of class, race and sexuality. They have pressed for men to change their oppressive masculine practices, for instance, by initiating and running stopping abuse programmes for men (Carmody & Carrington, 2000:345; Carrigan et al., 1985:598; Chung, 2001-2002:7; DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:880; Douglas & Godden, 2002:4; Gondolf, 1985:314, 2004:624; O'Neill, 1998:469; Schechter, 1982:45; Scutt, 1983:280; Sev'er et al., 2004:567). Effecting legislative changes to outlaw marital rape and violence by husbands, and placing men's violence against women on political, institutional and public agendas are major feminist achievements, not only in the west, but globally (Costello, 2004-2005:43; Lees, 2000:59; Lehrner & Allen, 2009:657).

However, such engagement with socio-political institutions, not only continue to expose sexism at the state level, but also exposed differential treatment of people of colour, poor people, lesbians and gay men. For example, it became apparent black working-class men were more likely to have rape complaints made against them and more likely to be arrested than white middle-class men. Further, the justice system provided less adequate services to women of colour, poor women and lesbians, than to white middle-class heterosexual women (DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:880; Gondolf, 2007:649; Hanmer et al., 1989:5; Pence, 1999:34; Walby, 1990:142). Interviews with women show that health services often fail to identify domestic violence. This means that underlying causes of women's mental health problems such as depression and anxiety often go unaddressed (Robertson et al., 2007b:267).

One of the first changes feminists sought for women during the 1980s, was to change the law so that men's domestic violence would be recognised as criminal (Douglas, 2008:444; Stewart, 1999:2). Once legislation was changed, it was "crucial to women's safety and survival" that police, lawyers and the court use the legislation appropriately (Hanmer et al.,

1989:6). But, as MacKinnon (1983:644) argued, “the law sees and treats women the way men see and treat women”. The reality of this statement continues to hold truth, and the situation is more complex than this. Studies find that some police and family court judges collude with men, whilst others uphold the law in support of women (Busch, Robertson, & Lapsley, 1992:157, 183; Jones & Schechter, 1992:69; Robertson, 1999a; Robertson & Busch, 1998:48; Robertson et al., 2007a, 2007b).

There are sexist biases in the legal system that legitimise rape, for example, many rapists escape processing in the court (Brownmiller, 1975 cited in Edwards, 1987:19; Hanmer et al., 1989:5; Koss, 2005:104; Walby, 1990:141). Interviews with women highlight long delays for some women in court decision making as to whether a protection order will be granted or extended. Some courts interpret psychological violence as a difference of opinion between partners, as opposed to being part of a campaign of power and control (Robertson et al., 2007b:44, 47). The state enables some men to engage women in lengthy child residence/contact and property court battles as a tactic to control their ex-partners’ finances and psychological wellbeing (Murphy, 2002). Specialist family courts have been developed in the USA, Australia, Canada and the UK (Robertson et al., 2007b:208). Although such courts are intended to improve justice for abused women and to direct perpetrators to treatment (Stewart, 2005:5), Robertson and colleagues (2007b:210, 217) warn that poorly administered courts fail to hold male perpetrators accountable.

During the 1980s feminists reported that police considered domestic violence to be of low priority (Stewart, 1999:2). The state has often refused to intervene unless the violence is extreme. In these instances, women cannot depend on police protection so are driven back into relationship with their violent partners (Walby, 1990:136). It is more often the case that, rather than charging a violent man, his abuse will be dealt with as a civil matter through a protection order (Douglas, 2008:444; Laing, 2000:6). However current studies show that some police take no action in response to men who breach protection orders and some police misinform women about

protection orders (Katzen, 2000:131 cited in Laing, 2003:7; Robertson et al., 2007b:38, 45, 148-149). Some police minimise psychological violence, which means, for instance, not enforcing breaches that involve intimidating telephone calls and text messages. On the other hand there are police officers who do show good understanding of psychological violence. It is suggested that such inconsistencies in police handling of family violence are the result of inadequate training (Robertson et al., 2007b:38, 45, 148-149).

Since the 1970s some feminists have argued that the state is as much part of the problem as the solution (Hanmer, 1978 cited in Walby, 2002:537). As women's ongoing experiences show, the state's failure to hold perpetrators accountable contributes to those men's sense of entitlement to use violence against their partners and contributes to the continuation of domestic violence (Pence, 1999:32). Thus feminists have argued that men beat their wives "because they can get away with it [and that] it is not that they all *do*, but that they all *can* should they wish to" (Hanmer, 1990:33-34).

Therefore, one of the feminist responses to resolve the sexist, racist and otherwise biased state response to domestic violence is to re-educate agents of the state. For example re-educating police (Huisman, Martinez, & Wilson, 2005; NSW Ombudsman, 2006) has resulted in some changes to police procedures (Walby, 1990:141). Health providers are taught screening and referral protocols to improve their responses to abused women (Glowa, Frasier, & Newton, 2002; Robertson et al., 2007b:267; Standards Council, 2006; Washington State Department of Health, 2008; Wong, Wester, Mol, & Lagro-Janssen, 2007). And some welfare agencies, charged with providing financial assistance to abused women, are developing protocols and training staff to respond appropriately (WINZ, 2009).

The feminist influence on socio-political change has been an iterative process. While conducting the current research project, an increasingly conservative political and economic climate" has posed "a danger for the hard-won advances" (Sev'er et al., 2004:567). Some western government policies are aimed at preserving the family. Although this may benefit

women by enabling their sense of self-determination to choose to remain with an abusive partner, it is a policy that maintains the patriarchal organisation of the family (Hanmer, 2000:20). The policy also serves to reframe men's violence as a communication problem. Thus emphasis is placed on helping men and women to improve their communication whilst the structural power men hold in the family is ignored (Chung, 2001-2002:12-13). Beliefs in patriarchal family values influence some court practices that recommend inappropriate shared parenting. Such practices ignore, at best, the past and present effect domestic violence has on some women and children, and at worst, the danger that may be present due to some men believing they have lost rights to their patriarchal entitlement (Laing, 2003:8, 17).

Thus some western governments' domestic violence policies "reflect a strong adherence to social conservatism and a hostility towards core feminist responses" (Phillips, 2006:194) by avoiding recognition of gender dynamics (Webster, 2007:57), deleting the word "equality" from intervention goals (DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:876) and "condoning, perpetuating and facilitating the very circumstances (patriarchy and anti-feminism) in which male violence against women continues to thrive" (Costello, 2004-2005:49).

Finally, McKenzie (2005:12-13) points out that after a three year market research project, costing the Australian government at least \$3.53 million, the government withdrew the launch of the public multi-media campaign at the last minute. The campaign slogan was going to be "No Respect, No Relationship", but a new campaign was quickly developed to replace this with the slogan "Violence Against Women, Australia Says No". The function of the original campaign was to help people understand that psychologically controlling forms of abuse, as well as physical and sexual abuse, are inappropriate ways for men to relate to women. Whereas the new (current at the time of this research) campaign only depicts images of physical violence and rape and the slogan has no bearing on what men do, rather only states what the government is doing. The Prime Minister states

in the foreword to the booklet that went to all Australian homes, that the government's role is not "to tell people how to live their lives; our personal relationships are private" (Commonwealth of Australia, 2004:1).

2.2.3.8 Interventions that focus on men

In the 1960s and 1970s the feminist agenda was to empower and protect women, but such interventions did not address men and their violent behaviours (Orme et al., 2000:89). The thought of feminists focusing on men was controversial (Lewis, 2004:204) and the provision of men's stopping abuse programmes was treated with skepticism (Dobash & Dobash, 1992:241). Some feminists argued instead that men's violence should be addressed by the legal system, community education, demands for housing, jobs and child care services (Dobash & Dobash, 1992:241). However, feminists were concerned that psychological treatments were focusing on dysfunction in women or the couple (Mankowski et al., 2002:169), so the first pro-feminist re-education programme, EMERGE, was set up in 1977 in USA to focus on male perpetrators' behaviours (Dobash & Dobash, 1992:243).

In 1981, the Duluth Police Department adopted one of the first mandatory arrest policies. This resulted in increased numbers of perpetrators entering the criminal justice system. However, some problems arose (Paymar & Barnes, 2006:10) for example, in some instances mandatory arrest benefits men over women (DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:880; Robertson et al., 2007b:152, 157). It was also found that imprisoning first-time perpetrators was impractical. In response to these problems, a stopping abuse programme was established in Duluth to re-educate perpetrators using feminist understandings of men's violence against women. The aim was to provide a low-cost programme so that it would not limit funding necessary for supporting battered women (Paymar & Barnes, 2006:10).

The men's programme is known as the "Duluth Curriculum", or the Duluth Abuse Intervention Programme (DAIP). This men's programme was

devised so that it would work in conjunction with a coordinated response from the community known as the “Duluth Model”. This model involves coordinating law enforcement, criminal and civil courts, mental health providers, faith-based leaders, media, the business sector, social security agencies, and so forth to work together. Each agency is assigned specific roles and protocols. This, along with effective information flow between agencies, that discusses and resolves problems highlighted by “real cases”, has been found to be the most effective way to keep victims safe and hold perpetrators accountable (Paymar & Barnes, 2006:10; Pence, 1999:29; Robertson et al., 2007b:153). It is only when agencies have shared visions and common understandings of domestic violence that coordinated community response protocols produce seamless support to abused women and consistently hold male perpetrators accountable (Pence, 1999:34; Robertson et al., 2007b:152-153).

However, feminist advocates and facilitators at perpetrator programmes are often suspicious about the effectiveness of programmes. Whilst some men do change their beliefs and behaviours, there are often high drop-out rates and many men who complete programmes continue to abuse women (Cavanagh, Dobash, Dobash, & Lewis, 2001:697; Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005:156). Debates about the value of men’s programmes have shifted from whether programmes should be offered, to deciding on the most appropriate conditions that would support the effectiveness of such programmes (Laing, 2000:10). In this respect, research so far shows that the most effective perpetrator programmes operate as part of the broader coordinated community response, hence this is considered the best way forward (DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:881; National Council, 2009:137). For example a four-year longitudinal follow-up evaluation of four stopping abuse programmes in USA, that worked in conjunction with a coordinated community response, found “a clear de-escalation of reassault and other abuse over time, with the vast majority of men reaching sustained non-violence” (Gondolf, 2007:652).

The combined Duluth Model and men's stopping abuse programme curriculum has become the most widely used domestic violence intervention strategy internationally (Day, Chung, O'Leary, & Carson, 2009:204; Lewis, 2004:204; National Council, 2009:135; Paymar & Barnes, 2006:10-11; Taylor & Sullivan, 2007:1).

However, not everyone who claims they operate their men's stopping abuse programme on the Duluth Curriculum and Model actually adheres to it. For example, an Australian study found varying levels of adoption of the models and inconsistent use of the principles in practice and conceptualisation (Day et al., 2009:205). A New Zealand study found that some locations fail to support women and hold perpetrators accountable because they do not understand what an appropriate coordinated response actually means (Robertson et al., 2007b:152-153).

This combined model is, however, continually evolving in response to empirical research and grass-roots experiences to better address nuances and complexities in men, women and "the system". For example Duluth practitioners continually seek ways to balance over and under arrest of perpetrators. Part of the solution entails finding and utilising effective services in the wider community for dealing with the range of perpetrators' complex issues (Gondolf, 2007:649; Laing, 2000:4; Paymar & Barnes, 2006; Taylor, 2008:8).

2.2.4 Uniting psychological, sociological and feminist perspectives: An ecological framework

Theory building that specifically explains domestic violence has been hampered by the fact that many feminists have been reluctant to acknowledge the role psychological risk factors play, and many psychologists and sociologists have been reluctant to acknowledge the influence of wider socio-political power structures (Heise, 1998:262-263). Consequently, in the late 1990s Heise (1998:264-265) proposed an integrated ecological framework to synthesise understandings of risk factors

that highlight the interplay between men as individuals and society, by categorising this interplay into five layers: ontological/individual factors, microsystem, exosystem, macrosystem and mesosystem. This approach maintains that male domination and the interrelationship of patriarchal beliefs and values are central to this framework as these factors have relevance at every level of the social ecology (Heise, 1998:277).

At the first level, ontological/individual risk factors include men's psychological issues, and their personal history such as witnessing and directly experiencing violence as children in the family of origin. At the second level, the microsystem risk factors are male dominance, control and wealth within the family, marital and verbal conflict and men's use of alcohol. At the third level, the exosystem risk factors include low socioeconomic status, unemployment, isolation of women and the family and delinquent peer associations. At the fourth level, the macrosystem risk factors include male entitlement and ownership of women, masculinity linked to aggression and dominance, rigid gender roles, and acceptance of interpersonal violence and physical chastisement. At the fifth, and final level, the mesosystem accounts for the interplay between various aspects of men's social environment including linkages between men's family, place of work, extended family and peer networks, plus the linkages with social, cultural and state institutions (Heise, 1998:264-265).

Scholars argue that single-factor explanations of domestic violence such as men's psychological characteristics, when considered independent from socio-cultural influences, are inadequate predictors of future violence (Gondolf, 1988:190; Heckert & Gondolf, 2005:20). In this respect, the ecological framework is considered "state of the art" (Brownridge, 2006:807) in developing risk assessment instruments to help predict whether women are at risk of violence or homicide and in developing coordinated community responses to protect victims and hold perpetrators accountable.

Among the strongest risk factors listed on risk assessment instruments are the man's history of psychologically controlling and threatening behaviours, his use of drugs or alcohol, whether his physical violence has increased in severity or frequency over the past year, whether he owns a gun and if he is unemployed (Campbell, Webster, & Glass, 2009:655; Cattaneo & Goodman, 2005:158; Gondolf, 1988:199; Laing, 2004:7; Mouzos & Makkai, 2004:3; Próspero, 2008:644; Weisz, Tolman, & Saunders, 2000:78).

Best practice globally, interweaves the ecological theoretical framework into the Duluth Model (i.e. the coordinated community response approach) (Crowe et al., 2009:4; Fanslow, 2005:74; Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2002; Maiuro & Eberle, 2008:148; Pease, 2008:16; United Nations, 2008:5; World Health Organization, 2004). Feminist understandings of gender and socio-political power structures are at the core of the ecological framework. No matter what intervention is used to stop men's violence against their partners, men ultimately return from a programme, or from jail, and continue to live in "patriarchal families, patriarchal places of work, and patriarchal places of leisure". Hence changing individual men, without changing the society in which they live is doomed to failure (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2008:181).

2.2.5 Conclusion

The purpose of this discussion has been to outline the three dominant theoretical views – psychological, sociological and feminist – that explain perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. The psychological perspective makes it apparent that psychological dysfunctions and skill deficits are major risk factors for men to use violence against their partners. A major problem with this is that socially derived problems are located in the psyches of individual perpetrators. Issues, such as depression, attachment disorders and lack of impulse control, are considered the focus for intervention, which sometimes can evade focusing on men's violent and controlling behaviours and evades

situating men's psychological issues within broader socio-political structures.

The sociological perspective shows that social categories such as young, non-white, poor men represent major risk factors for men's intimate partner violence. Whereas, feminists point out that perpetrators exist across every social category, although men's experience of power differs across categories. Resource, social control and exchange theories help explain men's differential relations to power, so have been built on by feminist researchers. However, unless a more nuanced theory is used to explore the ways gender and power are operationalised in perpetrators' lives, it is difficult to understand specifically why men with authority would have a need to use violence to maintain it and why women with low levels of authority are not more violent than they are.

The major focal points of feminist theories have been on women's oppression in general, with specific focuses on sexuality, violence against women in general, the family, the state and patriarchal ideologies. Theoretical advancements have been made in understanding that patriarchal gender hierarchies are intricately intertwined with other social hierarchies such as race, ethnicity, class, disabilities, age and geographic location. But the predominant theoretical focus here has been on women and the empirical effects that social structures have on women. Although this has been vital for understanding the extent of the problem, it has deflected attention away from understanding how male perpetrators of domestic violence are individually affected by patriarchal practices and ideologies.

Feminists have played a major role in effecting change throughout society aimed at developing equality between men and women and keeping women safe. Yet early feminist theories imply change is not possible. For example, it is argued that men are socialised *into* a patriarchal society. The implication here is that patriarchy pre-exists men. Although contemporary feminists argue for a relational approach to doing gender and that men choose from multiple discourses that either condone violence or condone

non-violence, there are no theoretical concepts that explicitly explain how men might be active agents in defining those discourses and in changing patriarchal power structures.

All three perspectives focus on the family of origin as a central site that fosters intimate partner abuse. The psychological and sociological perspectives show that witnessing and/or experiencing abuse as children is correlated with men's abuse of their partners, although neither perspective is able to explain why this is not the case for all men. Whereas feminist perspectives show that there is a correlation between the patriarchal organisation of the family and men's intimate partner abuse. Contemporary feminists, however are able to explain why not all men go on to abuse their partners, that is because there are multiple forms of masculinity and social discourses that guide men's practices.

Psychological and sociological assumptions permeate popular culture, thereby leading to narrow stereotypes that render invisible the majority of perpetrators. Early feminist notions that all men dominate and control women, or have the potential to do so, may have a role to play in backlashes by men's rights groups and state policies. This means men who do not fit the stereotypes are free to continue to abuse women. It also leads professionals to collude with perpetrators. Whilst psychological, sociological and feminist scholars and grass-roots professionals continue to hold tight to their own paradigms and refuse to acknowledge the interconnections across paradigms, theory development will stagnate. The ecological framework has been posited as a resolution to this problem, however, the framework does not provide theoretical concepts that explain how the levels can be bridged. Without nuanced close-up theoretical explanations of perpetrators' motivations, decisions and social influences across all levels of the social ecology, women will continue to live in danger and any further change will stagnate. The purpose of this thesis, then, is to formulate a new theoretical framework that accounts for finely detailed mutually reinforcing processes between individual perpetrators and social structures. This new framework will be outlined in chapter three.

A small number of qualitative in-depth empirical studies have already been conducted with men from the three dominant theoretical approaches. These will be reported in the next section. But it will be shown, that although men's narratives show conflicted, contradictory, complex attitudes and practices, most (not all) of the authors are unable to provide fine-grained theoretical concepts capable of capturing men's subtle processes.

These studies were not reported in the previous section because men's own perspectives tend to be ignored in dominant descriptions of perpetrators. Rather, most knowledge about male perpetrators, as reported in the above section, stems from quantitative studies utilised by psychologists, sociologists and feminists. Feminist knowledge about men also mainly stems from reports of clinical observations of male perpetrators or women's stories, all of which render men's perspectives invisible. Because there are major backlashes against feminism, and change is slow, it is imperative that empirical studies seek greater understanding of issues from perpetrators' perspectives so the domestic violence field can advance.

2.3 Research from Male Perpetrators' Perspectives

There is a paucity of in-depth research with men who have used violence and other forms of abuse against their live-in female partners. This section reviews this small body of work. The theoretical basis of much of this research is implied, whilst some studies explicitly use one or several theories. In many cases theories overlap which makes it impossible to discuss the literature under the headings of clearly defined theories. Instead, the layout of this review draws on Heise's (1998) ecological framework although even then, because qualitative research is messy (Fine, 2007:464), there are no clearly defined boundaries. Nevertheless, this section begins by reviewing studies that focus on men's individual psyches, issues relating to family of origin, and the men's immediate relationship with their partners. Then reviews studies that explore issues of masculinity, male domination

and the wider influences of patriarchal social structures. This will be followed by a review of studies that focus on men's change processes and will end by reviewing studies that seek to understand the strategies men use when accounting for their behaviours.

Almost every interviewer sourced their participants from men who were either self-referred or court mandated to attend counselling or group programmes aimed at helping abusive husbands to change. Some interviewers sourced men from prison (Hearn, 1998b; Thurston & Beynon, 1995; Wood, 2004), men on probation (Hearn, 1998b; Thurston & Beynon, 1995) or men on parole (Bettman, 2005). Hearn (1998b) was the only interviewer who interviewed men who were not currently in contact with any agencies. All of these studies will be summarised in some detail, because compared with quantitative research on men, and research from women's perspectives, the following qualitative in-depth research from men's viewpoints identify deeper and more specific understandings of men, their perceptions, interpretations, rationales, influences from other people, social messages and social contexts regardless of the theoretical approach.

2.3.1 Men's perceptions of themselves, others and wider social influences

Coleman's study of 33 American men found that perpetrators had deep fears of dependency on women, yet also believed that women should provide them with encouragement and support aimed at maintaining their ideal self-image as strong, dominant, superior and successful. When women failed at this task, men felt betrayed. Coleman suggests that men's fear of dependency is a likely reason why men distance themselves from their wives and why they denigrate women's abilities as wives and mothers. Coleman (1980:211) argues that when men feel stripped of their "overadequate façade" this results in anxiety and poor self-esteem, which in turn leads to being violent. Coleman also argues that men's violence results from intense marital symbiosis (Coleman, 1980:212), so her recommendation for family therapy means treating both men's and women's psyches. She

advocates that understanding men's psychological needs for control in the face of relational conflict means practitioners should reframe men's helplessness and powerlessness (Stamp & Sabourin, 1995:303) "as being manly and courageous" (Coleman, 1980:212). Stamp and Sabourin (1995:303) argue that the men's psychological problems stemmed from witnessing abuse in their childhoods.

This view was also taken by James and colleagues (2002) in their study of 24 Australian men who had problems revealing vulnerabilities and emotions, an issue that the authors conclude stems from living with conflicted parents, abusive fathers, parents who were emotionally distant, and mothers who were anxious and depressed. According to the authors these experiences led to insecure attachment, problems with dissociation and engaging in pursuer/distancer patterns with their partners. They conclude this also led to a sense of entitlement to be serviced by their partners, and to use violence when they do not get their own way (James et al., 2002:12-15). The authors suggest these issues not only stem from experiences in the family of origin, but also from adherence to "traditional masculine" values (James et al., 2002:15).

Eisikovits and Enosh (1997) conducted a study of 20 Israeli men's experiences of guilt and shame and created a conceptual model showing a combination of psychological and structural elements that were required for moral feelings to emerge for men following violence against their partners. For moral feelings to emerge, men had to accept that they were violent and accept responsibility for that violence, they had to be aware of a conflict in values, and/or a conflict in the image they had of their actual self versus their ideal self and finally, they had to experience accusations from either imagined or actual others (Eisikovits & Enosh, 1997:314). In the case where men's reaction to moral feelings lacked awareness and choice, this led them to attempt to placate their partners, deny responsibility and maintain violent attitudes and behaviours (Eisikovits & Enosh, 1997:319). The authors hypothesise that the more authentic a man's remorse was, the more likely he would not use violence again (Eisikovits & Enosh, 1997:320). Coleman

notes that a number of men in her study were remorseful following violence, but a man's statement that she uses to illustrate remorse is: "I cry on her shoulder; why does she make me do this?" (Coleman, 1980:209). Whether this represents an authentic acceptance of responsibility is debatable given that it could fit with the definition of blame.

In their study of 24 Israeli men, Eisikovits and Winstok (2002) conclude that men who chose to stay with their partners did so based on a "universally agreed on script of the good life" (Eisikovits & Winstok, 2002:690). This included good health, a nice home and children, a wife, good income and respect in the community. Having a stereotypically good life, it is argued, allows some men to perceive that staying is by choice, and this also enables them to minimise their accounts of violence. Conversely, since the majority of the men were from the low to low-middle-classes, they perceived little choice, and felt forced to stay due to a lack of economic resources. In these cases their descriptions of violence were more expanded and intense (Eisikovits & Winstok, 2002:689-697).

Several studies observed that women were invisible or discussed as "the other" in men's accounts, except as the object of violence or the cause of that violence (Hearn, 1998b:86). In Eisikovits and Winstok's (2002:689) study above, they noted the man's lack of adjective to describe his wife compared with the descriptions given of health, home, children and income. Very few men in some studies refer to their partners' experiences (James et al., 2002:7), they trivialise or deny injuring her (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 1998:401; Ptacek, 1988:145) and if they do mention any effects of their violence, this tends mostly to be about effects on themselves, rather than their partners (Bettman, 2005:245). Goodrum and colleagues (2001:238) contend that, avoiding paying attention to injuries they inflict on their partners, is a tactic some men use to maintain their view of themselves as good and non-violent men.

In contrast, Bettman's (2005) study of 24 Australian men shows what men think about live-in relationships with women and working for a female boss.

She notes some men believed that cohabiting with women meant loss of freedom and rights and that real intimacy was almost non-existent. On the positive side, some men admired their wives' strengths and abilities. But a couple of men spoke of difficulties working for female bosses (Bettman, 2005:175-182) and men suggested women did not have the natural capacity to lead (Bettman, 2005:112).

Despite acting violently, Reitz's (1999) study of nine American men aged 28-51 found they did not believe violence was good, so Reitz argues they used cognitive restructuring to reduce the guilt of being violent, by claiming that when they were violent they were not being themselves (Reitz, 1999:160-161). Reitz likens men's need to be dominant to the existential-phenomenological view that suggests people act in accordance with their personal perceptions of themselves in the context of their relationships. In this case, men who felt threatened in their relationship, and driven by the intolerable feelings of being smaller and weaker, had to do what it took to win (Reitz, 1999:163).

Goodrum and colleagues (2001) who interviewed 58 American men from a range of races found that men interpreted their partners' behaviours as attempts to control and negatively influence them which led these men to retaliate violently (Goodrum et al., 2001:237-238). In contrast, non-violent men in the study's comparison group interpreted their partners' critical feedback as having a positive influence which motivated them to make changes (Goodrum et al., 2001:236-237). The authors use a symbolic interaction approach, to explain the differences between violent and non-violent men's reactions. This approach assumes that men's interpretation of themselves, their partners, and their interactions, shapes men's responses and decisions (Goodrum et al., 2001:223).

Another study that explores men's interpretations of themselves, in the context of their relationships, documents patterns in men's identities that encompass hierarchical binaries. Binaries include winning or losing, big or little, good or bad, adult or child and strong or weak, with the men often

feeling the lesser of each pair (Reitz, 1999:153). Reitz discusses this phenomenon in relation to Walker's (1979) cycle of violence model which depicts women's experience of men as contrite and remorseful before a honeymoon phase. However, from the viewpoint of men in this study, rather than feeling regretful, they were actually feeling like small, helpless, powerless, losers, and as Reitz asserts, it may be for this reason that violence occurs again after the honeymoon phase. Like men in Winstok and colleagues' (2002) study, men used violence in an attempt to become the winner and re-establish a sense of psychological power (Reitz, 1999:162). Reitz also used gender role socialisation theory to explain men's need to dominate, suggesting that, if they fulfilled this role, they would feel psychologically satisfied because there was only one person who could win within the framework of non-egalitarian roles (Reitz, 1999:160).

A study of 25 Israeli men shows that the men blame women for transgressing a "universally accepted cultural rule" (Winstok et al., 2002:135), thereby causing a conflict that pushed these men, who regarded themselves as ordinary, into an abnormal situation in which they felt forced to use violence to bring the relationship back into balance. Their reason for feeling so forced was that they believed they were socially expected to maintain the mutual, and just, balance in their relationship. These men believed they were obliged to make the rules, judge when women transgress and that they had the right to enforce the rules as "that's the way it is with everybody" (Winstok et al., 2002:132). Within this set of obligations, if as men, they did not keep the relationship in balance, this would set off a range of emotions such as anxiety, humiliation, jealousy and helplessness causing a psychological imbalance and loss of control, which would lead to a loss of self. This, in turn would direct men to escalate to violence as a means of regaining a sense of psychological power and control by restoring the relational balance (Winstok et al., 2002:131-133). The authors argue that men's perceptions as to whether their wives' actions were deemed worthy of violence were judged by a series of personal, interpersonal and socially agreed upon norms. Once men decided women's actions posed a threat, men would then base their decision to use violence against a cost-benefit ratio.

When the benefit of violence outweighed the cost, men would use instrumentally controlled violence against their partners (Winstok et al., 2002:137-139).

Another Israeli study, shows that some men are compelled to maintain a particular fixed gendered identity in a legal institutional context. Buchbinder and Eisikovits (2004) examined how 20 men perceived police intervention at their first, second and subsequent points of contact. They note that, at every stage, men's identities as good and powerful are threatened, and their attitudes and behaviours are geared around maintaining or establishing identities congruent with their self-images. At the first encounter, when police tended to be lenient, men attempted to align themselves with the police, believing that police would reinforce their normative identity as good and powerful. In this sense, men did not liken themselves to other violent men who came into contact with police. At the second encounter, when police tended to be progressively more forceful, men felt helpless and struggled against a force that was trying to transform them into a criminal. When men experienced subsequent encounters with police, they experienced their persona of strength being torn away "exposing their pain, isolation, and sense of inadequacy and powerlessness". As a consequence, they tended to adopt an "identity as angry gender victims" (Buchbinder & Eisikovits, 2004:462) and blamed the social and legal system for robbing them of their social resource of patriarchal dominance. Men became angry victims because they felt betrayed by their partners who called the police and they felt the police had breached their trust, by not supporting their authority over their partners. The authors surmise that this can account for recidivism following police intervention (Buchbinder & Eisikovits, 2004:451-463).

Men in Anderson and Umberson's (2001:369) study found that if a woman had used violence against her partner and police wanted to arrest her, men said they volunteered themselves to be arrested rather than the violent woman. The authors suggest that this action enables men to reclaim their desired form of masculinity, by avoiding positioning themselves as victims.

Bettman, who interviewed Australian men from a wide range of races observed that these men's stories highlighted complexities and contradictions in those men's relationships, but Bettman argues that any cultural and racial differences "operate almost universally" under the umbrella "of an idealised western patriarchal masculinity ... a hegemonic masculinity" (Bettman, 2005:264-265). She further argued that men's violence was motivated by a need to defend a fragile hegemonic masculinity (Bettman, 2005:203), men's aggression was aimed at living up to "conventional gendered behaviour" (Bettman, 2005:244), that swearing allowed men to live up to the "male gender role" and that anger was an expression of "normal manhood" (Bettman, 2005:245).

Perpetrators in some studies drew simultaneously from the provider/protector and master/slave masculine discourses to guide their relationships. Wood (2004:559) interviewed 22 men in USA from a range of races aged 23-54 who were serving time in a medium security prison. Men drew on the discourse that "men are dominant and superior" a discourse that contained entitlements to independence, to be served by, and to control women. This discourse included the stipulation that in the event that women failed to adhere to serving men, the resulting insult to men's pride gave justification for using violence against women. Conversely, over half of the participants in Wood's study believed in the discourse that men should protect, respect and care for women, a discourse that included the belief that "real men" do not hit women. Paradoxically interviewees believed dominant, superior and controlling behaviours also represented "real men." Some men believed they embodied these qualities, accordingly their violence against women was an expression of this ideal of being a "real man." In contrast, other men did not believe they measured up to the ideal of dominant controllers, thus their violence against their partners was an attempt to live up to that version of "real man" (Wood, 2004:568-570).

The 12 men in Levitt and colleagues' (2008:437-438, 445) study were largely living in poverty, so believed they could not, but should, live up to the role of provider and leader. The authors argue that the men's inability to

live up to the roles led to shame and feelings of emasculation, which resulted in using violence to regain their masculine power.

Gadd (2000, 2002, 2003) reports case studies with six men in the UK aged 26-48 from a range of races and socioeconomic groups who had sought help to change. He opposes the pro-feminist masculinities' stance that perpetrators are always motivated to gain male power and hegemonic masculinity by abusing their partners. Instead he concludes that those men who use power games and violence are actually attempting to conceal, or defend against, psychological anxieties, insecurities and vulnerabilities (Gadd, 2000:439, 445, 2002:65, 2003:341, 343, 351). He argues that abusive men attempt to compensate for these vulnerabilities by employing a range of empowering discourses of masculinity, including a heroic discourse of sexual care for their partners (Gadd, 2003:346), discourses of the new man (Gadd, 2002:70), of the family breadwinner, and of a "rational, caring organiser" (Gadd, 2000:439).

Gadd acknowledges that not all men who feel vulnerable and insecure beat their partners. He uses Jefferson's (1994) theory of masculine subjectivity by suggesting that, for men who do have the propensity to use violence against women, nuanced psychoanalytical clues lie within men's biographical frames of reference about how to be a man (Gadd, 2000:441, 2003:337). According to Gadd, these clues explain why men use violence against women, even when they do not agree with violence against women, or when they believe their partners are their closest confidantes, and in spite of actually wanting to be caring, protective providers. Some men did not want to control their partners, others were aware their violence was wrong, and some did not blame their partners for their own violence (Gadd, 2000:440, 2002:71, 2003:343). From this psychoanalytic interpretive approach to masculinity, Gadd (2000, 2002, 2003) argues that many men will continue to repeat abusive behaviours until they are helped to come to terms with their own vulnerabilities.

Thurston and Beynon (1995:198-199) also note complex links between violence and vulnerability. They report a case study of one man's historical experiences of alienation and ridicule at school, feelings of alienation and lack of love from his father, competition amongst siblings and a constant battle to find acceptance as a man. One way this man sought to find a secure masculine self-identity was to join a bikie group, however, the meanings he gave to violence and its link to masculinity were not straightforward, rather differed across contexts and fluctuated over his life history.

Most of the men in Bettman's study mentioned experiencing fear – “fear at school, on the sporting ground, in the streets and in relationships” (Bettman, 2005:242), they feared killing their wife, feared being vulnerable and rejected, feared appearing soft and feared facing reality (Bettman, 2005:140-142). They stated that fear led them to be argumentative, angry and violent. Others said they felt inadequate as providers or inadequate in general and that controlling people was a way of compensating for inadequacy (Bettman, 2005:242-243). Men in Levitt and colleagues' (2008:443) study also said fear of being seen as weak and vulnerable led to violence against their partners. James and colleagues (2002) show that men's fathers humiliated and criticised their sons for showing vulnerability or closeness to their mother, and for refusing to fight. Additionally, mothers encouraged some boys not to cry or be sissies and the authors surmised that violence in the family of origin influenced men to perpetrate bullying amongst their peers. To the contrary, men's fathers, mothers and male peers contributed to shaping traits such as strength, independence and being in control which the authors call “traditional masculinity” (James et al., 2002:16-18).

Men in some studies experienced confusion about how to be a man in modern society, so used violence as a way of holding onto masculine qualities of power and control over women (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:375; Bettman, 2005:150-154; Levitt et al., 2008:444). Such men said that women brought out men's weaknesses causing a reduction in power and control, so to save face the men compensated with aggression (Bettman, 2005:145; Levitt et al., 2008:444).

Other research participants discussed violence between men and some compared this to violence against women. Some men said violence was legitimate against men when used in retaliation (Bettman, 2005:126), that violence was acceptable between two mates to resolve a conflict, that in certain situations men said they knew how to bow down and communicate correctly to avoid violence from a would-be attacker (Bettman, 2005:216), while others saw violence as essential for human survival and that men could save women and children from danger (Bettman, 2005:191). Men in Lundgren's (1995:238) study seldom hit anyone outside the relationship but men in other studies were violent outside the family (Ptacek, 1988:143) and some men discuss being violent in pubs and town centres but not inside shops (Hearn, 1998b:86). Whereas violence amongst males is seen as legitimate, some men describe growing up in a "subculture of masculinity" that believed violence against women was wrong (James et al., 2002:16-18). Other men talk about mixed social messages that domestic violence is both acceptable and not acceptable (Bettman, 2005:193), which could be why some men both deny and acknowledge their violence against women (Hydén & McCarthy, 1994:563). Some men reduce their agency by constructing violence as a natural, normal and/or acceptable part of everyday relationships (Hearn, 1998b:105, 118; Lundgren, 1998:170) for example, "everybody has a bit of a smashing time every now and again" (Hearn, 1998b:118).

Men in Bettman's (2005:123-126) study pointed out the paradoxical nature of mateship, saying that men could be destructive towards each other and also could be very loving and caring. Whilst Hearn (1998a:173) found in his study of 60 men from the UK, that most perpetrators were socially isolated, but of those that did have relationships with male peers, or male family, men in these networks tended to provide direct or indirect support for men's continuation of physical violence against known women (Hearn, 1998a:154, 1998b:190). Hearn concludes that men maintain their social networks based on implicit, or explicit, agreements not to interfere in each other's business. Some participants said they expected their friends to use physical violence

against their partners and were suspicious if they did not (Hearn, 1998a:157, 1998b:190).

Anderson and Umberson (2001) who interviewed 33 mostly white men living in USA from a range of socioeconomic groups, reported that interviewees said that men everywhere, for years, encouraged other men to maintain dominance over women. While another man talked about male peers goading men who believed they were victims of dominating female partners, by asking who “wore the pants” (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:367-368).

Lundgren interviewed 40 Norwegian couples and concludes that men consciously use “controlled switching” strategies of punishment and comfort (Lundgren, 1995:221), that is some men decide when to beat their partners and when to show kindness (Lundgren, 1995:243). Lundgren suggests that the more unpredictable, and the greater the mix of punitive and loving behaviours, the greater the certainty that women will become feminine and men will become masculine. She further concludes that the more restricted the space is for women to express femininity, the more expanded the space is for men to express masculinity (Lundgren, 1995:261).

Lundgren (1995, 1998) argues that historical discourses permit men’s abuse against women, whilst modern discourses constrain such abuse. The couples she interviewed were from a fundamentalist Christian religion and the men used religious ideologies to justify their violent and controlling behaviours. However, rather than defining their behaviours as abuse, men saw themselves as acting on God’s behalf to teach women to be mothers and to service their husbands (Lundgren, 1998:185-186). Lundgren calls this the “pedagogical process of gender constitution” (Lundgren, 1995:224), whereby, until the woman obeys and submits to the limits of femininity, the man believes he cannot be a man (Lundgren, 1995:246). According to Lundgren, the central aim of men’s “overarching project of violence” (Lundgren, 1995:250) against their partners is to shape and design their masculinity (Lundgren, 1995:247). Lundgren suggests that men have a

choice of constituting masculinity based on two sets of rules, that she calls regulative or constitutive rules. Regulative rules operate at the level of contemporary standards and expectations of gender equality, whereas constitutive rules are deemed to be historically longstanding rules, framing masculinity as dominant, controlling and violent. Regulative rules are considered more surface, flexible and apt to change, whereas constitutive rules are deemed more deeply-embedded, stable and difficult to change (Lundgren, 1995:210-211, 1998:184). Lundgren argues that men who abuse their partners are breaking current surface socio-cultural rules of masculinity but are acting in accord with *overlapping*, deep-seated, subcultural rules of masculine behaviour (Lundgren, 1995:259-261).

Levitt and colleagues (2008:437-438, 445) interviewed 12 American men, aged 20-48 who were Christian, Jewish, Islamic and Jehova's Witness and specifically asked if their faith had affected the course of their relationships. Unlike the men Lundgren interviewed, none of these men believed their violence against their partners was caused by God, rather they said God wanted them to become better people.

2.3.2 Men's change processes

Some studies identify some key factors in men's change processes. MacPhee-Sigurdson (2004) traced nine Canadian men's process of change at 12 and 18 month follow-up periods after completing a stopping abuse programme. While all the men had begun the programme with feelings of apprehension, confusion, and anxiety, and had, at first, minimised their abuse, all believing they were the least abusive of the men in the group, they credited the group with helping them to eventually shift from blaming their partners to taking responsibility for their behaviours. They also considered it beneficial to understand psychological as well as physical abuse. All nine men said that understanding the effect their experiences of child abuse had on their adult behaviours was healing. They all went on to develop bonds with other men in the group and continued to attend a follow-up support group, which they considered enhanced their feelings of safety as well as

being vital for maintaining non-abusive behaviours and developing healthy relationships with other men (MacPhee-Sigurdson, 2004:18-21).

Another study of men engaged in changing entailed interviews with 12 American men and notes that although the level of their violence was similar to other programme participants, the men engaged in changing were slightly older, tended to have higher status jobs, were more likely to want to maintain their families, to attend some church and to have attempted previous counselling (Gondolf & Hanneken, 1987:181). Neither MacPhee-Sigurdson (2004), nor Gondolf and Hanneken (1987), applied a theory to interpret these men's process of change. However, some men in Gondolf and Hanneken's study said that they believed their violence had been motivated by a failure to live up to an abusive masculinity portrayed by their fathers, and their resulting low self-esteem had influenced their abusive behaviours. These men said their changes entailed developing an autonomous individuality separate from stereotypical gender roles (Gondolf & Hanneken, 1987:182, 187).

Another study with perpetrators in the UK found that stopping abuse programmes can be effective in reducing men's violence and in improving men's attitudes towards women and enhancing their ability to empathise (Lewis, 2004:209). Edmiston (2005:241) concluded from her interviews with men that, for change to be long-lasting, there is a necessity for a combination of self-reflection and a change of meaning systems to occur in interaction with others. Edmiston notes that the 10 American men in her study who were engaged in changing said establishing a trustworthy and supportive relationship with a male or female (usually a counsellor from a stopping abuse programme) was vital for their ongoing process of change (Edmiston, 2005:195-198). Whereas, some perpetrators in other studies believed counsellors, psychiatrists, police, courts, refuges, hospitals, ambulance services and church ministers (Bettman, 2005:259; Levitt et al., 2008:440) were "somewhat lacking" in their ability to help.

Some studies found that most of the men they interviewed attended stopping abuse programmes because they wanted to maintain their relationship (Bettman, 2005:252; Edmiston, 2005:177-238; Ptacek, 1988:141), or as one man said, he did not want his child to become abusive (Bettman, 2005:253). Attendance was not necessarily motivated by a desire to stop their abuse. However, for the men in Edmiston's (2005) study, the impetus for change involved a range of critical incidents such as being imprisoned, believing their physical violence had gone too far and fearing the consequences of this. While for others, it was the remorse felt after harming their partners that was the impetus for change. Continued impetus for change occurred when men attended stopping abuse programmes because they were confronted with images of other men's abusive behaviours that they found disgusting. They saw similarities between these men and themselves and concluded that they needed to change (Edmiston, 2005:177-238). Men's changes meant examining their earlier lives where they had learned "that aggression and domination are synonymous with masculinity" (Edmiston, 2005:218), and adopting ideologies and behaviours that moved away from "the tenets of patriarchy" (Edmiston, 2005:7). Men's change was ongoing, non-linear and not always rational (Edmiston, 2005:244) and entailed experiencing "fear, despair and desolation" (Edmiston, 2005:239), due to losses such as their home, partner, children, power and privilege, and the belief that they were always right (Edmiston, 2005:159-239).

On a different note, a study of 66 Anglo-Australian men conducted by Jones (2004:175) outlines ways some men resist, manipulate or misinterpret content learned at such programmes. For instance, when men learned the skill to take time-out, some made their partners responsible for calling time-out, others made their partners be the one to remove herself from the situation. Some men reversed what they had learned about power and control, saying that women's refusal to have sex represented the equivalent of sexual violence, and thus was harmful to men.

2.3.3 How men account for their violence

Many feminist researchers explore the tactics men use to save face when accounting to an interviewer for their violence. In asking men to account for their behaviours, researchers were guided by Bandura's social learning theory (1976, 1977, 1979, 1986 cited in Dutton, 1986:381-382), or Scott and Lyman's (1968) model of accounts, which are statements made to explain a person's problematic behaviour. Accounts involve using socially approved excuses and justifications as a means of negotiating one's identity, with the aim of neutralising "an act or its consequences when they are brought into question" especially by someone perceived to have higher status (Scott & Lyman, 1968:46, 59). Specifically, justifications comprise accepting responsibility, but not the blame, and excuses involve accepting blame, but not responsibility, for violence. Rather, individuals cite socially approved reasons as responsible for causing it (Scott & Lyman, 1968:47).

Dobash and colleagues (1998) and Cavanagh and colleagues (2001) explore men's tactics of minimisation and use of apologies, by analysing the accounts of 122 men and 134 women of Scottish, English or Irish parentage. Dobash and colleagues (1998) show that compared with the women (some of whom were the men's partners), men reported a lower prevalence and frequency of violence and controlling behaviours. While they did agree about the prevalence of each other's verbal abuse and behaviour towards children, the men did not agree with women's view that they use the children as weapons against their partners (Dobash et al., 1998:401).

Cavanagh and colleagues (2001) expand on Scott and Lyman's framework by using Goffman's remedial work (1971 cited in Cavanagh et al., 2001:699), which adds two relational concepts to men's accounting. That is, requests (usually before a violent event) and apologies (usually after a violent event). Men made requests of their partners (as women) to shut up, stop nagging, or to "back off" when they were criticising, challenging and pursuing the men's authority, or otherwise being disrespectful or disobedient. They also made requests that women service their sexual needs

and if women failed to fulfill these requests men were brought to intolerable limits, consequently they held women responsible for any violent consequences (Cavanagh et al., 2001:710; James et al., 2002:4-5). Although the majority of men in Cavanagh and colleagues' (2001:708) study apologised after abusing their partners, the authors contend that some men manipulate western society's social etiquette that apologies should be accepted, because in such cases some men use the opportunity to press women not to pursue further discussion about the abuse (Cavanagh et al., 2001:708). These studies find that some men tend not to take complete responsibility for their abuse unless they attend stopping abuse programmes (Cavanagh et al., 2001:711).

In their exploration of American men's accounts, Coleman (1980) and Stamp and Sabourin (1995) found that most men accepted that they were violent, but justified their violence by blaming their wives' behaviours. According to the men, wives were deemed not to be good enough wives or mothers, to have poor communication skills, to be verbally and physically aggressive and this was what drove men to violence. Men stated they were abusive because they were jealous of their partners' past, or imagined, future relations with other men (Coleman, 1980:208; Stamp & Sabourin, 1995:294-295, 301), while one man mentioned feeling inferior because his wife had a higher level of education and occupation (Coleman, 1980:208), and another man was dissatisfied when his wife publicly embarrassed him (Stamp & Sabourin, 1995:290). Men believed they worked harder, and put more into the relationship, than their partners (Stamp & Sabourin, 1995:295). About a third of the 33 men in Coleman's study accepted responsibility for their violence, but would not take the blame, rather they made excuses for their violence, by saying it was due to a loss of control when drunk (Coleman, 1980:209). Coleman therefore recommends a focus on controlling alcohol as a major therapeutic necessity (Coleman, 1980:213), however, she makes no provision for conceptualising the story one man gave of drinking and taking pills while consciously preparing to brutally attack his wife the following day (Coleman, 1980:209).

Ptacek (1988) interviewed 18 and Bograd (1988b) interviewed 15 American men and both interviewers show that men make socially acceptable excuses for their abusive behaviours. Men blamed feelings of stress, frustration, alcohol or drugs as being responsible for losing control (Bograd, 1988b:69; Hearn, 1998b:122; Ptacek, 1988:142-143; Wood, 2004:565). Ptacek warns that men's appeal to loss of control may be a superficial excuse, aimed at hiding the evidence that their "violence is deliberate and warranted" (Ptacek, 1988:153). Their violence had specific aims. These aims included maintaining dominance over their partners, giving clear warnings of future violence (Ptacek, 1988:150), facilitating communication, stopping a fight (Bograd, 1988b:69), hurting, frightening or silencing their partners, or punishing her for failing to be a good wife (Mullaney, 2007:239). Mullaney (2007:239) interviewed 14 American men from a mix of white and black races, unemployed and blue-collar workers aged 21-48. The men said that because of the energy they had spent in giving to women, they thought ungrateful women deserved violence. Mullaney suggests this reflects the practice of hegemonic masculinity and she concludes that men's practices of providing for, and protecting women, involve obligation that women give in return, in a specific way.

Hearn (1998b:126) notes that men in his study blamed their violence on their partners' sexual infidelity (whether this was real or imagined), her neglect of the housework, her poor childcare duties, her lack of effort in her appearance, or for not restricting her movements, autonomy, social life and/or use of the house. Hearn (1998b:122) argues that these violences are aimed at reinforcing ownership of women. Hearn (1998b:144) contends that blaming women for men's violence invokes taken-for-granted understandings of dominant constructions of masculinity and femininity, sexism and hetero-patriarchal structures.

Hearn (1998b:109, 121) and Ptacek (1988:148) contend that men's abuse is a response to having male privileges being unjustly denied. Feminist authors suggest that men are "highly socially adapted" (Hydén & McCarthy, 1994:562) as their rationales serve men's collective interests (Ptacek,

1988:155). This means that men's justifications can be interpreted "as socially congruent rather than as 'evidence' of individual male deviance" (Hydén & McCarthy, 1994:544).

Dutton (1986:389) shows that some men blamed their abuse on subcultural norms that accept and encourage violence. He argues however, that national surveys seeking community attitudes towards men's violence against women find minimal support for such violence (Dutton, 1986:382) and that "we have yet to find a cultural group where consensus acceptance of severe wife assault exists". Rather he asserts that men have "a subjectively exaggerated cultural acceptance of wife assault" (Dutton, 1986:389). In this study of 25 Canadian men, Dutton notes that, among the men who blamed their partners for the violence, there were increased levels of minimising the severity, frequency and effect of their violence, while men who blamed themselves either minimised highly, or not at all (Dutton, 1986:389). Dutton also notes that self-referred men who attributed their violence to themselves tended to neutralise self-punishment, by highly minimising that violence. In contrast, the court-referred men who blamed themselves for their violence did not minimise their violence. Dutton suggests that being convicted may motivate men to "come clean" (Dutton, 1986:388).

Other studies demonstrate the content of what men specifically minimise. The 20 Swedish men in Hydén and McCarthy's (1994) interviews minimised their violence by claiming it was a mutual fight between themselves and their partners, so was not serious, or by minimising their descriptions of one-way assaults (Hydén & McCarthy, 1994:553-554). Some men minimise their physical violence, but admit to intentionally dominating, intimidating, punishing and frightening their partners into submission (James et al., 2002:4-5).

Some men use relativisation, firstly by talking about violence they do *not* use, claiming that this is worse than the types of abuse they do use (Hearn, 1998b:115; Mullaney, 2007:235) and secondly, by comparing themselves favourably with other men (Hearn, 1998b:115; Mullaney, 2007:204). Wood

(2004) contends that from her participants' accounts the concepts of minimising and making excuses obscure the notion that men are actually attempting to distance themselves from "real abusers" whom they do not admire. Men dissociate themselves from "real abusers" by pointing out that they are not abusive every night, that they do not hit her as hard as they could, that there are times when they do not hit at all, for example one man who used mind games to control women prided himself on not hitting women (Wood, 2004:565-566). Men's definition of "real abusers" may, in part, be influenced by opinions of those with high social status and media representations. For example one participant who claimed he was not really violent said his medical doctor agreed with his disclaimer (Hydén & McCarthy, 1994:556). Jones (2004) conducted a discourse analysis of print media depictions of domestic violence perpetrators and masculinity. Among the dominant discourses she observes, perpetrators are depicted as the deviant "other", which includes the mentally ill, the ethnically different, and monsters. Jones notes that some of the men she interviewed used this discourse to form their subjectivity as a way of distancing definitions of themselves from stereotypical perpetrators (Jones, 2004:253-254).

Other men hide their violence from others by using social rhetoric that can deceive listeners. Adams, Towns and Gavey (1995:388) discovered that a colleague abused his partner, but no one had detected this. In response, they conducted a rhetorical analysis of 14 New Zealand men's language devices and note the intricate strategies men use to disguise assumptions of authority. The authors contend that this serves to protect perpetrators from being challenged, and further strengthens the naturalness and reasonableness of male domination over women (Adams et al., 1995:403).

In sum, feminists assert that, from analysing men's accounts, men appear to "have agency and intention in line with cultural, historical and gendered expectations" (Hydén & McCarthy, 1994:562).

2.3.4 Conclusion

To conclude, a major strength of interviewing men in-depth, regardless of theoretical perspective, is that the narratives strengthen quantitative data by providing deeper understandings of men's interpretations of social messages and life experiences and their motives to abuse their partners. Valuable contributions include noting the fine detail of how moral reasoning and guilt are operationalised by perpetrators and noting men's rules for engaging in violence amongst men compared with rules for using violence against women. It was also important to reveal some ways men's relationships with male peers and male family influence them to abuse their partners. It is important to note the comparison between types of men who minimised their violence compared with those who did not, as this knowledge forms the basis for many intervention strategies. A lot is known about women victims' reasons for staying in relationship with male perpetrators, but it was extremely useful to review a study that sought some male perpetrators' reasons for staying in relation to someone they do not think is an adequate wife.

However, the one-dimensional focus on physical violence in the majority of these studies silences any exploration of the range of psychological abuse and "invisible coercion" (Gavey, 1992:329) used by perpetrators against their partners. Where issues of gender, and social power arise as issues, some authors' interpretations remain superficial, leading to the portrayal of men as individuals minimally influenced by society. For example Dutton holds firm to the need to explain men's intimate partner abuse as psychologically driven by negating the complex ways in which men interpret cultural discourses.

A very important finding is that made by Reitz (1999:162) in relation to her challenge of Walker's (1979) cycle of violence model that showed from men's perspectives that feeling helplessness and powerlessness may contribute to men using violence after the honeymoon phase. This argument shows the vital importance of interviewing men in-depth in order to develop

and strengthen links between the psychological, sociological and feminist approaches. However, where Reitz (1999:163) pointed out that men who felt smaller and weaker had to use violence to win, this issue cannot be understood through the lens of existential-phenomenological theory alone. Once a socio-cultural-political lens is applied the question becomes: why does being small and weak lead to violence for some men? Without an ecological frame that accounts for cultural messages that give kudos to masculine strength and large physique, men's processes and logics cannot be fully understood.

An important theme that arose was men's motivation to use violence as a result of feelings of powerlessness, inadequacy, fear and vulnerability. Although most authors did not account for these experiences theoretically, Gadd (2000, 2002, 2003) did by providing a psychoanalytic perspective, which linked social understandings of masculinity, with men's psychological reasoning and with violence. Some researchers explore men's relationships with men and note these are both abusive and caring, and men believe violence is a legitimate way to deal with conflicts amongst men. It was important to observe the range of contradictions in perpetrators' lives – men both denigrate and admire women, men resist change and manipulate knowledge learned, whilst other men want to change and welcome help to change despite living in a sexist patriarchal society. Men draw on a range of conflicting discourses including the provider/protector and master/slave discourses. Whilst some men interpret the provider/protector discourse to include care, respect and non-violence towards women, other men use this discourse to justify violence against ungrateful women. It becomes very clear that perpetrators are influenced by male peers, their family of origin and social discourses. This validates feminist arguments that, to stop intimate partner abuse, change must take place at every level of the social ecology. By utilising qualitative methods that interview men in-depth, knowledge gained will go some way to refining interventions.

Interestingly it has been argued that the ecological framework “is currently one of the most common frameworks used to represent the levels of

influence that contribute to violent behaviour” (Fanslow, 2005:72), yet this framework has not been utilised by any of the qualitative researchers reviewed in this chapter. Although Coleman’s (1980) study pre-dates the ecological framework, her study highlights the problems that do occur when scholars hold firm to a theoretical view that is unable to capture complexities, despite the complexities embedded in men’s narratives. Coleman used psychological perspectives and a family systems model as her explanatory guides, which led to arguing that men’s attitudes and violence resulted from marital symbiosis so the couples required family therapy. This left most of what men had to say unexplained. Men in her study said they lost control when drunk, said they consciously chose to use violence, were jealous, dependent on their wives, felt inferior, and needed to pursue a self-image of superiority. None of this could be explained by marital symbiosis alone. Further, Goldner (1992:58) argues that family therapy conducted without acknowledgement of wider socio-political power structures “provides perpetrators with a new language of excuses”. If an ecological framework was used, these conflicting experiences could be explained by a combination of psychodynamic explanations that link feelings of inferiority and jealousy with cultural representations of masculinity that bestow heroic status on men who use violence and that link with patriarchal ideologies that condone men’s control over women.

2.4 Problems with the Current Theoretical Perspectives

This section evaluates the current theoretical perspectives in four parts. *The first three parts* evaluate the psychological, sociological and feminist perspectives of men’s intimate partner abuse through the lens of the ecological framework. Feminist theories are central to this framework, thus by applying the concepts of gender and power to the psychological and sociological perspectives this can bridge the gaps across all levels of the social ecology. Feminist perspectives are continually evolving, so will draw on contemporary feminist work to evaluate these perspectives as a whole.

While not a perfect critique, the aim will be to explore the range of feminist perspectives for their ability to capture fine-tuned understandings of male perpetrators so that the bridges across all levels of the ecological framework can be strengthened.

Fourth, the ecological framework itself will be evaluated, through the lens of contemporary feminist scholarship, for its ability to capture men's conflicted, contradictory and nuanced experiences of gender and power. This critique will serve to advance the psychological, sociological and feminist interpretations of perpetrators, by drawing together the strengths from each perspective and advancing a more holistic multifaceted approach to gender and power that more adequately links the individual and social levels. Ultimately, though, this evaluation will reveal shortcomings in the ecological framework, which means there is no coherent theory – feminist or otherwise – that explains the multitudinous psychological, social and political elements that arise in qualitative interviews with male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. This chapter will end by arguing for a new theoretical framework that will capture the shortcomings in the dominant theoretical perspectives.

2.4.1 Psychological perspectives

Whilst psychological perspectives offer important insights about some male perpetrators, without grounding these insights in a broader analysis that takes account of social constructions of gender and socio-political power structures, the way forward for stopping domestic violence will be hindered. A content analysis of 1040 psychology abstracts on domestic violence exposed a marked absence of social, political, historical and contextual features (Salazar & Cook, 2002:418). Thus, some feminists argue that exclusive psychological perspectives let communities and government agents off the hook as they do not have to examine their own behaviours and they do not push for structural changes (Berns, 2001:263). Single-factor psychological explanations ignore realities such as men behaving differently in the public and private arenas (Robertson, 1999b:70) and ignores the

notion that societies with higher levels of support for male dominance are associated with higher levels of intimate partner abuse (Jewkes, 2002:1425). However, when other variables are controlled for, this strengthens findings from the psychological perspective – such as the finding that socially derived attitudes mediate between alcohol use and violence.

Psychological studies of skill deficits ignore women's experience of men, who are quite able to communicate denigrating put downs to women while in the midst of beating her. Some feminist research shows that perpetrators are able to assert their perceived rights in relationship, and are able to state what behaviours they expect from their female partners (Robertson & Busch, 1998:51). One reason for this discrepancy between psychological studies about men and women's experiences of men is the primary focus on psychometric measuring, whereas if such measures are interconnected with feminist understandings of masculinities, skill deficits will be seen as resulting from processes that occur in interaction between particular people and social structures. This is also the case, whether men have a mental illness or not, because feminist research shows that the common denominator across all perpetrators is their gender-based justifications for making such requests, and for controlling their partners (Gondolf, 1987, 1993:234, 1999:14, 2007:647; Pence & Paymar, 1993; Stark, 2007:5).

Other scholars argue that men are often not angry when they abuse their female partner, as their abuse is often deliberate and intended (Gondolf, 1985:314, 1993:241, 2007:648). However, when they are angry, the notion that men lose control, does not explain why they relieve their tension by abusing their wives and not their bosses (Bograd, 1988a:17). It also does not explain how men who become angry with their female partners in public, are able to wait until they are in the privacy of their home to abuse her (Bograd, 1988a:17). Further, when men in stopping abuse programmes are asked what they want to gain from their violence, they readily explain motives such as, "I wanted her to stay home" (Robertson & Busch, 1998:56).

In most psychological research, understanding men's use of physical violence is the main focus. Less common, is any explanation of why men psychologically control and abuse female partners. By explaining violence as a problem of poor impulse control, this psychological perspective is not able to account for the reasons why men engage in a premeditated pattern of systematic non-physical tactics of power and control (Chang, 1996; Gondolf, 1985:316, 1993:241; Jones & Schechter, 1992; Kirkwood, 1993:43-87; Pence & Paymar, 1993; Stark, 2007) and are able to control which part of a woman's body they hit (Edin et al., 2008:236; Pence & other contributors, 1984:479; Robertson & Busch, 1998:51; Stark, 2007:2-3).

Feminists have long argued that anger management is a narrow and inadequate treatment approach because it individualises the problem by not challenging social structures, and it aims to change only one form of behaviour, to the detriment of addressing the complex range of coercive and controlling tactics and ideologies that support men's abuse of their partners (Edmiston, 2005:233; Gondolf, 2007:648; James, 1999:7; Pence & Paymar, 1993; Stark, 2007:10).

There are many limitations of the alcohol disinhibition theory. It appears that heavy drinking is associated with an underlying need for power and control rather than the physical effects of alcohol causing such a need (Gondolf, 1995:275). Many men who use alcohol are not violent towards their partners (Gelles, 1987:114; Gelles & Cavanaugh, 2005:177) and of those who are violent towards their partners when drunk, they are also violent, manipulative and controlling when sober (Galvani, 2004:358; Gelles, 1987:114; James, 1999:7; Robertson & Busch, 1998:49). Men are not always violent towards their partners after drinking (Scutt, 1983:118) and one study shows that men who never drink alcohol use violence more often than men who drink on occasion (Gelles & Cavanaugh, 2005:179). Women report that violence occurs in private regardless of men being intoxicated in public and drunken perpetrators selectively aim their violence at their female partners (Galvani, 2006:652; James, 1999:7; Robertson & Busch, 1998:51). Cross-cultural studies show that different cultures sanction

different ways of behaving when under the influence of alcohol (Gelles, 1987:114; Gelles & Cavanaugh, 2005:177; McDonald, 1994:10-25) and it is only in western cultural discourses that alcohol is endorsed as an excuse to behave in antisocial ways (Collins, 1989:62; Field et al., 2004:252; Galvani, 2004:357; Gelles & Cavanaugh, 2005:178; Heise, 1998:273; James, 1999:7). Consequently, men who believe alcohol will cause violence, use this as an acceptable excuse for their abusive behaviours (Galvani, 2004:359; Margolin et al., 1998:337) and will tell police, for example, that they were drinking at the time of abusing their partners, when blood tests show they are not over the legal limit of intoxication (Gelles & Cavanaugh, 2005:179).

As Gelles (1993:39) pointed out, the early role played by psychological approaches has a lingering effect several decades later, which can be detrimental for two reasons. First, men and women draw on commonsense psychological and sociological understandings to define whether they are being abusive, or are being abused, and second, professionals draw on these understandings to inform their intervention strategies. Thus the psychologisation of perpetrators, without accounting for historical and socio-political contexts, perpetuates dangerous stereotypes that serves the psychology profession, while leaving the gendered social order intact (Dobash & Dobash, 1998:141; Salazar & Cook, 2002:411).

2.4.2 Sociological perspectives

Sociological explanations offer insights supportive of feminist understandings of men, but tend to ignore, or minimise the significance of issues of gender and wider social power structures. Social learning theory is gender neutral. The theory assumes that boys and girls learn by imitation, so according to Stith and colleagues (2000:648), for boys to perpetrate violence as adults, and women to become victims, this means they must be modelling parents of the same gender. However, their review of the literature is not able to find adequate documentation of the gender of the abuser in men's and women's families of origin. As it is known that women are also violent

towards their partners, Stith and colleagues (2000:648) suggest that if social learning holds relevance for men, it is more likely that men's violence is correlated with cultural socialisation, whereby boys are rewarded for being violent. The intergenerational transmission of violence discourse ignores that men's intimate partner violence stems from "social and economic oppression of women more generally" (Webster, 2007:61).

Experiencing abuse as a child can generate sympathy for men, which can reduce their responsibility for their abusive behaviours, and the theory disregards issues of power and control in men's relationships (Rosenbaum & Leisring, 2003:7). Although witnessing abuse as children is said to create a sense of powerlessness in men, stories some men tell suggest otherwise, as many men talk about threatening their fathers and attempting to protect their mothers when they were young (Rosenbaum & Leisring, 2003:8; Women's Health Gouldburn North East, 2004:23).

The subculture of violence theory is argued to mask the reality that in western societies men from all ages, socioeconomic classes and races abuse their female partners – albeit unevenly spread across those social categories – nevertheless must be acknowledged (Cunradi et al., 2002:378; Dobash & Dobash, 1979:22; Edwards & Hearn, 2004:51; Heise, 1998:273; Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler et al., 1997:288; Stark & Flitcraft, 1996:28) and that a re-analysis of earlier data finds that men from all classes have high levels of acceptance of violence (Kirkwood, 1993:17). This theory lacks nuanced understandings of diversity and difference *within* each social category, and how that complexity influences men's decisions to use violence against their partners (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005:45). By not utilising the concepts of gender, power and control as analytical tools, the subculture of violence theory is unable to explain why men suffering work-related stress choose to aim their frustration towards their female partners (Bograd, 1988a:19), nor can it explain the research which shows that white men in white-collar jobs are more likely than men from other races, and men in blue-collar jobs, to control their partners using non-physical forms of

abuse independent of, or alongside physical violence (Gondolf et al., 2002:305).

The long history of discriminatory practices within state institutions and human service agencies that, for instance, lead to arresting poor men and men of colour at higher rates than rich, white men, is not explained by the subculture of violence theory (Rees & Pease, 2006:15). For the domestic violence field to move forward it is important to build a theoretical bridge between subculture of violence theory and feminist theories. Another reason why this is important is that the predominance of subculture of violence theory in everyday contexts and texts contributes to myths that perpetrators *only* come from certain social categories. This can have the effect of endangering women. Robertson and Busch (1998) report about a case where a white upper-middle-class businessman murdered his partner. Part of the background to this case was a child residence and contact hearing in which the judge colluded with this man allowing his violence to remain hidden. The judge dismissed the woman's need for protection. The authors argue that the woman's murder might have been prevented if it was not for the judge being influenced by the dominant subculture of violence discourse (Robertson & Busch, 1998:47-48).

Resource theory is also gender neutral. It does not explain why it is that women, who have higher economic and occupational status than their husbands, do not use violence as an extension of that status. The same limitation applies to ultimate resource theory, which cannot explain why the huge numbers of women with fewer material resources and lower social value than their husbands do not all beat their husbands. However, when a feminist lens is applied to ultimate resource theory, the usefulness of the insights about men is sharpened. O'Brien (1975 cited in Walby, 1990:136) showed that men were more likely to use violence if their wives had economic and educational superiority over them. Resource theory tends to view this as a class issue, but when an analysis of masculinities is taken into account, it can be seen that this is a patriarchal need for the man to establish superiority over the woman. Because being the breadwinner is associated

with men's status, economic impoverishment may diminish men's sense of masculine pride and authority, and such feelings of emasculation may lead to violence as a way of restoring power in the relationship (Anderson, 1997:858; Katz, 2003:12; Yllö, 1993:51).

2.4.3 Feminist perspectives

Feminist scholarship on violence against women "is driven primarily by social action and research that contains very little theory" (Hunnicut, 2009:553). Whilst feminist theories have become increasingly more sophisticated, the main focus has been on women's oppression in general. It is argued that violence against women is under-theorised from feminist perspectives and "theory development remains slow" (Hunnicut, 2009:555).

Pease (2000:14) argues that unless qualitative studies focus on men's subjective experiences "they could be seen as being naturally inclined towards domination", but the tendency for many qualitative researchers, as reviewed in this thesis, is to lapse into using binary understandings of social discourses and masculinity as if they are "simple, unified, and undifferentiated wholes" (Flax, 1987:638). Whereas it is argued that if a true post-modern feminist approach was taken to explaining the multitudinous elements in men's narratives, attention would focus on "the complex processes and matrices through which gender is *produced*" (Cosgrove, 2003:92).

For example, Lundgren (1995, 1998) argues, in her qualitative study, that historical discourses permit men's violence and modern discourses constrain it. Likewise James and colleagues (2002:15) argue that violence by men they interviewed entails adhering to traditional masculinity. These are important feminist insights because they highlight the influence that social discourses and masculinity have on perpetrators' behaviours, but they ignore evidence that there have always been discourses that oppose men's violence against women, that there are contemporary discourses that

condone men's violence and that there have always been multiple ways of practicing masculinity. This problem may be because contemporary feminist theories have not been explicitly devised to explain domestic violence, and in particular have not been devised to explain the male perpetrator.

It is argued that intersectionality is the "most important contribution that women's studies has made so far" (McCall, 2005:1771) because it acknowledges that men express unequal levels of power dependent on social location. But Blake (1998) argues that some feminists continue to make sweeping generalisations about race, class and gender, whilst Acker (2006:446) argues that the concept itself only enables social locations to be broken into simplified sub-categories such as white, black, middle-class and working-class because the concept is incapable of articulating the nuanced processes by which each social location becomes imbued with an array of different values, interests and gendered relationships.

There are two theoretical problems here. First, although intersectionality allows for the recognition that there are women with more power than some men, when feminist theories are applied to male perpetrators, men are nearly always depicted as having more power than women regardless of race or class and that they use violence to maintain their power. Second, in cases where men have less social power than their wives, rather than explain those men's violence through the lens of intersectionality, resource theory is relied upon for this purpose. In this case, the feminist theory of male perpetrators assumes men are always attempting to gain power.

One nationally representative sample of men in masculine and feminine occupations highlights men's need to maintain power or retrieve a sense of power in relation to female partners. The study finds that both gendered occupations have links with violence by men in the home. It is argued that men who are permitted to use violence at work, such as the military, who also use violence at home may do so because their use of violence to claim authority readily spills over into the home. Whilst it is argued that men in

female dominated occupations who use violence at home may be compensating for a blocked masculinity (Melzer, 2002:830-831).

Several of the qualitative studies reviewed in this chapter observed that men are not always powerful, rather they found that some men experience fear, weakness and vulnerability which leads to violence. Many of the researchers fall into the trap of drawing on binary notions of homogeneous gender categories to explain this. For example, Levitt (2008:443) argued that men's subsequent violence was aimed at defending their masculinity and Bettman (2005:203, 244-245) variously argued violence and anger were motivated by a need to defend a fragile hegemonic masculinity, or to live up to "conventional gendered behaviour", or "normal manhood", or the "male gender role". The problem here is that Levitt's reliance on men's descriptions as explanations meant contemporary scholarship that challenges the use of the singular notion of masculinity was ignored and Bettman's patriarchal theoretical approach slips and slides across outdated and contemporary ways of understanding gender.

Other researchers who found men experienced vulnerability did not have a theory that could capture the nuances of the issue. For example, James and colleagues (2002) argued that men had problems revealing vulnerabilities and emotions resulting from experiences in their dysfunctional family of origin, but they do not explain the processes and logics that link this problem to experiences in the family. Buchbinder and Eisikovits (2004:451-463) observed that some men became angry victims when they felt police did not support their patriarchal authority. The problem here is that feminist theory that links the state to domestic violence can only account for the state's support of men's violence against their partners. Whereas Gadd (2000:441, 2003:337) utilised a nuanced psychodynamic approach that tracked men's biographical references about how to be a man. He argued for the importance of close-up research into men's psychodynamic processes in order to understand men who do, and do not, agree with violence against women, and men whose violence was motivated by power and those men whose violence was motivated by powerlessness. He challenged the

feminist notion that male perpetrators are always conscious actors, but that men might be motivated by a multifaceted unconscious (Gadd, 2000:445, 2002:73, 2004:396; Pease, 2000:14).

This thesis argues, as Cosgrove (2003:92) and Goldner (1992:56) do, that feminist theories, and interpretations made of men's narratives in qualitative research, need to break away from the habit of drawing on "either/or" to explain gender and power and to recognise men's experiences and social discourses and institutional practices as "both/and". The concept both/and can simultaneously acknowledge feminist fears that men will be let off the hook if the spotlight is put on men's vulnerabilities, whilst maintaining the stance that men must be held accountable for their horrendous crimes of violence and immoral engagement in non-physical forms of abuse and control against their partners (Goldner, 1992:61).

Theories that utilise a relational approach are capable of capturing factors that fit with the notion of both/and. Contemporary feminist scholarship continues to argue against gender as containing fixed traits and instead argues for a relational approach to doing gender and doing difference (Jurik & Siemsen, 2009; Kitzinger, 2009; Messerschmidt, 2009; West & Zimmerman, 2009). This thesis argues that a relational approach represents a vital theoretical foundation that can advance understandings of male perpetrators' multiple ways of performing abuse and care and would account for why men behave differently across contexts. The relational approach would help strengthen an understanding of why men responded differentially to first, second and subsequent police arrests in Buchbinder and Eisikovits's (2004) study, for instance.

Several feminist scholars have called for a "social analysis that seriously critiques men as men" (Hanmer, 1990:29; Hearn, 1999:4; McCarry, 2007:406) that involves the psychology of the perpetrator of domestic violence and that analyses those men's "gendered expectations about family relationships and dynamics, and the patriarchal ideology and structure of society" within which individual men "and relationships are embedded"

(Yllö, 2005:20). This analysis should seek to understand the ways individual male perpetrators situate themselves within the complex web of patriarchal power structures. The empirical and theoretical focus on male perpetrators needs to understand men's perspectives on "the political, as well as the personal, implications of transforming power relations" (Hearn, 1999:4; Ramazanoglu, 1992:339). A theoretical approach that critiques men as men would include seeking to understand men's relationships with other men and how those dynamics effect men's motivation to, or not to, abuse and control their female partners (Hearn & Whitehead, 2006:45-46).

Dominant feminist theories, always focus on men's relationships with women as the foundation for domestic violence to occur. But for the past 20 years DeKeseredy and colleagues (1990, 2007, 1993, 2002, 2006) have been developing a patriarchal male peer support theory that argues that certain kinds of relations amongst men increase the risk for some men to abuse women. The theory assumes that attachment to male peers in contexts such as some fraternities, sporting arenas, schools and the military, encourage narrow expressions of masculinity and legitimise abuse against women (Sabo, Gray, & Moore, 2000:129-130). Indeed, empirical studies show support for this. Some sporting institutions valorise violence and sexual assault against women, promote misogyny, homophobic dominance, suppression of empathy for others and foster a culture of silence that protects the abusers (Messner, 2005:318). Studies of fraternities find that some peers encourage being sexually active, segregating the genders, demanding women's servitude, telling sexist jokes, consuming alcohol (Boswell & Spade, 1996:137-139), and gang raping women (Godenzi, Schwartz, & DeKeseredy, 2001:5). However this is not the case for all male peer groups, rather there are high and low risk factors that encourage these practices (Boswell & Spade, 1996:133). Despite the mounting empirical support for patriarchal peer support theory, it has been minimally applied to understanding male perpetrators of domestic violence (DeKeseredy et al., 2006; Hearn, 1998a, 1998b; James et al., 2002:16-18; Rosen, Kaminski, Parmley, Knudson, & Fancher, 2003). Hearn and Whitehead (2006:45-46) therefore propose that future studies should explore whether men's

motivation for perpetrating violence against their live-in female partners may entail the need to appear “heroic” in the eyes of other men. This proposition will be explored in the current thesis and will extend the exploration to understanding how men’s relationships with men influence perpetrators’ use of non-physical control over female partners.

2.4.4 Ecological framework

Qualitative studies extend and strengthen quantitative findings that male perpetrators’ abusive and controlling behaviours entail multiple influences at the psychological, sociological, and wider socio-cultural-political levels, yet none of the researchers used Heise’s (1998) ecological framework to account for men’s narratives that did cross these boundaries. However, Pease (2008:16-17) argues that the ecological framework has never developed a theoretical coherence. Apart from suggesting that patriarchal practices and ideologies provide links between psychological and sociological explanations, the model provides no conceptual tools that can bridge all the levels. At present there is no theory that will enable a nuanced complex explanation of how the risk factors are operationalised in the lives of individual male perpetrators.

Therefore, this thesis argues for the development of a new theoretical framework. This framework will utilise a nuanced feminist approach by synthesising two complementary theories, namely Connell’s (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu’s (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory which, together, are capable of capturing the dialectical interweaving between male perpetrators’ individual practices with social power structures. This new framework will be discussed at length in chapter three.

2.4.5 Conclusion

This section has explored the main problems with the current theoretical perspectives and revealed that, by applying feminist concepts of gender and

power to psychological and sociological perspectives this strengthens the links across all levels of the ecological perspective on male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. But the evaluation of the feminist socio-political level of the ecological framework revealed that many feminist researchers continue to rely on early feminist understandings of male perpetrators as singularly having and wanting power. This renders invisible men's fears, vulnerabilities and experiences of powerlessness that lead to violence. In order for the domestic violence field to advance, it is imperative that paradigm wars cease, and instead unite important insights from all paradigms, in order to better keep women safe and hold men accountable.

At first glance, the ecological framework would appear to resolve this problem, but the framework lacks conceptual devices that researchers can use to explain men's processes and that can explain the mutually reinforcing interconnection between men's individual psyches and social power structures. Contemporary feminist scholarship that draws from post-modern and post-structural feminisms, queer theory, feminists of colour and otherwise self-reflecting feminist scholars, is able to explain men's conflicted and contradictory experiences, however, there is no coherent theory that has been devised from these perspectives that can capture the full depth and breadth of male perpetrators' experiences. Therefore, this thesis proposes a new theoretical framework that can fill this gap.

2.5 Conclusion

The purpose of discussion in this chapter has been to focus on literature that explicates understandings of men who perpetrate physical violence and non-physical forms of abuse and control against their live-in female partners. This chapter explored the dominant theoretical perspectives, that is psychological, sociological and feminist, that wrangle for position as the foremost authority on how to explain and understand which men abuse women, why they do so and the best intervention suited to change those men's behaviours. In the late 1990s the ecological framework was proposed

as a way to overcome paradigm hostility, by arguing that, in reality, risk factors for men's violence against women exist across all levels of the social ecology and must be taken into account when assessing risk to women and in developing interventions better suited to holding men accountable.

Feminists note from women's stories that men perpetrate a wide range of psychological abuse and structural control, and that for some women these experiences are accompanied with physical violence, whilst other abused and controlled women never experience any physical violence. However, despite this knowledge, quantitative and qualitative research from all three perspectives tends to maintain a narrow focus on men's physical violence, thus leaving a wide range of behaviours and their motivations unexplained.

Although psychological perspectives acknowledge the influence of the family of origin in men's psychological wellbeing and acknowledge the influence of social messages in men's attitudes and beliefs, the greater tendency is to individualise men, to ignore historical changes and to avoid acknowledging political bias. Sociological perspectives have highlighted the uneven distribution of male perpetrators across certain social groups including younger men, men from low socioeconomic classes and men from non-white races. Although it is imperative these groups of men be understood, a singular reliance on this focus can render invisible the fact that many older, white, middle-class men do perpetrate abuse against their partners. Further, this sociological perspective does not apply a power analysis that takes racism and other social hierarchies into account when explaining this uneven spread.

Each perspective provides a different view about what is considered a suitable intervention for perpetrators to change, but over time the combined use of the ecological framework and coordinated community response has developed interventions that focus on change at all levels of the social ecology. Many men's stopping abuse programmes use one or more of the dominant perspectives, to varying degrees, in their trainings. A problem with this is that group facilitators, who are not educated in the weaknesses

and strengths of each approach, can be swayed towards singular psychological perspectives, which tend to dominate taken-for-granted socio-cultural understandings as represented through the media.

A problem with all three perspectives is the major methodological gap, in that men's perspectives have been missing from the equation for quite some time. However, of those studies that have been reviewed in this chapter, some feminist researchers have slipped into utilising early feminist dichotomous notions of masculinity and social discourses rendering the complexity of men's perspectives untheorised. Other authors note more specific motivations underpinning men's minimisation of their violence, whilst other in-depth studies allow a greater understanding of the psychological and structural elements required for morality to emerge. Some studies explore men's relationships with men, and note that men do not only denigrate women, some men admire, care about and respect women. But ultimately these complexities and contradictions are also not accounted for theoretically.

Although some of the qualitative researchers acknowledge men are influenced by contradictory social discourses that condone and support violence against women, in the end most conclude perpetrators are always influenced by a social discourse that supports violence. Some feminist perspectives render change impossible by arguing for an uncomplicated view that all male perpetrators have and want power and benefit from socially derived power. In reality some in-depth studies from male perpetrators' perspectives note that some men indeed want to, and do, engage in the process of change, but yet again such change is not explained theoretically. Further, qualitative research from men's perspectives finds that men experience fears, vulnerabilities and powerlessness, which then lead to violence, but only Gadd, who used a psychoanalytic approach that linked masculinity and power to men's psyches, was able to provide a coherent theoretical explanation for the link between vulnerability and men's subsequent violence. The reason most researchers who uncovered men's vulnerabilities and fears were unable to explain this theoretically may

be because post-modern feminisms that can capture conflict and contradictions, have so-far not been used to their full extent as an appropriate way to explain male perpetrators' complexities.

Given the limitations inherent in the dominant theories to date, the next chapter argues for a more fine-grained feminist theoretical framework to guide the current research about male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. Two complementary theories will be used for this purpose. These are Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory. Connell's theory will enable a more complex understanding of relations amongst men and between men and women, whilst Bourdieu's framework will enhance these understandings by examining theoretical mechanisms that produce these gendered relations. The two theories enable a focus on men's multiple masculine practices at the intersections where individuals and society meet. Thus these practice theories will enable a crucial understanding of the logic of practice inherent in men's normative framework of masculinities including the form of agency in each configuration of masculinity and an understanding of social enablers and constraints on men's repertoire of masculinities.

CHAPTER THREE

A New Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce some theoretical ways of thinking about men's abuse of their female partners which both extend the work of the previous chapter, while also taking into account the problems and assumptions inherent in some of that work. In order for this to occur, this chapter will introduce and discuss, in detail, the work of Connell (2000a, 2002a, 2005) and her theorising of the ways men choose one practice of masculinity as opposed to another and the work of Bourdieu (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) and his theorising of the relationship between the individual, their social practices and social contexts.

More specifically, it will be argued that Connell's theory of masculinities enables a multifaceted understanding of men by building on the work of feminist theorists. In her engagement with the relationship between gender and power, Connell extends contemporary feminisms by offering even more nuanced ways of thinking about not only relations between men and women, but also amongst men themselves. Connell does this through a recognition of the existence of a gender hierarchy amongst men, as well as between men and women, and by understanding the multiplicity of socio-cultural expectations and ideals of manhood that exist within western society. Although Connell offers nuanced understandings of complex gendered relationships and describes these well, the work of Bourdieu will be invoked to explore how these relationships are produced and played out.

Bourdieu's framework complements, deepens and strengthens Connell's work by contributing four essential ingredients: a deeper understanding of the mechanisms and logics that explain how masculinities emerge; a more

nuanced understanding of power and the ways in which it is internalised by men; a more complex account of the multiple ways individuals and structures are intermeshed; and a more intricate understanding of the fundamental principles that entail change while simultaneously accounting for the inertia of change. Taken together these theories offer conceptual tools that bridge the gaps across psychological, sociological and feminist ways of understanding the social ecology of male perpetrators and the society in which they live.

3.2 The Relationship Between Connell and Bourdieu

In 1985 Connell and her colleagues Carrigan and Lee, drew from feminism, gay liberation, contemporary socialism, psychoanalysis and the history and sociology of practice (Carrigan et al., 1985:173-174) to outline a new sociology of masculinities. This formulation was a nuanced response to gender theories that were plagued with dichotomous notions of individuals and social structures. At this time most research on men held to feminist insights that portrayed masculinity as “unrelieved villainy and all men as agents of the patriarchy in more or less the same degree” (Carrigan et al., 1985:552). This obliged Connell to develop a nuanced critical theory of masculinities.

While intimate partner abuse is not a focus of her work, Connell’s theorising of men and masculinities is of significance to this thesis for the following reasons. First, Connell’s focus on multiple and collective masculinities extends contemporary relational approaches to knowing in finer detail how men’s violence and abuse and love and care unfold differentially in relation to other men, to women and to social structures. Second, the ability of Connell to conceptualise a hierarchy of masculinities by understanding varying ways in which men are positioned in relation to power, gives space to the idea that not all men need to be violent and abusive in order to benefit from men’s collective domination over women, while at the same time

opening up possibilities for change. Third, the way in which hegemonic masculinity is positioned in relation to other patterns of masculinities and femininities, allows for ways of rethinking the influence that other men have in men's relationships with women. Fourth, Connell's reconceptualisation of the ways in which socio-cultural structures both negatively and positively sanction particular patterns of relating amongst men, and between men and women, provides a way of rethinking men's agency in their decision to practice abusive behaviours across a range of contexts.

Since his first book *The Algerians* published in 1958, until the time of his death in 2002, Bourdieu worked extensively on developing a theory to transcend the dichotomies of structuralism and subjectivism. He aimed to reconcile two opposing notions: that social structures mechanically determine people's practices; and that people are free agents acting consciously and rationally (Bourdieu, 1977:83, 1989:14, 2000a:8, 136, 2000b:2; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:3, 10, 15, 23, 47; Calhoun & Wacquant, 2002:1; Wacquant, 1989:41). For Bourdieu, objective and subjective structures are inseparably incorporated within each other. Objective structures shape subjective structures and in turn subjective structures shape objective structures – thus they are only fully expressed in relation to each other. At first sight this interrelation appears circular, thus Bourdieu's model is often critiqued for leading to endless reproduction. However, as this chapter will show, multiple complexities that occur at the intersection of the two structures open the way for ongoing processes of change.

Bourdieu began developing his theory from ethnographic research on social relations he conducted in the 1950s and 1960s with pre-capitalist Kabyle peasants in Southern Algeria. His aim in using this material to create a theory for late capitalist societies was to avoid being blinded by the familiarity of his own society (Bourdieu, 2001:3; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:170-171). Over time though, his theory did incorporate understandings from late capitalist countries (Calhoun & Wacquant, 2002:1; Fowler, 2003:469; Moi, 1991:1033). However gender was not Bourdieu's primary

project and his theory of gender has been criticised for failing to take into account the “detraditionalising of gender” (Adkins, 2003:32) and patriarchy (Fowler, 2003:470), along with men’s and women’s increased reflexivity towards gendered practices (Adkins, 2003:33) in western societies, by instead focusing on the “structural constants of masculine domination” (Bourdieu, 2001:81; Fowler, 2003:479; Silva, 2005:98).

It is argued that Bourdieu’s book *Masculine Domination* oversimplifies gender relations much in the same way some feminist theories polarise men as dominant and women as subordinate (McNay, 1999:108, 2000:26, 56, 2004:183, 189; Silva, 2005:95). Bourdieu’s monolithic account of gender identity and practices misses the complex, contradictory and heterogeneous character of gender (Chodos & Curtis, 2002:402; Connell, 1983:152; Kraus, 2006:131; McCall, 1992:852; Moi, 1991:1033).

Nevertheless feminists such as Chodos and Curtis (2002), Fowler (2003), McNay (1999, 2000, 2004), Adkins (2003), Skeggs (2004), Moi (1991), Silva (2005), Kraus (2006), McCall (1992:852) and Carrington, Mills and Roulston (1999) have engaged with Bourdieu’s overarching theory of practice to explain the ways individualised gender interacts with objective social structures. This is because Bourdieu’s overarching theory did continue to develop richer complex accounts of society (Silva, 2005:89) which provide an “explanatory power that is not offered elsewhere” (Connell, 1983:153; Skeggs, 2004:21). This explanatory power of Bourdieu’s work will be invoked to complement Connell’s nuanced understandings of gender. Connell (1983:153) said of Bourdieu’s theory that “very few systematic social theorists ... have a way of talking about what living in the world is really like, its shadows and its sunlight, its languors and its teeth”.

Bourdieu’s dense and wide-ranging principles thus hold significance for this thesis for the following reasons. First, Bourdieu does not see society as a monolithic whole, rather he reconceptualises society as broken into a range of semi-autonomous fields with their own logic and regularities of conduct,

which sometimes interact with the logic and laws of other fields. This reconceptualisation challenges two claims: that a monolithic patriarchal structure determines men's internalisation of socio-cultural messages; and that society is divided into a simple twofold logic of public and private domains. Bourdieu's ability to conceptualise a range of fields provides multiple and variable opportunities for internalising an array of discourses, values and interests, thus allowing for the mechanisms underpinning men's embodiment of socio-cultural messages to be reconsidered. The conceptualisation of fields operating by independent logics allows a rethinking of what enables men's private abuse in the home compared with the enablers and constraints for their possible abusive or non-abusive practices across a range of social contexts.

Second, Bourdieu cuts through the dichotomous notion of individuals as either passive subjects of social conditioning, or as rational, autonomous, conscious and free. Instead he posits a holistic view that sees that people's habitus has "an infinite capacity for generating" thoughts and actions (Bourdieu, 1990b:55). Bourdieu's conviction that the habitus is both a structured structure and a structuring structure clears the way for reappraising perpetrators as potentially passively internalising the social, and/or as capable of reflexively choosing which values and practices to adopt. The concept further opens the way for viewing perpetrators as not just resistant to change, but as potentially wanting to change, as potentially having the ability to change, as well as the ability to influence objective structures.

Third, Bourdieu's conceptualisation of capital provides an understanding of the ways power operates vertically and horizontally, thus permitting ways of thinking differently about men's relationships with women in contemporary society and further opens the way for understanding the influence that men's relationships with men have in their choice to abuse their female partners. Finally, Bourdieu's pivotal focus on the intricate, multifaceted relationship that occurs at the nexus of field, habitus and capital provides undeniable openings to infinite possible behaviours in relation to each individual. This

nuanced relational configuration further opens the way for reconsidering early feminist ideas that not all men are violent, controlling and non-loving, and that some men are in reality abusive, controlling *and* loving. It also allows for an understanding of how practices are reproduced over time and why stopping domestic violence is a slow process, as well as offering an ability to distinguish mechanisms that do promote change.

The rest of this chapter details the specifics of Connell's and Bourdieu's work ending with a discussion demonstrating the way in which Connell's and Bourdieu's theories work together to support the current research.

3.3 Connell's Theory of Masculinities

The purpose of this section is to unpack the central elements of Connell's work that are important in rethinking men's violence and control against their female partners. Connell's theory is discussed in two parts. *The first part* outlines the concepts of multiple and collective masculinities. Here it will be shown that multiple masculinities are formed in mutually reinforcing relationships with various social structures, discourses and material possibilities. Specifically, Connell argues that men are active in choosing which patterns of masculinities to practice at any given time or place. In turn, choices and practices are shaped by men's location in a number of social categories such as age, race or class. In this discussion, Connell takes a historical approach to masculinities, highlighting that men's everyday practices are products and producers of history. There is also a strong emphasis in this theory on men's practices, as opposed to their identities, allowing for analyses of individual men's complex and contradictory behaviours in their daily relationships, and over a lifetime. Given the conflicting desires and logics this involves, it will be demonstrated that men practice non-abusive behaviours towards partners, whether they abuse their partners or not.

The second part deals with more complex concepts; namely the interplay between hierarchies of masculinities, hegemonic masculinity and socio-cultural structures. All three aspects are intricately intertwined. Specifically, Connell demonstrates that the notion of hierarchies of masculinities and femininities renders the monolithic concept of patriarchy redundant in this theory. Instead Connell shows that there are relational patterns in the gender order that divide men hierarchically according to a range of masculinities; including hegemonic at the top, and then complicit, subordinated and marginalised masculinities holding complicated and varying positions in relation to power. Hegemonic masculinity is associated with men who dominate and control their female partners, whether this is through physical violence or non-physical forms of abuse. This section will spend some time detailing the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity as it relates to this thesis.

However, despite the strengths of this work for a theoretical reconceptualisation of violent and controlling men, it will be argued that a weakness of Connell's theory is the tendency of those who apply it to dismiss the emphasis on men's practices and to revert to early feminist notions of fixed, unified individuals. Discussion here will demonstrate that this problem has partly occurred because Connell has been both ambiguous in her descriptions of masculinities, and lacking in the specifics of her theory. A major strength, however, of Connell's approach is that every concept leads to an opening for change. The second major strength lies in the dialectical interweaving of men's individual practices with social structures that enables personal, social, contextual and political elements to be accounted for. As a consequence, this theory forms an excellent basis for re-theorising male perpetrators who abuse their female partners.

3.3.1 Multiple masculinities and collective masculinities

Connell's concept of multiple masculinities is formulated as a response to the many problems Connell notes with some feminist and sex role theories that "dichotomise the experiences of men and women" (Carrigan et al., 1985:559-580; Connell, 1987:62; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:837) and

which posit notions of a one-dimensional system for socialising boys into one set of masculine norms, which in turn lead to the simplified notion of a unified coherent masculine identity (Carrigan et al., 1985:556). Connell acknowledges that sex roles are socially internalised, but against this, Connell's theory shows that "multiple femininities and masculinities are a central fact about gender and the way its structures are lived" (Connell, 1987:63).

Connell's adoption of these principles broadens understandings of the ways multiple patterns of masculinities are formed in a mutually reinforcing relationship with varied social structures. In this way men actively resist or choose to conform (Carrigan et al., 1985:581; Connell, 2005:27), not to one set of norms, but to a range of ideological and material possibilities (Connell, 1997:9, 2002a:77). There are many ways men can learn to be violent and abusive, just as there are many options for men to learn not to practice violence and other forms of abuse.

In fact given the manifold possible social locations for men to practice masculinities, such as race, class, age, sexuality, education, religious beliefs, occupation, income and leisure activities, this too opens many possibilities for men to practice sexist or respectful behaviours. Connell refers to non-hegemonic masculine practices that engage with exit, or counter-sexist politics (Connell, 2005:220), that deploy pro-social democratic relations amongst men and between men and women. Thus, not only do multiple patterns of masculinities exist within the same culture, and sometimes within the same institution, they also differ across geographic locations and different cultures (Connell, 2000a:217, 2002a:89, 2002c:vii-viii, 2005:249; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:831, 845). Masculinities are practiced differently across time, for instance in contemporary society the institution of sport is particularly prominent in defining certain masculinities rendering some more honoured than others (Connell, 2000a:11). Connell argues that such "historical unevenness" is vital for understanding gender relations (Connell, 1987:96) and for adequately accounting for processes of constancy and change in gender practices, albeit at differential rates

(Connell, 1987:79, 2005:44). As a specific example, Connell explains that from whatever place a practice originates, that place is forever altered. In concrete terms this means that when a man becomes a lover, becomes educated, or gets angry, he and the people he relates to are changed as a result of these practices (Connell, 1987:79).

A hallmark of Connell's theory of masculinities is the emphasis on practice, and she consistently makes the distinction that masculinities are not what men are, rather masculinities (and femininities) are what men do (Connell, 2002c:viii). In this sense masculinities and femininities are dynamically constructed as men act by using available resources in the given context. Masculinities and femininities "do not exist prior to social interaction" (Connell, 2000a:218, 2000b:4, 2002c:viii). For example, some men may use violence in the home as a resource to perform a particular pattern of masculinity. Connell believes a way to prevent woman abuse is to remove the requirement for such socially enforced patterns of masculinity (Connell, 1996:3, 2000a:218). This means that in order to understand particular men's abuse against their female partners, Connell states, "we must explore specific masculinities to understand how social tensions are expressed as violence by specific agents" (Connell, 2005:258) and why many men are resistant to practicing femininities. A final implication of this focus on multiple masculinities is the recognition that not all men are violent and that there are non-violent respectful masculine practices which may provide models for perpetrators to adopt (Connell, 2000a:216). The concept provides a way of exploring what love and marriage mean to abusive perpetrators.

While the notion of multiple masculinities applies to the ways various men practice masculinity, it also applies to the fact that one individual man may practice multiple masculinities, including abusive and non-abusive practices, in any given day or across their lifetime. Connell argues that practices that construct masculinity are internally complex and contradictory (Connell, 2000a:13, 2000b:4-5, 2002c:viii; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:852). Complexities entail conflicting desires, emotions, logics,

possibilities and conduct (Connell, 2000a:13, 219, 2000b:5, 2002c:viii). For example, a heroic sportsman, or top level businessman, may practice one configuration of masculinity publicly on the sports field or at work, but privately practice another masculinity that undermines their status (Connell, 2000b:4-5, 2005:63, 77). However, a positive implication of the tension involved in juggling these conflicting masculinities means that many men would be willing to change (Connell, 2000a:219, 2000b:5) and that interventions for change could strengthen a man's non-abusive practices while dismantling the social sanctions and motivations behind their abusive practices.

However, a barrier to change is the collective support for particular patterns of masculinity (Connell, 2000a:217). Men may adopt particular practices associated with, say, aggressive competitive team sports at the individual level, while at the same time these patterns reflect those that exist collectively (Connell, 2000b:4). Although individual men may adopt masculinities differently across different social categories such as race or class, there are also unities amongst men because they collectively benefit from the gender order, a point that will be discussed in the following section. Some patterns of masculinity are collectively defined and sustained by gender structures and institutional gender regimes, whether this support stems from peer groups or military organisations (Connell, 2000a:11, 217, 2000b:4, 2002c:viii). The implication of collective masculinities makes it difficult for change to transpire, because changes at face-to-face levels may occur at differential rates to those at structural levels. Connell's notion of men's agency and resistance is important here. Given the wide range of multiple masculine practices, individual practices do not necessarily mirror collective patterns exactly (Connell, 2000b:4).

3.3.2 Hierarchy and hegemonic masculinity

The notion of a hierarchy of masculinities stems from gay men's experience of violence and discrimination by heterosexual men (Carrigan et al., 1985:552). Rather than a monolithic notion of patriarchy, whereby one

group of men dominates one group of women, Connell sees multiple hierarchies of masculinities and femininities. In this scenario, some men dominate other men, as well as dominating women, and even within those hierarchies there are various patterns of relations of domination and subordination (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:846). Men are positioned differentially in relation to power. The emphasis here is that the divisions amongst men, and the relations between men and women, are based on hierarchy and dominance, as opposed to difference.

Hegemonic masculinity is positioned top of the rank while other forms of masculinity are complicit with this, as are some women (Connell, 2005:242), while yet other masculinities, are subordinated or marginalised (Connell, 1987:183, 2000a:10; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:846). These forms of masculinity will be discussed in more detail later. However, the process of domination and subordination is dynamic, in that hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities are constructed and reconstructed, contested or displaced, historically at both the individual level and collectively (Carrigan et al., 1985:594; Connell, 2000b:5, 2002c:viii).

Connell borrowed the term hegemony from Gramsci's analysis of class relations in Italy, and developed the concept 'hegemonic masculinity' as a way of explaining the high social position of particular men within the hierarchy of masculinities (Carrigan et al., 1985:553; Connell, 1987:183-188, 2000a:23). Generally speaking the concept of hegemonic masculinity aims to explain the dynamics of social processes, such as struggles for power among men, which entail "patterns of masculinity [that] are socially defined in contradistinction from some model (whether real or imaginary) of femininity" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:848). The practice of hegemonic masculinity "has numerous configurations" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:840) that involve the "successful claim to authority" (Connell, 2005:77). Hegemonic masculinity entails the "currently accepted" (Connell, 2005:77) "successful collective strategy in relation to women" (Carrigan et al., 1985:592; Connell, 1987:185-186) that legitimises "the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (Connell,

2005:77). However, the hegemonic strategy of domination does not mean all men are actively engaged in claiming authority or in dominating women.

Connell presents a sparse framework that outlines hierarchical divisions among men that includes hegemonic, complicit, subordinated and marginalised masculinities, which entail a mixture of processes that produce and sustain contemporary hegemonic masculinity. These hierarchical divisions among men are based on sexuality, race, class and particular expressions of masculinity and femininity. This framework allows for rethinking relations among men and the influence other men may have on men's abuse of their female partner. For example, men practicing complicit masculinity are not intensely dominating, nor do they actively oppose hegemonic masculinity, but they benefit psychologically and materially from the divisions among men and from the subordination of women, whether they practice care and respect in their face-to-face relations with women or not (Carrigan et al., 1985:592; Connell, 1987:185, 1996:4; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832).

Contemporary hegemonic masculinity is always heterosexual (Connell, 1987:186). This means that men practicing subordinated masculinity are mainly homosexual men who are often detested, by men who agree with the hegemonic project, for presumably practicing so-called femininity, and heterosexual men are also subordinated if they practice effeminate masculinities. Conversely, men practicing marginalised masculinity are mainly working-class men, men of all races other than white, as well as some men from some ethnicities within the white race. Connell argues that the hegemonic gender project "does not mean total cultural dominance", instead other patterns of masculinity are despised or denigrated rather than eliminated (Connell, 1987:184, 2000b:3). Strategies used to uphold the status of hegemonic masculinity entail, for instance, gay bashing or verbally abusing men who are deemed to be sissies or wimps. Subordinated and marginalised men are further kept in their place, for instance, through state policies and institutional practices that favour hegemonic masculinity.

Hegemonic masculinity is also contested and negotiated based on men's physical prowess. Connell emphasises the significance that men's physical bodies, as symbols of masculinity or femininity, have in vying for positions on the hierarchy of masculinities. Boys learn that the social definitions of manhood are incorporated in particular body shapes and postures, with men's physical prowess becoming an important socio-cultural signifier of particular masculine practices, at both the personal and collective level (Connell, 1987:83, 1997:8, 2000a:21, 26, 2005:60-66; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:851). Some men's bodies are portrayed as threats of potential violence and are also subject to violence. Men may draw on ideological practices as a way of providing "proof of men's superiority and right to rule" (Connell, 2000b:8, 2005:54) over other men and over women, whether women are physically stronger or not. The notion that men's bodies are socially informed has significance for appreciating motivations behind men's physical and non-physical abuse of women. An implication of the notion of men's bodies as arenas of social practice, is that stopping violence programmes should not limit education to the intellect. Rather, Connell argues that there needs to be ways for men to experience bodily pleasure non-violently (Connell, 2000a:218).

The concept of hegemonic masculinity was also formulated in conjunction with the notion of emphasised femininity, which depicts a particular form of femininity in women that complies to patriarchal interests and desires (Connell, 1987:183). Femininity, associated with women, places them at the bottom of the gender hierarchy, whether in practice they perform masculinity or not (Connell, 1987:186) and whether they are complicit or active agents who contest masculine domination or not (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:829). According to Connell, this global subordination of women's femininities is because "power, authority, aggression" are not, on the whole, themes of femininity, whereas they are for masculinity (Connell, 1987:187). The concept of emphasised femininity, though it continues to hold relevance since the theory was devised, does not negate the empirical evidence that there are ongoing reconfigurations of women's identities and practices which are increasingly being accepted by younger

men (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:848), a notion that holds hope for the cessation of domestic violence. However, the fact of compliance by particular men and by some women is what makes hegemonic masculinity so powerful and sustainable (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832), therefore has significance for understanding male perpetrators' motivations to abuse their partners.

Complicit, subordinated and marginalised masculinities are affected by hegemonic masculinity and their practices partly entail having to "work out their relationship with it" (Connell, 1987:183, 186, 2002c:viii). However, Jefferson (2002:71) and Demetriou (2001:346) argue against earlier renditions of Connell's theory that posited the practice of power as unidirectional and the idea that hegemonic masculinity was unaffected by other masculinities. In response to these criticisms, and because of 20 years of empirical studies examining the dynamics of masculinities, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:845) now argue for a more complex view. Agreeing with Demetriou's (2001:346) assertion that hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities reciprocally influence each other, this is a vital concept that holds relevance for understanding how other men may influence men's decision to, or not to, abuse their female partners.

Connell's theory emphasises the agency of subordinated and marginalised men who actively resist domination (Carrigan et al., 1985:598; Connell, 2000a:217; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:829, 847). Men are creative, active agents who engage in negotiations, who resist, contest, improvise and choose not to conform to gendered hierarchical power patterns, whether this is at the face-to-face level or in response to social structures (Carrigan et al., 1985:598; Connell, 1987:61, 63, 2002a:59; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:841). This is important for understanding men's adherence to rules that condone or condemn violence across a range of social contexts. Nevertheless, where there is any vying for position in any given context, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:849) argue that the peak of the hierarchical pyramid suggests that there are only limited numbers of men who can practice hegemonic masculinity. These complex variations in

men's practices associated with power differentials within hierarchies of masculinities, makes it possible to more deeply comprehend what these hierarchies mean for male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse and how these hierarchies may influence them.

To maintain men's place at the top of the hierarchy, the theory emphasises a mix of strategies that are necessary for both producing and sustaining hegemonic masculinity. Sustaining strategies include the policing of masculinities, and also involve the simultaneity of sexual attraction to women, direct misogynist behaviours, and the exclusion of women from men's social networks (Connell, 1987:186, 1997:8). One strategy for policing masculinities in contemporary western societies is the elevation of male heroes, who are "usually specialists in violence" (Connell, 1987:249) and are crucial to the cultural imagery of masculinity (Connell, 2005:213). Cultural discourses of persuasion are often embedded in gender regimes of institutions, such as sports and the media (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:846) and are used for the disciplinary purposes of policing men by "setting standards, claiming popular assent and discrediting those who fall short" (Carrigan et al., 1985:594; Connell, 1987:186, 2005:214; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:844).

Violence is encouraged as an ideal masculine practice. Heroic figures who use violence, whether symbolic or real, range from exemplary sportsmen, war veterans, iconic movie characters and the actors who play them (Connell, 1987:185). However, studies across multiple contexts show that these authoritative images may not represent common everyday practices (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:846). While some men do actively participate in upholding these ideals by practicing hegemonic masculinity in the form of playing rugby/football, and practicing domination, aggression and brutal competition (Connell, 1997:8, 2005:37; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:850), other boys and men practice alternative masculinities. However in doing so they are policed, for example, by being called fags or cowards (Connell, 2000a:217). These policing strategies are

important for investigating male perpetrators' rationales for engaging in violence.

Connell argues, however, that hegemonic masculinity does not always require such masculine themes. At the institutional level, for example, hegemony is upheld through institutional practices such as those that imply the importance of family values, corporate profit, individual freedom and international competitiveness (Connell, 2005:212-213). Institutional sanctioning of particular patterns of masculinities becomes important for understanding men's resistance to change. In the end, though, the major point that Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:840) wish to make about hegemonic masculinity is that it does not always entail toxic practices, rather it entails practices that permit "men's collective dominance over women to continue".

Guided by this assertion that men's intimate partner abuse correlates with hegemonic masculinity, it is important to explore the complexities of hegemonic masculinity a little further. First, according to Connell, practices often entail ambiguity and overlap, which, in short, means men's practices such as merciless competitiveness, may represent a struggle to construct hegemonic masculinity, but may also represent practicing complicit masculinity. What is more significant here is that, as Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:839) suggest, a "blurring between hegemonic and complicit masculinities is extremely likely if hegemony is effective". Second, hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities are not monolithic. This means that the position of authority does not always require the practice of physical violence (Connell, 2005:77), even though the concept hegemonic masculinity was formulated, in part, to explain the "specific shape of violence in communities where physical aggression is expected or admired among men" (Connell, 2002b:93).

Connell (2005:77) argues that hegemonic masculinity is ultimately more likely to be produced when there is a fit between cultural ideals and institutional power, but this is not always reflected at the face-to-face level.

Men who practice hegemonic masculinity in corporations and government may bear little resemblance to media images of the violent hero (Connell, 1987:185). In fact, ample evidence shows that hegemonic masculinity is sustained through non-violent cultural consent (Connell, 1987:185; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:846). In sum, hegemonic masculinity means “ascendancy achieved through culture, institutions, and persuasion” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832), which entail diverse behavioural practices aimed at protecting men’s material interests (Connell, 2000a:21).

Connell’s notion of interests is an important one for understanding men’s motivation to abuse their partners. Earlier it was stated that complicit men benefit from the collective project of men’s domination over women (Carrigan et al., 1985:592; Connell, 2000a:32, 2005:79; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832), however it is not just complicit and hegemonic masculinities that receive a patriarchal dividend. It appears that subordinated and marginalised men too benefit, albeit unevenly (Connell, 1997:8, 2005:242). Statistically speaking, men receive higher wages and have greater opportunities for promotion than many women, and additionally, men at any socioeconomic level may demand sexual services from women (Connell, 1997:7, 2000a:25, 32, 2005:79-80, 82, 226). Many men may have some interest in maintaining the status quo, be it domination over women or the drive to maintain particular forms of physical prowess. Given that the persistence of the overarching gender order favours men, Connell’s concept of internal complexity and contradiction allows for a more detailed examination of men’s interests. Specifically, features that motivate hegemonic masculinity, which is deemed to be related to men’s power and control over their partners.

Despite the notion that men receive some form of patriarchal dividend, research finds there are multiple psychological and physical costs for some men: poor health resulting from excess alcohol consumption; physical injuries from playing aggressive sports; early death due to physical violence and risk taking on the roads; and his willingness to sever ties with close relationships (Connell, 2000a:11, 2002a:6, 2005:257; Connell &

Messerschmidt, 2005:850-851). However, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:850) warn that men, as the privileged group, should not be treated with pity. Rather, they simply suggest that these costs should be factored into any analysis. Because of the costs particular men experience, this could imply that some men will be motivated to change (Connell, 2000a:217).

It is important to note the weakness in the application of the theory of masculinities in the secondary literature, if only to avoid repeating the same problem in the current research. First, some writers have reduced the concept of multiple masculinities to a homogeneous masculinity that belongs to all western men, regardless of sexual orientation, emotional articulateness and anti-sexist behaviours. For example, Kimmel (1994:131) claims that men's fear of other men is the great secret of American manhood and Kaufman (1998:8) asserts that "men are everywhere unsure of their own masculinity". Other writers have been criticised for conflating masculinity into sets of fixed negative traits that depict men "as unemotional, independent, non-nurturing, aggressive, and dispassionate" (Collier, 1998 cited in Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:840; Hearn, 1996:207; Martin, 1998:473; McMahan, 1993:690). While Leach (1994:36) claims "that masculinity is defined by sexism, the objectification of women, misogyny, homophobia, aggression and the suppression of emotion".

Second, reverting to liberal humanist notions of men as unified subjects, despite researchers' use of Connell's theory, has partly occurred because of Connell's sometimes ambiguous use of the concept of masculinity (Lusher & Robins, 2009:5). While Connell insists that any form of masculinity is not a fixed type, some definitions in her early writings occasionally implied that masculinity did represent fixed types. Hegemonic masculinity was said to be "aggressive and competitive" (Connell, 1997:8) and masculinity in general was referred to as "an aspect of individual character or personality" (Connell, 1987:185, 2000a:29).

In response to these criticisms, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:829, 847) agree that any notion of masculinity as a fixed trait must be discarded. So

Connell restates her position in *Masculinities* underscoring the notion that masculinity “is always masculinity-in-relation” (2005:44), that masculinity is what men “actually do, not what is expected or imagined” (Connell, 1996:2) and:

“I emphasise that terms such as ‘hegemonic masculinity’ and ‘marginalised masculinities’ name not fixed character types but configurations of practice generated in particular situations in a changing structure of relationships (Connell 2005:81).”

The notion that gender is relational and forever in flux, leaves wide open various opportunities for change in men’s face-to-face practices, and the gender order as a whole. This concept provides space for exploring the ways in which male perpetrators react to formal and informal interventions and how proactive they are in seeking help to change. Connell’s theory is able to account for the nuanced processes involved in the practice of dominating and abusing women by locating the points of convergence where men’s abusive practices meet with the practices of male peers and authority figures as well as the institutional regimes, ideologies and social structures that each legitimate or challenge men’s abusive behaviours.

In conclusion, men’s embodiment of socio-cultural messages is a complex, active and ongoing process between men and the multiple ideological and material possibilities available across western societies. Multiple masculinities are practiced by various men, making some men villains and other men not, and some men villains in one context, but not in another. Connell’s conceptualisation of multiple masculinities opens the way for reconsidering perpetrators as entirely bad, rather the concept means that men’s possible desire to be caring and loving can be explored. Men’s reasons for practicing diverse patterns of masculinity are also multiple and complex. Dominant masculine practices are supported at the collective level which may mean alternative patterns of masculinities, such as care and respect for women, may be resistant to adoption at the collective level, thereby slowing the process of change.

Hierarchies of masculinities are practiced in complex ways. Given the link between hegemonic masculinity and some men's pursuit of power and use of violence and control, whether that is against other men or women, the conceptualisation of a particular pattern of a hegemonic project is significant for rethinking male perpetrators' motivations and practices. The ways in which complicit masculinity condones hegemonic masculinity is important for theorising other men's influence on perpetrators' physical and psychological abuse against their partners. Finally, Connell's argument that masculine practices entail internal complexity and contradictions permits an exploration of men's simultaneous desire to engage with and/or resist domestic violence interventions. This chapter will now turn to exploring Bourdieu's work, which will be invoked to complement and strengthen Connell's.

3.4 Bourdieu's Field Theory

Bourdieu's model is dense. Each concept interrelates in complex ways, thus his model will be introduced and discussed in four parts. *The first part* introduces Bourdieu's three pivotal concepts: field, habitus and capital. Social contexts (fields), men's individual meaning systems (habitus), and capital (power/resources) interact in subtle ways. The interweaving of these concepts will be discussed in *the second part*. Applying these concepts will show why men use coercive control in one situation but not in another, how society enables intimate partner abuse in one situation and not in another, and how care, love and empathy emerge given specific conditions.

The third part extends this by exploring Bourdieu's conceptualisations of: position and position-taking; symbolic power and symbolic violence; doxa, orthodoxy and heterodoxy; and *illusio* (interest and investment in a given situation). These concepts will explain the effects men's worldviews, social rewards and social discourses have on their actions and motives. *The fourth and final part* outlines the mechanisms that enable change. Discussion here

explains why change in the gender order is slow, but that variations and constant revisions in the habitus permit change.

3.4.1 The formulation of field, habitus and capital

Bourdieu states that multiple and diverse effects underpin behaviours and the social contexts in which they take place. Bourdieu posits the formula [(habitus)(capital)] + field = practice (Bourdieu, 1986a:101) as a starting point for encapsulating these multiple and diverse effects. Field (social context), habitus (individuals' cognitions and embodied know-how) and capital (power/resources) produce practices that, in every moment, operate fully in conjunction with each other, thus are inoperative without each other. Far from being a mechanistic formula, Bourdieu sets out to show that the combination of these three major concepts operate as an art form. The creative possibilities are infinite at the point where each concept, along with their multifarious histories, converge. Before discussing how practices are operationalised at the juncture of the three concepts, each concept will be introduced separately.

3.4.1.1 Field

Bourdieu's first central tenet is the *field*. Rather than theorising society as a whole, Bourdieu conceptualises society as a series of historically formed "relatively autonomous" fields, or social contexts, each with their own logic, and each composed of structured spaces of objective positions. The position that an individual, group of individuals, or an institution occupies, depends on their individual or collective habitus (thoughts, expectations) as well as on the volume and form of capital (power) they bring to the field (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1993:72; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17, 97, 126; Wacquant, 1989:39).

As social contexts, fields are domains of forces, the boundaries of which are set by the specific logic of the game and the degree of influence on other fields. These domains of forces are founded on relational configurations that

Bourdieu likens to spaces of play or games, where individuals or institutions struggle to maintain, gain or transform the stakes on offer. Conflict, struggle and competition are inherent to fields because the distribution of capital is inequitable. Struggles entail, for example, attempts to maintain position, accumulate capital, or to push the boundaries of the field (Bourdieu, 2000a:183; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17, 96, 181; Wacquant, 1989:39-40).

Games, or the practices within a field, do not follow explicit rules, rather they follow regular patterns, a notion that Bourdieu calls the *principle of regularity*. Specifically, the principle of regularity, in combination with the volume and type of capital individuals possess, ensures that games are “something other than simple games of chance” (Bourdieu, 1986b:241). In other words, the types of capital existent in a field shape the profits on offer as well as shape the regularities that frame the logic of the field. Likewise, whatever stakes are on offer depend on the logic of the field at any given time (Bourdieu, 1977:72, 1990a:64, 1990b:53-54; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:108). The prevailing hierarchy and composition of valued capital are stakes in the game that follow different logics depending on the specific field, whether it be the family field or business field for instance. Fields such as these only exist because individuals believe in, and actively pursue, the stakes inherent in the specific field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:19; Wacquant, 1989:39). Belonging to a field implies an individual’s vested interest in the stakes of that particular game and implies that they are capable of having some sort of effect on others in the field, or on the field itself (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:80; Wacquant, 1989:36).

However, some positions in a field are more dominant than others, consequently, the relation of power between positions foretells that the chances of winning are unequal, thus unfair. Bourdieu contends that advocates who fight for equal opportunities for women must take into account the mechanisms underlying this inequality (Bourdieu, 1993:73, 2000a:70, 215). Warde however argues that the game analogy has some weaknesses, for instance the concept of field fails to account for non-

competitive games and non-strategic action by people who may play for “internal benefits such as moral satisfaction, self-esteem, personal development and social interaction” (Warde, 2004:15-20). This is important to note when reconsidering male perpetrators as potentially practicing behaviours other than domination and abuse.

3.4.1.2 Habitus

Bourdieu’s second central tenet, *habitus*, constitutes an open scheme of “durable and transposable dispositions” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:13). Specifically dispositions include, but are not limited to, capacities, propensities, beliefs, sympathies, preferences, appreciations, tastes, antipathies, embodied know-how, distastes and aversions. Habitus functions as an orienting *principle of action*, enabling people to intuitively know the laws, logic and rules for how to behave in particular fields. Bourdieu posits that the social is history and that history becomes embodied as second nature, providing people with a practical sense for how to behave in given situations (Bourdieu, 1977:72, 78, 82-83, 1989:14, 1990b:53, 1993:46, 86, 2000a:133, 150, 214-215; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:13, 126, 133). Habitus provides “normative prescriptions about the proper way to conduct domestic relationships” (Bourdieu, 1996:20), but it is only at the juncture where habitus meets the field that habitus functions fully (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:19).

Acquisition of habitus is framed by past circumstances, both individual and collective, and by cumulative exposure to particular social positions within different fields and within categories such as class, gender, economics, education, physical and mental ability, age, geographic location and nationality (Bourdieu, 1977:82, 1990b:54, 1993:73, 1996:21). Individuals internalise the full sets of relationships embedded in social, cultural, economic and political conditions from their early experiences. Although early conditioning carries “disproportionate weight” in the inculcation of dispositions, habitus can be modified based on new experiences across the lifespan (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:133-134). Experiences gained within

the family of origin are then transformed through individuals' schooling, through influences from peer groups and are transformed by subsequent experiences thereafter (Bourdieu, 1977:87, 2000a:161; Wacquant, 1989:40). In short, habitus is socialised subjectivity. However, despite people's conditioning Bourdieu does not consider people to be passive subjects, preferring instead to use the concept "agents", who are capable of influencing the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:107).

Bourdieu states that "gender is an absolutely fundamental dimension of the habitus" (Bourdieu, 1997: 222 cited in Kraus, 2006:128) and it is during early conditioning that children construct gendered identities. Part of this process entails incorporating understandings of asymmetrical gender relations (Bourdieu, 1990b:78). Bourdieu acknowledges the research that shows the link between abuse in the family of origin and the increased possibility of being violent against others. However, Bourdieu asserts that conditions in fields other than the family play their part in replicating such patterns by defining, validating and encouraging certain aspirations while discouraging or prohibiting others. Bourdieu argues that in order to reduce domestic violence, the mass of violence that "is neither noticed nor punished" in other fields must be reduced as well. Bourdieu points out that people's active violence within fields (such as work, prisons, schools) is a product of symbolic violence of economic and social structures (Bourdieu, 2000a:233).

Economic and social conditions shape mental structures, however, it is the shaping of the body that is most central to Bourdieu's account of habitus. The five physical senses are socially informed, yet Bourdieu emphasises a sixth sense that he calls a *practical sense* or a *feel for the game*. Agents develop a kind of learned ignorance, or an intuitive sense of order, duty, honour, direction, necessity, humour, absurdity, beauty, balance, morality and sense of limits or sense of reality (Bourdieu, 1977:124). Equipped with this feel for the game, agents entering the game do so with a specific recognition of the logic and stakes of the game (Bourdieu, 1993:72), they collude with the logic by partaking in the game without questioning it.

Bourdieu likens this practical sense to that of the body that automatically stops at a red light when driving up to an intersection (Bourdieu, 2000a:176).

Men and women learn the sense of how to embody socially constructed notions of masculinity and femininity. Social injunctions inform the way agents exercise manners, walk, sit, stand, talk, eat, dress, use machines, make facial and bodily gestures, decide which emotions to express and how to do so, as well as deciding whether to use physical violence or not. A number of feminists however critique Bourdieu for failing to account for the internalisation of contradictions and complexities inherent in masculinity and femininity (Chodos & Curtis, 2002:402; Kraus, 2006:131; McCall, 1992:852; Moi, 1991:1033). Despite this failing, Bourdieu's concept of practical sense explains how men, for instance develop a sense of ease with the configuration of masculinity they do internalise, so that they sense when they are in the right place, or they have a sense of unease when out of place. This practical sense means knowing how to inhabit and maintain their rightful position which entails making minute adjustments in mannerisms when around people in different positions as a way of keeping within rank (Bourdieu, 2000a:141, 157, 176, 184, 2001:22-33, 62).

Having a feel for the game implies that agents tacitly understand what is required of them when entering a field, such as becoming a husband, thus they behave as they do because "it is the only thing to do" (Bourdieu, 1990a:11). Likewise masculine domination manifests as a cognitive and embodied structure "that is profoundly obscure to itself" (Bourdieu, 2001:37). Agents, who enter a field with a near perfect fit with the habitus, are predisposed and capable of playing the game. They take an interest in the game, have an investment in the stakes on offer and accept the rules of the game as commonsense. Consequently, agents do not behave randomly, rather their socialised commonsense orients them to do what is self-evident, and social forces structure particular practices as credible. The parameter of what is considered acceptable or unthinkable is linked to the logic of the field and to the history of positions in the field (Bourdieu, 1977:164,

1986a:110, 1990a:11, 64, 1993:18, 2000a:138, 157, 242; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:107).

Bourdieu emphasises that personal body expressions and “a tacit law of perception”, are the basis of a collective habitus, or a commonsense understanding of the world, for example, in common understandings of the notion of family (Bourdieu, 1996:21). Collective identities, such as husbands, the middle-class, gender, teachers and workplace managers, for example, are configured over a long slow historical process, and each type of collective habitus produces practices aimed at satisfying shared individual interests. Although not all people from the same class or group develop the same habitus, it is more likely that people of a similar class will develop a similar habitus compared with the habitus internalised by people of a different class. Particular men who experience particular social conditions will develop a habitus reflective of the collective habitus of a group of men who have shared similar social conditions and worldviews. Agents’ personal idiosyncrasies are never more than a deviation from the particular time or place in which habitus is constituted or expressed. Homogeneity enables practices to be synchronised without any deliberate calculation (Bourdieu, 1977:72, 86, 1985:725, 1990b:53, 60, 2000a:145, 155-157; Wacquant, 1989:41).

Despite sharing similar schemes of dispositions, Bourdieu emphasises that no two people and no two social circumstances are identical, that there is diversity within homogeneity (Bourdieu, 1977:85, 1993:46, 2000a:146). In short, the basis of a collective habitus is shared vision and shared positions, as embedded in agents’ mental and body structures. Finally, Bourdieu contends that “it is *only in relation* to certain structures that the habitus produces given discourses and practices” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:135), accordingly the habitus is relational.

3.4.1.3 Capital

Bourdieu's third central concept, *capital*, is used interchangeably with the concept of power. Different species of capital denote different breeds of power, dependent on the field of play. Capital comes in the form of economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. Briefly, economic capital entails accumulation of money or property. Cultural capital encapsulates embodied manifestations such as sporting prowess and other dispositions, objectified forms such as collections of art works or technology (including the talent to use the technology), or institutionalised forms such as educational qualifications. Social capital entails durable networks of intimate or close acquaintances, who invest energy in maintaining and setting the limits of the group. This form of capital is the foundation for the existence of groups, including families, or an entire nation. Group members share in this collective capital, depending on their level of contribution to the group, and together members set the criteria of entry and defend any collectively owned credentials. The extent of the network contributes to the volume of capital (Bourdieu, 1977:194, 1986b:243-251, 2000a:183; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99; Wacquant, 1989:119). Conversely, symbolic capital is considered to be a product of the above species of capital. Symbolic capital yields power in proportion to the level of social recognition such as male honour, prestige, credit, respect, reputation, admiration and love (Bourdieu, 1985:731, 1990a:22, 2000a:241-242).

“A capital does not exist and function except in relation to a field” (Bourdieu, 1993:73; Wacquant, 1989:39, 101). Hierarchies and categories of capital partly characterise the structure of a field, shape the stakes that the field offers and influence the regularities of the field. Individuals' positions are partly founded on possession of a particular amount and specific configuration of capital brought to the field, so agents' chances of winning the game are influenced by the capital they possess. Different forms of capital can be used to acquire other forms, with the main aim being to acquire the form of capital(s) most suited to winning based on the logic of a

specific field (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:241-242, 1993:73-74, 2000a:199-201; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99; Wacquant, 1989:39, 101).

3.4.2 The convergence of field, habitus and capital

The basis of Bourdieu's major precept is that individuals' practices can only be understood by comprehending the convergence of social conditions that produce the habitus within the social conditions in which people subsequently operate. Discussion here argues first, that habitus is most often homologous with the field, that agents' dispositions mirror their past and present position, and that their ongoing experiences can reinforce the habitus. Second, that the field acts as a censoring device further placing limits on people's practices. Third, that habitus does not always fit perfectly with the field, thus, despite objective and subjective constraints, habitus is not destiny. Accordingly, habitus is transformative, generative and creative. Finally, while individuals bring capital to the field, ready to use strategically as weapons to win the game, the logic of the field is partly informed by the hierarchy, volume and composition of capital. Individuals have a greater chance of winning when the capital they possess closely matches their ability to increase that capital. And their chance of winning increases if that capital is pertinent to the field.

“Both concepts of habitus and field are relational in the additional sense that they function fully *only in relation to one another*” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:19). The fit between habitus and field indicates that agents do not have to consciously decide what behaviours are appropriate, rather the habitus functions at a pre-reflexive level, generally out of reach of critical consciousness or the will (Bourdieu, 2000a:156, 178). The habitus motivates agents to enter an environment in which they feel at home, in which they can achieve the expectations and desires that are part of their pattern of dispositions, and that are also on offer in that particular field. The resemblance between disposition and position and the resemblance between disposition and people's material possessions and social networks are readily evident in people's lives (Bourdieu, 2000a:143, 150; Bourdieu &

Wacquant, 1992:12). Bourdieu likens this fit to being a “fish in water” where people take for granted the environment that surrounds them (Bourdieu, 2000a:14; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:127).

The principle of continuity and regularity guarantees that agents with the right pattern of dispositions will produce practices appropriate to a given field in the present. This occurs when past social conditions that produced the habitus resemble the present social conditions. Inherent in the habitus is a set of expectations, anticipations and hypotheses that may lie dormant until reactivated when entering a field with a similar logic of practice to that experienced in the past (Bourdieu, 2000a:169). The principle of continuity from the past to the present assumes that present behaviours cannot be understood solely by examining what currently appears to have provoked the present-day situation. This point has major significance for researching male perpetrators because, as Bourdieu asserts, practices can only be understood by relating the historical and social conditions that fashioned the habitus to the historical and social conditions in which the current practice occurs (Bourdieu, 1990b:54).

Within this framework Bourdieu emphasises that the habitus is a structured structure that is objectively regulated and that it functions as a structuring structure without obeying rigid rules or conscious goals. Rather, the habitus produces practices that follow patterns of regularity inherent in a given field. This suggests that habitus is adjusted to the logic of characteristics existent in any given field and as such, the embodiment of a particular configuration of dispositions makes it possible to predict how a particular agent will behave in a particular field. Dispositions are only converted into practice in appropriate circumstances and only in relation to a particular situation (Bourdieu, 2000a:149, 151; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:19, 74, 126-127).

Bourdieu further explains that where the habitus is out of line with the field, agents are still able to master the rules of the game if their set of dispositions closely relates to what is required by the field. If agents are capable of

making minor adjustments to their habitus then they will easily adapt to the requirements of that field and choose the most appropriate practice possible (Bourdieu, 1990b:62, 2000a:160).

That said, Bourdieu is hesitant in his use of the word “choice” as it implies rational action, a notion that does not fit with his model. Instead, Bourdieu asserts that for someone to be motivated by enlightened self-interest their decisions would have to be perfectly informed and that this is seldom possible because the time needed to deliberate and the extent of information required are usually limited. Consequently Bourdieu prefers to refer to choices as “reasonableness”, that is, what can *reasonably* be practiced at the intersection where the socio-historical conditions that shaped the habitus meet with the inequalities in possession of capital, which in turn meet with the constraints imposed by the field (Bourdieu, 1990a:11, 2000a:129, 140, 219-220). In any given situation, a person can reasonably be expected to do what makes sense to them at the time, given their life experience and given the bounds, censures, costs and benefits associated with the field they are in at that moment.

Bourdieu posits *the principle of action* whereby at the junction of habitus and field two histories mix (Bourdieu, 1993:46, 2000a:150), thus there are infinite possible practices that can result (Bourdieu, 1977:83, 1990a:9, 1990b:55). The range of possible practices is limited by the notion that “the field functions as a censorship” (Bourdieu, 1993:91) by advocating certain practices and penalising others. Various fields provide different options for agents to pursue, rendering some options possible and others as impossible, and thus causing different individuals and groups to perceive these options as sensible or ludicrous (Bourdieu, 1977:78, 1990b:54, 2000a:149; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:74). This conceptualisation opens the way for reconsidering why perpetrators are abusive in the home, for example, and may not be abusive in other fields. Because of the variety of options on offer, fields do not mechanically determine practices, although they do have an effect on agents’ practices. Fields have such effects because they present schemes of external necessities such as gendered division of labour, a

domestic moral compass, duties, cares, aesthetics and limits (Bourdieu, 1977:78). However, the more independent a field is from the influence of other fields, the freer it is to impinge its distinct logic (Wacquant, 1989:41).

The censoring devices inherent to a particular field can be reinforced or challenged by other fields that attempt to impinge their own logic, such as their own specific logic of hierarchy of capital. A field's boundaries only stretch as far as its impact is effective (Bourdieu, 1985:724). This interrelational influence across fields encapsulates the way the domestic violence legislation, for example, intervenes in the logic of the family field, thus opening the way for exploring men's perceptions of the influence domestic violence interventions have on their decisions to change. Despite men's perpetration of power and control in the family field, Bourdieu contends that the *principle of perpetuation* mainly lies outside the home in fields such as the state, religion and the education field (Bourdieu, 2001:34, 116).

Where dispositions are suited to the logic of a specific field, the habitus contributes to defining the field as a meaningful and worthwhile place to invest energy. As a consequence, positive reinforcement for continued participation is likely (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:127). Conversely, despite agents' feel for the game, they cannot randomly do as they please, otherwise negative sanctioning will occur. Additionally, when an agent's habitus is too far removed from the logic of the field, negative sanctioning is also likely (Bourdieu, 1990b:62). Bourdieu points out that regardless of negative consequences, people whose habitus is out-of-place "are the troublemakers who often make history" (Bourdieu, 1993:47).

The habitus, according to Bourdieu, operates by a *strategy generating principle* (Bourdieu, 1977:72), that he suggests enables agents to effectively deal with unexpected and endlessly changing circumstances. Bourdieu contends that although habitus, statistically speaking, has the propensity to reproduce the social conditions from which it was developed, there are opportunities to choose between a series of options and to transform

objective structures. This is partly due to having a feel for the game, which equips agents with the ability to adapt to an unbounded number of possible situations, which no objective rule can predict (Bourdieu, 1977:83, 1986a:110-111, 1990b:53-54, 2000a:219, 234-235; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:18, 133). The strategy generating principle opens the way for questioning why so many perpetrators continue to abuse partners given the feminist led movement for change. The concept of *illusio* (interest and investment in the game) and logic underpinning the relations of power within any given field, may go some way to understand men's resistance to change.

Agents have an interest in maintaining or accumulating capital. Capital is used as a "weapon and a stake" (Bourdieu, 1986b:247) to enhance an agent's chance at profiting from the game. Strategies include: maintaining capital, increasing capital, attempting to legitimate the value of their capital, discrediting the value of opponents' capital, or upping the stakes by instituting a monopoly over the sort of capital effective in a field (Bourdieu, 1986b:251, 1990a:64, 1993:73, 2000a:153; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17). An agent's chances of winning the game is enhanced by the development over time of capital and habitus, and whether this has led to possessing the required capacity to increase the chances of profiting from the game. In short, the more that capital increases, the greater the chance of profiting at the game (Bourdieu, 2000a:227). Different types of capital can be exchanged to increase other types of capital. The prestige associated with symbolic capital can be used in exchange for increasing social networks, thereby increasing social capital. The chance of winning the game is further dependent on an individual's position, but inequitable exchanges can create obligations, resentments and enduring relations of dependence (Bourdieu, 2000a:199-200).

Male domination, for instance, is based on inequitable relations of exchange, whereby, for example, men's economic capital can be symbolically exchanged for women's household services. This form of asymmetrical exchange is legitimised through complex webs of symbolic

power embedded in, but not limited to, the state and the economic field (Bourdieu, 2000a:103; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). According to Bourdieu, the foundation of the symbolic gender order excludes the possibility of an equitable return, leading to an enduring paternalistic dependence that he calls an asymmetrical relation of recognition and gratitude. The social organisation, that results from symbolic power, shapes men's beliefs and practices in relations with women. Asymmetrical relations are deeply entrenched in the habitus, thus men's dominating practices in the family field are deemed natural, self-evident with no need for justification (Bourdieu, 2000a:199-201).

Symbolic capital in particular can only be competed for and won from people with the same power. The game entails using dispositions such as male honour and prestige as capacities to exploit others to secure the profits of some instance of domination. Pursuit of this species of capital is strongly related to achieving recognition from others, and the more that a group encourages such pursuits and grants recognition to someone, the more power that person has, therefore more chance of winning the prize of domination, and the greater the chance of avoiding symbolic manipulation. Agents involved in such pursuits also do so because they possess a habitus that believes in the importance of gaining such recognition. In turn the more someone is encouraged to acquire honour and prestige and the more that the individual wins, the more interest they will have in reinvesting energy into the continued pursuit of symbolic capital. Bourdieu contends that symbolic capital rescues such individuals from insignificance and provides a source of meaning (Bourdieu, 2000a:226-227, 241-242; Wacquant, 1989:41).

In contradiction to the glory of social recognition, however, the underlying principles of symbolic capital imply that individuals derive their existence by living through others' points of view, they become entangled in a web of total dependence on how others perceive them and how others define who they "really" are (Bourdieu, 2000a:166). Bourdieu's account of symbolic capital entails a "cruel" existence for two reasons. First, it unevenly distributes social importance and a person's reasons for living. Second,

others can withdraw appreciation and recognition at any time. The endless attempt at acquiring and maintaining recognition is an intensely emotional one that entails surveying in advance how others may define the individual, then sacrificing aspects of the self in exchange for recognition and admiration (Bourdieu, 2000a:167, 241). Bourdieu argues that a man has a “duty to assert his manliness in all circumstances” (Bourdieu, 2001:50) and that manliness is “constructed in front of and for other men and against femininity, in a kind of *fear* of the female, firstly in oneself” (Bourdieu, 2001:53). Despite this conceptualisation, the underlying principle may prove relevant for some men when examined through a more nuanced masculinities lens, and thus has relevance for re-theorising male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse.

3.4.3 Power relations

The complexity of practices that occur at the intersection between habitus, field and capital are further limited by the intricate maneuvering of power relations. The central elements of concern that will be discussed here include: agents’ positions and position-taking, which are intermingled with issues of symbolic power and symbolic violence; the use of doxa (taken-for-granted assumptions that naturalise the social world) by dominant groups to maintain their position; and the concept *illusio* (interest and investment in the game) which demonstrates processes motivated by self-interest and investment, which have in turn been shaped by field, habitus, and capital. An understanding of the orchestration of relations of power is vital to understanding male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse.

Individuals entering a field take up a *position* that closely reflects their habitus, including the volume and type of capital they possess. Bourdieu contends that *the principle of vision and division* enables an understanding of the logic of agents’ practices. By vision he means *position-taking* – an agent’s worldview, opinions and judgements – that reflect their position (Bourdieu, 2000a:130, 183; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:11; Wacquant, 1989:40). By division, Bourdieu is referring to the ways in which fields are

characterised by an ensemble of unequal objective power relations, which in turn reflects the unequal distribution of position (and capital), and that this impinges on agents who are ranked hierarchically based on domination and subordination (Bourdieu, 2000a:99, 134, 216; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:13). Positions may also be homologous, but the *principle of distinction*, which Bourdieu suggests is the basis of human behaviour, sets homologous positions apart, because, although similar, they are not exactly the same (Bourdieu, 1977:17, 2000a:134; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:97; Wacquant, 1989:39). Distinctions exist between two seemingly similar people even though they appear to possess similar volumes of capital. For example, distinctions may be made between two men in the homosocial field because one may possess economic capital and very little symbolic capital in the form of heroism, whilst the other man may have less economic capital but greater levels of that form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99).

Despite the objective structure of positions, positions are also partly determined by agents. Here some individuals are resigned to maintaining their position, while others are more capable of changing position. Additionally, regardless of position agents show some evidence of effect on the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:80; Wacquant, 1989:36). In the case where agents determine their position, this is facilitated by perceptions of power relations that are inherent in their habitus (Bourdieu, 1985:729), while those whose positions are structured objectively, use strategies that agents use in any given game. For that reason, a male perpetrator's practices are best predicted by the agent's position (Bourdieu, 1985:739, 2000a:135).

According to Bourdieu, male domination operates through symbolic power and symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2000a:170-171, 2001:1-2, 116). Domination entails symbolic force and sometimes entails physical force, thus making it very relevant to intimate partner abuse.

Symbolic power is defined as the struggle for production of a common worldview and the struggle to ensure social acceptance of that worldview.

Symbolic power relations are deployed by the state, other agencies such as the church, the legal and educational fields, as well as by every group, including the ruling gender (Fowler, 2003:473) and by individuals in fields who hold institutional capital and who have been authorised to speak (Bourdieu, 2001:116). Bourdieu points out though, that individuals authorised to speak do not represent idiosyncratic views, rather they represent the desires of the groups who give them their authority (Bourdieu, 1987b cited in Fowler, 2003:477-478). The aim of dominant groups is to legitimate the self or a particular group, by justifying their own worldview, the social order and their own existence. For example, the state operates as an officially recognised authority vested with the legitimate power to impose principles of division such as marriage and divorce, and to regularise social categories such as gender, age, sexuality, competence, and social status, which in turn are reinforced by, for instance, the education field.

Groups struggle to regulate practices and to enforce knowledge and recognition. Groups struggle to gain monopoly over defining social classifications such as masculine/feminine, strong/weak and high/low. And they struggle to define the logic and limits of the group. Finally, individuals in dominant positions struggle to gain complicity for their point of view, manipulate situations so that others in the game experience a reduced degree of freedom between expectations and chances of winning and they exercise discipline and constraints over others. The state, groups and dominant individuals further use symbolic power to transform the discourses and concrete products that they originally imposed. They can change how the social world is represented, change that which they monopolise, and exert new bases of knowledge and recognition (Bourdieu, 2000a:175-177, 186-189).

The result of symbolic power relations is *symbolic violence* which manifests for recipients as “false clarity” (Bourdieu, 1990a:52). This is a condition that is buttressed by collective self-deception that, in turn, is only possible because objective mechanisms of symbolic power operate through habitus,

and thus orient people's specific interest in the game (Bourdieu, 2000a:192). They are further inscribed in language, and exemplified in such phrases as masculine strength and feminine weakness, which are used in everyday written and verbal communication (Bourdieu, 1989:14, 2000a:156, 244). The system of symbolic power renders male domination as legitimate through a mechanism Bourdieu calls *the twofold naturalisation*, which means that socially constructed discrimination is inscribed in bodies that are themselves a naturalised social construction (Bourdieu, 2000a:181, 2001:23).

This naturalisation process leads the dominator and the dominated to take the social order for granted. Given that symbolic violence is imposed uniformly on individuals, the dominant are also dominated (Bourdieu, 2000a:175, 2001:49). Bourdieu cites the example that men are dominated by having "to try to live up to the dominant idea of man" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:173). Given that male domination is objectively imposed on men's and women's habitus, Bourdieu asserts that alongside attempts at freeing women, it is vital that men also be freed of the strictures of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2001:114).

The *doxa* represents the domain of unnamed, undiscussed and undisputed fundamental beliefs and assumptions about the social world. This means that any knowledge of what actually produces the social order is relegated to the unconscious. Firmly established self-evident assumptions represent what Bourdieu calls "the doxic acceptance of the world, due to the immediate agreement of objective structures and cognitive structures" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:168). Nevertheless, Bourdieu contends that doxic beliefs are not pushed onto individuals through deliberate propaganda, nor do agents robotically submit to them (Bourdieu, 2000a:168, 176, 178).

Doxic presuppositions regard the gender order as natural. For men with doxic beliefs, there is no perception that the overall current gender hierarchy may be just one possible order among many, rather male domination is assumed to be grounded in natural reality. Agents whose practices are in

agreement with the doxa imply agreement with it, along with an ignorance of the social origins of aspects of the social world and the social conditions that make the doxa possible. Doxic beliefs represent ultimate forms of dogma, conservatism and conformity (Bourdieu, 1977:164-170; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:73-74). When agents behave in ways they believe they ought, such as using violence against another man at the pub, and if numerous others share in these practices, this collective practice becomes the basis of consenting to an agreed upon commonsense (Bourdieu, 1977:167). This collective reinforcement of the fit between habitus and habitat leads to more of the same behaviour. In this sense, doxic submission limits practices to the boundaries of the social order and such taken-for-granted limitations go without saying. The family, for instance, is considered a “universal norm”, so when a man marries and creates a family he enjoys “a symbolic profit of normality” (Bourdieu, 1996:23).

Doxa shapes the bounds of practice, which is not a problem for individuals who feel a sense of belonging within such confines. Conversely, those who are not raised in such a milieu may have had experiences that prompt them to question self-evident assumptions. Questioning, critiquing and challenging doxic assumptions occur in what Bourdieu calls the *field of opinion*. The field of opinion is the location of competing discourses and is divided into two realms; that of orthodoxy – which entails defending the doxa; and that of heterodoxy – which entails efforts to reposition the parameters of the doxa. The field of opinion provides the space to be aware and recognise that the social order can be different. However, the realm of *orthodoxy* is used by those wanting to defend the social order by using language aimed at restoring the doxic condition, or if that fails, at least providing people with official and acceptable ways of thinking and speaking that repudiate non-conformity. Unlike the doxa, orthodoxy is open to dispute so it is in the interests of dominant groups to maintain a strong boundary around the realm of doxa and to ensure generational transmission of doxic dispositions. In contrast to orthodoxy, people, such as feminists who explicitly question and reflexively challenge the social order, and who provide alternative discourses that expand social possibilities, occupy the

realm of *heterodoxy*. It is the realm of heterodoxy that dominated groups have an interest in expanding, as it is only in this realm that the full extent of the truth of the doxa can be uncovered (Bourdieu, 1977:164-170). The notion of heterodoxy is important for examining the degree to which perpetrators are offered the opportunity at counselling and stopping abuse programmes to engage in challenging doxic and orthodoxic assumptions.

For the domain of the doxa to maintain itself or expand, objective structures must remain as stable as possible, thereby increasing the likelihood of reproducing the status quo in agents' habitus (Bourdieu, 1977:165). Reproduction of the social order occurs when the habitus meets with conditions that are identical with the conditions that produced it (Bourdieu, 1990b:63). However, a perfect match between objective and subjective structures is not the universal rule (Bourdieu, 2000a:159).

Finally, the concept *illusio* encapsulates an individual's belief in the value of the stakes of the game, thereby leading to an interest and investment in the game (Bourdieu, 1993:18, 2000a:11, 102, 207, 222; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117-118, 173; Wacquant, 1989:42). The notions of interest and investment are vital to understanding male perpetrators' motivations and practices. Bourdieu states that obedience to explicit rules does not account for behaviours, rather *the principle of sufficient reason* (Bourdieu, 1993:18) explains that social behaviours represent some sort of interest and investment in the game. Upon entry to the game, inherent in individuals' habitus is a specific *illusio*, including a gendered *illusio* (Bourdieu, 2001:51), along with doxic assumptions internalised as a result of symbolic violence, all of which contribute to an agent's interest.

Investing in the stakes is a prerequisite for membership of a field. Despite that, it is only individuals with particular configurations of habitus that recognise the stakes and interests inherent to a particular field. Consequently they enter a field with preconceived expectations and hopes that particular stakes will offer meaning and direction. For those already in the game, the dynamics that occur at the convergence of habitus, capital and field generate

the impetus to invest continued participation (Bourdieu, 1990b:67, 1993:76, 2000a:208; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:98). Bourdieu claims that unless people are willing to risk ostracism they have no option but to play the game and thus invest in maintaining or improving their position and ownership of capital (Bourdieu, 2000a:153). Regardless of position, no one benefits from the game unless they take part, and accordingly taking part implies agents have an interest and commitment to safeguarding the field, their position and their capital, for instance, some men have a vested interest in safeguarding masculine honour and reputation (Bourdieu, 1986b:250, 2000a:153, 243; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:173; Wacquant, 1989:40).

At a collective level, individuals who cooperatively share in the competition and stakes of the game also share common fundamental interests in it. They share a more or less conscious self-evident sense that the processes and objectives of the game are worthy, requiring no explicit justification for wanting to play. In fact, when questioned, they may not be able to voice any explicit reasoning believing the game makes commonsense (Bourdieu, 2000a:11, 102, 239).

3.4.4 Mechanisms that enable change

Central to Bourdieu's theory is the notion of time and history, and the notion of ongoing change. Bourdieu's main emphasis is the relational configuration that occurs at the intersection where habitus, field and capital meet, consequently the range of possible practices is infinite, albeit within socio-historical bounds (Bourdieu, 1977:83, 1990a:9, 1990b:55). Discussion thus far has demonstrated that agents are adaptable and strategic in their practices, and that fields do not robotically shape agents' practices (Bourdieu, 1990b:55). The following discussion outlines the many possibilities put forward by Bourdieu that open the way for individual and social change.

Against critiques that Bourdieu's theory is purely about reproduction, Bourdieu often points out that ironclad links between expectations and

opportunities can be broken, or that such links are often not ironclad in the first place (Bourdieu, 2000a:234). Bourdieu proffers the notion of *twofold uncertainty* which suggests, first, that aspects of objective structures, including rules, are open to interpretation, and that playing with rules is an acceptable component of the game (Bourdieu, 2000a:235; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:18). Second, aspects of subjective structures, such as a feel for the game, can engender a latitude of free rein, thus effecting desired outcomes. A further condition that increases the scope for diverse expression occurs when agents occupy contradictory positions, or when there is a level of awkwardness in the fit between habitus and position. Both conditions can prompt conscious choices that lead to alternative practices (Bourdieu, 2000a:160, 163).

An imperfect fit between habitus and position enables habitus to be characterised by the existence of an open system of dispositions, the notion of variation, and constant revision over a lifetime – the latter qualities which contrast with the dominant social order. While such revision is never radical, it does demonstrate that habitus “helps determine what transforms it” (Bourdieu, 2000a:140, 149, 161; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:133).

Agents who operate through a form of reflexive analysis are never fully determined by the external world, rather incorporation occurs in varying degrees, based on the extent that agents determine themselves. Reflexivity invokes agency, opening the space for altering perceptions, monitoring what causes the inclination to automatically fit dispositions with position, and thus enabling different responses (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:136). Any mechanistic actions resulting from a feel for the game further depend on an individual’s level of flexibility, their position, the area of activity and the current situation (Bourdieu, 2000a:161). Individual events such as encounters and affairs can change an agent’s life direction (Bourdieu, 1986a:110). Although Bourdieu acknowledges the feminist movement for generally breaking men’s and women’s mutual gender reinforcement (Bourdieu, 2001:88) in western societies, Adkins argues that rather than freedom from gender, reflexivity has entailed “actively reworking the social

categories of gender” (Adkins, 2004:9). Adkins’s point has implications when rethinking perpetrators’ engagement with domestic violence interventions.

Change in the social order is further made possible by the notion that dispositions weaken through lack of use because people’s positions change, or dispositions become obsolete because social conditions change. Collective events such as wars, crises or rapid social change contribute to shifting agents’ practices, as do modifications in the structure of fields themselves (Bourdieu, 1986a:110, 2000a:160-162). One modification that Bourdieu believes is necessary for change to occur necessitates the alteration of the distribution and relative volume of forms of capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:18). Characteristics inherent in fields already provide scope for change to take place. These characteristics entail diversity in social conditions including an array of probabilities (Bourdieu, 1990b:60), thus the certainty of rewards, profits and sanctions is indeterminate (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:18).

A problem here though, is the inertia of the habitus (Bourdieu, 2000a:172, 2001:89; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:130). The *principle of time and lag* means that dispositions can fall out of sync with changing social conditions, causing some people to be slow to keep up with external changes, especially individuals whose habitus was perfectly adapted to previous social conditions. Some groups’ practices persist beyond changes in social conditions. For the sake of researching male perpetrators, it is important to take account of the relatively permanent aspects of habitus that remain concealed despite obvious objective changes (Bourdieu, 1993:87).

In conclusion, Bourdieu’s model has shown that field, habitus and capital never operate separately. Rather, they function together as a complex relational configuration, where subjective and objective histories mix and yield infinite possible practices, albeit within the constraints of the field. The field operates by its own particular logic and functions as a game in which people hold different positions, some of which are more dominant

than others. Positions in turn reflect particular worldviews, possession of capital, and their interest and investment in the stakes of the game. The game is played differently depending on this configuration.

Habitus is mainly formed early in life although it is continually revised across time and place, thus change is inevitable. People's scheme of dispositions is affected by symbolic violence whereby those in dominant positions attempt to put forward their worldview as commonsense. When such symbolic power is effective people internalise the social order, believing that gendered power relations are a natural and legitimate phenomenon. Although people do challenge commonsense assumptions and thus effect changes to the social order, they risk being defeated by those pushing orthodox views aimed at maintaining the social order and they may also risk being shunned by others.

Despite constraints inherent in fields, habitus is generative, creative and transformative. While individuals are both passive and active agents, they are structured and able to re-structure society, thus enabling the idea that perpetrators are both abusive and loving, as well as both resistant to and desirous of change. Bourdieu's ability to portray society and individuals as more than dichotomous, as more than unconscious or conscious, as relational rather than separate entities, permits male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse to be rethought. His fine-grained tenets open the way for reconsidering the idea that men's relationships with men influence their relations with women.

As a consequence, Bourdieu's concepts are important for gaining a nuanced understanding of men's social conditioning and their subsequent reproduction or refashioning of that conditioning. The concept field is of particular relevance for expanding an understanding of male perpetrators' daily lives outside of the family and for uncovering the ways men engage with different enablers and constraints in different fields, thus building greater knowledge of the social influences on men's abuse of women. Bourdieu's conceptualisations of capital and *illusio* importantly permit new

ideas about what motivates men to be either caring or abusive against their partners, as well as what motivates men to change.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has argued for a nuanced theoretical framework to support the current qualitative research with men who abuse their female partners. This argument has been made in response to the dominant perspectives that explain male perpetrators' use of physical and psychological abuse and control against their female partners. Consequently, this chapter has argued for the combined use of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory to develop a nuanced theoretical framework in order to rethink male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse.

It has been shown that Connell's work contends that multiple masculinities and femininities are crucial to the way gender is practiced at the face-to-face level and in relation with social structures. Men may resist, or conform, to multiple ideological and material configurations of masculinity offered across time and place. Nevertheless masculinities are only formed as men act, they do not exist prior to social interaction, and men's violence and control entails the need to practice a particular configuration of masculinity. Connell's theory incorporates a model of hierarchical relationships between particular configurations of masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity holds the highest position on the hierarchy, while complicit masculinity condones this, but may not actively engage in pursuing a higher position. Subordinated and marginalised masculinities represent men who engage in effeminate behaviours as well as men from non-white races and men from working-class situations. Men are positioned differently in relation to power, although patterns of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities do mutually influence each other.

These patterns are collectively defined and sustained through strategies that police behaviours, for instance men are denigrated or physically attacked for

practicing femininities. Despite the divisions amongst men, all men receive a patriarchal dividend from the collective project of men's domination over women, thus men on the whole have an interest in maintaining the status quo. However, the salience of Connell's concept that masculine practices are replete with internal complexity and contradiction allows for a detailed examination of the costs that men experience living in a patriarchal society as well as their interests in breaking the gender patterns.

This chapter has shown that Bourdieu goes beyond the immediate manifestation of individuals and their circumstances and sees a much more complex and nuanced way in which social concepts impinge on behaviour. Bourdieu demonstrates that remote elements such as income and education are salient to an individual's social positioning as is their biographical trajectory that has informed their habitus. Individuals are subject to a double structuring in that social structures such as race, gender and class shape the habitus and individuals act as creative agents able to structure the field. When an individual enters the field their personality and the socio-historical conditions that informed their habitus are applied to the field. The field itself has its own logic, set of capitals, positions, authorities and values. A man's decision to abuse his partner stems from a complex historical, social and personal nexus of material and ideological occurrences.

Bourdieu's model also highlights a range of factors that are at stake in making change. Perpetrators risk losing symbolic and social capital, yet at the same time such change would free men from the endless imperative pursuit of recognition from others. Change is made difficult by the doxic effects of symbolic power and the forces at play that inform men's interest and investment in taking up particular positions. Bourdieu's work is ideal for re-theorising the broader cultural principles of perpetrators' experience, as well as for reconceptualising men's micro workings of everyday practices in particular social contexts.

Taken together the works of Connell and Bourdieu provide a range of possible ways to reframe a theory of male perpetrators of intimate partner

abuse. Both bodies of work are based on practice theories. In the case of Connell, practices transpire at the point of convergence where multiple and hierarchical masculinities and femininities meet with social structures, ideologies, institutions and face-to-face relations. While in the case of Bourdieu, practices prevail at the convergence of field, habitus and capital. In both cases individuals' cognitions and physical bodies are shaped historically and socially. Men embody perceptions about gendered power relations, beliefs about how to relate to women, specific relationship styles and skills, along with interests and desires about how to be a man, drawn from a range of possible concrete and ideological influences. Both models emphasise the importance of bodies along with material and symbolic interests in orienting men's current practices, and both models acknowledge the costs for men who become entrapped in an endless loop of needing to be a man in front of men.

Both models offer ways of conceptualising individual and social change, while at the same time highlighting the collective practices that support the status quo, making the reduction and elimination of intimate partner abuse a slow process. Connell argues that strategies that police masculinities both encourage the pursuit of hegemonic masculinity, which is linked to men's abuse of women, and denigrate patterns of masculinities that encompass loving and caring practices. Bourdieu argues that symbolic power and the resultant symbolic violence, encourage the development of self-evident beliefs and practices about men and women, and that orthodox arguments abound in an attempt to persuade men and women to maintain an inequitable gender order. The notion of heterodoxy is important for examining the degree to which perpetrators do, or do not, continue to draw on doxic assumptions regardless of attending stopping abuse programmes.

Connell's notion of complicit masculinity makes the pattern of hegemonic masculinity a powerful and sustainable project and his concept of complicit masculinity is vital for researching other men's influence on perpetrators' abuse of female partners. Bourdieu's concept of the field allows for an examination of the relationship between complicit and hegemonic

masculinities across a range of everyday social contexts in perpetrators' lives, including school, sports, the pub and workplace. This examination across fields permits a deeper understanding of the social conditions from which perpetrators develop abusive or non-abusive dispositions that they bring into the family field.

Although Connell provides empirical examples of the way hegemonic masculinity is operationalised and sustained, Bourdieu's model augments the conceptual explanation of this. For example, the intricate and varied relationships between habitus, symbolic power, capital, doxa, reflexivity, field, stakes, interest and investment, position and position-taking are able to provide an explanation of how a given pattern of hegemonic masculinity manifests to include men's abuse of their female partner, especially men's choice to use non-physical forms of control.

Since the research method used in this project was abductive, Connell's and Bourdieu's theories were used to guide the data collection and data analyses. The next chapter will outline the research methods that were used to carry out the current project. The research methods were specifically guided by a methodology stemming from epistemologies that underpin Connell's and Bourdieu's theories, including the notion that individual men's knowledge is contextual. Therefore the influence of the context of the interview situation is significant for the kind of knowledge gained in this research.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Research Process and Guiding Methodological Rationales

4.1 Introduction

The theoretical framework described in the previous chapter identified dimensions that will be explored in this qualitative in-depth research with male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse and control. Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory guided the focus on particular relationships. Connell's theory enabled an exploration of the relationships between hegemonic, complicit and subordinated masculinities and the role of gender policing in the shaping of those masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity is positioned at the top of the hierarchy of masculinities, subordinated masculinity is down the bottom and complicit masculinity entails condoning the hegemonic project. It is this project that maintains hierarchies amongst men and the domination of men over women. Bourdieu's theory enabled an exploration of the relationships where habitus, field and capital converge and shape each other. Habitus draws attention to individuals' backgrounds, field focuses on the social context in which individuals position themselves, whilst capital provides a resource and motivation for individuals to act.

This method chapter proposes a strategy for data selection, collection and analysis suitable for capturing those relationships. This is an exploratory study and therefore utilises theoretical sampling (Mason, 2002:121; Silverman, 2005:130-138) coupled with an abductive research approach (Boje, 2001:51-52; Mason, 2002:180; Wirth, n.d.; Yu, 1994).

This chapter first discusses the way theoretical sampling (Mason, 2002:121; Silverman, 2005:130-138) was used to source participants and to raise

questions of masculinities. Theoretical sampling is not concerned with whether the participants are typical perpetrators, nor is it concerned with making statistical generalisations to other populations. Rather, theoretical sampling provides an opportunity to focus theoretically on particular personal and social characteristics that the men bring to the research project. The aim in this study is to offer a theoretical framework, which explores the ways in which normative frames of masculinities support perpetrators' behaviours. The theoretical framework that emerges can then be applied in other settings to explore the relevance of the propositions more broadly. This chapter includes a discussion of ways in which the research participants are, and are not, representative of men in general who attend stopping abuse programmes. The purpose of this discussion is to determine how transferable the theoretical findings are to other contexts.

Second, this chapter outlines the theoretical reasoning underpinning the interviews. Other researchers have noted that men are sometimes difficult to interview, thus discussion outlines the range of techniques used during the interviews to minimise potential problems and maximise openness and disclosure.

Third, this chapter discusses the stages of the abductive research project, which entails a three stage iterative process underpinning Peirce's logic of discovery (Boje, 2001:51-52; Wirth, n.d.; Yu, 1994). Each stage was guided by theoretical sampling (Corbin & Strauss, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 2004; Mason, 2002:121; Silverman, 2005:130-138) and narrative theories, specifically Ricoeur's triple mimesis (Verhesschen, 2003) and Riessman's (2002) narrative analysis. The first stage describes the preconceived knowledge brought to the research process. Matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994:239-244) were used as a visual aid to focus in on the depth and breadth of emerging concepts to help decide the next questions to ask. The second stage utilised Burke's (1969) grammar of motives to describe patterns in men's narratives. Concept mapping (Campbell & Salem, 1999) was used as a visual tool to aid these descriptions. The third stage began when Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory and Connell's

(2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities were applied to draw inferences from patterns in the data and refigure new theoretical knowledge about perpetrators. Throughout the discussion of these three stages, arguments are made that illustrate the epistemological standpoints used when gathering knowledge from men's perspectives.

Fourth, much feminist research in the domestic violence field focuses on women's perspectives but this ignores heterogeneity among women and men (Flax, 1987:642). Since the 1980s, with the adoption of feminist philosophies by some male researchers, and the development of critical studies on men and masculinities (Hearn, 2004:50), research *on* men *by* male and female feminist researchers has been conducted with a rigorous commitment to feminist goals, that is *for* the benefit of women. However, some researchers transferred feminist research guidelines *carte blanche* to their research with men. But not adhering to the complexities of gender, specifically the complexities associated with men, has meant an entirely new set of issues for feminist researchers, including potentially dangerous outcomes (Gadd, 2004:388; McKee & O'Brien, 1983:158; Owen, 1995:256; Taylor, 1996:112). This chapter engages with these issues by outlining the safety strategy implemented in this research.

Finally, the procedures involved in recruiting participants and arranging interviews, problems and delays that arose during those processes, and the ethical considerations will each be briefly outlined.

4.2 Selection

This study involved qualitative in-depth face-to-face semi-structured interviews with 16 heterosexual men aged 26 to 60. To be eligible for the research project the men had to fit the following criteria: admit to having been physically violent and/or emotionally, intellectually, sexually or financially controlling of a live-in female partner; be of white European

ancestry; be born and schooled in either Australia or New Zealand; be 18 years of age or over; must not be on parole.

The criterion that men admit to abusing their partners was based on the notion that, compared to men who are still denying their abusive behaviours, such men may be more likely to be forthcoming with information useful to effect change for the benefit of women. Interviews were conducted with facilitators of these programmes (Appendix 5) in order to discover the ways interviewees were, or were not, representative of men who generally attended the referring programmes. Although the programmes catered for men with physical disabilities, none of the men who volunteered to be interviewed had a physical disability.

The empirical literature suggests that perpetrators of violence and coercive control are often difficult to recruit (Bettman, 2005:90; Edmiston, 2005:86; Hanmer & Hearn, 1999:4; Harne, 2005:175; Hearn, 1993:10) and, unless they have been officially recognised as perpetrators by legal or social service agencies, they are often reluctant to publicly admit to their behaviours. When it is considered that more than 33% of women in Australia have experienced physical and/or sexual abuse by their intimate partner in their lifetime (Amnesty International Australia, 2008:11), there are enormous numbers of men who never attend stopping abuse programmes. However, advice from local practitioners suggested it would be unlikely that perpetrators could be accessed through places of work, community notice-boards, or newspapers and that it was inappropriate to access men through abused women who were in crisis. Practitioners did, however, confirm the most likely way to access participants would be through stopping abuse programmes or generic counselling services (PADV, 2000:2).

In the end the 16 men were recruited from five stopping abuse programmes and one anger management programme. The broad variation in demographics of men who typically attended those programmes matched the men who volunteered to be interviewed. This enhances the

transferability and fittingness of the theoretical framework to white men in other contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:124; Mason, 2002:122-124; Schofield, 1993:211; Silverman, 2005:130-138) such as male perpetrators who have never attended a stopping abuse programme, men who rape or are violent towards women who are strangers, men who abuse their power and control in the workplace and not at home, school boys who bully, and boys who are violent towards their mothers.

All the participants in this research had sought help to stop abusing their intimate live-in female partners. Given that the men were engaged, to some level, in a process of change, this meant it was likely they would be able to reflect on the normative framework that guided their abusive, and non-abusive behaviours. This then provided an ideal opportunity to explore logics, tactics and strategies that form these men's repertoire of masculinities.

Theoretical sampling was used to generate theory about male perpetrators by simultaneously collecting and analysing men's narratives. During, and after, each interview the data was analysed in order to develop the properties and dimensions of emerging themes and concepts (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:153; Glaser & Strauss, 2004:226, 229; Mason, 2002:180).

Theoretical sampling means it is not possible to be clear about the direction of the sampling path at the outset of the interviews (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:147; Mason, 2002:45). In order to lay a foundation to begin exploring the men's normative masculine frameworks, the questionnaire devised for the first interviewee was based on general topics and concepts (Glaser & Strauss, 2004:226), specifically concepts relating to Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory. From this point forward, the data analysis and the theoretical concepts guided changes to the questionnaire for each subsequent case, as well as probing questions asked of each man (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:146).

A problem associated with sourcing domestically violent men is that some perpetrators do not provide intelligible, lengthy or deeply insightful responses during research interviews (Gadd, 2004:396; McKee & O'Brien, 1983:151; Taylor, 1996:116). An indeterminate number of men was sought (12-18) which allowed for the opportunity to access a minimum number of men who were most forthcoming with a variety of in-depth material until theoretical saturation was reached (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:148). Although a precise theoretical judgement could not be made about saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 2004:230), there came a point where it was apparent that the men were not raising any new themes. Also an analysis of the themes that had emerged, indicated that enough diversity across the depth and breadth of the properties and dimensions of those themes had been discovered, which was sufficient for the purposes of this study (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:148-149; Glaser & Strauss, 2004:229).

Once general information about the men had been found, it became apparent they represented the capacity to maximise variation. This enabled the adoption of the logic of comparison, which entailed identifying relationships between men's social circumstances, between themes that emerged, and between theoretical concepts (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:143). This process enabled comparisons to be made within the narrative of one individual man as well as comparing narratives between the men. For example, Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory was utilised in order to explore the logic underpinning various masculine dispositions to perpetrate or respond to psychological abuse across four fields. This enabled a comparison of how configurations of masculine practices may be similar, or different, depending on the field.

Men of white European ancestry, born and schooled in New Zealand or Australia, were sought because this research has a strong theoretical focus on the interplay between society and masculinities. But practices of abusive forms of masculinity occur in a complex relationship with other social structures, such as race. The manifestation of patriarchal control varies across cultures (Cribb & Barnett, 1999:61; Crichton-Hill, 2001:204;

Gondolf & Williams, 2001:284; Holder, 2001:5; Mouzos & Makkai, 2004:32) and white European culture takes on a particular form in New Zealand and Australia. That form is similar across the two countries. Therefore, race was controlled for in the recruitment of participants because the development of habitus including knowledge about hierarchies of masculinities and the meaning of different configurations of masculinity is context specific (Bourdieu, 1990a:14; Connell, 2002a:65; Cupchik, 2001:4; Lincoln & Guba, 1985:230; Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis, & Dillon, 2003:17; Wacquant, 1989:43). The tightening of the research focus to the practices of white masculinities in these two countries allows for a more adequate understanding of a particular process of power and control against female partners, so strengthens the adequate transferability of the theoretical findings.

By controlling for race, this provided an opportunity to explore theoretical nuances. For example, two men were of European Mediterranean descent which meant they had experiences at school that marginalised their position on the hierarchy of masculinities because of their ethnicity, which is a lower form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243) than that held by those men of British descent. Whereas, the latter men who occupied low positions, did so because they held lower levels of cultural capital in the form of having small physiques, poor physical health, or by virtue of playing a sport that lacked social prestige.

Table 1 shows the ancestry of the men's parents. It also shows that more than 80% of the men were raised as Christians, more than 80% of their parents had lived in Australia and New Zealand for two generations or more, whilst all the men had siblings and all their fathers were employed when they were young. About 69% of the men's fathers worked in working-class occupations while 50% of them worked in middle-class occupations. Many of the men's fathers had more than one occupation, which meant some worked in working-class and at other times in middle-class professions.

The similarities and differences in men’s social backgrounds provided an opportunity to theoretically evaluate similarities and differences in positions occupied on the hierarchy of masculinities across four fields outside the family. This further enabled an observation of the variations and similarities in the ways social messages were embodied in their habitus. The dominant focus on the risk-factor that abuse in the family of origin is strongly correlated with perpetrators’ adult behaviours, leaves a major gap in understanding any influences outside the family. Therefore Bourdieu’s

Table 1: Participants' cultural, religious and socioeconomic background

		Number of participants
Parents' ancestry	Ancestry of fathers: Scottish/German (1), German (1), Polish (1), Maltese (1), Greek (1), European unknown (11)	16
	Ancestry of mothers: Scottish/English (1), French (1), Greek (1), European unknown (13)	16
	Most parents had lived in Australia for 2 or more generations	13
	Six parents born in Europe (2 of these parents were educated in Australia)	3
Parents' marital status	Never divorced	7
	Divorced after participants aged 15 or 16	7
	Divorced when participant age 10	1
	Single mother since participant's birth – he had several stepfathers	1
Religion during participant's childhood	No affiliation	3
	Various Christian groups: Pentecostal, Jehovah's Witness, Methodist, Church of England, Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox.	13
Participant's religion at time of interviews	No affiliation	10
	Christian	5
	Multi-religious (including Christianity)	1
Participant's siblings	1-7 siblings – fairly even distribution of brothers and sisters	16
Father's occupation – all employed, some had more than one occupation across socioeconomic groups	Labouring such as glazing, dishwashing, farming, chimney sweeping, machine operating, bus and truck driving, building and polishing furniture.	11
	Electrician, soldier, clerk, salesman, retailer, draughtsman, managing director, anaesthetist.	8
Mother's occupation	Housewife/mother – no outside occupation	8
	Housewife/mother and cleaning, secretary, administration, industrial sewing.	8

concepts of habitus, field and capital guided the exploration of various position-taking and masculine motivations to, or not to, use abusive and controlling behaviours at school, the pub, sporting arena, workplace, as well as in response to domestic violence interventions.

Table 2: Participants' current socioeconomic status

		Number of participants
Education	Left secondary school at end of years 9 or 10	3
	Left secondary school at end of years 11 or 12	2
	Completed apprenticeships: fitter and turner (1), chef (1), electrician (5)	7
	Completed certificates: horticulture (1), welding, refrigerant gases and maths (1), laboratory technician (1)	3
	Completed Bachelor of Education	1
Occupation	Unemployed - both men looking for blue-collar work	2
	Casual part-time employment (one of these men received single parent allowance to care for his daughter)	3
	Full-time employment	11
	Self-employed	3
	Blue-collar jobs in: machine operating and maintenance, fitting and turning, tree lopping, truck and forklift driving, factories	8
	White-collar jobs in: computer contracting, property investing, training and management	6
Income	Unknown	2
	\$26,000 to \$49,000	6
	\$50,000 to \$150,000	7
	One self-employed man's business earned up to \$400,000 but he could not say a true take-home amount	1
House ownership	Does not own a house	9
	Owns a house	7

As Table 2 shows, the men's adult socioeconomic status is similar to their childhood status. They are positioned across a range of working and middle-class occupations, income levels, education levels and home ownership. The two men who are unemployed were explicit about how long they had been unemployed. One had left prison six and a half weeks prior and the other man said that one month and three days ago he had ceased an apprenticeship that he had been part way through. They were both actively seeking work in blue-collar occupations.

This variety of socioeconomic experiences offered the theoretical sampling opportunity to compare the reasoning underpinning paradoxical masculine

reactions to other men's encouragement to abuse and control women. Despite this variation in social circumstances, and tensions in the way masculinities were deployed, it was observed that all 16 men had firm understandings of particular masculine codes of behaviour including who to abuse, where, when and how to abuse that person.

Table 3 shows the men's school years spanned a variety of geographic locations. One man grew up in New Zealand, whilst the others grew up in five different Australian states and one man had a short experience of schooling overseas. Most men attended city schools, many went to school in small towns, whilst five men went to school in rural areas. None of the men lived rurally now. So none of the referring programmes were from rural or remote areas, yet domestic violence in these areas occurs at higher rates than metropolitan and regional centres (National Health Advisory Committee, 2002:11).

Only four men never moved towns or schools, whilst some moved towns once to attend high school, and nine of the 16 men had moderate to high levels of mobility. Some of the men who changed schools, and some men who attended boys' schools, spoke explicitly about being bullied because of these situations.

Regardless of whether men changed schools or not, or whether they attended public, private, co-educational, or boys' schools, 100% of the men experienced bullying in some way at school. Only one man was never a bully, nor victimised, but he was able to name characteristics of bullies at school, and another man had minimal experience of bullying. Guided by the principle of comparison inherent in theoretical sampling, this mixed experience of school bullying enabled an exploration of paradoxes and tensions in the ways masculinities were practiced. For example, bullies were practicing hegemonic masculinities, boys who tagged along were practicing complicit masculinities, whilst victims who did not retaliate were practicing subordinated masculinities. However, processes here varied dependent on levels of interest in pursuing symbolic and social capital.

Table 3: Participants' schooling

Participant	Public/Private	Location where attended primary and secondary school	More than one primary/secondary school (Location & reason for change)	Portrayal as Bully or Victim
1	Public	City	-	Victim – later decided to be the bully
2	Public	Small town	-	Victim – learned to retaliate
3	Catholic boys' school	City	-	Victim who retaliated
4	Public	Small town	-	Bully
5	Public	Moved from rural to small town for secondary school	-	Victim who retaliated
6	Public	Moved from rural to small town for secondary school	-	Victim once – retaliated
7	Public	Moved from city to rural area for secondary school	-	Victim who retaliated
8	Catholic one year Public	-	2 x secondary – same city because parents split	Both (mostly bully)
9	Public	-	4-5 x primary – same city because parents moved	Victim – always retaliated
10	Public primary Catholic boys' secondary	-	2 x primary - same city – because it was closer to home	Bully
11	Public	-	2 different cities in 2 states – no reason given	Neither – but observed a lot of bullying
12	Public	-	4 x primary, 2 x secondary – several different towns – because parents split and moving with mum's work	Eternal victim – retaliated
13	Public	-	3 x schools different rural towns and areas – because of his abusive behaviour	Both, got worse after started work
14	Private Public All boys' & Co-ed	-	Many rural, towns, cities (includes one overseas) and different states – because of father's occupation	Victim – later decided to be the bully
15	Public	-	Approx 20 x primary, more than 1 secondary in same city – because parents split, or father in jail, other family issues	Victim – who learned how to fight back
16	Public Catholic one year all boys'	-	Several primary & secondary in different towns, cities and states – because parents sought new lifestyle	Both

The criterion that research volunteers be no younger than 18 was chosen because 18 is deemed old enough for a man to have a history of being abusive in a live-in relationship. According to information gathered from the referring agencies, 18 is commonly the youngest age of men who attend

stopping abuse programmes in Queensland. Despite this criterion, Table 4 shows the majority of men who volunteered for this research were in their 30s and three were in their 40s and 60s.

Table 4: Participants' ages

		Number of participants
Participants' ages	Men in their 20s	1
	Men in their 30s	12
	Men in their 40s	2
	Men in their 60s	1

Whereas higher numbers of perpetrators of intimate partner abuse are non-white, working-class, younger men aged 18-30, theoretical sampling in the current research provided the opportunity to develop a theory that included white middle-class older men.

All the men were white, they spanned socioeconomic groups and three were older. This meant the norms, rules, codes of conduct, frustrations and motivations associated with various masculine practices could be explored in detail. This also enabled an exploration of dispositions towards physical violence and/or psychological abuse and control and how these might vary according to class and age across multiple fields.

Fifteen men were asked for demographic details about their current or immediate past aggrieved partner. Table 5 shows information given by seven men about the aggrieved partner with whom they currently resided, the other eight men gave information about their immediate past aggrieved partner. Apart from the women's ages, the information the separated men gave related to the period when they lived with their partners. These men had been separated from their partners for one month to two years. One man found it difficult to say whether he did, or did not, live with his current partner. Although he slept at her house seven nights a week, it was decided to classify him as separated because they rented two different houses and did not have joint possessions or finances.

This group of men tended to have relationships with women of fairly equal age, and who had fairly equal socioeconomic status to the man. Of the small number of women who earned more than their partners they did so for only short temporary periods. In a small number of the relationships, women had higher levels of education. Given that these characteristics did not provide an opportunity to theoretically sample for masculine practices in relationship with women of higher or lower socioeconomic status, it was decided to compare masculine dispositions to working for female bosses.

Table 5: Participants' aggrieved partner

		Number of participants (15 men's partners)
Women's ages	Women were aged between 22-57	15
	Women younger than their partners Two women were 9 and 10 years younger than their partners	13
	Women older than their partners These two women were 4 years older than their partners	2
Women's race	Western European 13 born and schooled in NZ or Australia 1 born and schooled overseas	14
	Aboriginal	1
Women's religion	No affiliation	5
	Christian 1 woman was non-practicing	8
	Multi-religious	1
Education	Left secondary school between years 8-12	8
	Tertiary education Certificates in cosmetology, dental nursing, computer-related topics 2 women had Bachelors degrees in Education and Internet Technology	7
Occupation	During the years of living together, 8 women did not work outside the home	8
	Part-time jobs	2
	Full-time jobs	5
	Barmaid, administration, dental nursing, teaching, management	7

Psychological approaches to understanding male perpetrators find those men to have some form of mental illness at higher levels than among other men, which is often the result of family of origin abuse. These approaches also observe that alcohol is often implicated in men's violence. Whereas Table 6 shows that 69% of the men in the current study had never experienced any mental health issues, only a quarter of the men had a drug or alcohol issue at the time of the interview and 31% had never had a drug

or alcohol problem. Men who attended the referring Queensland programmes were screened for severe psychiatric disabilities, or other issues that cause danger and disruptiveness. This protocol is the same for many other Australian programmes (Keys Young Pty Ltd, 1999:117). This may mean that more perpetrators in the community have higher levels of psychopathology than those who attend programmes and those men who volunteered for this project.

Table 6: Participants' mental health, drug and alcohol issues

		Number of participants
Mental health issues	Past mental health issues relating to previous drug and alcohol use	2
	Hospitalised for post-traumatic stress disorder in the past	1
	Depression in the past	3
	Recently suicidal	1
	Depression (current at time of interview)	2
	Never experienced mental health issues	9
Drug and alcohol issues	Drug and alcohol issues in the past – no longer an issue	7
	Drug and/or alcohol issues at time of interview to the extent that their partners called it an issue	4
	Never experienced drug or alcohol issue	5

These circumstances provided an opportunity to theoretically sample for and compare practices of masculinities that occur in relationships with other men and the influence these practices have in developing mental health issues. It also provided an opportunity to explore the pursuit of capital that underpins any jockeying for position on the hierarchy of masculinities in the pub environment.

The criterion that men should not be on parole was used when sampling research volunteers, because it is an offence to interview prisoners released on parole according to the Queensland Government's Corrective Services Act 2006 Section 132 (Queensland Government, 2006:100). It would, however, have been legal to interview a man on parole if written permission was gained, but due to time constraints it was decided not to pursue this, as evidence from other researchers attempting to interview prisoners, found that gaining such permission would likely not be given, or if it was, could have taken months (Whiteley, 2006). One man that was interviewed was on

probation. To ensure the legality of this, the man’s Probation Officer was contacted and he gave reassurance that any research interview was subject to an agreement between the participant and the interviewer.

Table 7: Participants' criminal history and domestic violence orders

		Number of participants
Criminal record	Five men committed for one or more crimes Four of these same men convicted for rape and/or violence against a woman and/or a female partner	5
	<i>The following shows how many of the five men convicted of a crime committed which crime:</i> Traffic/driving offences including drunk driving (4 men) Drug offences (3 men) Home invasion (1 man) Assault policemen (1 man) Attempted murder of a man (1 man) Jailed on several occasions for assaulting men and arrested and/or convicted and jailed for domestic violence approx 30 times – 10 years jail overall (1 man) Jailed on several occasions for assaulting men and jailed for breach of DVO – 2 years jail overall (1) Jailed three times for assaults and bodily harm against female partner (1) Convicted for domestic violence (1) Rape (1 man)	
	No criminal record	11
Domestic Violence Order against the men	Ten men had currently, or at some time held at least one DVO	10
	2 of the 10 men have had 2xDVOs to the same partner 1 of the 10 men has had 2xDVOs to two different partners 2 of the 10 men have had 3xDVOs taken out against them, but one man had 2 of the DVOs squashed 1 man has had many DVOs against him but they had all expired at the time of interview	
	6 of the 10 men held a DVO at the time of interview (one man was currently disputing his)	
	Six men had never had a DVO against them	6

Five of the participants had a criminal record for a range of reasons as shown in Table 7. Offences included violence against other men, rape, violence against women in general, as well as violence against female partners. The other 11 men did not have a criminal record. According to programme facilitators three of the men with a history of imprisonment apparently represented the more abusive end of the continuum of men who attended the referring programmes. Despite this, facilitators were asked to

only put forward names of men they considered would not pose a danger during the research process.

Ten men had been served Domestic Violence Orders (DVOs) against their current, or ex-partners. One man was currently disputing the order against him, nonetheless he was accepted as a participant for the study because he did admit to abusing his partner, although it was obvious throughout the interview that he wanted to make a point that women are equally, if not more, abusive than men. This mix of men with, and without criminal records, the mix of offences committed by those men with records, the mix of men with current and/or past DVOs and the men who had never been served with a DVO, enabled theoretical comparisons to be made. Such as comparisons between various configurations of masculinity and various degrees of interest in pursuing different types of capital, depending on the censoring devices in different fields. These comparisons highlighted that, regardless of background, they operated from similar normative masculine frameworks. They had similar motivations to, or not to, use physical violence or non-physical forms of abuse and control against men and women.

Since 1989 the number of applications for DVOs has increased on a yearly basis from about 3,000 in 1991 to over 14,000 in 1999 (Office of Economic and Statistical Research, 1998-1999:31). However, very few men with DVOs against them attend programmes. Douglas (2007) concluded that magistrates were less likely to refer perpetrators to programmes when programmes charged a fee, which is the case for Brisbane programmes. Instead, magistrates were more likely to place perpetrators on recognisance of good behavior (Douglas, 2007:10). These findings mean there are more men with DVOs who do not attend programmes than do.

Given that several volunteers had experiences with legal interventions, this provided an opportunity to theoretically sample for their position-taking in response to legal interventions. Even some of the men without criminal

records or DVOs took up hegemonic positions on the hierarchy of masculinities in response to domestic violence legal interventions.

All 16 men had biological children and some had stepchildren. Some men had stepchildren in the past but in Table 8 only counted the stepchildren they had financial or emotional attachments to.

Table 8: Participants' children

		Number of participants
Number of children	38 biological children plus a 39th child due to be born one month after the man's first interview	16
	9 stepchildren	
Children's ages	<p>Aside from the child due to be born, children were aged 18 months to 34 years.</p> <p>The majority (approx 31) were aged 18 months to 12 years Approx 7 were teenagers and 5 were aged over 21</p>	

Describing men's contact with children is messy, so cannot be set out on the above table. Of the seven men living with their partners, four had all their children residing with them. For a fifth man, one of his children resided with him, the other three were old enough to have left home. The other two men had children by two women. The children belonging to their current partner resided with them and the children belonging to their ex-partner resided with their mothers. One of these men had contact with his child and the other man did not. One man, who lived on his own, had one of his children residing with him full-time and he did not have contact with his other children that resided with their mother. Of the eight men who had none of their children residing with them, five had contact with their children, one had restricted contact and two had no contact. Fourteen children resided with their father. Of the 24 children who did not reside with their father, 19 had contact with their father and five had no contact. Any other children had left home.

Eleven men had children residing with ex-partners. Seven of these men paid child maintenance through the Child Support Agency (CSA)¹. One man paid direct to the children's mother and one man had only separated the month before his interview, so no arrangements had been made to pay child maintenance. One man claimed an emotional attachment to his stepson but did not pay anything towards his financial maintenance and the final man refused to pay child support through the CSA or direct to the mother.

Men's experience of paying child maintenance through the CSA provided an opportunity to theoretically sample for their masculine position-taking in response to this intervention. It became apparent though, that of those men who were not separated from their partners, or who have no issues with the CSA, they all drew on a similar *illusio* and configuration of hegemonic masculinity.

As can be seen in Table 9, prior to attending the programme that referred them to this research, a high proportion of the research participants had sought help to change. Of those who attended the programme voluntarily they did so whether they had ever had DVOs against them or not. Some of these programmes catered for men who were violent to men, but all the men who volunteered for this project had attended the programme because they had abused their live-in female partner. Some men were currently part way through attending the referring programme. Three men had attended the programme between 18 months and 10 years ago and had continued intermittently to attend an ongoing stopping abuse support group.

The variation in the research participants' reasons for attending the referring programme, their stage of re-education, and the differing degree to which men had sought prior and ongoing help, enabled comparisons to be made in responses to what worked about the referring programme that might inspire

¹ The Child Support Agency is an Australian Federal Government Agency formed in 1988 to assist separated parents to take responsibility for financially supporting their children (Child Support Agency, 2006).

changes in masculine logics and practices and what configuration of masculinity is required to invest energy in accepting help to change.

Perpetrators are notorious for being selfish, so the men who volunteered for this research had changed enough to be motivated to volunteer their time, and sacrifice the cost of travelling to and from the interviews. Men who volunteered would have had a degree of confidence in talking to a stranger, to a woman and to an academic about a topic that perpetrators are renowned for not discussing.

Table 9: Participants' help seeking

		Number of participants
Type of programme that referred research participants	Stopping abuse programme	15
	Anger management programme	1
Mandated/voluntary attendance at programme that referred research participants	<i>Mandated to attend:</i> Condition of child residence/contact court order: Referred by Child Support Agency (1) Mandated as part of agreement to see his son – his ex-partner referred him to the programme (1) Condition of Intentional Correction Order: Referred by the court (1) Condition of Domestic Violence Order (1) Referred by Probation Officer (1)	5
	<i>Voluntary attendance:</i> Six of these men found the programme themselves (2 of these men had previously attended counselling at that organisation and one found the programme by calling Lifeline) One man was referred by a domestic violence centre One man was referred by Men's Helpline One man was referred by a marriage counsellor Two men were referred by their partners	11
Length of time at programme	Eight men were attending the programme at time of interview and were 5-12 weeks into that programme	8
	Eight men had attended the programme recently, or some years ago, of 12-22 weeks duration	8
Other formal help seeking	<i>Thirteen men sought help prior to attending the programme that referred them to the research:</i> Three men attended previous anger management programme One man attended one-on-one anger management with a psychologist Four men attended relationship counselling Two men attended individual counselling One man attended a previous domestic violence programme Two men attended many non-defined programmes	13
	No formal help received elsewhere	3

Given the level of many volunteers' motivations to change, this opened the way to theoretically sample for the nexus of habitus, field and capital that is required in order to respond with a favourable configuration of masculinity to a range of domestic violence interventions, including media campaigns that oppose physical and sexual abuse against women, bystander intervention as well and legal and human service interventions.

4.3 Collection

Two rounds of qualitative in-depth interviews were conducted. Sixteen men were interviewed the first time and 10 of these men were interviewed a second time. Dependent on men's responses to the set questions, there were a number of free-flowing questions uniquely asked of each interviewee. The relaxed structure of open-ended conversation style semi-structured interviews allowed room for dropping topics for which men had no response, and for probing deeply and pursuing pertinent topics men raised (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:268; Owen, 1995:250; Patton, 2002:342, 352; Reinharz, 1992:21; Schwartz, 2000:823). If men talked about their abusive behaviours towards their partners, the subject was not probed any deeper, because such information was not being sought. But when men discussed the ways other men encouraged or discouraged their use of power, control and abuse towards their partners, further questions were asked to uncover the dimensions of this theme.

The kinds of questions asked included: whether men saw violence and bullying as socially acceptable in one situation and unacceptable in another situation. Men's responses were sought to domestic violence interventions such as media campaigns, dealing with the Child Support Agency, bystander intervention, legal interventions and what men found useful and not useful about the stopping abuse programme. Men were asked what they expected from marriage, whether there was a hidden contract men took into marriage, what love and caring meant to men and what types of things women call abusive that men do not agree are abusive. Men were asked how

other men encouraged control of female partners and they were asked how men react to working for a female boss. The full questionnaires can be seen in Appendices six and seven.

Theoretical sampling enabled deep probing into these questions. When using the theoretical sampling method the researcher acts like a detective seeking clues that will expand and saturate theoretical concepts (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:144). The role of theoretical sampling during the data collection phase entails modifying questions to explore emerging theoretical concepts. The emerging theory controlled which of the men's responses to probe in-depth and which topics to discard (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:144; Mason, 2002:137).

During the first interview men's experiences of violence, aggression, abuse and control were explored across multiple fields. Many men discussed bullying at school and work. Some men said bullying was a game or a joke. Bourdieu's theory guided the exploration of this aspect of men's habitus further, which led, in the second round of interviews, to ask how boys are affected by bullying.

This led to an exploration of the norms of managing schoolboy behaviour by teachers and other authority figures to try to prevent bullying, which then led to the development of Connell's concept of gender policing (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:844) and Bourdieu's concept of censorship (Bourdieu, 1993:91). During the second round of interviews, which explored men's definitions of "successful masculinity", it became apparent that physical violence and psychological bullying represented practices associated with successful masculinity in fields in which censoring devices allowed those practices. This finding then gave leads to explore what a hierarchy of masculinities meant to the men. This exploration led to questions that expanded an understanding of the roles social and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990b:53) had in men's motivation to abuse other men and to abuse their female partner.

Despite following particular responses, this did not mean being certain where they may lead (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:144). Theoretical sampling is cumulative in that each case study builds on the previous case, which in turn informs which theoretically driven questions will be asked of the next interviewee (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:145-146). Some men were interviewed a second time which provided another opportunity to better ensure theoretical leads were more adequately followed, expanded and saturated (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:148).

4.3.1 Test interviews

Test interviews were conducted with the first four men. The purpose for this was twofold. First it was a strategy to cope with the issue of being a female outsider to discover what worked and did not work. Second, it was to uncover some general information to kick-start the process of theoretical sampling.

Being female influenced the development of the language used in the questionnaires. Females who interview men are outsiders who have to speculate how men will respond (DeVault, 1990:98; Laws, 1990:217; Owen, 1995:254; Reinharz, 1992:261; Taylor, 1996:111). Because Owen (1995:260) and Taylor (1996:111) were outsiders, and because there was a paucity of literature on their topics, they both experienced difficulties developing their questionnaires. They had difficulty deciding what language might best be used to suit the range of possible interviewees. Because this gender gap between interviewer and interviewee was experienced in the current research, it was advantageous that men were white able-bodied and heterosexual as these qualities closed that gap.

As familiarity with the men's language grew, this enabled the integration of participants' own terminology into the questions because this aided men's understanding, which increased the chance of gleaning quality responses (Reinharz, 1992:20; Reitz, 1999:147). Sometimes illustrative examples were used in questions (Owen, 1995:258; Patton, 2002:366) including examples

of what other men already interviewed had said. Or examples were given of what was popularly known about men, and then the interviewee was asked for his own thoughts about the matter.

In the first few interviews, some men struggled to give answers to questions. During the development of the questionnaire tips given by other researchers were used for how to word questions and possible prompts to use that may encourage disclosure (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:103; Patton, 2002:350-354; Ptacek, 1988:137; Reitz, 1999:147; World Health Organization, 2001:27). To encourage men to relax, interviews began with questions about sport, as it was thought this was a less threatening topic (Harne, 2005:182; Lincoln & Guba, 1985:270; Patton, 2002:352).

The complex nature of men's lives meant it was difficult to compose neat questions suited to seeking information about so-called straightforward lives. As an example, the first two men were asked for demographic details about their current, or immediate, past partner. The third man to be interviewed did not have a current partner and he had not been abusive towards his immediate past partner. Instead he had been abusive towards scores of previous partners. It did not seem appropriate to ask for details about a non-aggrieved partner. After this interview it was decided to alter the question and to ask all men for details about their current, or immediate past, *aggrieved* partner. This kind of alteration utilised the technique of continual adjustment (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:202). Any questions not asked of the first few men were asked of those men if they were available for the second interview.

4.3.2 Second interviews

Ten of the 16 men were interviewed a second time. The second interview provided an opportunity to ask a new set of questions to clarify, validate and increase the depth of data from the first interview (Reinharz, 1992:21) and to increase the opportunity to develop theoretical saturation (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:148; Spencer et al., 2003:156). Additionally, due to time

constraints associated with the rooms used, some of the first interviews had to stop before all questions were asked, so the second interview provided the time to complete the first interview. The questionnaire developed for the second round of interviews (Appendix 7) did not have to be altered after testing it on the first few men. Time and budget constraints, similarly meant some comments made by men could not be explored further, for example some men began discussing benefits and costs associated with using violence in one field compared with another. There was no time left to explore this theme further, therefore leaving a gap in the research (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:145).

The reason six of the men were not interviewed a second time was that three of them were not available due to work commitments and a fourth man was not able to be contacted. Two men were willing to be re-interviewed, however their work commitments meant making several changes to interview times. Ten and a half months had already elapsed since starting the process of recruiting participants and continually rescheduling the final two appointments was taking a great deal of time. Ten men had already been interviewed a second time and a pre-analysis of this data suggested that theoretical saturation of information had been reached (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:148; Spencer et al., 2003:156), so it was decided to cease expending effort in attempting to schedule a time to interview the final two men.

4.3.3 Interview techniques

When interviewed, some perpetrators can be elusive, ambivalent, superficial, avoidant, defensive, resistant or dishonest (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:106; Hearn, 1993:8; Ptacek, 1988:140). Other researchers offered the benefit of their experience by suggesting a number of techniques for minimising the above problems and for maximising openness and disclosure. These suggestions represent two ends of a continuum. At the non-judgemental end it is thought interviewers should create a conflict-free, emotionally unresponsive environment (Arendell, 1997:363; Harne,

2005:182; McKee & O'Brien, 1983:158; Patton, 2002:365; Ptacek, 1988:137) and at the judgemental end it is thought interviewers should adopt a confrontational stance and challenge misogyny as much as possible and dismiss men's sympathy-seeking narratives (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:101; Gadd, 2004:396; Harne, 2005:182; Lee, 1997:560; Patton, 2002:403).

This research was guided by the principle of mindfulness which meant an attempt was made to manage the tension between these extreme positions by adopting the middle ground (Patton, 2002:40; Reinharz, 1992:29). The goal was to gather information for the purpose of effecting long-term social change. An empathic and respectful approach was adopted and attempts were made to establish rapport with men's humanity and willingness to be interviewed, while at the same time holding onto the political position that coercive control and violence against women is wrong (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:96) and destructive.

Reinharz (1992:267) suggested "it seems dangerous to require rapport in all feminist research", however, anytime men in the current project showed underlying misogyny, or expressed sexist attitudes or behaviours, no explicit challenges or judgements were made in response. This did not mean the interview approach was unemotional, detached, indifferent or uncommitted. Taking a mindful middle ground enabled a calmness and ability to see more clearly a wider view. Bourdieu's (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:12) position was adopted, that at the same time men make choices to abuse women, their dispositions to do so are influenced by social structures. It was important, for the goal of effecting change, to gain men's insights into such influences. Holding a middle ground meant having the choice to draw on two extremes as and if needed. For example, if a purely neutral stance was taken this would not have meant following a rigid safety plan. Likewise, if any participants were abusive, being mindful would have enabled the setting of a clear boundary that informed the man such abuse was not appropriate.

There are benefits of being a female researcher when interviewing men who are elusive, avoidant and who give superficial responses. First, it is socially acceptable for men to discuss personal problems with women, so this may encourage men to speak in-depth more freely than they might if the interviewer was a male (Arendell, 1997:348; Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:99; Owen, 1995:262; Schwartz, 2000:825; Williams & Heikes, 1993:281). Indeed several participants said they felt safe sharing vulnerabilities with women, but not with men. Second, as a woman not having taken-for-granted understandings of men's masculinities, this meant that when men suffixed superficial answers with "you know what I mean?" it was acceptable to probe them for more detail.

It was also advantageous to have extensive interviewing skills including a heightened ability to listen sensitively and with self-awareness, as well as awareness of abused women's stories. Other interviewing skills used were openness, empathy and respect for the men's humanity, a strong awareness of men's abuse, misogyny and the effects on women, and the ability to quickly establish rapport. It was advantageous to have experience as a counsellor and trainer dealing with sensitive issues, including intimate partner abuse. Such experience and training met good interviewing practice standards suggested by the World Health Organisation (2001:10-14).

4.4 Analysis

Peirce's logic of discovery (Wirth, n.d.) was utilised to guide the data analysis throughout the selection, collection and analysis phases. This is an abductive research approach, which allows for each phase to occur simultaneously in an iterative cyclical process (Boje, 2001:51-52; Mason, 2002:180; Wirth, n.d.; Yu, 1994). Specifically, it provides a way to navigate back and forward between preconceived ideas, while describing patterns in the data and drawing inferences from them (Adkins, 2007; Mason, 2002:182; Wirth, n.d.; Yu, 1994).

Because of the dearth of knowledge from perpetrators' perspectives, this was an exploratory study, so abductive reasoning is an ideal approach because it encourages theory building and the development of ideas from multiple sources including *a priori* as well as emergent concepts (Adkins, 2007; Boje, 2001:51-52; Mason, 2002:182; Wirth, n.d.; Yu, 1994). Ideas that drove the development of the questionnaires and analysis of the data stemmed from personal and professional experience and previous empirical research and literature on related topics and fields. The ideas were further driven by the theoretical sampling approach, which entails simultaneous data collection and analysis. The analysis is aimed at deciding which data to collect next, in order to generate theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:144; Glaser & Strauss, 2004:226; Mason, 2002:180). Thus, ideas that drove the questions and analysis were drawn from the data itself and a synthesis of Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory.

Three methodological approaches were intertwined variously throughout each stage of this abductive research and theoretical sampling process. First, Ricoeur's triple mimesis (Verhesschen, 2003) provided a way to interpret men's narratives by understanding that a narrative is a composition that mediates between the man's unspoken life experience, his creative representation of that experience and the researcher's subsequent interpretation of his narrative. Second, Riessman's (2002) narrative analysis provided a way to excavate the social and contextual elements beneath men's utterances. Third, Burke's (1969) grammar of motives provided a way to distinguish patterns in men's descriptions which could then be interpreted using Connell's and Bourdieu's combined theoretical framework.

Finally, two visual techniques were used to aid the analysis. Matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994:239-244) were used to readily detect gaps to follow-up in the second interview and to detect leads to follow theoretically. Concept

mapping (Campbell & Salem, 1999) was used to readily detect links between Burke's (1969) dramatic roles and patterns in men's narratives.

This discussion will now turn first to describing the three methodological tools that guided the analysis. Following on from this, the strategies used throughout the stages of knowledge gathering will be outlined.

4.4.1 Ricoeur's triple mimesis

Ricoeur's triple mimesis (Verhesschen, 2003) was used as a theoretical tool to guide analysis throughout the research project. This is a narrative theory that entails three stages: prefiguration, configuration and refiguration.

Mimesis I is known as the *prefiguration stage*, which represents the quality of the men's life experiences before discussing them in the interview. These pre-narrative experiences include: multiple masculine values, motivations and practices; norms and practices by others such as teachers at school, colleagues at work and professionals representing different domestic violence interventions; as well as social messages and ideologies that are meaningful to various configurations of masculinity (Verhesschen, 2003:453).

Mimesis II is known as the *configuration stage*, which represents the men's narrative about their life experiences. The notion of 'mimesis' means that, when the men discuss their life story, they are engaged in telling a creative interpretation of that story. This is not an exact copy of reality. For instance, the beginning, middle and end of the narrative may not necessarily match what occurred chronologically in men's experience. Instead, in the telling of the story, the man's experience is a creatively re-assembled synthesis (Verhesschen, 2003:453-456). Riessman's (2002) narrative theory dovetails with Ricoeur's. She asserts that participants narrate responses to research questions in different ways for different reasons. Narratives may be fully formed, chronologically ordered stories painted in extensive detail. Other narrators may talk around a theme, while some may use hypothetical

narratives in order to summarise the meaning of actual events, yet others may respond to questions without any narrative form (Riessman, 2002:230-231). Although several different stories can be told to describe the same experience (Verhesschen, 2003:458), men draw their descriptions from their experience of socio-cultural signs and symbols including the words uttered (Riessman, 2002:218; Verhesschen, 2003:453). The story told depicts the men's current socio-cultural normative framework, and it is this framework that is the focus of this research project.

Mimesis III is known as the *refiguration stage*, which represents the reader's interpretation of the narrative. It is only when the men's narratives are read, that the configuration of their life story is completed. However, the reader gains revelations and makes their own interpretations of the narrative, which leads to transformation, refiguring and re-presentation of the men's story into a new story (Verhesschen, 2003:454). This refiguration occurred when Connell's and Bourdieu's theories were applied to draw inferences from the patterns that arose during the configuration phase.

4.4.2 Narrative analysis

Riessman's (2002) understanding of narrative analysis was used as a methodological tool to excavate the social and contextual elements beneath men's utterances. There is much debate within feminist and domestic violence literature as to whether men's knowledge can be trusted (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:103; Hearn, 1993:13; Ptacek, 1988:133). Feminists fear that men's knowledge may not be credible or legitimate, or that the symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1977:165) they possess means they may offer knowledge that advances men's dominant interests. Abused women, feminist researchers and domestic violence practitioners have consistently pointed out that men who perpetrate violence and control against female partners attempt to maintain power and avoid taking responsibility for their behaviours by lying, denying, minimising, justifying, rationalising and blaming (Buchbinder & Eisikovits, 2004:463; Cavanagh et al., 2001:696; Harne, 2006; Mullaney, 2007:237; Pence & Paymar, 1993:128).

Flax (1992:456) argues that the issue is not one of truth seeking, rather one of querying what authorises men's knowledge. Narrative analysis poses the notion that men's narratives themselves do not reflect truth, rather are representations of their perspectives, which themselves are already partial because they are rooted in the positions they hold within social fields. Different positions in a field reflect different degrees of power, different degrees of interest in seeking and maintaining power, as well as influence what can, and cannot, appropriately be said (Bourdieu, 1990a:32, 1993:91; Connell, 2005:34; Riessman, 2002:257; Verhesschen, 2003:461). Individuals' understandings and perceptions change across time and place and their re-presentations are also provisional (Bourdieu, 1990a:14; Connell, 2005:6; Riessman, 2002:234; Stillar, 1998:179-195; Wacquant, 1989:41). Additionally all knowledge is not accessible. Men's habitus partly consists of an embodied sense of practical know-how, a feel for the game that is internalised unconsciously, so they may be more skilled at gendered practices than they are at verbally articulating them (Bourdieu, 1988:161; Martin, 2003:344).

This thesis utilises a constructionist approach to interviews, which assumes interviewees are not people with "a single identity waiting to be discovered" (Silverman, 2006:132), rather the "interviewer and interviewee actively *construct* some version of the world" (Silverman, 2006:118) by skillfully weaving appropriately situated stories (Silverman, 2006:132) in accord with "rules for managing one's presence before others" (Silverman, 2006:130). Holstein and Gubrium's (1997:127 cited in Silverman, 2006:130) idea of "the active interview" means men's narratives cannot be interpreted as "simply true or false" (Silverman, 2006:153).

Ricoeur (Verhesschen, 2003:456) and Bourdieu (1986a:110) both assert that men's narratives do not reflect random utterings, rather men's normative framework is produced by the socio-cultural-legal-political and historical forces that structure habitus and field (Bourdieu, 1986a:110). Men's normative framework stems from the particular nexus of these forces that men re-present in current time in the current situation.

In short, the purpose of this research is not to measure the truth about the range and extent of men's abusive behaviours towards their female partners. Instead, theoretical sampling guides the aim, which is to explore men's current normative framework of masculinities and to generate theory to theoretically explain men's desires and choices to inhabit various configurations of masculinity over others (Glaser & Strauss, 2004:227; Mason, 2002:121; Silverman, 2005:130-138). One of the criteria for participation in this research was that men admit to having been physically violent and/or emotionally, intellectually, sexually or financially controlling of a live-in female partner. No further questions were asked on this matter, rather the research took a wider look at the social development of men's abusive and caring habitus and this did not involve asking any questions that would elicit the need to admit to, or deny, anything.

Because people can use communication and truth as tools in the struggle for power (Bourdieu, 1977:165, 2000a:198; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:144), male perpetrators must be studied with caution (Harne, 2005:173; Hearn, 1993:4; Ptacek, 1988:133). The interviews with the men were approached with an open mind, while at the same time listening to men's narratives from a nuanced feminist perspective and while holding extensive knowledge of abused women's experiences gained: by conducting research with women (Murphy, 2002); by two years' experience as a group facilitator at Hamilton Abuse Intervention Programme in New Zealand; and by counselling women on a one-to-one basis in a self-employed capacity.

The narrative approach underscores the importance of acknowledging not only the context of the text, the context of men's lives outside the interview room, but also acknowledges the interview context itself as a place that shapes what men say and how they say it (Cupchik, 2001:4; Lincoln & Guba, 1985:40; Ricoeur, 1994:154; Riessman, 2002:218; Spencer et al., 2003:46; Stillar, 1998:113; Verhesschen, 2003:453). Men's habitus includes a scheme of perceptions of the rules and parameters of participating in interviews. The interview venue was at a place where men's abusive

behaviours were not condoned. People the men liked, trusted and respected, who had referred them to the research project, were often present in the building during interviews. Each of these elements may have played a part in shaping the direction of men's narratives.

One of the principles of narrative analysis is the notion that the speaker and listener "produce a narrative together" (Riessman, 2002:223), with both people continually involved in refiguring what they see, experience and hear. Interjections made were based on theoretical sampling (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:144; Mason, 2002:121; Silverman, 2005:130-138), which meant focusing more deeply on some of the men's utterances over others. Regardless of the reasoning underpinning interjections made by the interviewer, they cause the participant to maintain, or alter, the direction of their story and, in turn, the interviewer interprets what is heard through their own habitus (Riessman, 2002:222-224).

Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:136) argues that researchers should bring a reflexive critical habitus to the research project in order to reflect on ways the researcher's power influences the research process. Rather than confessing their personal biography, Bourdieu recommends that researchers outline their sociological habitus. In this case, the sociological habitus of this 48-year-old PhD scholar is: able-bodied heterosexual female of Anglo-Saxon and Celtic ethnicities, born in New Zealand; of upper-working-class background; educated in New Zealand and Australia; guided by Buddhist principles; lives with a defacto partner; and is currently working as a self-employed counsellor and trainer. These mixed social positions, alongside cumulative personal and professional experiences, influence the political motivation to find pragmatic ways to resolve social injustices. This sociological habitus would have had some influence on the ways that the men composed their narratives.

Additionally, gender is constructed in relation with others (Connell, 2000a:218, 2000b:4, 2002c:viii). Ricoeur asserts that not only are people's narratives imaginative, they are composed through the act of will

(Verhesschen, 2003:455), therefore people tell their story differently to different listeners depending on how they want to be known (Riessman, 2002:224). Men practice particular patterns of masculinity in relation to female interviewers (Williams & Heikes, 1993:281). For example, several men apologised for using swear words during their interviews. Because of the influence the interviewer has on participants' re-presentations, this was behind the reasoning for turning down the offer made by a rural stopping abuse programme facilitator to conduct the interviews with potential volunteers. It was important to maintain consistency of one interviewer's presence across all interviews.

4.4.3 Burke's grammar of motives

Burke's (1969:xv-20) grammar of motives was used to excavate patterns in men's talk that could then be used to interpret their practices in nuanced detail. Burke contends that within the information men convey are sociological clues to men's motivations. Burke developed a model that guides researchers to look for a certain kind of sociological narrative, and to uncover key patterns in men's speech that reflect dramatic roles. The elements to look for are agent, act, purpose, agency, scene and attitude. Specifically, an *agent* is the person who is performing particular actions, or may be the person being affected by those actions; the *act* reflects what action is occurring; the *purpose* represents the reason why the agent acts as they do; *agency* represents how an agent does what they do – this includes the tools they use, for instance the use of the physical body to enact violence and the use of speech to enact psychological bullying; the *scene* represents the time and place in which actions occur and has an influence on the agent's actions; *attitude* influences how an agent may act.

This thesis utilises Burke's notion of the scene to excavate patterns that depict the background that motivates men's actions. The scene operates as a context, a backdrop, or a "scenic container" that motivates people to act. Therefore scenic containers can include a physical location, an emotional environment, a stopping abuse programme, men's attitudes, a social or legal

discourse, a set of ideas and values, historical practices or ideologies, or actual experiences, and so forth that motivate men's actions.

Each dramatic element is interdependent, so Burke's model uses the notion of "ratio" to locate the patterns of relationships between each element. Patterns that reveal a scene-act ratio enable researchers to then interpret how a particular scenic container motivates men to act as they do. The scene-act-purpose ratio allows the researcher to deduce the quality of the action from the quality of the scene, and the purpose underpinning the action in that particular context, for example.

4.4.4 Strategies used in the logic of discovery

Abductive research allows for the discovery of knowledge, and use of that knowledge, at every stage from the beginning to the end. Each stage is guided by similar principles to Ricoeur's triple mimesis. At the prefiguration stage the researcher starts with knowledge from personal and professional experience, which has some bearing on the choice of topic and approach to researching that topic. In this case Connell's and Bourdieu's theories were used to address the knowledge gap in the domestic violence literature and to guide the data selection, collection and analysis. At the configuration stage the researcher describes patterns in men's narratives, whilst ensuring these descriptions remain faithful to the participants' meanings. At the refiguration stage, the researcher reintegrates the analysis of those patterns into the theoretical framework, thereby producing new knowledge about male perpetrators. Strategies used throughout these stages will now be outlined (Adkins, 2007).

4.4.4.1 Stage one of knowledge discovery

Stage one in the logic of discovery (Wirth, n.d.), equates to Ricoeur's prefiguration phase (Verhesschen, 2003:455). This stage firstly represents knowledge the researcher brings before conducting the first interview, for example in this instance, knowledge about male perpetrators. Second this

stage represents the researcher's knowledge development whilst interviewing the participants and before the interviews are transcribed.

Before writing the questionnaire for the first round of interviews, the researcher makes a range of inferences, from a number of sources. When seeking a gap in the research literature and selecting the research questions, there was minimal experience of working with men as a counsellor, group facilitator or researcher. During the course of conducting this research, friends, family and professionals would ask about the research project and very quickly would intervene with their own self-evident perceptions that men who abuse intimate partners differed from the average man on the street, and/or that they had dysfunctional childhoods, anger control problems brought on by stress and/or that their problems were psychological. During the literature review phase reading hundreds of articles and books, these same conclusions were written from psychological and sociological perspectives. An academic background in psychology added to the tendency to "know" men separate from historical and socio-cultural perspectives. It was refreshing to find a few qualitative studies interviewing men from a critical masculinities' perspective, though some assumptions made are less nuanced than others (Bettman, 2005:264-265; James et al., 2002:15; Levitt et al., 2008:443; Lundgren, 1995:261).

It was difficult to think outside the square until "discovering" the empirical work of Hearn and Whitehead (Hearn, 1998a, 1998b; Hearn & Whitehead, 2006) and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory. These discoveries finally enabled the development of a questionnaire that could put aside the tendency to yet again explore common understandings.

The opportunity was taken to build on Hearn's (1998a, 1998b) empirical finding that male friends and family members support perpetrators' abuse of women partners, and Hearn and Whitehead's (2006) subsequent proposal that this was a central feature worthy of research. Rather than the feminist tendency to examine men's relationships with women, this research had a major focus on men's relationships with men.

During the data collection phase, theoretical sampling involved a deductive process, whereby Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory were used to identify relations of hegemonic and subordinated masculinities, by exploring men's dispositions and how these might look across different fields. The aim was to uncover the role that capital might have in men's practices and the ways men positioned themselves in relation to the fields of power and homosocial relations amongst men. This theoretical framework was used to explore the influences these fields might have in men's relations with women. Masculine position-taking was compared across an array of domestic violence interventions and to any interest in change.

As each subsequent man was interviewed, the theoretical sampling approach guided the comparison of one man's narratives with the next man's (Glaser & Strauss, 2004:227; Mason, 2002:124). After the eighth interview there were satisfying and optimistic feelings that the depth and richness of data was building as each man spoke. A sense of confidence was building as each man filled in another piece of the puzzle, or repeated the answers given by other men, thereby strengthening the validity of their responses. During the first five interviews there were surprising answers, whereas when nearing the end of the first and second rounds of interviews the answers were more predictable. This indicated saturation was being reached (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:148; Spencer et al., 2003:156) and also that theoretical knowledge about perpetrators was expanding beyond the preconceived ideas that kept crying for attention early in the research process.

After the 12th interview, themes were extracted from the transcripts based on the research topics and were entered into matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994:239-244). The purpose for drawing up these matrices was twofold. First it was to look for gaps that arose in the first interview and to look for clues to follow-up in the second interviews. The second purpose was motivated by theoretical sampling (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:145), which meant using matrices as a tool to identify rich information relating to

emerging concepts, in order to develop questions to further explore the dimensions and properties of those patterns. Using this visual aid helped clarify which topics to focus on and which to discard.

Full quotes were entered into the matrices, which meant the rows and columns were large. Nonetheless, it provided a quick way to see where men had either a little, or a lot, to say on particular topics because columns were long where one man might have made many comments on a theme, or columns were empty or short, where other men might have had nothing, or little, to say on a theme. Using matrices allowed for an easy visual comparison within and between cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994:239-244). It was easy to see where several men answered questions from a particular vantage point, so other men were asked for their opinion on these perspectives during the second interview.

Finally, by utilising the theoretical sampling method (Corbin & Strauss, 2007:153; Mason, 2002:180), the second interview questionnaire was guided by Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) masculinities theory and empirical studies that observed men's narratives render women and their experiences as invisible or trivial (Dobash et al., 1998:401; Eisikovits & Winstok, 2002:689; Goodrum et al., 2001:238; Hearn, 1998b:82; James et al., 2002:7; Ptacek, 1988:145).

4.4.4.2 Stage two of knowledge discovery

Stage two of the discovery of knowledge was entered after the interviews were transcribed. For the researcher, this stage equates to Ricoeur's notion of configuration. This meant analysis involved an inductive process of configuring patterns in men's narratives ready for interpretation at the third stage.

The methodologies that guided the configuration of patterns stemmed from a synthesis of Ricoeur's triple mimesis (Verhesschen, 2003), Riessman's (2002) narrative analysis and Burke's (1969) dramatisic model. The

rationales inherent in these models were used because they were congruent with Connell's (2002a:65) and Bourdieu's (1990a:14; Wacquant, 1989:43) epistemological standpoints, in that what men know, and what they tell about what they know, not only stem from their personal lives, but are intricately linked with social structures.

After each interview, the typist transcribed the audio recordings fairly close to verbatim. The tapes were listened to several times while filling in gaps missed by the typist and noting where men had used physical gestures instead of using words. For instance, one man rubbed his fingers together in a culturally specific way to indicate money instead of using the word money. Because the gesture was implicitly understood, no attempt was made to make the gesture verbally clear for the audio recorder. Additionally, intonations were noted that indicated emotions or attitudes, such as disdain, which provided contexts for arguments to be made when interpreting the data (Riessman, 2002:225).

No matter what form men's answers took in this research, Ricoeur's (Verhesschen, 2003:454) and Riessman's (2002:220) narrative approaches emphasise that the men's narrative identity should be honoured by taking care to maintain the sequential and structural integrity of men's meaning-making narratives. Looking for patterns in men's utterances, involved looking for similarities, differences, connections and relationships. For example, men described bullying as a major way they related to boys at school and bullying also occurred at work. Within the pattern that described bullying, were patterns about men's responses to being victimised and the rules that guided how to respond.

By applying Burke's (1969) framework to look for patterns in men's narratives that revealed the relevance of agent, attitude, act, scene, purpose and agency in men's strategies, it became apparent that within the category of rules, there were specific rules that guided when and why to use self-defence, when and if to initiate abuse, who to abuse, when to do so, what tactic to use and where to carry out the abuse. For example, some men acted

as agents in a given scene, such as the pub, and chose to affiliate themselves with other violent men, or co-agents. The agency, or method, the agent chose, such as whether to use physical violence or verbal taunts, depended on the purpose they wanted to achieve. The choice of co-agents, for example, was also based on the purpose, which, in the case of bullying at school, was to assure victory.

Concept mapping (Campbell & Salem, 1999) was used as a visual aid to excavate patterns in men's narratives by ordering them in relation to Burke's dramatisic roles (1969). For example, the concept map about the theme 'love' showed a significant relationship between scene-act. This enabled an examination of women's acts, such as breaking confidentiality and disloyalty, to then, be defined as a scene, that in turn motivated men to use violence. It was only by drawing visual maps that displayed patterns of inter-connected vocabularies of motives in men's utterances, that the prose used to describe these connections was able to flow with ease.

4.4.4.3 Stage three of knowledge discovery

Stage three of the discovery of knowledge was entered after the patterns in men's narratives were described. This stage entails the interpretation of those patterns. For the researcher, this stage equates to Ricoeur's notion of refiguration (Verhesschen, 2003:454). It was during this refiguration phase that theoretical sampling guided the application of Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory to make inferences from the patterns in men's narratives. When quoting men's talk to illustrate theoretical interpretations, men's original meaning was maintained by taking care in choosing the start and end of a narrative and, where needed, by including the research question alongside men's quotes (Riessman, 2002:220).

Any interpretive discoveries at this stage were bound by the patterns initially prompted by these theories (Stillar, 1998:179-195). Despite the fact that Connell's and Bourdieu's theories had guided the questions asked of

the men, stage three of analysis, now entailed examining what concepts resided within the patterns, in order to find new ways of understanding the masculine framework of male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse and control. Ricoeur asserts that it is not the men that are being analysed, rather their text is analysed in order to understand the men's world, and the normative framework they use to describe that world (Verhesschen, 2003:454). The patterns in men's narratives, for instance, were organised as if successful masculinity operated differently across the school and workplace fields. The patterns showed that the way these fields were structured shaped these differences. Therefore proposing that behaviour management strategies by teachers and norms of workplace management have a role in shaping abusive and non-abusive masculine practices.

Any aberrant cases (Mason, 2002:124; Silverman, 2005:132) that did not fit patterns were interpreted and discussed in relation to the opposing patterns throughout the three data chapters. For example not all men used physical violence, however, Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243) enabled a way to understand why a small man who never used physical violence, would instead use verbal abuse in order to claim a position mid to high on the hierarchy of masculinities.

By looking for ways the theoretical concepts worked in men's lives, it became apparent that although all the participants practiced hegemonic masculinity, they did so from varying positions on the hierarchy of masculinities. By asking questions to excavate the dimensions and properties of men's habitus, a striking finding was that men did have dispositions to love, care and empathise. But their drive to avoid practicing, or appearing to practice, subordinated masculinity was pivotal in men's experience, regardless of their relation to hegemonic masculinity. Regardless of the men's position on the hierarchy of masculinities, this central drive featured for all the men, and appeared to be related to their interest and investment in gaining symbolic and social capital.

By exploring men's position-taking in the homosocial field, it was noticeable that this bore a major relationship with their hegemonic position-taking in the family field. Data analysis at this stage of the abductive process allowed the discovery that men's position-taking in relation to domestic violence interventions differs according to the position they believe is taken by the intervention, or by the professional representing that intervention. This was salient in understanding why some men were motivated to pay child maintenance through the Child Support Agency, while other men were not. Finally, the notion of symbolic capital was able to explain why some men were influenced by other men to abuse and control their partners and why those same men were influenced by other men to reduce or stop that abuse.

4.5 Entering the Field

The following briefly describes the strategies used to recruit the 16 volunteers who came from five stopping abuse programmes and one anger management programme in South East Queensland. Discussion will outline constraints faced by a series of gatekeepers that caused delays in recruitment, strategies used to arrange and re-arrange interviews, ethical considerations and safety strategies. An extended discussion of these issues is recorded in Appendix 10.

4.5.1 Recruiting volunteers

The process of recruiting volunteers was broken into two stages for the purpose of meeting budget and time constraints. The first stage entailed seeking volunteers from organisations that were located within two hours of driving time from Brisbane. Stage two entailed seeking support from organisations at greater distances around Queensland.

Stage one began on 7 August 2006 when 14 Queensland organisations were sent a letter (Appendix 1) outlining the project objectives, the number and

type of research participants being sought, and information about what was expected from the organisation, should they choose to become involved. Along with this, they were sent the following samples: the information sheet that was to be handed to potential research participants (Appendix 3); the participant questionnaire (Appendix 6); the questions for the referring organisations (Appendix 5); the consent form for the men (Appendix 4); and the consent form the organisation was to sign before any recruitment of participants could begin (Appendix 2).

Delays occurred at every level of gatekeeping (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1995:171). Organisations were under-funded and management, programme facilitators and receptionists were over-worked, which caused multiple delays from deciding to agree to support the project, to informing potential participants about the project and to arranging the interview venues.

By the end of October, not enough volunteers were forthcoming, so stage two was implemented, which entailed seeking support from organisations at greater distances around Queensland. During the week before Christmas enough men were recruited from the original group of organisations. All the facilitators who were still actively attempting to recruit participants were informed and thank you letters were sent to the participating organisations.

4.5.2 Arranging and re-arranging interviews

The next major hurdle was arranging and re-arranging the interviews. Several factors had to be managed to make interviews happen. These included managing men's tendency to forget appointments, managing men's regular need to re-schedule due to work commitments and matching men's availability with room availability at times that coincided with the presence of staff, and managing logistics to make it easier for some men to attend.

Other male and female researchers have found men to be unreliable and reluctant participants whether they are perpetrators or not. As has happened

to other interviewers (Harne, 2005:177; Ptacek, 1988:140; Taylor, 1996:115), some participants in this research turned up late, cancelled at the last minute, or did not show up at all. These problems meant, as Ptacek (1988:140) experienced, making hundreds of phone calls scheduling, and rescheduling, interview times. Conversely, most men were on time and some were early.

Despite the extensive effort involved in making interviews happen, or indeed because of that effort, of the 19 interviews scheduled in the first round of interviews, 16 eventuated.

4.5.3 Ethical considerations

During the recruitment process men were handed an information sheet (Appendix 3) by their stopping abuse programme facilitator, which outlined a number of ethical considerations men could expect when volunteering. These included guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity, their right to refuse to answer questions and that interviews would last 1-2 hours. Before interviews commenced, men were asked to choose a pseudonym as a means of securing anonymity. Typists who were engaged to transcribe the audio recordings signed a statement of confidentiality (Appendix 9).

4.5.4 Safety strategies

Other researchers found that when perpetrators and non-violent men have been interviewed at their place of work, or at stopping abuse programmes, some have treated female researchers as sex objects and sexual prey, causing women to feel intimidated and fear attack (McKee & O'Brien, 1983:157-158; Taylor, 1996:113). The current research strategy was devised to cope with potential problems that might arise (Hearn, 1993:10) so that “as much control as possible” (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:106) could be maintained.

The referring organisations were asked to provide access to interview space during hours when their staff would be present. This is a common practice cited in the literature (Harne, 2005:176; Ptacek, 1988:135). Overall, 26 interviews were conducted spanning 48 hours. The World Health Organisation's (2001:10) suggestion to strictly adhere to safety procedures was followed, which could account for why none of the warnings of danger highlighted by other researchers occurred. An extended discussion of recruitment, ethics and safety issues that arose when entering the field, is set out in Appendix 10.

4.6 Conclusion

Because there is a paucity of qualitative in-depth research with men who abuse and control their female live-in partners, an abductive research strategy was used which allows for the use of *a priori* knowledge to help build new practical and theoretical understandings in an iterative spiraling process. In conjunction with this strategy, theoretical sampling method was chosen for developing a theory that makes a contribution to comprehending perpetrators' normative frameworks of masculinities.

Ricoeur's and Riessman's narrative theories and Burke's grammar of motives were selected as ideal methodologies to use in support of Connell's and Bourdieu's theories. The underlying epistemology of each enabled the discovery of interplay between individual and social contexts. This interplay was incorporated into ethical considerations for the participants and the adherence to a safety strategy throughout each stage of the research.

CHAPTER FIVE

Men's Relationships with Men

5.1 Introduction to New Knowledge about Perpetrators

These next three chapters outline findings from qualitative in-depth interviews conducted with 16 men who admitted to having been physically violent and/or emotionally, intellectually, sexually or financially controlling of a live-in female partner. *This chapter* explores men's relationships with men. Specifically, the role of physical violence and psychological bullying will be explored in relation to the men's struggle for position on the hierarchy of masculinities across four social contexts outside the family. *The following chapter* will explore men's relationships with women, including an exploration of contradictory masculine expectations when they live with women, men's perceptions of care and love, an in-depth investigation into psychological abuse and control over women partners, and patterns of masculine response to women with higher levels of authority than men. *The third chapter* will explore changing masculine practices and the changing social messages and socio-cultural and legal practices that influence those masculinities. The three data chapters will explore the interweaving of individual and collective masculine practices of men in this study with the practices of other men, and with practices by those who are authorised to represent a range of institutions, including schools, pubs, workplaces, sports, stopping abuse programmes and a range of other domestic violence interventions.

Interwoven throughout men's narratives will be findings from previous qualitative in-depth research with perpetrators, which will be used as a counterpoint, or a means of strengthening the current findings. These three chapters will engage in a theoretical discussion utilising Connell's (2000a,

2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) field theory. The synthesis of these two theories will enhance current understandings of perpetrators by deepening and broadening what is already known and by offering original and significant explanations that will pave new pathways towards changing men who perpetrate abuse, as well as towards changing those people and institutions that condone hierarchies that produce abuse.

5.2 Introduction to Men's Relationships with Men

The purpose of this chapter is to explore men's relationships with men for the purpose of understanding the logics underpinning their normative frameworks of masculinities. This exploration is aimed at excavating socio-cultural influences that contribute to men's masculine meaning systems and how these might differ within four social contexts: school, sporting arena, the pub and workplace. By exploring the logics deployed in boys' relationships with boys during men's early years and with other men across their lifetime, this chapter aims to understand ways other boys and men encourage or discourage perpetrators' abusive and controlling behaviours. As this exploration unfolds, the meaning that hierarchies of masculinities have in perpetrators' lives becomes apparent.

The impetus for exploring these relationships is based on findings by Hearn and Whitehead (2006:45) that the continuation of physical violence amongst men, and by men against women, is rooted in taken-for-granted notions of how to be a man. Part of this notion is the importance of men's relationships with men and the formation of masculinities within those relations. The authors propose that an exploration of relations between men is the best place to discover men's motivations for, and conformity to, physical violence against live-in intimate female partners. This thesis extends this research by also exploring psychologically abusive and controlling

behaviours amongst men, as well as their attempts to conform by using non-physical tactics of abuse and control against female partners.

Patterns in men's logics underpinning their narratives are excavated using Burke's (1969) grammar of motives. At the core of Burke's model is the notion of dramatis personae consisting of six elements: agent, act, attitude, scene, purpose and agency. Each element impacts on the other, it is this impact that will be interpreted through the lens of Connell's and Bourdieu's combined theoretical framework.

This thesis argues that men's relationships with men take place within hierarchies of masculinities. In any given social context, many men struggle for power and it is these relations of power that configure various patterns of masculinities: hegemonic, complicit, marginalised and subordinated masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity entails practices that dominate other men as well as women. Hegemonic masculinities include white, middle to upper-class heterosexual men, but not all men in these social categories actually fit here. Those who do not practice hegemonic masculinities may be practicing complicit masculinities, which do not engage in direct domination over other men and over women, but comply with the hegemonic project (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832). Marginalised men tend to be men from lower socioeconomic classes and non-white races including some ethnic groups that are at other times considered white. For example in Australia not all men of western European descent are defined as white, rather ethnic groups of Mediterranean descent are often marginalised by dominant groups and given the denigrating label 'wog' (Connell, 2000b:3). In western society, subordinated masculinities represent homosexual men who are defined by dominant groups as effeminate and denigrated using labels such as poof or fag. Heterosexual men who show any signs of effeminate behaviour are subordinated and denigrated using labels such as wuss or sissy (Connell, 2000a:31, 217, 2002a:6, 2005:79; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:837).

The impetus for exploring men's relationships with men across four different contexts stems from Bourdieu's notion of the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17). Bourdieu argues against the notion of an overarching logic inherent in society and, instead, suggests that society is composed of a range of semi-autonomous spaces of play called fields. Depending on whether men occupy a dominant, equal or subordinated position in the field, they are variously able to secure profits in the form of capital that are offered within specific fields (such as school, sports, the pub or workplace). Inherent to each field is a particular logic that censors which practices are legitimate, or not, and which forms of capital are most prized in that field (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1993:91; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17-19; Wacquant, 1989:39-40). Among the stakes on offer in the homosocial field are masculine honour (Bourdieu, 2001:472), in the form of symbolic capital and mutually beneficial relationships in the form of social capital that can be converted into symbolic capital.

Men's narratives are an outcome of the mix of the interviewees' and interviewer's habitus-field-capital. Narratives show that men respond to interview questions from multiple positions including: drawing on past events, present experiences, surmising about the future, stating views as if they are personal opinions, and stating views about what all men, or at other times some men, might believe and do. This chapter does not report the "truth" of men's reality, rather discusses men's normative frameworks of gender and power as re-presented in the interview context at this particular time of men's lives (Silverman, 2006:112).

5.3 Successful Masculinity

This section explores how hierarchies are socially constructed at the face-to-face and institutional levels (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:839). This leads to understanding which practices perpetrators define as "successful masculinity" and highlights the fact that this definition differs according to

the logic of practice in any given field (Bourdieu, 2000a:120; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117).

5.3.1 School and sports

5.3.1.1 Honourable masculinities

James reiterated the others' views when he said that at school "successful masculinity" was "*number one ... size and just presence... I'm a lot shorter than the average guy, people who were bigger than me got treated like the respect of a man, but I got the respect of a child in comparison.*"

Masculinities associated with large physiques are socially honoured forms of cultural capital so are bestowed with a privileged and powerful position (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243, 1990b:72, 2000a:171; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:172). Rigid oppositions between big and small and between strong and weak are socially constructed symbols (Connell, 2000a:26), which become inscribed in boys' bodies and minds in the form of perceptions and dispositions.

However, on its own, body size did not guarantee a position at the top of the hierarchy at the face-to-face level. By applying Burke's (1969) framework to excavate patterns in men's talk, it appears masculine practices were differentially oriented in response to physical size. Sam, a large man said, "*If a guy six foot two has a go at me I have to stand and I have to fight.*" For yet other boys, the cultural symbolism associated with size acted to protect their masculine position. For instance, Lazarus said a big boy starting at a new school was not vulnerable to getting punched "*unless there was another big fella there.*"

Links between physical size, physical violence and sport were complex. Although practicing physical violence and playing rough sports were markers of hegemonic status on the hierarchy of masculinities it did not necessarily follow that violence was always practiced as part of

configurations of hegemonic masculinities. At any given time, boys and men who played sport used cultural capital in the form of physical skills in a variety of ways depending on their masculine position-taking (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99).

By examining the linkage of scene-act-purpose-agency (Burke, 1969:15), there was a complex interplay between traits and practices, that varied between men, in order to achieve honourable masculinity. According to Lazarus *“the perpetrator was probably the good sportsman, or the biggest bloke, bloke with the hardest head.”* Bob added, *“Although a lot of the time a lot of the guys that were good at sport were violent at the same time. But I would certainly say that one didn’t lead to the other.”* Whereas Sam said such a boy would *“be in the same top of the food chain even if he didn’t fight.”*

Men’s position in a field tends to orient their masculine position-taking, but this is not always inevitable. Constraints in any given field also shape masculine behaviours, so the probability of practicing violence depends on the degree of match between habitus and field (Bourdieu, 1993:46, 2000a:153; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:11; Wacquant, 1989:41). Previous research into the field of nationally honoured sports, such as basketball and football in USA, indicates that sportsmen’s violence outside the sporting arena is actively encouraged by mechanisms inside that arena (Messner, 2005:318). Corporate sponsors and the media, for instance, impose onto the habitus of sportsmen particular representations that honour hegemonic masculinity and discredit femininity (Bourdieu, 1989:23, 2001:34; Connell, 2007:6).

5.3.1.2 Semi-honourable masculinities

If men could not, or would not, use physical violence, or did not play sport well, or had small bodies, some men would challenge authority as a method of gaining acceptance, as worthy males, from certain groups. This was a form of agency (Burke, 1969:xx) that Alex said was a means of *“buying*

their way into the group". It seems that the interviewees had some interest in gaining a position mid to high on the hierarchy of masculinities, but were not all in agreement with the most appropriate form of agency to achieve this. For example some interviewees considered bad boys to practice a popular form of masculinity, while others considered these practices to represent "*dickheads*."

Whether boys used physical violence, or bad-boy behaviour to climb the ladder of masculinities, depended on possession of capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99). Some patterns of masculinity included cultural capital in the form of physical size and the capacity to use physical violence (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243), hence this configuration enabled domination by playing aggressive sports. However those masculine patterns associated with lesser physical capability such as Geni's who "*was weak physically at school*" and was picked on and very lonely, would use the teacher and classroom setting as weapons in his strategy to climb the ladder of masculinities. He said, "*I was a proper little brat as far as the teachers went ... middle of winter I'd open a window, and the teacher'd say, 'Close the window'. I was challenging authority... Maybe I'm not making it with them in the playground so I'll show them who's boss in the classroom.*"

There was ambivalence amongst the interviewees about where academia came on the hierarchy of masculinities at school. The men perceived that their schools glamourised sport as a way of inculcating qualities of courage, strength, competition, leadership and the aspiration to win – instruments that can be used to serve the hegemonic project. Bourdieu argues this implies "a certain anti-intellectualism" (Bourdieu, 1993:122). This could explain ambivalence amongst the men, for instance Rick said that academia "*was never ... a point winner*."

Patterns in men's narratives indicate a relationship between act-agency-purpose (Burke, 1969:7) in that different men engage in different acts, and different forms of agency such as being a brat or bullying, but the underlying purpose is the same. That is, the purpose of deploying these

various abusive masculine practices is to show who is boss and to prove who was big and strong.

Chris said, "*The educational guys [were the boys] who you'd pick on because you wanted to prove to someone else that you were big and strong.*" Conversely, Sam, a man who practiced hegemonic masculinity by perpetrating physical violence throughout his school years, would use intelligent boys to help achieve and maintain his position as "*top dog*" because "*the brainwaves would help me get out of things a lot easier coz they knew the loopholes. They use their mind before I use my fist.*"

Implied in Sam's comment is a possible issue relevant to socioeconomic class, and thus to marginalised masculinities. It has sometimes been suggested that physical violence is associated with working-class men who are engaging in protest masculinity as a means of asserting some power (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:847). Whereas it has sometimes been suggested that intellectual strategising is associated with middle to upper-class men. However Bourdieu (1988:154) warns against assuming such direct relationships. It was rare for men in this study to raise issues of class, and of those who did, it was apparent that the relationship between class and hierarchies of masculinities was complex. Rick said the popular boys were middle-class based on the notion that they wore "*brand labels*", and Brendan said he was "*picked on at school*" because he just had "*the bare essentials and ... didn't wear the latest fashion.*" To the contrary, David said the bullies were "*the kids from a poor background.*"

This thesis argues that although there were a range of behaviours that bestowed some patterns of masculinities with honour, and that depicted domination and control over other masculinities, it would seem that some configurations are more hegemonic than others. The argument points to a hierarchy of masculinities within what constitutes hegemonic masculinity. Beasley (2008a, 2008b) makes a similar proposal arguing for a broader definition of hegemonic masculinity by acknowledging there are vertical

and horizontal relations within the category (Beasley, 2008b:98). This further suggests that men who abuse their female partners bring a habitus to that relationship that reflects position-taking from multiple possible positions within a range of hegemonic masculinities.

5.3.1.3 Dishonourable masculinities

Bill was the only man who included ethnicity as part of the hierarchy amongst boys at school. He pointed to the struggle between hegemonic and marginalised masculinities (Connell, 2000b:3) when he said that *“white, Australian playing football was up the top, and half a dozen wogs playing basketball were down the bottom.”*

Smaller boys at school, and smaller men in general, regardless of context, were considered to feature low on the hierarchy. This form of subordinated masculinity meant they were not deemed to be intimidating according to Sam who was *“six foot five, and a guy four foot two to me is nothing. A little boy as I class him, could be a full grown man ... but he’s no threat ... even though he might be able to kick the shit out me.”*

The interviewees were ostensibly heterosexual and their references to boys and men implied that all masculinities were heterosexual. Two men were asked explicitly where gay men came on the hierarchy of masculinities. Sam said, *“Down the bottom lowest scum on the earth”* and Peter said, *“That’d be way down the scale. Way, way, way down the scale.”* Peter was then asked, *“Is that the same even for any boy who’s not gay but is said to be like a gay, you’re weak?”* and he replied, *“That’s right, that’s right, yup.”* Homophobia sustains hierarchies amongst masculinities. In contemporary society *“homosexuality threatens the credibility of a naturalised ideology of gender and a dichotomised sexual world”* (Connell, 1987:248).

Therefore, some heterosexual men develop an embodied feel (Bourdieu, 1977:124) for how to survive in the homosocial field by practicing hegemonic masculinities in order to avoid the stigma of appearing

effeminate or any stereotypical behaviour deemed to be associated with gay men. Instead, to gain respect and acceptance by male peers boys would act tough. For example, Sam said boys lost respect from their sports teammates if they did not “*smash that person who’s hurt you, you’re going to be called yellow ... gutless ... coward.*”

Similar to men in this study, two thirds of the 24 men in James and colleagues’ (2002) study were perpetrators and/or victims of peer bullying. Those men felt that at that time verbal and physical violence were the right way to resolve conflicts and their peers pressured them not to perform “traditionally” feminine roles. Men said the effect of these experiences resulted in difficulties expressing their “softer side” (James et al., 2002:16-18). An American study that resurveyed nearly 1,000 young adults found that one pathway to violence against female partners stems from boys’ experience of aggression during their school years (O’Donnell et al., 2006:701).

5.3.2 Workplace

Cultural capital in the form of physical prowess (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243) in the workplace was considered important for doing masculinity in jobs that required the use of the body, whereas it was not important in jobs that required mental capacity. When speaking about apprentices being abused Chris said, “*It was kind of opposite [to school] because the ones that were more the blokey blokes got the worst treatment. The ones that were okay and said, ‘Yes sir, no sir, three bags full sir’, they didn’t get it so bad.*” Other practices deemed to represent high status on the hierarchy and thus defined by the men as “successful masculinity”, included leadership, hard work, experience, skill, solving problems and getting along with others. Men had a clear understanding of tensions and paradoxes in the logics of masculine practices and accompanying enablers and constraints, across the contexts of the school, sportsground and the workplace.

The men had a long history of embodying socio-cultural messages at school and their early working lives that condoned physical violence as well as psychological and verbal abuse. As a consequence, such dispositions were embodied in their masculine habitus. However Bourdieu's (1993:90-91) conceptualisation of the censorship inherent in every field explains why the men were able to adapt their masculine habitus in contemporary workplaces where policies now rule out physical violence. Instead, patterns in men's narratives reveal compromising so that practices fitted with the constraints of the field. During his description of successful masculinity in the modern workplace Rick said:

“If you're a loud person all the time you can assert yourself as being a more strong personality ... sort of dominant in my approach amongst the boys because of being a bigger mouth... You weren't flexing muscle, it was more about being assertive and being outspoken, which isn't really masculine, well can be seen as.” (Rick)

To conclude, according to the men in this study, hierarchies of masculinities and the definition of successful masculinity at school and the sporting arena entail similar symbolic and face-to-face attributes and practices. Whereas, from the interviewees' perspectives, the workplace field is changing, which influences their definitions of successful masculinity. Physical violence is no longer condoned there, but this does not mean the stakes in the game have changed. Although the men said many workplaces have anti-bullying policies, psychological abuse and control continue to be condoned. This shows that non-physical forms of coercive control are at the core that sustains the hegemonic project. Therefore it is important that researchers, policy-makers and domestic violence interventions focus beyond physical violence by addressing subtle covert dominating practices. Many men's habitus readily adapts to new constraints in the workplace because the loss of economic capital and loss of hegemonic status as breadwinner are costs too great to risk, which provides a strong impetus to change. The habitus perpetrators take into their relationships with women includes dispositions to seek honour for using physical violence and psychological bullying. And it includes the fear of appearing weak in the eyes of real and/or imagined men. However, men who do cease violence at work, when the regularities of

that field change, highlights the importance for political-legal-cultural changes to influence the family field towards democratic relations.

5.4 Positioning on the Hierarchy of Masculinities

This section focuses on men's positions on the hierarchy of masculinities at school and, for some men, across their lifetimes regardless of context. For some men who were reducing or stopping their use of physical violence, they modified their definition of "successful masculinity" so that they could still claim a high status on the hierarchy of masculinities.

5.4.1 Men know their position

Every man in this research had used one or more forms of abusive and controlling behaviours against other boys when they were young, against other men as they aged, and against women, yet they spanned the ranks on the hierarchy of masculinities from top, middle to bottom.

At the top of the hierarchy of masculinities was Sam who has "*always been top dog.*" Rick perceived himself to be at the top of the hierarchy:

"The popular boys I could go and hang out with them whenever it suited me to do so... I kinda swung between... I was one of the cool guys. I'll do whatever I fuckin' want, I don't care whether it's cool or not, I am cool?... in my own head I'd already elevated myself to a status like I've got credential... I can protect myself on a physical level, I can protect myself on the verbal level, so don't mess with me... I always thought I was in the top of the hierarchy anyway, whether or not people were telling me that." (Rick)

This practice of hegemonic masculinity in the form of fierce independence (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:840) does not mean opting out of the homosocial game, rather this configuration of masculinity is played out differently to boys and men who prefer to be a member of a group while they maneuver their way through the game. It is still hegemonic masculinity

when the intent and effect is to establish power over other masculinities and to maintain that hierarchy.

Anthony said, *“I’m an alpha male ... very strong, independent person... The alphas always dictate to the betas, ‘You will do it this way and this is how I want you to do it’.”* Although Anthony claimed, *“I’ve never liked to be in control, even though I am, and it’s usually by default (laugh) that I end up being there because I am the alpha male and everyone in the group of people pack around me”*, he went on to assert:

“I’ve never cared much for what other people think. I’ve been very strong to stand up for my own opinions, and own ideas. Probably not all that much help for your research coz I’m a very different male. I might give you slightly different insight from being one of those, coz what you may find you get a lot of males like I said form a pack mentality, the alpha and beta males and stuff and I don’t follow that.” (Anthony)

Peter thought those at the top of the hierarchy *“were wankers, dickheads... No substance or, errrrr [makes a sound like intellectually handicapped], what they used to call, they used to call them ‘The mean’.* So I certainly wouldn’t wanna, if you tried to break into that group.” Peter said that instead:

“I saw myself as an outsider... I consider myself better than, not that I’d go around, I suppose the more, for a better word, nerd, it’s not, nerdy type, ones that were no good at sport and into books and all that... I suppose I was not as bad as that.” (Peter)

Descending further down the hierarchy of masculinities, Bob, Lazarus and Chris considered their masculine practices to be, as Lazarus said, *“In mid range.”* Bob *“was in between the footy players and the doing the wrong thing group”* and Chris did not see himself *“in the top of the nerdy”* rather he preferred to consider his masculinity as *“one of the bottom runners of the tough boys.”* While Alex considered himself to be *“friends with everybody”*, but *“mainly I was friends with the nerds.”* Finally, at school, Geni’s pattern of masculinity was *“down the bottom (laugh)”*, which was also where Bill considered himself to be.

No matter where men considered themselves to be positioned on the hierarchy of masculinities at school, on the sportsfield, or at work, they often sought to have power over others, so shifted position by practicing hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005:78). This thesis argues that men who abuse their intimate partner – whether that is by using physical violence, verbal abuse, psychological abuse or various forms of structural control – practice hegemonic masculinity even if they may not hold a hegemonic position at other times or in other contexts (Connell, 2005:55; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:838).

5.4.2 Modifying the definition of successful masculinity

Previous to men's engagement with reducing or stopping physical violence they considered non-violent men to be sissies. Ironically, now the men were attempting to be non-violent, they modified their definition of successful masculinity so that they were not considered sissies.

Rick said, *"We're all doing a violence programme because we were over violent (laugh)"*, not that they were becoming sissies and James said that in the past *"if you weren't violent, for sure then you were a little bit lacking in the man department. But I certainly don't think like that these days."* While Sam reiterated others' views when he said, *"I'm a better man than I was."* Bill added that *"you don't actually leave being a sissy, there's just other ways"* and Lazarus turned the issue around saying, *"We're trying to become sissies. You can't be a sissy, but you can try and become one."*

Lazarus said becoming non-violent involved reshaping what is successful masculinity by *"tricking it up a little. Like if you have a car and you put a set of mags on it, you haven't changed the car, you've just modified it... Updating it."* He reiterated what others said in that updated successful masculinity meant *"a lot more thought goes into it ... and it's hard for me ... because the hand would move before the head was in gear."* Several men such as Bob said successful masculinity was now *"about having control [of] ... all of yourself ... You've gotta be a bit smart about the way you*

conduct yourself.” He added that relinquishing being head of the house meant he’d “*already kind of given up a little bit of my authority [by having] a discussion with my wife... But I don’t think I’m any less of a man for having a discussion with my wife.*”

A major problem with stopping abuse and anger management programmes is that some fail to address hegemonic masculinities that entail psychological and structural power and control over women – and over other men (Keys Young Pty Ltd, 1999:64; Robertson et al., 2007b:106; Stark, 2007:7). This means making changes at the local level, whilst not addressing larger-scale power arrangements. Instead Sam, like others, now associated psychological abuse as a skillful component of his modified form of successful masculinity:

“I can delittle [sic] somebody now a lot quicker than I can with my fist. I can bring a man down from where he is, high and mighty, down to a child... These days society’s changing, they don’t like violence. So if I can delittle [sic] somebody quicker with my mouth than I can with my fists, yup, I’ve learnt that over the last ten years.” (Sam)

Previous studies show that some domestic violence interventions that set out to protect women from serious physical violence, inadvertently lead many men to maintain hegemonic status on the hierarchy of masculinities by replacing physical violence with coercive control tactics (Stark, 2007:57). This goes against the feminist argument that physical violence is key to the maintenance of domestic violence. It also emphasises the need for domestic violence programmes to address men’s coercive control against other men as well as against women – they are interconnected.

To conclude, men’s position on the hierarchy may not directly relate to whether hegemonic masculinities will or will not be practiced, rather a better predictor is the level at which the stakes of the game are taken seriously and the level of vested interest in gaining symbolic capital. Even though physical violence may no longer be an option for some men who are seeking to change, some may struggle to redefine the rules of hierarchy and definitions of successful masculinity under which they have lived. To regain

honour and retain benefits held under previously accepted rules of hegemonic masculinities some men may reconsider their perception of sissiness as they are compelled to accept the path to non-violence. A modified definition of successful masculinity means many may continue to claim hegemonic status by abusing and controlling other men and controlling women in non-physical ways, thus social power structures remain in tact.

5.5 Determining what Constitutes a Hierarchy

Patterns in men's narratives reveal four main forms of agency that determine what constitutes a hierarchy of masculinities including: peer pressure, backing from authority figures, political and cultural policing of masculinities, and men's aspirations to receive recognition. These are each described in turn.

5.5.1 Peer pressure regulates hierarchies

Some interviewees said peer pressure represents the first masculine resource that produces hierarchies of masculinities. Neither individual men, nor peer groups solely determine hierarchies of masculinities. Instead, individual and collective habitus are an embodiment of the social conditions to which they have been exposed over their lifetime. Social contexts structure habitus, and men's individual and collective habitus structures social contexts (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:12-13). However, such structuring only occurs at the nexus where each structure relates to the other (Bourdieu, 2000a:151).

This explains why some men respond to peer group pressure, and why peers have a feel for which groups have masculine status, and which do not. Sam said that there was "*peer group pressure*" to achieve the goal of being "*number one*", whilst Chris added "*there was certain groups that you were ... aware of and try to stay away from, or you become part of that group, that peer group pressure thing.*" By adhering to peer pressure, the

masculine purpose may not be to reproduce the hierarchies and relationships that some men feel controlled by, but to gain symbolic capital in the form of recognition.

5.5.2 Authorities regulate hierarchies

The logics of practice some men encounter by those in authority in the fields of sport and school include condoning physical violence and psychological bullying. The norms of behaviour management by some sports authorities entail active encouragement to use physical violence. Sam reiterated others' statements when he said the pressure to be violent came "*mainly from the coach*" while Lazarus reiterated David's views when he said, "*You get other parents that egg it on. Like, I don't mind it so much when it's adults, but I don't like when it's seven year old kids and you got some parent screaming on the side, 'Punch him, punch him, punch him', or 'Kick the little so and so'.*" David added "*all the parents were on the other team. Yeah, it was a bit frightening for us, for sure.*"

A second norm of action used to regulate hierarchies by those in authority, is to set up formal situations for physical violence to occur at school, for example Bob said, "*We had teachers organising boxing matches... If you had a gripe with someone you'd say, 'Oh, I'll see you Wednesday', and everyone knew what that meant (laugh).*" Brendan said, "*There were a few teachers ... that let the fights happen. Just made sure we shook hands after it. I still believe that's how things should be sorted out.*" Congruent with the norm that some teachers condone physical violence amongst boys, Bob added:

"Even if somebody did complain, not a lot was done. The two involved would be called into somebody's office, 'You blokes shake hands and that'll be that', and you'd shake hands in front of the teacher and the next day (laugh), back into it again." (Bob)

A third normative frame interviewees describe authorities utilising infers that authorities ensure the continuation of hierarchies of masculinities by curbing some abusive practices for the moment, but doing nothing to

prevent future occurrences. Several men said these norms meant teachers “*definitely didn’t do anything to stop the future*” (Geni), that “*a lot of it was band-aid stuff*” (Rick), that if bullying “*was exposed, it was maybe smoothed over with a bit of a talk [but it was not] taken further or even taken seriously*” (James). The men said the norm of behaviour management deployed by many teachers meant they “*turn a blind eye because it’s too much paperwork*” (David), because the attitude meant they were “*here to teach, not discipline*” (Bill), or because teachers “*were petrified to come anywhere near our group [of 65]*” (Sam). Likewise some authorities made no effort to prevent physical violence on the sportsground from occurring long-term for the same reasons as at school. These quotes highlight how complicit men and women contribute to shaping some men’s physical violence to gain masculine status. This acceptance acts as a symbolic backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that motivates the reproduction of dispositions to comply with a hierarchy of masculinities.

Previous Australian and New Zealand studies of school bullying also indicate that teachers tend not to intervene to stop it, because psychological bullying and physical violence are considered by teachers to be a natural, inevitable and harmless part of boys’ development (Keddie, 2005:435; Maharaj, Ryba, & Tie, 2000:42).

A fourth norm of authoritative management discussed by some men that enables the continuation of hierarchies amongst masculinities is to place greater emphasis on reinforcing other forms of hierarchical structures – like respect for teachers. Lazarus said, “*It was alright to punch on [boys] at school, but you didn’t disrespect your elders... You respect your elders or you get lifted.*” Max said although “*you’d be caned for fighting*” the “*worst cane, the main one is for being disrespectful to the teachers.*”

Likewise some interviewees perceived that school management norms meant passively condoning the hierarchy of masculinities amongst boys, whilst actively policing the hierarchy of institution over individual. Bob said that when playing football at school, “*if you just threw a punch, got sent off,*

that'd be the end of it.” However, when they played away from school, “*if you were an embarrassment to the school, or abusing people, say if women were around, things may change and you might find yourself in the principal’s office*” because “*that school’s big on what the public viewed them as*” whereas at school “[*fighting*] got swept under the carpet.”

This thesis argues that agreement between masculine cognitive structures and social structures does not simply reflect a system of knowledge about how to behave as a man (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:13-14). Instead this correlation between habitus and habitat realises a political function aimed at upholding the gender order whereby it appears natural and inevitable that hegemonic groups can and will dominate others. It is argued that boys, men, teachers, coaches and parents draw on their habitus in the form of beliefs and perceptions to motivate their practices, which then, for some, in turn create hierarchies of domination and subordination. At the point where habitus and field converge and relate to each other (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:127), these schemes of beliefs and perceptions have a tendency to reflect the social structures that construct habitus, and are perceived as natural, rather than social constructions that change over time. However, not only does habitus reflect social structures, practices motivated by habitus help to construct social structures that reflect habitus.

5.5.3 Political and cultural policing of weakness

The third mechanism that some men report as contributing to the formation of hierarchies of masculinities is rooted in the political and cultural policing of weakness in boys and men. Several interviewees indicated that they were hypersensitive to being thought of as anything resembling being gay.

Max highlighted this issue that was apparent for 14 men in this research “*don’t show people your weakness, because they’ll strive on it they’ll use it and they’ll destroy ya ... they’ll take advantage of it.*” Taking advantage of men’s so-called weakness represents a disciplinary action aimed at promoting the hegemonic project (Connell, 2005:214). The following quote

reflects the way collective expectations embedded in the habitus tend to structure the social world while the social world simultaneously structures the habitus (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:74). Sam said, *“You couldn’t show your soft side... If I showed that I was weak, people would pounce on that... They’d call you names, ‘You’re gutless, you’re yellow, you’re a dog.’ And it’d make you feel... Well just put the wall back up’.*”

Numerous previous studies of boys’ perceptions about what specifically structures hierarchies of masculinities in the school setting have found that incessant cultural disciplining of so-called softness causes some boys to develop a tough façade and to engage in abusive behaviours against other boys and against girls to ward off abuse by other boys (Carrington et al., 1999; Goodey, 1997; Mac an Ghaill, 2000; Mills, 2001).

One form of cultural policing entails representing a small range of symbolisms of masculinity in the form of muscular, action-man movie and sporting heroes that serve as models for men to emulate (Connell, 2000a:11, 2005:215; Morrison & Halton, 2009:68). Consequently, Geni said that being thought of as wussy or weak equated to being called *“less than a man”* and Bob said, *“I don’t like it at all.”* This led some men to discuss how such labels affected them psychologically for instance Joe said, *“It made you feel worth nothing, worthless, little, like you’re a nobody. And you couldn’t defend yourself.”* James felt *“a bit defensive over it ... you don’t like to think that you don’t have the strength of the next guy... You feel a little bit degraded.”* Additionally, Geni said, *“I don’t think any man wants to be thought of as weak... It’s a stigma. Mentally affects against them... Emotionally it would hurt.”*

Feelings of worthlessness, degradation and stigmatisation represent a symbolic backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that would have motivated their defensiveness. While Lazarus thought *“some take it with a grain of salt. Others might let it build up... Just let it eat at ’em ... snap later.”* For those who snap, physical violence and verbal abuse are forms of agency (Burke, 1969:xx) that are considered honourable masculine practices. To understand

the normative framework of masculinities that orients abusive and controlling behaviours, it is vital to understand this juxtaposition of socially constructed notions of stigma and honour and the attitude this creates in the formation of masculine practices. This attitude may then motivate men to pursue honour and avoid stigma, a masculine process that represents the mortar that maintains the hierarchy of hegemony and subordination.

Studies indicate that heroic fictional figures practice a confined range of emotions and behaviours (Connell, 2005:215) and masculine habitus is an embodiment of such social mechanisms (Bourdieu, 1990b:56) that discredit subordinated masculinities and endorse hegemonic masculinities. Many masculine practices reinforce such social fictions by fending off insults physically or verbally. According to Joe, *“In amateur [football] if you get called a fairy you get pretty angry”* and Lazarus said the player would then *“want proof that they’re not a sook or a girl or frightened. Then probably some instances either yell and scream or go and pick a fight.”* To avoid being labelled a pansy in the first place Bill said, *“You were allowed to tackle because in one sense if you didn’t tackle hard enough, you were called a pansy”* and if players did earn the pansy label they *“just didn’t play the next game.”*

James said starting at a new school was an opportunity to prove he was not a sissy which demonstrates that choices from the repertoire of masculinities are not separate and free from the field, rather the censoring mechanisms of the field shape those choices (Bourdieu, 2000a:120) by denigrating effeminate behaviour and honouring aggression. James said when he started at a new school, *“the bullies will come out... I see myself as being lower down the masculine rung, but if I met it head on and dealt with it as quick as I could... I’d felt that I was more masculine in that way, by dealing with it with violence.”*

Rick added that it was vital not to appear victimised by feminising labels. By refusing to appear as a victim Rick’s choice of masculine reaction helped to structure gender hierarchies (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:172).

Rick said:

“He punched me in the face, ‘Say you are a fag’, and I’d say, ‘No.’ He punched me three times in the face and I wouldn’t say I was a fag. Because that is what he wanted, and then I [would be seen to be] backing down and becoming a fag... I was the victim in that situation but I still walked away thinking that I was empowered because I had been hit three times in the face, but I didn’t say I was a fag. It all comes back to whether it bothers you or not... It’s all that puffy chest thing, I am a man... You walk away from the situation, going I didn’t back down, I’m not sissy.” (Rick)

Being called a fag, a sissy or a poof, bothered many of the men’s sense of masculinity and led to physical violence or verbal abuse. This collective masculine response results from the merging of two histories (Bourdieu, 1993:46), that is the closer the current structure resembles the historical structure that produces the habitus, the higher the probability that masculine practices will be congruent with the structure. When a masculine habitus constitutes beliefs that physical violence and verbal abuse as honourable there is an increase in the likelihood to use such behaviours in fields that condone such practices. Alex said, *“Those guys I work with at work, if you called them a wuss they’d explode and go off”*, while Chris added, *“We’d be insulted and we’d have to prove that we weren’t... It would have been give verbal abuse back, or it would have been physical abuse. Try to make sure our manhood stayed intact.”* Likewise Bob said:

“One time at the service station a fella started doing burn smoking the tyres. I’m just trying to fill up me car, it’s like, ‘Bugger off down the road, I’ve got to breathe this stuff in.’ ‘Oh what are ya, a poof?’ It was like, ‘Don’t call me that mate, I don’t like that at all.’ I said, ‘Mate call me that again, I’m taking me jacket off and I’m coming to see ya.’ Sure enough, pulled me jacket off, put it in the car, coz I was in me suit, nice suit and stuff, and walked over there and I was gonna thump him, and he knew it too coz he took off (small laugh). But that’s one thing I don’t like being called. Call that stupid pride, but it’s just something that probably will never change.” (Bob)

The system of gender policing (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:844) is simultaneously a political and a cultural struggle between individuals, dominant groups and institutions for classifying representations of gender. Those whose classification systems dominate tend to win the stake in the struggle for power (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:14). Men who attempt to change their masculine responses to being thought of as sissies are engaged

in the struggle for claiming legitimate representations of themselves as men. This is why Bob thought his sense of manliness would always be affected by the accusation of poofster, and to the contrary, it is why James was able to toy with the possibility that there could be alternative masculine options for responding:

“You could submit to the accusation ... let them think that it’s not affecting you, or else you could become all defensive about it too. On the other hand search for some reason that proves that you’re not a wuss... Maybe try to justify it to yourself as being a man just as much as the next person.” (James)

Sam had mixed feelings about being thought of as *“less than a man.”* He discussed, with a degree of agitation, having mixed feelings about receiving physical affection from his brothers saying, *“In the last four years (smacking fist and palm together) I’ve copped a cuddle (smacking fist and palm together), from my brothers... ‘I love you bro’. That makes you feel, not that I’m gay (deepens his voice), it just makes you feel whole.”* But Sam’s claim that being thought of as less than a man no longer bothered him seemed dubious given his response to the question, “What is that fear that someone will see you as gay?” because he replied, *“It makes every male sick. Well, just normal every day male makes them sick.”* The poignancy of holding onto the desire to challenge such a representation of masculinity shows the force that gender policing has in the lives of some men.

5.5.4 Aspiring to recognition

The fourth resource that some men discuss as determining hierarchies of masculinities stems from boys’ and men’s aspirations to climb the ladder. Some masculine practices include aspirations to win the stake of symbolic capital in the form of recognition from real or imagined other boys or men (Bourdieu, 2000a:243). Rick’s comment encapsulates what other men said about the link between aspirations and hierarchies, *“There’s probably people that wake up and go, ‘Who cares I got things to do today’, and there’s other guys that’re bothered by it, it depends on pride levels.”* The level of interest a man has in being recognised by particular other men represents a symbolic scene (Burke, 1969:7) that motivates their form of

masculine actions. Rick mentioned several times that he was deeply bothered by being considered effeminate:

“[The] quieter guys or nerdy guys ... might get hit and then they don’t retaliate but, that’s ... that whole sissy thing... He got hit and he’s like, ‘Man you’re idiot, I don’t want to fight, go away.’ So it didn’t bother him. Whereas [if] I got hit it’s like, ‘I can’t believe you just hit me, you think you can hit me? You think you are going to get away with hitting me?’ Or, ‘You think I’m that stupid that I am going to let you hit me?’ Or, ‘You think I’m that weak that I’m just gonna stand here and let you hit me?’” (Rick)

When Rick was asked for more information about what might happen for the guy who walked away he replied, “*The less they cared and the less they retaliated, the thinner it went, someone simply stopped annoying them.*”

Men’s aspirations for recognition are not individualistic aspirations that appear from nowhere, rather the function of political and cultural policing by dominant groups and institutions serves to inculcate in the habitus the notion that hegemonic masculinities are honourable and subordinated masculinities are dishonourable, and that such representations are natural and inevitable. Men’s habitus is an unconscious embodiment of this history of gender policing. Unconsciousness, in Bourdieu’s (1977:78-79, 82) terms, is nothing other than the forgetting of this socially constructed history, so when faced with similar situations, many men have a tendency to produce the historical social conditions that produced their masculine habitus.

Being recognised with masculine honour and prestige gives many men the assurance that they belong, that they are legitimate members of a well-respected group. Bourdieu argues that men’s struggle for power amongst men, and the pursuit of the reward of recognition, cannot be explained by a need to produce a favourable impression. Instead Bourdieu (2000a:241, 243) argues that the struggle for power can only be won from men competing for the same power and that the power certain masculinities have over others derives its existence from other men’s perceptions. Some men depend on being credited with recognition from men with the same power as a way of justifying their existence. Men’s aspiration for recognition leads

to a dependence on other men, and a dependence on the continual engagement in the struggle for masculine power (Bourdieu, 2000a:166).

To conclude, perpetrators do not construct hierarchies of masculinities on their own. Peers, authority figures, face-to-face relations and cultural symbolisms act together in complex ways to sustain the hegemonic project. Particular social structures produce particular men's interests in practicing hegemonic masculinities by using abusive power and control tactics and likewise produce their interests in gaining symbolic capital. In turn those masculine practices structure the gender order. Contained in the habitus that perpetrators bring to relations with women, are varying degrees of hypersensitivity towards appearing effeminate and requiring approval from other men, which may have adverse effects on many men's ability to practice subordinated masculinity in the form of love and care. Nevertheless men are variously affected by policing of so-called feminine and masculine practices, which provides a distinct opening towards change.

5.6 The Need to Maintain Position

The purpose in this section is to explore motivations to maintain a high position on the hierarchy of masculinities. More specifically, men describe using physical violence and non-physical forms of abuse to gain rewards, such as social acceptance, respect and heroic status, which are on offer to those at the top of the hierarchy. Embedded in some of the men's habitus is an investment in the *illusio* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117; Wacquant, 1989:42) that physical or verbal force are necessary evils in the pursuit of hegemonic status. This sometimes entails practicing increasingly more aggressive patterns of masculinity over time in response to abuse from other boys and other men. Finally, this entails using a range of strategies to guarantee a particular position on the hierarchy. Within this framework, masculine position-taking is guided by clear rules for when to use physical or verbal aggression, who to abuse, how to practice such abuse and which

physical locations best clear the pathway to success in the struggle for a high position on the hierarchy of masculinities.

5.6.1 Rewards at the top

According to James, benefits of belonging to the popular masculine group at school included feeling “*safer in those numbers, with people you know can look after themselves.*” Geni said such popularity meant “*you weren’t beaten up (laugh)*”, while Sam said his high masculine status meant he “*could get anything. Do anything. And get away with it. People were scared of me, but I thrived on it.*”

Conformity to hegemonic masculine practices is not entirely voluntary (Bourdieu, 2000a:171), rather is shaped by the regularities of the field. Regularities include norms of management the men encountered as a result of teachers and sports coaches favouring boys who practice hegemonic masculinities. Bill said, “*You seem to get a free rein. A lot of teachers turn a blind eye... You can probably turn up to class couple of minutes late and nobody says anything, but if the lower person turns up five minutes late it’s, ‘Where were you, what were you doing?’*”

Some men talked about the pain of social exclusion when *not* accepted into the popular group. Geni said the cost of *not* belonging meant “*loneliness*”, and Peter said, “*You didn’t get a look in in certain selections for sporting teams, despite the fact that you knew that you were better than they were.*”

However, the normative masculine framework Rick and Henry describe includes costs depending on whether boys are interested in investing in the *illusio* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117; Wacquant, 1989:42) to be in the popular group or not, for example James said a cost of not belonging to the popular group causes “*a fear of not being accepted... I would be worried about being accepted.*”

This led Rick and Anthony to conform to the symbolic violence exerted by dominant groups, that through covert coercion assures men that if they practice violent masculinities they will become ‘somebody’ (Bourdieu, 2000a:170).

Patterns in the following quotes indicate a strong link between attitude-agency-purpose (Burke, 1969:xx). It can be inferred that embodied in the masculine habitus of some of the men, is the socially imposed disposition to use agency in the form of physical violence for the purpose of avoiding being invisible amongst peers. One of the logics beneath this hegemonic need is the desire to gain symbolic capital in the form of honour. For example, boys who did not fight were considered “*the underknowns*” (Rick) “*outcasts ... invisible*” (Bill) while Anthony said non-violent blokes would:

“Stick around guys like me. But those kind of guys who don’t want to be violent and don’t have the strength to be it, generally just fade to black. Some of the bullies might have a go at ’em but because they don’t put up a fight, ‘Oh there’s no honour in that.’ Someone like me who puts up a fight will give it a go.”
(Anthony)

The pattern in men’s descriptions infer that the link between agency-purpose (Burke, 1969:xx) is made stronger by co-agents who bestow symbolic capital on particular masculine practices, thereby shaping masculine attitudes, desires and beliefs. When James was asked if being tough increased the chances of having friends he replied that, “*It did at the time that was the theory of it when I was at school.*” For the men in this study, their normative framework suggests a feel for the game (Bourdieu, 1990a:11) that physical violence will bring masculine honour and will lead to social inclusion. This represents a symbolic backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that shapes their habitus. Such meaning-making reflects commonsense undisputed doxic assumptions, that violence amongst men is natural and inevitable and worthy of hegemonic status. Social support for so-called natural masculine practices contributes to particular masculine drives to conform to hegemonic ideals and ensures particular masculinities blend together to sustain the hegemonic project (Bourdieu, 2000a:243).

Anthony highlighted another collective notion that some men did not “*see any shame in violence ... the only time they ever feel something is when they’re standing in front of a magistrate. Trying to say I don’t want to go to jail, that’s the only time they feel any remorse, and it’s all a put on.*” The dominant groups with the credentials to bestow the award of symbolic capital, use their symbolic power to name which configurations of masculinity justify such an award (Bourdieu, 2000a:240). Accordingly such representations include the guarantee of heroism for masculinities that use physical violence amongst men, hence the development of certain patterns of shameless masculinities. Max said:

“After the football game, after any nightclubs, there was a lot of violence so you fought to protect. Back then get a bit of status. ‘Oh, his name’s Max’ and you get kind of cocky off it. I was popular. It’s having people look up to ya, It’s making people scared of ya. But you don’t think that people talk to you coz they’re scared of you.” (Max)

Many men learn early that such practices will lead to the prize of symbolic capital in the form of recognition. This prize is especially reserved for boys and men if they practice the particular masculinities that men in the current study have outlined (Bourdieu, 2000a:167).

Some boys and men actively encouraged their mates to be violent to “*get popular*” which was a form of masculinity Max wanted, so in grade four “*me mate said, ‘Go out and belt him’ and I belted him and now I got a mate. I didn’t know the other guy I was going to belt and you got popular, you got attention.*” Encouragement to practice this pattern of masculinity also occurred at the pub. Bill echoed Bob when he said, “*And he says, ‘You reckon you can just smash him?’*” and if the bloke did “*smash him*” he would be seen “*as a hero.*” Lazarus enjoyed watching physical violence so “*that used to be the only reason I’d go watch [football club] all the time, they were not a very good side but they could fight well. I didn’t egg it on, but I’d go down for a watch.*”

Embedded in the normative masculine framework described by Anthony is a feel for the game (Bourdieu, 1990a:11) that there is honour in physical

violence. He said men *“have face, ‘Hey look I beat him to a pulp, look how strong I am’.*” Being rewarded with symbolic capital in the form of heroic status opens the way for masculinities that entail bragging about violence, for instance Joe said, *“People say that you just beat up on such and such and, ‘Ohh, gee, you should have seen the way he punched him’.*”

Victims who initiate physical violence as a means of self-defence gain symbolic capital in the form of respect. Lazarus gave an example of this need *“at high school there was this one fella who everyone used to sling shit at... One day he’d just had enough, and he decided to stand up for himself, and belted the living crap out of this fella. Everyone cheered him on after that, and didn’t give him half as hard a time because he stood up for himself and a lot of people respect him for it.”*

Nevertheless, not all forms of masculinity entail a need to purposefully seek respect and acceptance from bullying and violent males. Rick said, *“In lots of people’s world thugs aren’t acceptable”* and Henry suggested, *“It comes down to looking for what you like and don’t like. I just literally steered away from trouble”*, while Bill said hanging around non-popular boys meant *“you didn’t have to prove [your masculine status] against the people who you play with... Generally if you play those different sports you don’t need or have the attitude that you gotta bash people up to get the ball... You proved it in another way, in skill not violence.”*

This thesis does not seek to know whether individual interviewees actively sought rewards at the top by bullying others, rather the patterns in men’s narratives highlight men’s normative framework which indicates a feel for the game that symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990b:53) is always on offer should they choose to pursue it and that violence and coercive control are strategies for achieving it.

5.6.2 Force as a necessary evil

Seven men said they were driven, over time, towards employing increasingly ever more hegemonic masculine practices in the form of physical violence and verbal abuse as retaliation against long-term bullying. According to Rick, becoming violent over time was in response to *“that whole teenage years of taunts and just kids being cruel.”*

Regardless of the underlying angst, when the victim participates in the same game as the bully this is indicative that they both believe in the stakes of the game and they are both struggling to win symbolic capital in the form of recognition (Bourdieu, 1993:73-74).

Physical violence was used as a tool for winning the stakes of the masculine game. Max had never been *“as violent as I did when I first started working at the [workplace]”* where he had been a 15 year old apprentice and the 20 year old blokes *“call you, ‘You pussies, you’re weak’ ... [substance] thrown at you ... ridiculed, put downs... That made me really, really violent.”* Max said he developed the attitude, *“I wouldn’t have anyone do that to me again.”*

The adoption of this attitude is a tactic used to increase the chance of claiming a legitimate right for the hegemonic position in the homosocial field (Bourdieu, 1993:73). Joe also adopted a new masculine stance later in life because his school experience meant *“I was always scared, I couldn’t do nothing about it”*, so once he *“grew ... I’m not short of 90 kilos... I got more of a, ‘I’m not gonna let people push me around no more’ sort of attitude... At the pub when you get pushed and shoved, I reacted because I knew I could look after myself. So I didn’t want to feel that uncomfortable scared feeling.”*

These shifts in masculine position towards greater levels of physical violence and new attitudes did not mean men’s habitus was not disposed towards violence when younger. Instead, as Joe pointed out, his disposition

towards violence lay dormant until he accumulated the cultural capital to use violence as an acceptable form of masculine agency (Bourdieu, 2000a:169) and the pub represents a scene that often enables this pattern of masculinity.

James described his decision to shift masculine practices by stopping being the victim and starting being the bully. A bully confronted him on the way to school *“but he was doing it in front of other people to show his power over me. I remember deciding then that I could maybe do something like he was doing ... like a protection thing for myself. And then I started to target people myself.”*

Within the homosocial field the different masculine positions men hold reflect the different volumes and composition of capital they possess (Bourdieu, 1986a:111). Although physical size and physical prowess represent superior forms of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243) amongst men, and physical violence is sometimes bestowed with symbolic capital, Geni, who was a skinny kid, knew that to compete successfully for power in the homosocial field he had to develop mastery over a form of capital that is less readily associated with the honour of hegemonic masculinities, by practicing it to a degree that he was able to represent it as a legitimate form of capital within the field (Bourdieu, 1977:170, 1993:73). He made a lifetime decision to stand up for himself by using his mouth:

“I found being bullied, or being at the bottom of the pecking order, I become very ... very sharp with the tongue. You may not be able to physically beat them ... but I could say something very scathing that could push their buttons, and usually something quite clever that all their friends would think was really funny, so it was humiliating ... And ... it’s always been my mouth or my tongue get me into trouble, rather than any physical violence.” (Geni)

Five men suggested physical violence was necessary and that no other options were considered to deal with particular situations. Men were asked if there were ways to handle bullying other than using physical violence

when starting new schools, Lazarus replied, *“I never thought of anything else. I was just used to it.”*

It is argued that the reason some men never think of alternative masculine responses to bullying stems from the notion that their habitus, that is their schemes of desires and dispositions, is constructed from the same history as the fields of homosocial relations and the school institution (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:127). When men’s practical sense for how to behave in those fields matches the stakes on offer in the game, their masculine practices seem the natural thing to do.

Anthony, a man who said, *“I never liked to be violent, it’s not something I want to consciously do, but the way to survive, you have to be in some cases”* went on to say:

“I remember one kid knocked me to the ground ... at little lunch. ‘You smack me, you wanna fight? Well fair enough, I’ll remember you.’ So at lunchtime I got up, tapped him on the shoulder, ‘You remember me?’ ... and I went *smack*, took a garbage bin and broke his jaw. Because I was on my own and I had to defend myself and it was a horrible thing. Even now I don’t feel proud of it, but a part of me feels that it was the only defence mechanism I had, my violence was the only thing that kept me alive.” (Anthony)

Given the time gap between being knocked to the ground and retaliating with a greater level of violence, this form of self-defence does not appear to represent the purpose of defending the physical body. Several men claimed that their increased use of physical violence and verbal abuse were caused by other boys/men’s violence and bullying. But by applying Burke’s (1969:xx) notion of purpose to patterns in men’s talk, this thesis argues that these defences were aimed at maintaining their hegemonic position on the hierarchy of masculinities and the symbolic capital that accompanies this position in the homosocial field. This purpose is shown in Rick’s quote: *“You’ll carry your pride into that fight, it’s more about that than physically protecting yourself”*. Pride is shaped by socio-political gender policing by institutions such as the media that represents the rough tough dominant masculine image as heroic (Connell, 2005:72).

5.6.3 Strategic position-taking

Men used a range of strategies best suited to guaranteeing that they would move towards a higher position on the hierarchy of masculinities or would maintain their hegemonic position. Strategic actions were guided by three clear rules. The first rule indicated the level of force necessary to achieve their aim without going overboard and killing someone. The second rule indicated when to retaliate with physical violence, and the third rule indicated the reasoning used regarding initiating physical violence.

Men used two broad categories of strategic masculine actions proven to clear the pathway towards achieving their position-taking goal. The first broad category entailed weighing up the options best suited to ensuring victory. Strategic options in this category included choosing the most appropriate target, the most appropriate tactic and the most appropriate location in which to carry out their physical violence or psychological bullying. The second broad category entailed forming alliances. Strategic options in this category included bullies using greater levels of abuse against victims if victims dished, which led to some victims aligning themselves with the bullies. Alternatively there were men who admired bullies, so would willingly pursue an alliance with them. Finally, some men who went to violent places, apparently for no reason, were able to improve their masculine position by association.

5.6.3.1 Guidelines for reasonable use of abuse

Men discussed the parameters of what constituted fair fighting and bullying. Henry's opinion was that *"it's within reason to have the odd joke and a bit of a chide"* but *"you have to have enough sense to work out how far you can go, where it's accepted and where the boundary is"* and that *"it's okay to bash your mate when you get pissed off with them, but that's as far as it goes, don't kill them."* Lazarus said a *"good fair fight"* entailed *"no kicking the bloke when he's on the ground, no belting someone from behind, make sure he can see it coming. Once he's had enough leave him alone."* And

that they would know a person had had enough “*if he’s sleeping ... bleeding too much ... or if he’s walking away.*” Rick added, “*There’s a difference between hitting someone with an open hand or a closed hand... I was only kind of always fighting at half potential coz you don’t wanna break someone’s nose at school, you’re not fighting for your life.*”

Men’s understanding of what constitutes a fair fight is a product of an embodied habitus that contains a feel for the masculine game of physical violence and bullying amongst boys and amongst men (Bourdieu, 1990a:22). A feel for the game is not always conscious, but stems from an embodied learned ignorance about the repertoire of logics of masculine practices within a variety of fields over time. However when the habitus is brought to a particular field and meets with a censoring device that sanctions some masculinities over others, some men have to compromise and shape masculinities in accord with the field (Bourdieu, 1993:90). This compromise may entail men who do not want to practice a violent form of masculinity to feel pressure to be violent, or it may entail men with masculine dispositions towards severe physical violence to hold themselves back, depending on the field where practice takes place.

5.6.3.2 Guidelines for when to retaliate with violence

Lazarus said boys and men have several options to respond to a bully, but running was not one of them:

“You can say, ‘Look I don’t wanna fight ya’. But you don’t sit there and let some guy beat the shit out of ya. [You should] grab hold of him, or just defend yourself, just keep out of the way. You don’t have to run away coz then you get picked on more for running. You just keep out of the way.” (Lazarus)

Max said that, “*When I was younger*” the reason for not running like crazy was “*you’re weak, ya wuss. Girl. Come back when you got a spine.*” Although some masculine choices may be conscious, this thesis argues that these men’s strategising tends first to be an outcome of pre-reflexive practices at the convergence of habitus and field. The dispositions men bring to the masculine game tend to unconsciously adjust themselves to suit

the logic and regularities of the field in current time (Bourdieu, 1990b:53, 2000a:129, 139).

Chris talked about the decision to, or not to fight, if he and his mates came upon an aggressive group of boys on the streets or the trains: *“If you thought you could get through it you’d fight your way through it. If you thought it was going to hurt, you’d try to run. Depending on how many there was.”*

At every point in relations on the hierarchy of masculinities, various configurations of masculinity are constructed (Connell, 2005:44). Brendan said, *“I was always taught to stand up for myself, so if someone had an issue with me and they continued to badger me, I’d take it out on them on the sportsground, tackle hard.”* Joe added, *“There’s messages saying fighting’s not good, but I was brought up ... always defend yourself... Defend yourself in every way, always stand up for yourself... Whatever’s required, whatever it takes.”*

Many of the masculine practices chosen are based on what can “reasonably” be practiced in any given field based on the habitus brought to the field, the logic and stakes of the game and objective position of any given masculinity in that field (Bourdieu, 1990a:11, 2000a:129, 140, 219-220). In the homosocial field, many men learn to develop an interest in investing in the pursuit of symbolic capital by practicing hegemonic masculinities. Part of the logic of that game entails self-defence. When a man holds a subordinated position in the homosocial field, the logic of practice inherent to that field has already provided him with a range of, albeit limited, possible strategies and rationales (Bourdieu, 2000a:120; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117).

5.6.3.3 Guidelines for initiating violence

One strategy used by some boys and men to avoid negative consequences, and better ensure they established their sought after masculine position, was

to provoke the other to throw the first punch. Rick said that, *“Quite often for me ... I would push someone so they hit you first, so you’ve got that grounding, ‘Oh they hit me first.’ That, whether it be for the police or just your stupid justification in your own head.”* Likewise Bob said that, *“Name calling and that [was] to try and provoke a reaction. Blokes that pick you for a fight usually want you to throw the first punch, so that when they beat the hell outta ya, they can say to the cops, ‘Well he threw the first punch mate, not my fault’.”*

Contained in some men’s habitus may be a reflexive disposition towards “a strategic calculation of costs and benefits” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:131), which those men may reflect on before they deploy a particular masculine practice. This situation would be more likely when men believe they have more to gain by pursuing one scenario over another (Bourdieu, 1977:22). Bob said, *“I don’t have a problem throwing the first punch either. You’ve gotta weigh it up at the time. I don’t do that very often, but I’m out for looking after me (laugh).”* According to Henry the masculine rules when initiating physical violence were, *“If you’re gonna start it make sure you can finish it... If you can’t finish it don’t bother even thinking about starting it (laughter).”*

5.6.3.4 Weighing up the surest options that clear the path to the top

Some men weighed up their options, by seeking out the most appropriate target, choosing the most appropriate tactic, and finding the most appropriate location best suited to beating the opponent and avoiding getting caught. The following strategic choices were the surest options for clearing the path towards climbing the hierarchy of masculinities, or maintaining hegemonic position.

5.6.3.4.1 The most appropriate target

Bob said it was necessary to choose the right kind of victim to bully to increase the chances of winning a desired position on the hierarchy of

masculinities. According to David bullies who are sure of their cultural capital in the form of physical prowess *“know they’re gonna have a bit of fun with this weak bloke ... coz they know they can beat him and he’s not gonna fight back, so they’ll go and intimidate him. They’d never pick on big blokes.”* James’s opinion was that this would *“guarantee a victory.”*

Information, ability and skills are forms of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986b:244, 2000a:183; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:119) accumulated unconsciously from lifetime experiences including past struggles for power (Bourdieu, 1989:23). The following extracts indicate a feel for the game which includes a masterful comprehension for what buttons to push to bring down opponents in the pursuit of building greater volumes of capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:99).

Many men knew they had won when they achieved their intention of upsetting or hurting the victim. Bob said that the effects of *“name calling might not happen in the first five minutes, but if it continues over a period of time, you definitely get people upset.”* He said, *“There was one fella I used to pick on ... coz he gave us the best reaction.”* When asked what it was he would achieve Bob replied, *“I intentionally upset him, but it was just for a bit of fun, didn’t really hurt him, I probably hurt his feelings, but I didn’t physically hurt him”* and that if he did not get the reaction he was wanting he would *“just move onto somebody else.”*

Of the men whose masculine habitus is constructed from social structures that resemble the fields in which they subsequently enter, the interests favoured by the habitus are sympathetic to those inherent in the field, thereby leading to a greater chance that men will pursue those stakes on offer in that field (Bourdieu, 1993:72). This explains why many men “move onto somebody else” when they do not succeed at raising a particular response from the first person. Patterns in men’s talk that reveal a relationship between Burke’s (1969:161) notion of purpose-agency, indicate that these men’s physical violence and bullying cannot be explained by examining individual men having conflicts with individual men. Instead

particular masculinities reflect collective interests in doing what it takes, to whoever fits the specific masculine criteria, for the purpose of moving up the hierarchy of masculinities and accumulating or maintaining symbolic capital.

Physical violence at the pub, according to James was *“more a random violent thing ... that there’s no particular motivation in pub violence other than to be violent.”* But, when James was asked if the bully could, “sniff out the right kind of victim” he answered, *“It’s a definite thing where the bullies will target someone who’s smaller or weaker than themselves.”* Geni confirmed this, *“(Laugh) even if he’s violent and drunk he would know the difference between somebody who’s six foot tall or five foot tall... they’re trying to prove to themselves, ‘I’m better than you’ ... ‘If you don’t like it I’m gonna biff you.’”*

Tomsen (1997:93-94) conducted a longitudinal study of physical violence and group drinking at five highly violent hotels and clubs in Sydney and concludes that there is definitely not a direct link between drinking and physical violence. Among his findings he notes that power plays, aimed at maintaining a tough masculine identity, contribute to the use of physical violence and that winning is not always necessary, rather having a go and being a threat to others is just as important as winning.

In other fields generally, Geni described a normative masculine framework that entailed a lack of cultural capital in the form of physical prowess, which leads to the motive to be *“very quick witted, very sarcastic. If somebody gives me a hard time, I know how to push their buttons... For instance I’ll say, ‘Well can you put me onto somebody who’s got more than two brain cells.’ I know straight away that would get anybody’s (laugh).”* Geni drew from a different form of masculine capital to harm his target in order to achieve his interest in rising to hegemonic status. This thesis argues that the abusive interchange amongst masculinities stems from some forms of masculinity incorporating an interest in conserving the capital that is offered

in a particular field, and such conservation ensures men are conserving themselves (Bourdieu, 1993:74).

Sam had a strong interest in conserving himself by conserving his masculine place, as “top dog” and he knew how to achieve this status. But he described one instance that confused him because his victim did not provide the satisfaction of the predictable victim response. The victim’s response meant Sam lost and the victim won a higher position on the hierarchy of masculinities. So in order to pursue his investment in ensuring victory in the future, Sam set out to resolve his confusion:

“I’ve abused a guy and he’s just stood there... He goes, ‘Are you finished?’ And he walked away... I knew it was abusive. But he dealt with it in a totally different way. That really played on my mind ... ‘I gotta get to know what makes him tick.’ I went out of my way to get to know him. And he goes, ‘Yeah you did hurt me, and you did destroy me’, but he said ‘I wasn’t going to let you know.’ So, [the victim claimed his position on] the pecking order. Everybody has their pecking orders in life, every male does. They wanna be king of the jungle, they wanna be top dog in their relationships.” (Sam)

5.6.3.4.2 *The most appropriate tactic*

Bob said, *“You just have to pick what’s the right thing to get that reaction, whether it’s name calling, whether it’s slapping them in the back of the head.”* Whilst Bill said the choice of tactic *“depends on situations, depends how far you are away from the action, if you’re far away from the action, instead of jumping in and having a fight, you’d use verbal... You back your team up. Since you can’t be in the thick of it, you do it verbally.”*

Men who enter a particular field take up an objective position in that structure, this position is shaped by the distribution of capital on offer in that field, therefore not all masculinities are credited with equal levels or kinds of capital. This plays a role in the tactics men can use to climb the ladder of masculinities and win the honour associated with symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1993:91). As Bill said, the choice of tactic depended on what best suited the context. Every field has its own scheme of regularities that censors masculinities so that some are more honourable than others.

Henry said:

“You don’t necessarily have to use your body to your advantage, it’s also what you can do and what you’ve got in your head and how you use it and how you talk to people... Voice commands control ... you can talk yourself out of any situation if you knew what to say and how to say it.” (Henry)

Verbal abuse was a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1985:724, 1986b:243) that some men knew could be used as a way of staying under the radar of the law in their pursuit to climb the hierarchy of masculinities. James thought, “*The verbal abuse is a lot more accepted [than physical violence] and you probably won’t go to jail for verbal abuse, that’s on the same parallel as the same damage you could do to somebody with physical abuse.*”

Whenever physical violence was deemed illegal in the eyes of the law, or deemed punishable as it sometimes (though rarely) was at school, and was increasingly deemed unacceptable in the workplace, it was apparent that verbal abuse and other forms of psychological abuse were becoming increasingly more valid as important signifiers of hegemonic masculinities amongst men who might ordinarily be oriented to using physical violence (including men who held cultural capital in the form of size and prowess). The changes in some fields meant it was not only smaller men who were calling on verbal capital as a weapon in the pursuit of symbolic capital. Peter said that at school bullies used ongoing psychological abuse to avoid the punishment physical violence might ordinarily bring “*derogatory comments... Exclusion, excluding them, isolating... The physical stuff, that isn’t consistent, because there’s constraints there, they can’t be doing that out where the teachers are. The comments, that’s ongoing.*”

5.6.3.4.3 The most appropriate location

Several men said some boys and men purposefully used physical violence or bullying tactics at locations that were known to be socially acceptable for such behaviour. When a particular field such as the sporting arena condones physical violence, cultural capital in the form of physical prowess is readily

drawn on as a resource in winning hegemonic status. Henry said, *“On the [sports] field, they’ve got the opportunity, may as well get it out while they’re out there.”*

If men’s physical capital is insufficient to win symbolic capital in one context, Peter said men can wait and *“you can also get your own back on the football field. Probably have a greater chance of doing that than you would when he’s got four mates standing behind him after school, so do a good tackle on him or something.”*

Egalitarian gender relations are changing at differential degrees within different fields of western society, therefore while the workplace functions as a field that is deterring physical violence as a tool for climbing the ladder of masculinities, other fields such as the institutions of sports and the media are increasingly condoning sexualisation of women and glamourisation of physical violence as tools for the maintenance of hierarchies of masculinities and the domination of masculinity over femininity (Connell, 2005:215, 2007; Messner, 2005).

Brendan also said the field of sports was a well known field for reproducing gender hierarchies:

“Sort out your differences, you take it out in sport or you have a one-on-one confrontation with somebody, then if you win or lose you walk away and forget about it and it’s all resolved ... if there’s any more issues that’s how you take it. You either get into a boxing ring or take it out in the sportsground.” (Brendan)

Other men said some boys chose specific locations away from teachers’ gaze. Peter said, *“Often those ones that are [bullying], the teachers are unaware of, they might be ... quite cunning in how they go about things... A lot of it went on behind the scenes... It went on and on.”* Or as James pointed out *“it was usually covered up in some way ... at school it was usually just between the kids.”* This seemed to be as Lazarus said, *“Coz you don’t do it when there’s a teacher around. Teacher can’t be everywhere. You always find a hidey hole”*, for example Joe said that *“everyone leaves*

out the same gates ... there's always opportunities. Yeah [bullies] get you, not even on your own, but on your way home, walking home as a kid, I mean you could be with ten mates but they'd still get ya."

This thesis argues that men who invest in the game that entails climbing the hierarchy of masculinities have an interest in gaining symbolic capital. The commitment to the pursuit of this interest forces those men to continually engage in practices that conserve the symbolic value of hegemonic masculinities which is inherent to this particular homosocial game (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:173). This explains why men like Peter waited until after school to get back at a bully. His strategy to enhance his hegemonic position entailed choosing to attack the bully's offsider, because the offsider was an easier target, and he chose to wait for a context where he was more likely to win:

"In primary school there was a kid – he was like a bully he had a go at me ... one of his offsidars used to catch the bus, and I felt too physically intimidated by these kids ... really to react and I s'pose hit him one. But I knew I could probably get his offsider by himself. I remember going once, when he got off the same bus stop ... so I had a go at him, punched up him." (Peter)

Such needs to strategise suggest the instability of masculinities and the constant tension and effort involved to maintaining a stable position on the hierarchy.

5.6.3.5 Forming alliances

Another strategy used to maintain relations of domination and subordination between different configurations of masculinities entailed forming alliances amongst certain masculinities (Connell, 2005:37). In the first instance this meant that men who practiced hegemonic masculinity, in the form of bullying, would intimidate some subordinate and complicit men into assisting them to maintain their hegemonic position. In the second instance some men who wanted to be like men who held hegemonic positions would willingly pursue an alliance with them.

5.6.3.5.1 *Obtaining alliance with offsidiers*

A strategy for ensuring victory for some bullies was to form alliances with would-be doblers by making life hell for them. No matter how bad the physical violence and bullying might be there were victims, or onlookers, who never dobled on the perpetrator because, according to Bob dobling on the bully “*was definitely unacceptable in my school. Dobbers were not very nice people.*”

This was not a notion particular to Bob’s school, rather the notion that doblers were not very nice people reflects a socio-political standard that works in favour of dominant groups and institutions. The notion represents a form of doxa (Bourdieu, 1996:21, 2001:2; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:74), in that it is an undisputed, taken-for-granted norm that those in dominant and subordinated positions adhere to. By following this doxic belief some victims have to suppress their assertive behaviours, and have to avoid aligning themselves with authorities that hold higher power than bullies. Yet, by using authorities to help curb bullying, this would mean bullies would be displaced from their dominating position. However, those in authority also function from the same set of doxic or orthodoxic understandings, thus the norms of authorities in this study entailed rarely, if ever, initiating top-down intervention against bullying masculinities. This lack of intervention provides bullying masculine practices the freedom to continue the pursuit of symbolic capital.

Peter thought, “*It’s funny coz everyone knows [bullying] goes on, but nobody will stick up for the victim ... so they don’t get to be victimised themselves ... weakness I suppose.*”

This thesis argues that there are social reasons that decrease the probability that peers will stand up for victims. Socio-political policing, on behalf of the media, the education system and so forth (Connell, 2005:253), function to impose dominant representations about legitimate ways to deal with bullying. Part of that dominant representation, which enters the realms of

doxa and orthodoxy, states that it is a sign of masculine weakness to report accusations against a bully to authorities. Included in this set of assumptions is the notion that victims should learn to develop the masculine strength to deal with their own victimisation. If a peer stepped in, this would send the message that the victim is weak and that the bully is not legitimate in their masculine actions. For any bully to be willing to authorise an intervener to speak, the intervener would have to possess very high levels of symbolic power and symbolic capital in the form of honour, respect and prestige (Bourdieu, 1989:23, 1993:91).

Lazarus said, *“If you dob you’ve got more problems... And then it’s not just one-to-one, get a couple of them, last longer, so you just get it over and done with.”* Sam said:

“If you didn’t dob you’d have a lot of respect... So we had a few people like that in our group because they wouldn’t dob on us. They most probably wanted to fit in but they were scared to dob on us, because if they dopped on us we’d flush ’em we’d bash ’em we’d do whatever we had to do. And they knew that, so, they just shut their mouths.” (Sam)

When examining patterns in men’s talk about dobbers, Burke’s (1969:xx) notion of the interconnection between scene-act-purpose indicates that complicit masculinities are sometimes motivated by the need to avoid being labelled “not very nice people” and to avoid being victimised. This thesis argues that if anyone breaks ranks and stands up for the victim, this would represent an act of heresy that disrupts the sustenance of hegemony (Bourdieu, 1977:169). Intervention would not only mean the bully loses his hegemonic position, so too would the intervener lose his ability to keep his hegemonic position, or at least pursue an acceptable position on the hierarchy.

Lazarus said, *“The little tag-alongs, they never did anything except suck up to the tough guys, try and please ’em.”* Bill explained how these offsidiers would *“bully for brownie points... ‘See what I can do for you’ ... you’d have to buy their lunches, get their drinks, be servants.”* Bill added it was these *“other guys who make [the bully] feel good”*, however *“the higher the*

pecking order, obviously the more bullying [the bully] can do and the more people you can get to do your bullying. But that was the whole thing coz on their own they're useless."

Connell (1997:9) argues that a complete demolition of hegemonic masculinities is not necessary for the construction of democratic gender relations. In rethinking the concept of hegemonic masculinities Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:853) argue that the concept should acknowledge "abolishing power differentials, not just of reproducing hierarchy" and that changes in the gender order could lead to a hegemonic masculinity that is "open to equality with women". Thus, if men did form alliances with victims against bullies, they would be planting seeds towards new configurations of masculinity where the term 'respect' is equated to constructive relations as opposed to linking 'respect' with fear as Sam did above.

However, based on the current socio-political policing of standards that contribute to shaping the gender order, such actions at the moment would not credit those boys with symbolic capital. Change at the face-to-face level and the level of social structures does not occur simultaneously, the issue of time and lag at one of those levels is inevitable (Bourdieu, 2000a:172). If men, at the face-to-face level, do break rank and form pro-social alliances with those at the bottom of the hierarchy of masculinities, the trend would lead to changes in social structures. The change would also lead to a range of benefits for many men including feelings of safety and trust and closer emotional ties amongst each other as well as between men and women (Connell, 2005:220-222; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:853).

5.6.3.5.2 Offsiders pursue affiliation

Some men, like Max, were complicit with the hegemonic project because they had a need to form alliances with bullies because they admired that form of masculinity. Max said, "*One person I used to hang around ... was a very violent man, violent towards animals, very violent... But I thought that*

was cool... I looked up to him, he could fight man, takes no shit from no one, just smash 'em, just fucking drivin' 'em."

This thesis argues that such alignments serve to increase social capital by building networks of "mutual acquaintance and recognition" (Bourdieu, 1986b:248; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:119). Belonging to a hegemonic group would increase men's masculine credentials, which would then increase the opportunity of accumulating symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1986b:243, 248-249).

Social capital can be drawn on to back up cultural capital in the masculine form of physical prowess and violence (Bourdieu, 1986b:244). James talked about the effect of being confronted by a bully in the presence of real or imagined tag-alongs who condoned the abuse, saying that the presence of complicit masculinities "*disempowers you that much more, that you feel like they've got support behind them, and I didn't have any support at all.*" When reflecting on the presence of the bully amongst a real, or imagined, group, James described the role complicit masculinities have in maintaining the abusive practices that were used to sustain the hegemonic order:

"It's probably a perception that there's this big group, but it's probably more that one individual, but you perceive it as being a group of people with the same mentality as the bully... Or might not be any support of him at all, they might not agree with him, but just because they're there with that person, you get this perception that they're all part of the same thing." (James)

The orthodox assumption that there is agreement amongst males that violent masculinities are cool, sets a scenic backdrop that motivates some disempowered men to become co-actors in the violent scene (Burke, 1969:7).

5.6.3.5.3 Associating with violent places

Another way some men formed alliances with other violent masculinities was by going to violent places, even though they said they tried not to, did not want to, or thought they would be better not to go to those places.

Henry, who engaged in lengthy narratives about being victimised throughout his life and who struggled with understanding which masculine practices to use amongst boys and later amongst men said that:

“Everyone said, ‘Don’t go to that pub coz that’s where the bikies go, and such and such got killed there one day coz he got a [weapon] shoved through his [body part]. So don’t go there.’ ‘Righto.’ So, I started going there. Had no problem at all. I was going there that often, and I was known by all the locals that went there, I was what 26 then, and these were men that would have been in their 40s, and at least three of them said to me that, ‘Henry, if anyone gives you any shit, you just fucking call my name’.” (Henry)

Despite Henry’s belief that his habitus lacked the feel for the game associated with climbing the hierarchy of masculinities, his habitus nevertheless contained an *illusio*, in the form of an interest in pursuing hegemony (Bourdieu, 2000a:207). Henry had trouble fitting in at school and work because he did not possess the physical capital, or the practical sense for which masculinity to deploy to win symbolic capital. Given his interest in pursuing men who practice hegemonic masculinities, this could explain why he went to violent places. He succeeded in forming alliances with men higher on the hierarchy. Their age and practice of physical violence gave them masculine credentials. By being taken under the wing of these men, Henry was able to accumulate a form of masculine esteem (Connell, 1996:4) and a much needed social capital (Bourdieu, 1986b:248) that he could use as a resource to establish a form of recognition that was missing for him in other fields.

This thesis argues that Bob also went to violent places for the same reason:

“I’m only a little bloke, a lot of the time if I go somewhere like the [tavern name], I don’t think it’s a very safe place for me to go... One time I was sitting there staring into the bottom of my beer, and a bloke come up and nudged me and said, ‘What’s your effing problem?’ I’m like, ‘What? What are you talking about?’ I didn’t even know him. I just said, ‘Look mate, I’ll just have me beer and I’ll be on me way, there’s no trouble’.” (Bob)

Chris said he tried to avoid particular violent areas of the city. Yet he also implied that he did *not* actively avoid those places. This implication can be

seen in his statement that he was constantly deploying violent masculine practices there:

“If we walked anywhere we’d be attacked by [an ethnic] group ... we were *constantly* in trouble, trying to get away from them, or dodge ’em... You had to be careful where you went... I was always scared to go to those places. I wasn’t the tough guy at school so I knew I couldn’t fight my way out of all the problems I had. But you definitely try to avoid places where you knew there was going to be a problem like that... I suppose I don’t look for it now.” (Chris)

This unsafe scene fits with Burke’s (1969:5) notion of a symbolic setting that would have given Chris’s group an opportunity to test the durability of their social capital. Congruent with the scene-act-purpose ratio (Burke, 1969:xx) underlying Chris’s masculine dispositions, in order to fulfill the purpose of winning a hegemonic position over the other group, co-agents (Burke, 1969:xix) in Chris’s group would be obliged to back each other up to ensure victory. Bonding experiences would better ensure the maintenance of the hegemonic project. In turn these actions would increase the chance of bestowing symbolic capital on each member (Bourdieu, 1986b:249-250). When Chris was asked what he meant by not looking for “it now” he replied, “*You put blinkers on, you try not to see those sorts of things like we saw it all the time when we were young because we knew that was the [suburb] boys... You always try to pick where you went away from that so you knew no one was going to hurt.*”

Chris had aged by the time he started choosing a form of masculinity that meant not seeing opportunities to engage in potential violence, he was engaged in a process of change motivated by a new purpose, which required a new form of agency (Burke, 1969:xx). That is changing his configuration of masculinity by reducing or stopping physical violence, not only against his female partner, but against men in general. His interest and investment in the hegemonic project had been curbed, hence his ability to “put blinkers on” and seek out new scenes that motivate egalitarian relations. This change away from using physical violence could have entailed a shift in the ratio of costs and benefits. Some of the costs of hegemonic project will be explored in the next section.

To conclude this discussion about particular needs to maintain a desired position on the hierarchy of masculinities, it was observed that among the benefits of popular masculinities are social acceptance and honour for using physical violence and bullying. These practices then become seemingly necessary for survival for some men, but rather than aimed at defending the physical body they are aimed at maintaining pride associated with holding a hegemonic position. Most men in this study have clear guidelines for how, where and when to practice which form of masculinity and they carefully choose which relationships are best suited to which practice of masculinity. The choice those men make is aimed at ensuring victory as a means of climbing the pecking order of masculinities and avoiding the stigma associated with being at the bottom. Hence, if they identify as victims, some will align themselves with bullies to achieve this aim.

5.7 Disrupting Hierarchies

This section focuses on complex and contradictory aspects of masculinities and logics inherent in fields in order to locate possible motivations men might use to move towards social justice. It will be shown that the men are motivated to use physical violence in fields where violence is condoned and subsequently rewarded, whereas they curb their use of violence in fields that sanction against it. Some men pointed out costs of pursuing popularity, while others outlined a range of psychological wounds that occur for boys who are victimised by bullying. Finally, men describe what caring means for men. Each of these themes can serve to disrupt hierarchies of masculinities, including the hegemonic project, and could motivate change towards democratic relations amongst men, and between men and women.

5.7.1 Changing fields changing practices

Motivation to be violent in a given context depended on the potential losses and gains enabled by the field of play. For example consequences for being violent at school differed to consequences for being violent at the pub. Bob

said that at the pub *“you can get yourself into a lot more trouble, like legally for one. And if you pick on the wrong bloke, there’s no teacher to tell him to stop punching ya.”*

Not only do individual men have particular interests in winning stakes in the game by using physical violence, interests are also “presupposed and produced” by the particular fields (Wacquant, 1989:41). Men tend to enter a field with a feel for the game on offer in that field. They may not engage in a conscious calculation of the costs and benefits of behaving in particular ways, rather the *illusio* presupposed and formulated in each field contains a particular set of social conditions that give a sense of “meaning and direction” to men’s practices (Bourdieu, 2000a:207; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117).

Several men mentioned the consequence of losing their job and income if they deployed physical violence at work. Chris said such masculine practices in the workplace *“definitely wouldn’t be tolerated, and they know as soon as they do do physical violence, they’re out, they’re fired.”* Lazarus added, *“Down the pub you’re always gonna get into fights. That’s just like a playground for big kids... Work, you’re always gonna have your bad days, but you don’t go starting fights at work, not if you wanna keep your job anyway.”*

These findings support Gelles’s (1993:38) social control and exchange theories that people act in accord with costs and benefits sanctioned by society. Whilst Bourdieu (1993:18) argues that the principle of sufficient reason explains why men invest in the practice of physical violence in one field, but not in another. This is because although some masculine practices entail an interest in deploying physical violence to gain the stake of symbolic capital, not all fields offer this stake for that particular practice.

Chris thought the hegemonic practice of psychological bullying at work was still acceptable:

“Not physical I don’t see physical violence, in some cases you may see physical violence. It’s more mental abuse... It’s still acceptable, like it’s starting to become not as acceptable. It’s like, ‘This year we’re going to kill three people, we’re gonna reduce our deaths by half.’ It’s still that mentality. Like now we’re starting to say, ‘Okay we’re aiming for zero, zero deaths, we don’t want any injuries at all.’ But bullying, ‘Seventy percent it’ll be okay.’ We’re still saying it’s acceptable for bullying, ‘We’ll pull you in, we’ll talk to you, we’ll give you three warnings’.” (Chris)

Although men’s habitus is adaptable and constantly changing in response to new experiences (Bourdieu, 2000a:161), the shift that has occurred in the workplace only reflects a shift in practices, not a shift in the stakes of the game. That is, the workplace field referred to by some men still permits the struggle for masculine power by using non-physical forms of abuse and control. Five men talked at length about experiencing severe abuse as apprentices and that this pattern of masculinity was the norm condoned by management in their early working lives. But as Chris said, masculine practices changed in conjunction with changes in the field that threatened the potential loss of economic capital, *“All of us would get together and initiate the apprentice because that was acceptable. Until one or a couple of the apprentices get hurt and it’s not acceptable anymore so it’s illegal to do that where it used to be legal.”*

The prevention of physical violence in the workplace does not mean a disruption to hegemonic masculinities, rather it means a shift in its configuration. The difficulty of changing hegemonic masculinities towards practicing democratic relations is rooted in the unrelenting support given to it by many institutions (Bourdieu, 2000a:172; Connell, 2000a:219), such as the workplace, that in some case continues to condone non-physical tactics of domination. Lazarus said:

“I’ve watched apprentices get dumped in 200 litre tubs of [substance], and had their hair shaved ... and we’re still doing the abuse thing. No physical though. Not anymore... You get the sack over that nowadays. You can still give ’em shit. You just can’t go touching ’em (laugh). You can’t go destroying their tools, or nailing their boots to the floor anymore, coz it’s not fun apparently (laugh).” (Lazarus)

The normative frame of school management was that physical violence was more likely to be punished (though not always), but, like workplaces

discussed by interviewees, deterrents never existed for psychological abuse at school either. Rick said he thought “*just physical*” violence was punished at school but “*a lot of verbal stuff got brushed over*”, while James added it was “*more physical [that was punished]. Very rarely was verbal or mental abuse... I don't think it was even ever considered to be any sort of abuse really.*” When Bill was asked if parents stepped in to stop the bullying at school he said, “*No, coz it was never physical.*” Bill talked about being psychologically bullied and eventually drew on a form of masculinity that enabled him to retaliate with physical violence, but that it was because of his use of physical violence that he was punished rather than the bullies who used psychological abuse. He said the bullies:

“Just keep on following you and keep on pushing you and keep on calling you names, you turn around and smash them and they don't get back up... But when the teacher comes over, he's down on the ground with a bloody face, and you're sitting there with a bloody hand, it's like, ‘Right, Principal's office and straight for the six’” (Bill)

This thesis argues that for democratic relations to develop, abusive and controlling masculinities have to be refigured at the face-to-face level by not only stopping the use of physical violence, but also by stopping the use of non-physical tactics of bullying and control amongst males and against women. The patterns in men's narratives show there is a complex interplay amongst students, teachers, work colleagues and workplace management that differentially contributes to maintaining the hegemonic project. Therefore, in agreement with feminist views, deep and broad change is required across society for the reduction of intimate partner abuse to take effect.

5.7.2 Costs of popular masculinities

An implication of internal complexities in masculinities is that men who struggle to receive the benefits of practicing hegemonic masculinities are also aware of the costs of doing so, for instance Geni said there was “*a fair bit of peer pressure*” in belonging to the popular group.

A cost of this pressure according to Lazarus was that if boys did not:

“Keep at that level ... if they don’t do so well regularly, they might be frowned upon by their mates... Yeah, if they played a couple of games in a row shithouse, or made a few too many mistakes a couple of weeks in a row, their mates might not admire them quite as much, or the rest of the school wouldn’t admire them quite as much.” (Lazarus)

A reflexive disposition that takes account of costs could open the way to motivating the reconstitution of abusive and controlling masculinities (Connell, 2000a:217). Change may be motivated, for instance, by the need to let go of the incessant pressure involved in practicing hegemonic masculinities. Peter said a cost of belonging to the popular group was that *“you had to maintain a certain image, not really be true to yourself a lot of the time.”* Whilst James said this meant:

“You lost a little bit of sense of self, because you’re taking on their beliefs and their opinions ... you’ve got to toe the party line, you’ve gotta follow the consensus of the group and you lose a little bit of your own individual thinking... You don’t necessarily have control over what the opinions are because maybe you’re looking up to somebody in the group who’s more in control of the group and it’s their opinions that get taken on and nurtured rather than your own.” (James)

By not being true to themselves and losing a sense of self, these are strategies that Burke (1969:xx) calls a form of agency. This agency appears to be an unconscious method used for the purpose of winning symbolic and social capital. The habitus constitutes desires embodied over time and social institutions represent certain forms of behaviour as more desirable and honoured than others. Given the complexity of these men’s embodied desires (Connell, 2000a:219), this thesis argues that one way out of the masculine game that beguiles particular men with prizes such as symbolic capital, is to find ways to reconstitute what practices are deemed socially honourable.

5.7.3 Empathy for victims

Men were asked what sort of effect they thought psychological abuse had on boys.

Bill said:

“It’s just, low self-esteem. Just puts you down... It doesn’t ... actually affect me like after I left school, but it’s just in the back of your head. I don’t believe that ever leaves... It turns you around. You just can’t study, you can’t get on with your day, your grades end up getting lower ... puts you down, humiliates you.”
(Bill)

Other men said boys victimised by bullies are “*extremely affected*” (Alex), “*traumatised*” (Geni), that “*there’s certainly serious psychological affects*” (James) because “*they’ve gone through a lot of hell in their life*” (Sam). Three men talked about a loss of self-esteem while Peter said victims have an experience of “*a sense of powerlessness... there’s nothing worse than feeling that you’re powerless, unable to do anything.*” James reiterated Alex’s view when he said, “*It’s the loss of their confidence.*” Then he reiterated Alex and Bill’s views saying that bullying instills “*fear ... it’s degrading for the victim, it’s humiliating and I’m sure it’s gotta have some affect on the rest of their life... That’s the worst thing out of bullying that it degrades somebody’s confidence more than anything.*”

Sam also said that victims were affected “*pretty hard, pretty scarred for life*” for example Bob thought that “*constant put downs ... sooner or later that person’s gonna ... believe that ... if it gets told to you that many times, it’s gonna stick sooner or later.*”

A form of symbolic violence used to sustain the hegemonic project, imposed on the habitus of men by some dominant discourses and institutional practices (Bourdieu, 2000a:181), is the self-evident attitude that masculine practices should not give an empathetic voice to the psychological effects of abuse and control. Bob had the attitude that although bullying “*impacts your life*” it was a strategy of hegemonic masculinity to “*toughen them up to the ways of the world ... probably everybody’s been picked on at some stage in their life, that’s part of growing up and you gotta learn to deal with that*” and although Lazarus pointed out victims would “*probably feel like you’re not worthy*” he said,

“You gotta get over it.” When Bob discussed bullying at school he said although boys might have wanted to complain to authorities:

“You’ve gotta bear in mind I did go to a boys’ college ... you’ve gotta be a man ... not so much bullying was a way to be a man, you’ve just gotta learn to accept that, and stop complaining and don’t whinge, ‘You’re being a big girl, why don’t you grow up?’” (Bob)

Because many men learn to toughen up to “be a man” they have to practice a form of masculinity that entails suppressing empathy for their own wounding. A meta-analytic study of the relationship between a lack of empathy and male offending found that some studies are inconclusive, other studies indicate a strong link, whilst others indicate the link is neither simplistic nor deterministic. The authors argue that the link is complicated by a complex interplay of offenders’ low socioeconomic status and low levels of intelligence (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004:469).

This thesis argues that the complex logic underlying this disposition towards low levels of empathy can be understood through patterns in men’s narratives made evident by Burke’s (1969:xx) notion of agency-act-purpose. Gender policing is a form of agency that promotes actions such as bullying boys for the purpose of toughening them up and developing honourable masculinities. Symbolic violence entails instilling attitudes that boys should silence empathy for their own wounding and for the wounding they inflict onto others. These attitudes form the habitus that these men take into relationships with women. These attitudes make possible the silencing of care and empathy in heterosexual relationships. The symbolic power, used by dominant groups and institutions, imposes this doxic attitude not only onto men, but also onto women, so that it seems natural to women that some men lack the ability to connect to the depth and breadth of their emotions (Bourdieu, 2000a:181).

5.7.4 Caring amongst boys and amongst men

Given that some boys perpetrate pain on other boys, the men were asked to think back to their boyhoods and answer, “What did caring about someone

else mean to boys?” Men’s answers ranged from boys not caring, to having trouble showing care, to practicing respect and loving each other. Further, men described how boys or men knew they were cared about. Sam, for instance said caring did not mean anything to boys “*at that time*”, while Bill said caring “*depends on the ages. You don’t see much of it*” and Geni thought, “*That probably some of them have trouble caring about anybody.*”

This thesis argues that the fact that many boys had trouble caring was not an idiosyncrasy of boys’ masculinities, instead it represents a collective masculine practice that functions to maintain hierarchies amongst men and men’s domination over women. Non-caring masculine attitudes and practices are features of the doxic gender order (Bourdieu, 1996:21). Certain socio-political practices honour men who suppress so-called feminine emotions – such as caring – and in turn people internalise the doxic belief (Bourdieu, 2000a:15) that this is a natural and inevitable way of being a boy and a man. This explains why Bob pondered, “*Hm. That’s something [that] hadn’t really had occur to me until I was about 20, caring about other people ... coz I didn’t care about other people. All I cared about was me.*” Bob thought this form of masculinity was common amongst boys, in fact James said something similar:

“That’s something that I feel I’ve matured with over the years, whereas as a boy I didn’t have a lot of real caring feelings towards other people that may have suffered in some way or the other, either physically or mentally some form of abuse... As long as I wasn’t hurt, then it didn’t really bother me, I didn’t have that empathy for the other person.” (James)

As Lazarus noted, to ensure hegemonic masculinities were practiced, any caring amongst heterosexual men must remain covert, “*There’s a lot of caring but it’s all under the counter... You care about your mates but you’re not gonna tell them that. You’re not gonna walk up to your mate and give ’em a cuddle. But you care, it’s just not, it’s not spoken of or shown.*”

Alex refused to hide his caring practices, but knew this went against the grain of the hegemonic project. He said, “*Well they loved each other and their mates, they’d get to the oval and run down to meet them... I see my*

best mate, I give him a hug and he gives me a hug. I don't care if anyone's watching no matter where I am I'll do that."

Although men in general, compared with male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse may be exposed to similar social discourses that advocate low levels of caring and empathy as part of the configuration of hegemonic masculinities, Bourdieu's (Wacquant, 1989:49) notion of *illusio* may account for the stronger link between low empathy and violent offending (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004:471), given that *illusio* is linked to men's masculine position. Some men's habitus contains a greater interest in investing in the stakes on offer for practicing hegemonic masculinities (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117; Wacquant, 1989:42), thus, this thesis argues that the greater the interest in being consecrated with symbolic capital, the higher the chance those men will reduce their expression of empathy.

Despite these men's masculine habitus being oriented towards non-caring, this does not mean caring was impossible. Instead, the habitus also contains an embodied feel for the masculine game (Bourdieu, 1990a:11) in that these men know caring represents practices that would position them low on the hierarchy of masculinities. This thesis argues that many men suppressed practicing care because they were avoiding the costs such as put-downs and stigmatisation borne of practicing subordinated masculinities (Connell, 2000a:31, 217, 2002a:6, 2005:78; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:834). This is why Rick was able to say that caring meant "*just being respectful of them, their gear, their attitude, their situation ... don't pick on them ... caring is just genuinely concerning yourself with someone's wellbeing.*" Peter added that caring means:

"...making sure they're safe... (Laugh) maybe if they're physically hurt you'd help 'em. Apart from that say on an emotional level, nah, and that follows through like for the rest of your life... Blokes ... don't really share too many emotions ... it's very superficial sense of care." (Peter)

Instead, Peter described a disposition towards caring in the form of “*doing something.*” Bill’s normative frame indicated that caring entailed “*asking questions about your work, about your home, ‘Is everything all right?’ ‘Are you happy?’*” Whereas Rick said, “*Some people need to be told, ‘Hey, I do give a damn about you, I care about you’.*” Lazarus knew heterosexual peers cared because “*if he’s talking to you and he’s smiling at you or he’s buying you a beer, there’s a good chance he likes ya. Unless he’s a woolly woofter and he’s trying to get in your pants. But more than likely he’s just a good mate.*”

Finally, James described the dilemma that exists for many boys and men, that is that practicing hegemonic or subordinated masculinities represent black and white alternatives. One pattern is honoured, the other is dishonoured (Connell, 2000a:217). There is little room for legitimate complexity in masculine practices, which is reflected in practices of caring and non-caring:

“You know you’re cared about if someone tries to interact with you, on a level without intimidation... Acceptance is the big thing about caring. Acceptance of people’s differences and not trying to force an opinion on you about what they think is the manly thing to do ... if you like to read books, then ... that must be a masculine thing to do. If someone could be accepting like that then I’d feel cared about. If someone would accept me for the way that I was... But I tend to find myself, when I was younger, getting drawn away from what I really liked to do myself and more towards ... the ones I looked up to, my peers ... if I do what they like to do then they’ll accept me, because we’re similar, not because they accept me because of who I am.” (James)

Many men experience wounding as a result of having to uphold an image that accords hegemonic status and they experience long-lasting trauma as a result of victimisation amongst boys and amongst men. Cultural policing of gender makes it seem natural and inevitable that many men have a narrow range of emotions, but patterns in men’s narratives in this study indicate that one imperative of the hegemonic project is to suppress expression of that wounding and silence empathy for suffering. This is the habitus these men bring into relationship with women.

A singular psychological approach to domestic violence might focus on men's experiences of victimisation and ignore their criminal and immoral offending against female partners. Whereas any wounding has to be viewed in the context of men's position in the gender order at large and it is vital that men's victimisation is never used as an excuse or a justification for engaging in power and control over women. Whilst male perpetrators have psychological wounds, they also must be held accountable for their violent, abusive and controlling behaviours. But such experiences should be taken into account when considering perpetrators' complex meaning systems that motivate their behaviours.

Nevertheless many men readily alter their behaviours to fit social changes such as contemporary workplace policies that sanction against physical violence. Social, economic and symbolic capital are withdrawn from men if they are violent in the workplace field, which provides clues to what motivates some men to change. But, ultimately, the hegemonic project is sustained in many workplaces that still enable the continuation of psychological abuse and control. The stakes in the game, that reinforce the hegemonic project, remain intact, consequently luring many men away from practicing masculinities that change the gender order.

5.8 Conclusion

Cultural mechanisms that inculcate representations of hegemonic masculinities and physical violence as heroic, and subordinated masculinities and weakness as inferior, influence many men's interest and commitment in the stakes of the homosocial game, which involve seeking positioning on the hierarchy of masculinities. Some men are more driven than others to struggle for powerful positions.

Many men's habitus embodies political and cultural messages that represent man-to-man violence as heroic. For this reason many men brag about violence towards men. Throughout their lives these men had considered

non-violent masculine practices to reflect so-called femininity, and the undervaluing of sissies led to regaining masculine status by deploying abuse. However, now that the interviewees were attempting to practice non-violence (towards other men and towards women), they refuse to consider themselves as sissies, instead they modify their definition of what they consider constitutes successful masculinity. Whereas previously their definitions of successful masculinity include physical and non-physical forms of abuse and control against others, their modified version now includes stifling physical violence, but continuing to use, or increase the use of, psychological abuse and structural forms of control. Against some feminist views that patriarchy entails a monolithic logic, this modification reflects the modifications occurring in some fields such as the workplace. It reflects the acceptance, across the four fields investigated, of non-physical forms of abuse by men, and it reflects the fact that some domestic violence interventions mainly address physical violence only. Neither normative masculine practices, nor the norms of management by many of those in authority across multiple fields, are actually challenging the core of the hegemonic project – that is the systematic wide-ranging masculine tactics of non-physical forms of control over other men and over women.

Self-defence is not necessarily about defending men's bodies, rather it entails defending their hegemonic position. Some subordinated victims or would-be doblers actively pursue an alliance with bullies, in part to maintain their safety, but also to increase their masculine credentials. The normative practices of authoritative figures, such as teachers and sports coaches reinforce hegemonic masculinities by actively encouraging and condoning social hierarchies, or by condoning abusive behaviours by merely turning a blind eye. Whereas the family of origin is the main focal point to understand where perpetrators learn to be physically violent, by utilising Bourdieu's concept of the field, this broadens understandings of fields where men embody socio-cultural messages. It is shown that bullies, and many victims and authorities across multiple fields act to maintain the hegemonic project across men's life-times.

Whereas psychological perspectives assume male perpetrators lack ability to control their anger and lack ability to control aggressive behaviours when drinking alcohol, this thesis challenges these assumptions as it finds that many men make strategic choices from their repertoire of masculinities. These strategies entail deploying masculinities geared towards abusing the most appropriate target, using the most appropriate tactic in the most appropriate location that maximises the chance of establishing credentials that can be achieved by practicing hegemonic masculinities. It is the definite interweaving of individual masculine practices with social enablers that permits such strategising. Instead of managing individual men's anger and alcohol consumption, for deep and long-lasting change to occur, change must take place at the face-to-face and institutional levels including at both the ideological and material levels.

Whereas social learning theory implies one-way passive learning, this thesis shows that men are active agents in drawing on particular socio-cultural messages, and that, in turn, their practices sustain and legitimise those messages. Internalisation is complex and multifarious and occurs differentially across different fields, in a mutual relationship with the logic and censoring of practice, and with forms of *illusio* and stakes on offer in each field.

Against psychological perspectives that individualise perpetrators' lack of empathising, this chapter noted that social policing of subordinated masculinities, at the ideological and face-to-face levels, encourages the suppression of empathising and caring for others. Findings here reveal that some perpetrators do have dispositions oriented towards care and empathy, however given that norms of management encountered in school, the pub, workplace and sporting arenas actively discourage such practices, and norms in each of these fields actively offer social and symbolic capital for abusive and controlling practices, it is little wonder that many men's abilities to care and empathise lie dormant. In order to incessantly pursue symbolic capital, many men must continually suppress knowledge of the costs of practicing hegemonic masculinities, and they must suppress the

wide range of so-called feminine emotions, including empathy and caring, that represent subordinated masculinities. Changes to the logic of practice in one field, such as the workplace, can influence some men to stop using physical violence in that field, but the problem here is that the stakes of the game have not changed. There are still encouragers for practicing hegemonic masculinities in the form of psychological abuse and control. Individual men alone cannot be expected to change, without changes to the political and cultural mechanisms that also sustain the hegemonic project. However, it was shown that changes in one field at a time do influence some masculine practices to change.

This chapter has shown the multitudinous social conditions that together form the masculine habitus of men who enter a cohabiting intimate relationship with a female partner. Chapter seven will extend these findings by exploring the influence that complicit girls and women have on encouraging some boys' and men's violent practices. While, the next chapter will explore men's relationships with women including socially constructed reasons underpinning men's abuse of women and men's perspectives on caring for and loving women, including the influence that other men have on many perpetrators' reluctance to show care and love for women.

CHAPTER SIX

Men's Relationships with Women

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore aspects of men's relationships with women that have not previously been researched from the perspectives of perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. The first of four sections examines the expectations held by the men in this study when they enter a cohabiting relationship with an intimate female partner. Their expectations are contradictory, in that they desire to build a long-term shared partnership, whilst also wanting women to adhere to an unwritten contract, which states men are masters to be served by women.

The second section examines what caring for, and loving a woman partner, means to the men who were interviewed. It will be shown that these men are motivated by contradictory social backdrops that simultaneously encourage and discourage motivation and ability to show care and love. The third section examines how, and why, those men psychologically abuse and control their partners. This focus will extend to exploring men's interpretations of the negative impact such control has on women.

The final section examines the interviewees' responses to working for a female boss. This investigation allows for a broader understanding of these men's relationships with women outside the home and the men's responses to contemporary shifts in gendered status reversal. It will be shown that while most men claim they personally have no problem, many of the normative frameworks of masculinities described entail an *illusio* that continues to value the stakes on offer in the gendered field of work (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117; Wacquant, 1989:42).

Burke's (1969) grammar of motives is employed to define complex logics and sets of relations underpinning patterns in men's narratives. This entails an exploration, for instance, of ways the interconnection between scene and purpose, for instance, might influence men's actions and the forms of agency men may use to meet their purpose. These patterns are in turn interpreted using a synthesis of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory, which together explain men's contradictory practices underpinning patterns in their talk.

"Hegemonic masculinity is based on practice that permits men's collective dominance over women to continue" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:840), thus this concept will be used to explain how the combination of physical violence, verbal and psychological abuse, control of finances and women's sexual and social lives, along with men's practices of love and care work together to maintain dominance over female partners (Connell, 2000a:31). The concept of subordinated masculinity, which is the opposite of hegemonic masculinity, will be used to show how the cultural policing of effeminate behaviour is a key method in promoting hegemonic masculinities as exemplary (Connell, 2005:214). The concept of complicit masculinity, which is practiced by men who benefit from patriarchal relations, but do not practice a "strong version of masculine dominance" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832), will be utilised to deepen understandings of how men's control over women is operationalised. It will be seen that the maintenance of hegemonic masculinities is more assured, the greater the overlap and blurring with complicit and subordinate masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:839).

Bourdieu's field theory will be invoked to explain the mechanisms underpinning the men's contradictory choices to care for women. The notions of symbolic power, doxa and orthodoxy will be used to explain the influence that contradictory social discourses have on male perpetrators' choices, whilst the notions of *illusio* and capital will be used to deepen the understanding of why some men choose to adhere to one social discourse over and above another. It will be shown that these choices are not

straightforward and depend on the specific mix of histories, masculine positions, interests and stakes on offer that occur at the point where habitus and field converge (Bourdieu, 1977:169, 2000a:100, 2001:34; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117, 127; Wacquant, 1989:42).

Rather than reducing this discussion to “the truth” or some kind of “facts” about the history of the person, every action is always a compromise between habitus on the one hand and field on the other. This discussion therefore reflects interviewees’ “*displays of perspectives and moral forms which draw upon available cultural resources*” (Silverman, 2006:144) in the interview context.

6.2 Expectations when Moving in with a Woman

Men have conflicting and contradictory expectations when moving in with a female partner. The first pattern in men’s talk reveals that many men want to build a life-long caring partnership with a woman. Whilst the second pattern reveals that many perpetrators enter relationship with an unwritten contract that guides them to pursue practices fitting with the man as master and woman as slave discourse.

6.2.1 Building a life-long partnership with a woman

Western society is organised around a division into nuclear families, a social construction which Bourdieu contends is embedded in the habitus of many men who then develop the belief that the commonsense thing to do is adopt a form of masculinity that entails marrying and having a family (Bourdieu, 1996:20-21). This was the backdrop (Burke, 1969:17) for several men’s motivation to marry. Henry said men marry because “*it’s part of the accepted society isn’t it? To find your female and settle down and do the right thing.*”

This thesis argues that the men in this study were operating from a doxic acceptance of marriage, that is, they accepted the idea of marriage without criticism (Bourdieu, 2001:34). But models of marital relations change across the centuries leaving multiple historical discourses and doxic assumptions about how to be a husband. “Hidden persuasion” is made possible when masculine cognitive structures are in agreement with the current objective structures (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:168), which is why Lazarus said men marry to “*keep the women happy (laugh). Most men I know don’t worry too much about the wedding things, usually the women that want to do the whole thing.*” Further evidence that interviewees’ normative frames of masculinities consisted of an uncontested doxic acceptance (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:74) of marriage was apparent in Chris’s quote:

“It’s because they *have* to. There’s something wrong with them if they don’t get married isn’t there? ... If they don’t have children there must be something wrong with them... It’s more pressure to get married.” (Chris)

Several men in this study drew from, what they labelled a 1950s model of marriage, as a means for them to know how to practice the masculine role of husband. Anthony included the 1930s and 40s in his framework:

“If we go back to the 30s, 40s, 50s, everybody knew how to be a man then because it was get out there fight, go to the first world war, but now it’s like, hey men have lost their way because of a lot of problems. They get married because they feel that’ll patch up their self-esteem, well I’m married therefore I’m desired, therefore I’m loved, therefore I’m everything.” (Anthony)

Bourdieu argues that seeking to preserve such a dominant family model reflects the inertia of the masculine habitus, that is the effect of historical social structures etched into these men’s bodies (Bourdieu, 2000a:172). By drawing on the regularities associated with the logic of the 1950s model of the field of marriage, these men were able to speak with certainty about the pattern of masculinity to employ within marriage. For instance Henry said marrying meant “*for one who knows where he’s going, is to basically sort out finances, have a good income, have a nice house, and then get the children sorted out in that order (laughter).*”

Thirteen interviewees were asked what men thought the role of husband entailed. All 13 men gave the same answer, that is, the husband is the provider. Some men added the role of protector to their masculine repertoire. Although the provider model was instituted in Britain around the middle of the 19th century (Connell, 2005:28; Gordon & Hunter, 1998:79), some men in this study linked the provider and protector roles to the 1950s model of marriage. Men discussed the provider/protector discourse separate from abusive and controlling practices. Mention of domination and control over women arose later when they were asked if there was an unwritten contract that men take into marriage, hence patterns in men's narratives indicate a configuration of complicit masculinities as these practices do not seek to actively dominate wives: "*Physical security on the house and the family*" (Chris), "*fixing stuff around the house*" (David), "*a disciplinarian*" (James), "*work hard*" (Anthony), and finally, Lazarus added, "*keep the missus and kids happy. Which usually involves bringing more money home than you can earn. To provide a happy home.*"

The provider/protector discourse is based on a logic of economic and symbolic exchange that can give rise to cooperative reciprocity, or can create obligations that set up a legitimate domination (Bourdieu, 2000a:197-198). Connell argues that although men's relations with women are "often interwoven with power", they also entail division of labour and emotional relations (Connell, 1987:97, 2002a:62-63). However, perpetrators can use the provider/protector role and can engage in emotional relations in ways that dominate, coercively control and restrict female partners' lives (Murphy, 2002:18-27). This means many male perpetrators have conflicting beliefs, desires and intentions. It will be shown in the following part of this section, that many male perpetrators also operate from an unwritten master/slave contract.

Other studies find that perpetrators also draw from the "man as protector and provider" masculine discourse to justify their violence. These findings are contrary to some feminist arguments that perpetrators only draw from

the master/slave discourse (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:369; Mullaney, 2007:239).

Bourdieu claims that, as new structures of marriage develop, such constructions help break the inertia of the habitus and to break taken-for-granted doxic assumptions (Bourdieu, 2001:89). For example one man, Rick, described a normative framework that entailed practicing a “modern man” non-hegemonic masculinity within the field of marriage. He said this position-taking was aimed at “*a fifty-fifty arrangement ... looking after each other ... in every facet*”, and that “*a lot of guys would think like that.*” For Peter, marrying was “*a commitment I took very seriously that I love my wife very much and I wanted to get a house together and start a family.*” Bob’s wife was his “*best friend*”, while Max and other men’s rationales include wanting “*a companion ... to grow old, buy a house, buy a block of land put a little caravan and just build stuff, build a future together ... a long-term goal ... for love.*”

“Pure love is a relatively recent historical invention” (Bourdieu, 2001:111) and marital relationships in western societies are now expected to be based on romantic love (Connell, 2002a:63). But, if men’s loving practices include mutuality, egalitarianism, companionship and intimacy this does not fit with hegemonic masculinities. There is complicity involved in supporting the dominant model of a heterosexual marriage as the thing to do as a male adult, but there is no evidence these discourses include an interest or investment in dominating women. Love is equated with femininity, which is associated with subordinated masculinities, whilst egalitarianism is not a currently honoured masculine practice and is actively opposed by some men’s rights groups (Chesney-Lind, 2006:11; Chung, 2001-2002:13; Connell, 2003:9; DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007:876; Dunn, 2004-2005:24; Rosen et al., 2009:518).

Lazarus married because it was “*nice to come home to someone... to have someone you know cares*” and Rick’s rationale was “*commitment, that two halves equal one*”. While Sam’s rationale was similar to others in that he

wanted “*to feel comfort and to feel safe, and you feel whole.*” These quotes suggest many men were seeking to benefit from the “normality” associated with complicit masculinities inherent in marriage-like relationships and having a family (Bourdieu, 1996:23, 1998:66). This particular pattern in men’s narratives does not reflect some feminist views that perpetrators are always intensely competing for power over women (Connell, 2005:79). Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17) argues that competition is inherent within every field, including the field of marriage, however Warde (2004:15-20) argues against this by suggesting that sometimes people may actually want to take up a position within a field in order to gain psychological benefits such as self-esteem and mutual social interaction.

Two men discussed desiring to invest less of their time with male peers and more with their female partners. James said:

“You’re committed to trying to find ways around problems, With a friend you can always just walk away ... but you can’t walk away from marriage ... having somewhere to go to instead of ... trying to find some social thing with friends on the outside... someone there who you can actually confide in. Brings that security as well.” (James)

Peter said:

“Full commitment... By the same token I often have a few beers with my friends. But really there’s just a shallowness in that, there’s nothing there a man can only do that for so long ... you need more than that in life, if you haven’t got someone special that you love then you’re ... just gonna end up broke and boozed and lonely, not fulfilled.” (Peter)

Given the common theme throughout this research that there are other men who encourage hegemonic masculinity in the form of power and control over women, the above two extracts suggest the possibility of longing to let that influence go. Although such an influence has its rewards in symbolic capital, the normative masculine framework described by these two men suggests these rewards are shallow in comparison with the fulfillment and emotional security that could be experienced by committing to live with a woman. Not only do the patterns in these two narratives contradict some feminist notions that perpetrators only want power and control over their

partners, they also indicate a reflexive disposition to reconsider the merits of continually striving for recognition by other men and the conflicting desire to find merit in sharing a loving relationship with a woman.

Symbolic power is exerted by men who practice hegemonic masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:840), and by a range of institutions, through the imposition of schemes of perception, appreciation, respect and desire which become embedded in boys' habitus. Many boys develop an embodied ability to recognise divisions in the hegemonic gender order, in which hegemonic masculinities dominate, and in which women are inferior objects who exist for the gratification of men who practice hegemonic masculinities. Boys and men are granted symbolic prizes of honour and glory for their part in upholding this gender order (Bourdieu, 2000a:167, 170-171, 241; Connell, 2005:82), thereby some men need to dominate women in order to gain the rewards of symbolic capital. This then becomes a pattern of masculine practice that justifies many those men's existence.

Dependence on approval from male peers conflicts with wanting to engage in an egalitarian relationship with a woman. Given that honour is not bestowed on subordinate masculinities in the form of egalitarian care and love, many men have to relinquish the need for recognition among particular peers and have to find something meaningful about a respectful relationship with a woman that will justify their existence. This is not easy for some men to do. This difficulty can be explained by Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005:844) notion of the cultural policing of masculinities, whereby practicing counter-sexist masculinity in the form of opting out of dominating women stigmatises men through multiple and incessant discourses that denigrate such practices, or they may be verbally or physically abused in an attempt to reinstate hegemonic or complicit masculinities.

Patterns in men's narratives reveal that two sets of expectations were met in relationship with women. The first set of expectations entails practicing a blend of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities in the form of

security, commitment and sexual fulfillment. James said, *“The security thing that’s met when I’m in a secure relationship with a woman... I look to a female partner as being a settling influence in my life and that’s certainly been there in ... relationships.”* Other expectations met for some of the men included *“the commitment to each other”* (Rick), *“a sense of stability, support, wholeness”* (Peter) and James was the only man who thought *“an expectation of sexual fulfillment in [a] relationship which can be met.”*

The second set of expectations met, that blended hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities, was by women taking care of the men, the house and children. Expecting dinner on the table may represent hegemonic masculinities if men are dominating and coercing women to do so, or it could represent a mutually shared agreement freely entered into by both partners, although such an agreement is complicit with the dominant model of marriage. Hegemony entails persuasion (Carrigan et al., 1985:594) and a great deal of women’s experience of psychological abuse and control entails subtle persuasion (Marshall, 1999).

Bill reiterated others’ statements saying that, *“Some men, they probably expect their dinner on the table at six and their laundry laundered [and this expectation was met] most of the time.”* While David added that he *“had 20 good years of marriage... I never thought anything was wrong with my wife. So I didn’t expect anything from her other than what she was doing. She never worked so she was at home, looking after the house and the kids. I didn’t expect her to do any more than that.”* It is not possible to claim whether these extracts point to the possibility of women’s complicity in men’s domination (Bourdieu, 2001:49; Connell, 2005:242; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832), or to women submitting to a subservient role in order to prevent abuse, or that women were neither complicit nor subservient.

Max reiterated Bill’s view when he said men experienced their expectation that marriage would lead to being part of a family:

“She stays at home look after the children. It’s great to come home, so tidy. It doesn’t have to be spick and span, but it looks like it’s lived in. Got tea for me, ‘Thanks for beautiful tea’. That comfort of home ... just a homey feeling, to walk home and it’s alive, instead of walking into a place where there’s no-one there and it’s emptiness... I like family life. I like having kids.” (Max)

The way in which some men discuss the desire for complementary roles, whereby men earn the money and protect women, and women care for men by cooking, doing the laundry and making a happy home, suggests that the men’s mix of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities may be practiced in “ways that sustain the patriarchal dividend” (Connell, 2000a:32). The provider/protector model can entail “asymmetrical relations of dependence of recognition-gratitude” (Bourdieu, 2000a:201). In other words, inculcated in men’s and women’s habitus is the embodied recognition that the logic of economic and symbolic giving requires acknowledgement, gratitude and giving in return. This logic means the protector and provider has the right to a response. If a husband does not receive the response, or believes the exchange does not adequately match his giving, he may feel he has been dishonoured and could retaliate with violence and other forms of abuse and control (Bourdieu, 2000a:198-200).

A study conducted by Mullaney (2007:239) found that men justified violence against their partners if women did not appear grateful for the ways men gave to them. Connell (2002a:63) states that “emotional commitments may be positive or negative, favourable or hostile”, but the questions asked of the men in the current thesis did not probe to uncover this complexity any further, thus the complex relations between provider/protector and master/slave practices is an important avenue for future research.

6.2.2 Unwritten master/slave contract

Contrary to the above findings, the tide changed when men were explicitly asked, “If men enter marriage with an unwritten contract what would it say?” It was at this point that 15 out of 16 men discussed hegemonic masculinity in the form of a master/slave imperative, whereby men are the rulers and decision-makers and women the slaves. The unwritten contracts

include independence and freedom for men, and restriction for women, which are practices associated with hegemonic masculinities. This finding fits with Lundgren's in that men in her study perpetrated violence and control to restrict the space for women to express femininity and to expand the space for themselves to express masculinity (Lundgren, 1995:261).

This thesis was not seeking to know the truth of interviewees' personal investment in the master/slave discourse, rather to explore men's normative framework of masculinities. Some men knew there were options in the repertoire of masculinities, but chose to discuss hegemonic masculine practices as the basis of an unwritten contract. James said the unwritten contract "*depends on which man's view I take! (Laugh)... most guys would like their wife or partner to be subservient to them. And be agreeable with the ideals of the husband.*" And Sam said, "*I believe ... in those days, [women] had to be a slave. No woman is a slave (smacks fist into palm). I know the morals there, when I got married ... The good side knew, but the bad side didn't want to hear it.*"

Sam said entering marriage was like owning "*a new car. Once I've done enough payments, it's mine. I own this. And that's how it's going to be. That's how a lot of males think.*" He said that enslaving women entailed treating them:

"Like pieces of meat and sex objects. 'Stuff it, it's my missus I'll do whatever I bloody like. If I want sex she's going to give it to me whenever,' and that's what a lot of males think like that. 'You got my ring. You'll give me sex when I want. If you don't I'll get it from somewhere else'." (Sam)

Patterns in men's narratives appear to play with orthodox and heterodox assumptions that alternate between defending male domination over women and stating the possibility it should no longer be that way. Playing with these possibilities could partly be an effect of attending stopping abuse programmes where undisputed doxic assumptions are challenged (Bourdieu, 1977:169). The master/slave discourse is an acceptable orthodox way of talking about the social world from the perspective of men who practice

hegemonic masculinities. The tension evident in some narratives suggests the tension of letting go of the symbolic rewards that accompany hegemonic masculinities.

Lazarus said the unwritten contract would include *“trust, honour and obey... Although if I said the obey bit the missus would get upset, ‘You’re not my boss’. Compromise, yeah.”* Max also joked around with tenets of hegemonic masculinities as if he was embarrassed by his own views:

“Do as the man says, no (laughter). Probably would. We can be very domineering. We want it our way. Our way or the highway girl. It doesn’t work like that. Unfortunately, no (laugh). A lot of men do want to rule the roost, like, ‘I went to work, I paid for fucking this, I’ve been working all week, get home to this shit’.” (Max)

Hesitancy in taking a decisive stand in the talk about the master/slave discourse could partly be because men were talking to a female interviewer. The master/slave discourse represents a hegemonic masculine *illusio*, that historically (and in some contemporary discourses), the field of marriage has presupposed. This *illusio* becomes embodied in the habitus as an expectation and feel for how the relations of husband and wife should be practiced (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117; Wacquant, 1989:42). The following quotes indicate this collective habitus. Geni said:

“I would think the majority of men would think the wife is like the doting little servant, slave, there to do everything. But a lot of men, he comes home from work in his suit and drops the briefcase and he expects the beer there and the meal on the table.” (Geni)

Likewise Bill said the contract entailed, *“I can do what I want but you gotta do what I tell you to. That’s the way I’d see 90 percent of marriages, from a man’s point of view.”* Brendan was very decisive in representing a hegemonic position and investment in superiority over women. He thought most men still saw *“themselves as the provider ... unless the partner can be better than that, then ... the men, they expect respect. And expect the wife to do the wifey things and let the man do his job”* and that men’s unwritten contract stipulated that women allow *“the man to have the final financial decision and the final direction for the family.”*

Other researchers find that men justify their violence by blaming women's failure to serve them as men (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:369; Mullaney, 2007:237; Wood, 2004:562), a finding that fits with feminist theories.

Many of the men discussed the hegemonic position that women should be sexually faithful but that men were free to seek sex elsewhere. Bob said, "*Sex every night for me... That is really part of the culture.*" Bill added that men marry "*to tie up the mini me (laughter). Get her off the market... Men want to go back to the market and the women can't. I dare say that's 99 percent of men.*"

Brendan, in the current study, said no expectations get met for men in marriage while Bill said this was the case for "*90 percent of men.*" Some men discussed ways women failed to fulfill their part of men's unwritten contract, for example Lazarus said, "*Cooking, cleaning, it's not done the way [men] want it. Sex, not getting as much as they thought they should get. Or thinking that the missus doesn't do enough around the house. I've got a few mates that whinge about how lazy their women are.*"

Given that the normative masculine framework some men describe entails the idea that women fail to conform to the master/slave contract, this strengthens findings from previous feminist research (Cavanagh et al., 2001:710; Hearn, 1998b:126; James et al., 2002:4-5; Lundgren, 1995:210-211, 1998:184; Ptacek, 1988:148) that if women do not behave in particular ways befitting of womanhood, these men draw from a long-standing collective habitus in the form of hegemonic masculinities that give men the right to discipline and control their partners.

Two men talked about the loss of freedom and independence some men experience in a relationship. Independence is commonly associated with contemporary configurations of hegemonic masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:840) and with practices pursued by many husbands. The contemporary honouring of men's independence may have its legacy in the industrial era that led to changes in gendered division of labour.

Husbands generally became sole family breadwinners, which led to independence from women and children (Gordon & Hunter, 1998:79). Underlying this are orthodox assumptions that presume the right to freedom and independence for men whilst restricting the lives of women. Henry said, *“You’ve got to get over the selfishness, coz you can be selfish if you don’t.”* He thought this was an issue for all men saying, *“Yeah. ‘Why should I give you my money? Go and earn your own.’”*

Peter said, *“When I first got married one of my issues was ... I felt as though I’d lose some freedom to ... still be able to see the boys every now and again. Without any problems when I got home about it.”*

This discussion on compromise and letting go of selfishness points to Connell’s notion of internal complexity and contradiction of masculinities in the lives of male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse (Connell, 2000b:4-5; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:852). There is no clear evidence in the discussion here that men are investing in the pursuit of independence and freedom to maintain domination over women, so could entail complicit masculinities. Henry and Peter struggled with whether to practice hegemonic or complicit masculinity or both. Henry said, *“I had to compromise ... she had no idea about how to cook. So I did all the cooking.”* Peter said:

“You lose your independence in some respects ... suddenly you’re married, no longer live like a pig, do things just your way ... gotta come up with some middle ground. Can’t just do things your way ... he’s getting under the thumb ... you got that pride thing as well, ‘Why should I have to do it that way? I’ve been doing it this way for ages’.” (Peter)

Contrary to some feminist views that men’s abuse is motivated by one social discourse, positioning them as singularly seeking power over women, men in the current study positioned themselves variously across different patterns of masculinity. Connell (2005:79-80) argues that marriage for men involves “extensive compromises with women rather than naked domination.” Lundgren found that men in her study used “controlled switching” strategies of punishment and comfort (Lundgren, 1995:221) and

that the greater the mix of punitive and loving behaviours, the greater the certainty that men would become the masculine men they were seeking to become (Lundgren, 1995:261).

To conclude, most men in this study are driven by conflicting masculine purposes and desires when they move in with their partners. There is tension in holding onto desires for freedom and independence on the one hand and compromising and engaging in mutually loving partnerships in which both people are entitled to freedom and independent thought and practices on the other hand. Against the feminist view that perpetrators singularly follow the master/slave discourse, many of the men's narratives indicate a complex blurring of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities and that many men strongly desire something other than mere power and control over their partners. However, Connell argues that overlapping and blurring of multiple masculinities provides strength to the sustenance of the hegemonic project (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:838). Given that the research participants were selected because they admitted to abusing and controlling their wives, it is important to note many of them desire mutual shared love and partnership. Connell argues that despite contemporary moves to base marriage on love rather than ownership, hegemonic masculine practices that uphold the gender order are difficult to abolish (Connell, 2002a:66). Habitus and social structures are continually changing. In contemporary society many male perpetrators engage in multiple masculine practices within the one relationship with their female partner. The family field is a site of tensions and struggles for the conservation and transformation of symbolic power relations (Bourdieu, 1996:22). It is only by examining the complexities and nuances that emerge when habitus, field and capital meet that clues can be found to explain why the master/slave discourse takes precedence in the lives of contemporary male perpetrators (Connell, 2005:29).

6.3 Care and Love

This section focuses on the meaning men in this study give to the concepts of loving and caring for women. Previous research has not explored what love and care means to perpetrators who abuse their partners. Nor is there previous research that explores their motivations to love and care for women, or if indeed they do. The impetus for exploring this topic stemmed from qualitative empirical data which notes women and their experiences are almost invisible, or are trivialised in men's talk (Dobash et al., 1998:401; Eisikovits & Winstok, 2002:689; Goodrum et al., 2001:238; Hearn, 1998b:82; James et al., 2002:7; Ptacek, 1988:145). On the rare occasions women are mentioned, these descriptions represent women as objects of men's violence, or as perpetrators of misconduct towards men. Quantitative and qualitative studies with male perpetrators find many lack empathy, or interest, in women's experience (Covell et al., 2007:172; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004), an issue that Hearn (1998b:82) concludes enables abuse of women to continue. The current research asked men directly what love and care meant to men.

6.3.1 Caring for women

Interviewees described care for women in two ways. First caring entailed providing financial and physical care, second they had learned over time to care for women through giving emotional support by listening and by verbally praising their partners.

Bob said caring involved telling *“her that she's beautiful every day. Just try and be nice. And try and provide as best as I can, like I don't earn a fortune, but whatever I own, she's welcome to it.”* While Bill added *“you're there when they need you as in a shoulder to lean on, ears to listen to, just general help... Do what you can for them, where possible of course.”*

Alex said:

“I spend a fair bit of money on my wife to show her that I love her, but I wish I got a cheaper hobby. But you buy them rings, you offer them a massage, you make them a cuppa before they ask you for one. You praise them up when you’re around other couples. I try to do that and it seems to be working.” (Alex)

Rick added:

“Women need to be heard in an emotional way that’s things I’ve overlooked in my time and not understood... Guys think they’re caring for women by providing money, by buying things... Coz it’s quite easy to open your wallet, really. And it’s quite easy to physically do something. It’s hard to really understand someone emotionally.” (Rick)

The masculine provision of money and masculine physicality are perceived as superior to women’s unpaid labour and women’s so-called weaker bodies, so this form of caring equates to practicing hegemonic or complicit masculinities (Connell, 1987:85) depending on whether men are using those practices to overtly dominate women or not. Whereas taken-for-granted views of women’s roles have been associated with emotional caring, a form of caring that is often considered inferior to men’s. When men engage in this form of caring, the taken-for-granted assumption is that this is practicing subordinated masculinities (Connell, 2000a:31, 2005:79). The embodiment of the socially dominant masculine disposition to care financially and physically, occurs at a pre-reflexive level, thus explaining why this form of caring is automatic and easy. A mechanism underlying the sustenance of hegemony incorporates the ability to impose dominant cultural ideals of masculinities for men to draw upon in their relations with women. These dominant ideals are incorporated into many men’s habitus and they reflect the institutionalised histories associated with the field of marriage (Bourdieu, 1989:23, 1996:21). The neat fit between habitus and field (Bourdieu, 1977:78; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:19) increases the probability that many men will draw on complicit or hegemonic masculinities in their position-taking as a husband who cares using economic and physical capital because this increases the chances of accumulating social and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2001:98). Hence men’s practices help sustain the discourses that inform the habitus.

Peter said he used to think caring entailed *“doing things, but it’s more than that, it’s the listening to them, as in really sorta listening, and not necessarily trying to solve anything.”* Research on domestic violence perpetrators commonly finds that men lack communication skills and concludes this causes individual men to resort to violence as a means of communicating (James, 1999:5; O’Neill, 1998:462). However, this may better be explained through a critical masculinities perspective. There was plenty of evidence in the previous chapter on men’s relationships with other men that many perpetrators learn across their lifetime that sharing the full depth and breadth of their feelings is wussy and weak. This thesis argues that many men may find it difficult to show emotional care by listening to their partners because they are afraid of appearing wussy or weak in the eyes of other men. This points to the use of verbal aggression and physical violence as tools for *avoiding* the practice of subordinate masculinities and the loss of symbolic capital.

Henry named reasons why some men find it hard to care. Reasons include men’s possible lack of understanding of women and men’s possible fear of getting it wrong. This implies the fear of being emasculated, the fear of becoming like women, or becoming “the other” and thus the fear of losing the status associated with hegemonic masculinities (Connell, 1987:249):

“It comes down to the interaction ... it also comes down to how much value you put on that relationship ... and love ... but then you could say, ‘What is love?’ ... It comes down to having the experience. Like a young guy that’s just coming into a relationship ... it’s one thing you’re not taught to do ... love ... it’s a trial and error thing until you work it out... It comes down what he knows about [caring], what he learns about her, how he knows to talk to her and what to say given the moods... If ... the male [is] not tuned into the female because she’s got extra hormones ... she’ll snap your head off and you’ll say, ‘What the fuck did I do, what’s wrong?’” (Henry)

Two men gave self-centred reasons for caring for women. Sam said he treated women *“like a queen. I give them anything they want, their kids, anything. Because they make me feel special, they make me feel alive.”* And Lazarus said he cared *“about how [women] look when we go out together”* because women have *“gotta look good so the boys are jealous.”* Here Lazarus’s reason points to practices of hegemonic masculinities in the form

of parading women as sex objects, using them as tools to gain validation from male peers and as tools aimed at winning competition with rival peers (Carrigan et al., 1985:587).

6.3.2 Loving women

Men were asked, “What does love mean to men?” Men’s answers indicate evidence of internally complex and contradictory masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832).

The first theme that describes what love means to men entails suppressing the ability to love, not knowing how to love, or narrowing the concept of love to that of physical intimacy. Several men said, as Chris did that, *“It’s a hard question for someone that doesn’t know it.”* Bob pondered, *“Hm? God. That’s tough! ... Hmm. Just. Ooh I can’t even think how to describe it!”* While Peter pondered at length, *“Ummmm, ah... Jeez. Isn’t that one of those philosophy type, Christ I don’t know. Um. Um, probably using up all your tape here...”* Anthony added that, *“The average man on the street hasn’t got a clue...”* David reiterated others’ views when he said he did not *“believe you can really love someone until you’re mature enough.”* Finally, several men said as David did that, *“A lot of blokes mistake physical intimacy for love”*.

Not knowing what love means, or defining it as physical intimacy, reflects hegemonic masculinities in that they are constructed in opposition to femininities (Connell, 2005:223). Given that love is not a topic commonly discussed by men in general, probably because it is a subordinated masculine topic (Carrigan et al., 1985:587), this can explain the tensions and hesitations in men’s discussion of what love means to men. Dominant cultural representations of masculinities, within the homosocial field, position heterosexual men as effeminate if they show love, therefore men may develop a masculine habitus that suppresses desires to feel and show love and suppresses the language to express personal meanings of love.

Therefore, it is no surprise that the second theme that describes what love means to men links love with ownership of women and expectations of women's subservience. David said, "*He loves his wife to do everything that she's told to do, and be obedient*" and Alex said he used to think "*love was an ownership type of thing, you love someone you're with them 24 hours a day.*" Although Sam said, "*Love to me means more than anything in the world*" he added that men know they are loved:

"By showing me... Nice, calm, peacefully, 'How was your day?' 'Oh, I'm in a bastard of a mood.' 'Okay love, do you want a cup of coffee?' It doesn't mean you're delittling [sic] yourself for that person, you're giving that person space. You're giving, 'Okay, talk about it when you've finished your coffee darls if you want to'... or 'Darls, here's a beer, go sit out the back'. If he's not a violent man, go sit out there. 'Children stay inside away from dad for half an hour, or 20 minutes. Let him wind down'." (Sam)

Millett (1971:36-37) argued early on that romantic love and chivalry are ideological techniques that disguise patriarchal power over women. Throughout his interviews, Sam described himself as a soft teddy bear, who was never physically violent to women. However, throughout his, and other men's, narratives were indicators of a prolific use of psychologically denigrating and controlling tactics. Men said it took time to understand how to understand women emotionally and that caring involved "trial and error". By linking love to obedience and ownership, this reflects a configuration of hegemonic masculinities, as this way of showing love maintains dominance over women (Connell, 2005:83).

Caution has to be taken in interpreting the third theme that describes what love means to men. For example Henry said, "*True relationship is you're fully consumed by each other... It's a matter of expressing your feelings and your concerns and talking about the most intimate things and know that that will never be repeated... unless it was really necessary.*" The reason for caution in interpreting what form of masculinity Henry is practicing here is because a controlling tactic used by perpetrators practicing hegemonic masculinities is the enforcement of privacy. The covert nature of psychological abuse and control ensures the abuse remains private, and is linked to control tactics that isolate women (Murphy, 2002:10; Stark,

2007:2). Caution also has to be taken when interpreting Henry's idea that love equates to being "*fully consumed by each other*" because another control tactic entails preventing women from having private space (Murphy, 2002:77).

The intricacies connected with the simultaneity of love and abuse could also be apparent in the following two extracts. Lazarus thought love entailed "*loyalty and trust... Coz without either of them there can't be too much love*", and Brendan said, "*If you love somebody then you'll do everything that it takes to see that they're happy.*"

Although these quotes have the appearance of shared love between two people who take responsibility for their behaviours, research from abused women's perspectives suggests that it is common for perpetrators to turn these seemingly benign qualities, into one-way requirements in favour of hegemonic masculinities. Women's stories indicate that perpetrators argue that women's close relationships with children represent disloyalty to the husband. Perpetrators restrict women's social activities by saying the only way women can prove they are trustworthy is to stay home away from mixing with other men. Finally, many perpetrators relinquish their responsibilities and demand women do everything to ensure the survival of the family (Murphy, 2002:88, 91-92).

The main reason why intimate partner abuse continues, even in the absence of physical violence, can be explained by Bourdieu's notion of "twofold naturalisation" (Bourdieu, 1990b:181). This is a process by which the social is inscribed in the masculine habitus and the resulting symbolic violence engenders a self-evident attitude, that the social order is natural and acceptable (Bourdieu, 1990b:53, 2000a:98, 173, 2001:2; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:14, 171). Embodied in some men's habitus is the self-evident, uncontested, seemingly natural notion that men have the hegemonic right to control women.

The fourth theme that describes what love means to men highlights desires that conflict with dominant understandings of male perpetrators as singularly seeking power and control over women. Several men said, as Bob did, that love meant their partner was “*your best friend*” and Max said love entailed:

“Understanding each other, hold each other, give each other a hug, perhaps a kiss, doesn’t always have to be sexual. Sharing time, go for walks, being there for each other, listening, understanding each other and trust. Trust is a big key. Once you wreck your trust it’s really hard to rebuild your relationship. Very hard.” (Max)

Max said, “*Sometimes they might be rough at it. Yeah, a lot of men know how to be loving.*” While Chris’s view associated love with being “*nurtured. We like someone to mother us. I like when she sits on the lounge and gives me a cuddle... companionship, two people together who have kids and a family. Everyone lives happily ever after. I don’t think we set out to argue all the time, but it does happen. It’s how you deal with it.*”

Chris’s version of love is evidence of a complex interplay of contradictory desires. Given the policing of subordinated masculinities (Connell, 2000a:31) and the notion that hegemonic masculine practices provide a dominant model guiding how men should resolve problems with female partners (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:839), this partly explains why some men choose the route of hegemony. Apart from thinking love equates to ownership, obedience and sex, culturally exalted masculinities do not associate love with honoured masculinities.

Some men discuss the purpose (Burke, 1969:xx) underpinning showing love or feeling loved. Rick’s idea of love entails feeling “*safe, or you feel content or you feel connected, or everything feels right.*” While Anthony thought love entails “*respect the differences, respect for the person they are, respect for what they want, respect for their own choices.*” James said, “*Love to me is unconditional acceptance... A willingness to accept bad things as long as there’s some commitment to change. Or to try and find some middle ground between the opposing view of you and your partner.*”

Peter said:

“I knew that I was in love, like I’m prepared to open up myself wide open to my wife, which I’ve probably never done with anyone else. That’s what love’s about, if you can let all your defences down and be who you really are. That’s love with no fear of, fear of hurt or it being used against you. To open yourself up totally.” (Peter)

When men in this study were asked what love meant to them, it was as if this was the first time they had ever talked about the subject. This was evident in the tones of their voices, their desire to find the right words that described how they felt and the emotions the subject stirred in them. Geni cried when he said, *“Love is caring and gentle... If anything happened to my wife I’d be (removing hanky from pocket and wiping tears from eyes), don’t know what I’d do.”* If a way to dismantle the current hegemonic project, and stop men’s perpetration of abuse and control over intimate partners, is to let down defences and develop the practice of love, vulnerability and openness, it is important to include discussions of subordinated masculinities (if they are not already) in stopping abuse programmes. These discussions would include the effects of stigmatising men for showing love, care and vulnerabilities and would educate men to support each other to take a stand against the subordination of masculine expressions of love.

6.3.3 Hopes and dreams for women

Interviewees were asked what hopes and dreams men have for women when they first start living together, then were asked what hopes and dreams they hold for their aggrieved partners now, at the time of the interview. Patterns in men’s narratives reveal a lack of ability to name hopes and dreams for women at the beginning of the relationship, but after attending stopping abuse programmes appear better able to do so.

6.3.3.1 Hopes and dreams at the start

Instead of naming hopes and dreams for women at the beginning of a relationship, Henry made a lengthy statement about why *“a lot of guys don’t have much dreams for their partners.”* These reasons stemmed from the notion that some men marry to be served by their partners, which was clearly indicative of hegemonic masculinities. Henry was not able to name wishes for his partner, rather he said, *“If Johnny’s just left home, ‘Who’s gonna look after me, who’s gonna make me tea, who’s gonna do me clothes?’”* Alex said:

“For her? I don’t know you always plan that, you have these expectations that you come home from work and there’ll be a beautiful roast dinner on the table, and the house will be spotlessly clean. Am I answering this question right, I don’t think I am? What was the question?” (Alex)

Then when the question was repeated Alex still did not name hopes and dreams for his partner, rather he said, *“That depends, see I lived with my ex-wife first up and we, I was very controlling, it’s like, ‘You’re not gonna do this today, you’re not gonna go to your mother’s today’, and all this stuff.”*

It can be seen from the above extracts that some men control women’s movements in directions that better ensure women fulfill those men’s expectations of being cared for. While some men shape their practices of hegemonic masculinities in ways that ensure gaining the patriarchal dividend (Connell, 2000a:32), this necessitates neglecting to have hopes and dreams that might benefit women.

The difficulty most men had in naming hopes and dreams they might have for their partners, instead of for themselves, was quite common in these interviews. This strongly indicates the need to benefit from the practices of hegemonic masculinities. Bob said, *“I’d like to think that everybody would treat their wife like a princess.”* Underlying this logic is a form of agency (Burke, 1969:xx) based on fantasy. Throughout men’s narratives they were more likely to mention co-agents’ (Burke, 1969:xix) encouragement for them to control and abuse women, but they did not mention any real-life

face-to-face relationships that guided them in what to do, or how to, love and care for women.

When Rick finally managed to consider his partner, he described practices indicative of complicit masculinities (Connell, 2005:79-80). Any attempt to please the woman was more related to a loss of power associated with hegemonic masculinities, than a desire to sacrifice himself to help his partner achieve her hopes and dreams. Ultimately though he wanted to benefit:

“I hope to think a lot of guys would be thinking the whole knight in shining armour, trying to satisfy their partners... You kind of go along with things, like my dad renovating houses and, ‘What do you think?’ ‘Oh I really want this colour for this room’ and him not really fighting it and mum going, ‘Oh that’s what I wanted, that looks great’, and then he gets satisfaction that she’s satisfied.” (Rick)

Connell (2000a:35) argues that the patriarchal dividend is pivotal to the politics of domination, whether men are practicing complicit or hegemonic masculinities. Thus, as can be seen in the above quote, perpetrators who are in the midst of reducing or stopping their abuse of women, appear to still need to find some way to benefit from what women do, even if this entails an emotional satisfaction.

When James was asked what hopes and dreams men have for their partners when they start living together he cried while answering the question. Although he gave much consideration to possible wishes for his partner he, like four other men, included hopes and dreams for himself. However these dreams suggested complicit masculinities because they did not actively seek domination over women, and they included the need to benefit from patriarchal dividends available to men who do not challenge the hegemonic project (Carrigan et al., 1985:592; Connell, 2005:79-80). James said, “*I’d love for ... a relationship ... where you grow together and learn all these new things in your life and spend time together and also spend time apart if that’s the way it is ... together, but on an equal basis.*”

Bob included himself in his hopes and dreams for his partner showing a complicit masculinity (Connell, 2005:79-80) that did not seek to be overly dominant. He said, *“I hoped that she would love me as much or more than I love her... I work a lot of hours to try and buy her the niceties of life that she deserves.”* Bill’s hopes and dreams for his partner entailed *“do things together and go places together”*, while Lazarus said, *“A lot of shags (laugh). Or just to be happy... Suppose she looks for a few shags too. Do the right thing by her. Be faithful.”* Sam’s dream was *“that she doesn’t get hurt. That you treat her the way you want to be treated.”*

Given that practicing hegemonic masculinities leads to receiving the patriarchal dividend of prestige, and “the right to command” (Connell, 2005:82), it is little wonder some interviewees found it difficult to separate themselves from hopes and dreams they might have held for their partners. The hegemonic project includes a need to benefit from what women do.

Only two men did not explicitly include their own desires in the naming of wishes and dreams for their partners at the beginning of the relationship. However the dreams mentioned were limited to house and family, thus implying, yet again, that this form of masculinity requires women to provide the benefit of the patriarchal dividend. For example, Geni said, *“To raise a loving happy family.”* Peter wanted to *“provide her with a nice house ... a family. Which weren’t necessarily my dreams... I knew that that was my wife, so I worked very hard to do that.”*

The sacrifices Peter made to provide his wife with her goal reflects Connell’s (2005:79-80) model of complicit masculinities. Connell contends that men make “extensive compromises” within marriage, however such investments lead to the high return offered by the patriarchal dividend. None of the men mentioned that women could independently create their own hopes and dreams, and that women might want something that those men have no interest in benefiting from. Rather, many men portrayed women as dependent on the masculine ability to provide her with hopes and dreams.

6.3.3.2 Hopes and dreams now

The men were further asked what hopes and dreams they had for their aggrieved partner now (at the time of the interview). This time, the men focused less on themselves – although this did still occur for some men – but they were better able to focus on hopes and dreams for the woman (whether she was now an ex-partner or whether they still lived together). Between the time of first moving in with their partners and the time of the interview, the men had undergone one or more educational programmes to help them stop abusing their partners, which could explain their shift in ability to focus on their partners.

First, some men hoped their partners would develop freedom and independence. Henry said, *“Hopefully she’ll get her schooling sorted out and get herself into a good job, and get some decent money coming in, earn her own.”*

Bob added, *“I want her to have her own friends, and lead a full life. If she wants to go horse riding, go... I’m not gonna stop her doing anything.”* Likewise Alex said, *“She’s just trying to get a job now, and once she gets a job she’ll be happy that she’s not stuck in the house all day long.”* Rick described having to change his position-taking in relation to his usual framework of masculinities, so his partner could develop freedom and independence. However he had some doubt that relinquishing the practice of hegemonic masculinity would benefit him:

“It’s whatever she wants that’s gonna make her happy, within sensible reason ... obviously anything she wants to do I’m accepting of her doing that, because I’ve always done things, so, I’m happy to let her do, join, anything she wants to do... I’d be happy to miss out on things if I knew it was beneficial.” (Rick)

Second, some men wanted their partners to be happy or healthy. Peter and Geni wanted their wives to be happy and healthy for the woman’s own benefit, but four men said they wanted their aggrieved partners to be happy so that the man himself, or the children, could get their needs met. These needs were indicative of complicit masculinities and the desire to benefit

from the patriarchal dividend associated with the happy family. Lazarus said, *“As long as she’s happy, makes things easy for me kids, I get to see my kids more often when she’s happy.”* Bob felt desperate for his wife to be happy with him:

“I just hope that she’s happy and happy with me. I don’t want her sitting at home thinking, ‘Oh jeez, I could’ve done a lot better than him’... I’d be really disappointed with my life if it come 20 years down the track and that’s what she was thinking of me... It’d probably kill me.” (Bob)

Third, two men hoped their ex-partners would benefit from living with their new male partners. Sam hoped *“that he makes her happy, more happy than I ever made her”*, while James elaborated on this dream for his ex-partner:

“That she will be able to learn how to trust again, and that she will be comfortable in a relationship with somebody else again... So that there’s not things in ... her world that remind her of the violence that I perpetrated ... So more than anything that she can trust somebody else again. Because ... I’m responsible for the destruction of that trust. And that would help me to heal too.” (James)

Neither of these men questioned the possibility that their ex-partners might be subject to power and control by their new male partners. This points to hegemonic or complicit masculinities, or an overlap of both, because neither configuration of masculinities actively questions or opposes the gender order. This lack of challenge ensures the hegemonic project is sustained (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832).

This lack of challenge also points to the doxic taken-for-granted assumption that all men are protectors and providers and that it is only men with individual problems who abuse their partners (Bourdieu, 1996:21). Institutions such as the media use symbolic power to represent such assumptions as commonsense (Bourdieu, 2001:116). Previous research notes that some men draw on print media discourses to form their definitions of themselves as perpetrators. Jones observed that dominant discourses portray perpetrators as the deviant “other”, including the mentally ill, the ethnically different, and monsters. Thus, men she interviewed were keen to distance any definition of themselves from

stereotypical perpetrators (Jones, 2004:253-254). Whereas, implied in the interviewees' narratives in the current study, men admitted to being perpetrators and did not explicitly question whether their ex-partners may or may not be being abused by their new male partners.

Fourth, two men who were in the midst of attending a stopping abuse programme and described attempts at making sense of their abusive behaviours, wanted their relationships to reconcile or to continue. Instead of naming hopes and dreams for his ex-partner Bill said, "*See if we can get back together and move on.*" Likewise Alex said, "*I love my partner and I hope we live together forever. We might not, some days are really bad.*" The implication here is that some men believe their relationships will work if they reframe their normative framework of masculinities, so that they move away from hegemonic masculinities towards non-abusive masculinities. However, neither man named a hope or dream especially for their partners. Instead their descriptions indicated a continued investment in an *illusio* focused on their own hopes (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:117; Wacquant, 1989:42), thus showing their movement away from hegemonic masculinities was not complete.

6.3.4 Tough façade obliging men to care less

The final focus in this section about love and caring explores an issue that prevents caring, that is many men's need to appear tough for other men's approval. As was seen in the previous chapter on men's relationships with men, some boys grow into men who are afraid of practicing subordinated masculinities because they are afraid to appear wussy or weak from the viewpoint of other men. This was the impetus to ask men in the second round of interviews whether being loving and showing love to a female partner might mean appearing wussy or weak in the eyes of other men. They were also asked if they thought this might affect men's ability to care.

Men's ability and desire to care for their partners is motivated by two conflicting sets of masculine interests. Some of the men are simultaneously

driven to seek a sense of hegemonic importance and esteem in the eyes of other men, whilst being driven to seek a sense of fulfillment and meaning by fully engaging in a caring relationship with a woman. According to Bourdieu different sets of interests prevail in different fields (Wacquant, 1989:49).

One of the scenes (Burke, 1969:17) that set the stage for many men to care less about women entailed relentless active policing by other men to discourage subordinate masculinity in the form of caring for women. Lazarus explained how such influence occurred at work:

“We rag on blokes at work all the time coz his missus rings every day... At the end of the conversation he always says, ‘Okay babe, I love you I’ll see you when I get home’. Now we like rag on him a fair bit over it, ‘Oh isn’t that sweet dearie, you love her, ohhhh’. And he just tells us to shut up, it’s his missus, he’s allowed to. And we pretty much leave it go after that, but we still give him shit the next day for it. It’s a running joke. He might get one day a week off where we don’t.”
(Lazarus)

Although some men challenged such taunts, some men developed a façade of toughness. This façade in turn created an emotional backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that, according to Rick “*lessens their ability to [care for women] ... if they’ve got that fence up, that shield up, that wall*” and Bill agreed. Peter thought his “*‘look at me’ big bravado sort of thing*” was a masculine strategy in response to a lack of safety and trust amongst males. This is another aspect of this emotional backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that motivates patterns of masculinities that entail lack of caring. The emotional vulnerability due to the lack of safety and trust is hidden from others because as Peter said:

“The damage is done underneath. It’s not seen, putting up the front all the time, that would cross over to your relationships with women as well. To open up to aspects of yourself that you have to keep hidden, for years and years and years.”
(Peter)

The field of homosocial relations and the field of heterosexual relations contain different sets of masculine logic and stakes, thus different social conditions influence the particular sets of masculine interests men might reasonably choose to invest in (Bourdieu, 1990a:31).

Sam's interest entailed seeking approval from other men. He said showing love "*was my soft side, you can't show your soft side.*" However, he said that the drive not to show the soft side in front of men meant women "*were just used for a couple of things in life. If you didn't get what you wanted, 'See ya'. It was straightforward.*"

Sam spoke here, not of individual practices, but of practices representing collective masculinities, practices endorsed through dominant cultural messages. Men with symbolic capital have the power to impose which practices are the most honoured, and the power to grant recognition and prestige on men who behave accordingly (Bourdieu, 1989:23). Connell (2005:214) contends that it is men practicing hegemonic masculinities who hold this power to impose standards of behaviour, whereas men practicing subordinated masculinities are discredited (Connell, 2000a:31), a strategy used to preserve hegemonic masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:837).

At the same time, although Peter and Geni were uncomfortable with public displays of love and care, they were adamant this would not affect how they loved their wives. Not all masculine practices conform to dominant messages. Bourdieu (2000a:207) contends that social behaviours are motivated by a specific *illusio*, or interest in a particular masculine game. The types of interests men have in any particular field are linked to their objective masculine position (Wacquant, 1989:49), thus the position of husband is a site where interests conflict. Firstly, men in the current study were pulled between hegemonic masculinities or a combination of complicit and subordinated masculinities. In other words they were pulled between notions that husbands should maintain freedom and independence and control and restrict their partners' lives, or they can have degrees of freedom and independence and not control and restrict women's lives, but husbands can be partners with women building a caring, loving relationship. It was noted in the last chapter that many men have an interest in gaining respect amongst male peers and it was noted in this chapter that although some men

find meaning in having a close relationship with their partners, they also find meaning in practicing hegemonic masculinities.

The conflict between some men's interests in the field of marriage and field of male peers, including the conflict between hegemonic and subordinated masculinities (Connell, 2000a:13), are actually tensions that can lead to change, in part depending on which interest holds the most meaning for men at any given time, or in any given field. Geni and Peter discussed these conflicts. Geni said, *"You can love someone and be deeply in love and without [making] a show of something in public"*, likewise Peter said although he was uncomfortable with *"that lovey dovey ... whole public, performance thing ... I don't think it would affect how I love my wife."* Peter had kept aspects of his masculinities hidden for many years, due to his investment in stakes inherent in homosocial relationships. But as time went by his desire to invest in the stakes on offer within his heterosexual relationship might have helped motivate him to attend the stopping abuse programme, thereby taking the risk of moving away from hegemonic masculinities, and relinquishing his investment in the field of male peers. Peter said that at the programme:

"There was a lot of stories there where it's gone past the point of no return, with bloody ugly separations and custody battles and I could see if I went on and on that was probably where it was heading. So it was good to see that. I'm very lucky with what I got so it made me feel thankful." (Peter)

Given that social discourses set the backdrop for individuals to act (Burke, 1969:7), this thesis argues that the constant discrediting of so-called feminine emotions and behaviours, associated with subordinated masculinities (Connell, 2000a:13) represent this backdrop. Therefore this is a major cause of men's intimate partner abuse. It is also argued that this is a major cause of hegemonic masculine practices that entail reluctance to show care and love, and reluctance to change masculine practices including seeking help. Not all men may directly seek to gain power over women. Rather many may have an interest and investment in avoiding subordinated masculinities to avoid abuse from other men, or they may be seeking to be

recognised as honourable by other men. This may be the case when abusing women in the privacy of their home, in that some men may be seeking an embodied feeling of approval by practicing hegemonic masculinities, even away from the presence of actual other men. The significance of this particular scene-act-purpose ratio is pivotal to this thesis (Burke, 1969:443).

This finding supports Hearn's and Whitehead's (2006:44, 46) proposal that perpetrators' power over women could be an "effect" of their abusive behaviours, as opposed to a "motivational cause" because they may actually be motivated by the need to appear "heroic" in the eyes of other men. Consequently, Hearn and Whitehead warn that professionals facilitating stopping abuse programmes should not give men the message that men's abuse of their partners is unmanly, otherwise this could motivate many men to re-offend in an attempt to restore their sense of manhood. Instead the authors assert that the motivating forces of masculinities underpinning men's abusive behaviours should be used as an educational tool (Hearn & Whitehead, 2006:48).

These conclusions support Connell's notion that the culture is used for disciplinary purposes, in part by upholding heroic icons, including violent male figures, for men to aspire to, and by denigrating any behaviours that smack of femininity (Connell, 2005:214). Connell argues that such heroism is "tightly bound" to representations of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005:234), thus only certain configurations of masculinity actually qualify for such a heroic status.

To conclude this section on love and care, it is argued that embodied in the masculine habitus, via the mechanism of symbolic violence, are messages that honour hegemonic masculinities in the form of using, abusing, neglecting and controlling women and messages that stigmatise subordinated masculine practices of loving and caring for women. Despite many of the men's desires to share care and love within a heterosexual relationship, the requirement that they let down their defences and make themselves vulnerable in order to practice care and love is heavily

discouraged in the homosocial field. Although some men challenge other men's provocations not to care for women, one form of *illusio* in the homosocial field encourages practices aimed at winning the stake of symbolic capital from real and imagined other men who have the authority to bestow honour on hegemonic masculinities. One form of *illusio* in the marital field is the emotional fulfillment that results in emotional intimacy, but emotional capital holds very little worth in the logic of hegemonic masculinities because of the symbolic violence imposed on the habitus.

A reason many men find it extremely difficult to name hopes and dreams for their partners, when they first start living with her, may be because the patriarchal dividend is central to the hegemonic project, so it is important to note that following attendance at stopping abuse programmes changes in masculinities lead to a better ability to name hopes and dreams for aggrieved partners now, that do not always include benefits to men.

6.4 Men Controlling Women

Throughout the interviews men indicated that controlling women was encouraged and acceptable on the one hand, and discouraged and unacceptable on the other. Many men controlled women because it was perceived to be acceptable, but they used tactics, and sought out contexts, that were best suited to avoiding being caught by authorities. Although several men stated that physically hitting women was cowardly, none of the 16 men said that sexist talk, or psychologically controlling behaviours were cowardly and it was extremely rare for them to say such behaviours were wrong.

It is argued that the normative masculine framework described in this section is overwhelmingly characteristic of hegemonic masculinities, in the form of domination that does not invest in the use force to achieve its ends (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:846). Men's motives stem from an *illusio*, that is a recognition of what stakes are on offer and a practical sense for how

to win those stakes (Wacquant, 1989:42). This thesis argues that the stakes many of the men aim to gain are social capital, which incorporates the desire to establish and maintain meaningful high-status social networks (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:119) and symbolic capital which incorporates the desire to be recognised by other men as having status and prestige (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:173).

6.4.1 Any control is better than no control

The first masculine tactic used to psychologically abuse and control women entailed finding the best way to avoid punishment. According to Bob, this configuration of hegemonic masculinities was evident at school dances. During a conversation about the benefits of belonging to the popular group at school Bob said, *“You can get a look in on some of the games we played, like at school dances... There’d be bets on ... with the popular crowd – who was gonna get what girl – and they were serious bets ... it was all organised. The fellas that were down low [on the hierarchy] didn’t even get a look in.”* This game was called *“pig lotto”* and entailed *“who could get the ugliest girl got the bag of money.”* When asked if that entailed having sex Bob said, *“No, it’s only a school dance so you don’t get away with too much coz there’s teachers everywhere. Being a boarding school, anything was better than nothing.”*

According to Bob the boys would create a tactic of control and abuse that would fall under the radar of the normative management style used by teachers, however Bob added that this game had *“been going on for years there, turns out that one of the girls, her brother found out about it, then she found out about it, then all the nuns found out about it, and we got a belting.”* Given that the game had been going on for years, it seems unlikely that a belting would stop it from continuing, or if it did, it is likely boys would find another tactic of hegemonic masculinity to use women as weapons in their pursuit to prove their prowess in front of each other.

Many workplaces are introducing policies against control and abuse of women, thus are attempting to change the configuration of the practices of hegemonic masculinities in the workplace. Chris said, *“Over the last years ... we used to see a lot of sexual problems, there used to be guys flirting with girls pinching them that’s become non-acceptable, so it doesn’t happen any more.”* Some patterns of hegemonic masculinity entail the determination to utilise psychological abuse, so ensure this is deployed out of sight of the workplace boss. Alex said many of his male colleagues *“don’t treat the women too well... One lady I work with she must be in her late 50s, she’ll go grab a wooden pallet and they’re like 25 kilos and she can’t lift it, so she’ll drag it along the ground and all the other blokes will just stand around and watch... If the boss walked through at that time they’d grab the pallet, it gets me mad.”*

The game at school, and the mass stop work in the factory, both suggest that practices of hegemonic masculinities in the form of humiliating others are perceived as legitimate amongst peers, but these men knew that their behaviours were not perceived as legitimate by the abused women, or by the norms engaged in by teachers or workplace management. In both cases this thesis argues that hegemonic masculinities perpetuate because of the esteem bestowed on acts of domination within the homosocial field.

Those men spoke with a degree of guilelessness about the way they talk about, or talk to, women. Bill said that at the pub men do not discuss relationships with women. Rather that *“you go to a pub and see a group of men and put a microphone there, nine times out of 10 it’ll be sports and the weekend, and the one time out of 10 it’ll be women.”* When Bill was asked if this talk about women was derogatory he replied:

“No. It’ll be more, ‘Look at her’, not in the point of putting women down or who you had last weekend. It’s just coz you’ve got five minutes to kill before the end of the beer ... it’s, ‘Look at her, wouldn’t mind doing her, wouldn’t mind doing her’, ‘Cheers, see ya later’ and go back to the wife. It’s not of putting women down, ‘Oh I bash my wife’ and everyone’s like, ‘Oh we need another round for that’, you wouldn’t hear that.” (Bill)

Anthony spoke of pub conversations amongst men that also objectified women. He said men would say *“how we’re not getting it, how we want more of it, why isn’t that pink skirt over there coming over to say hello for more sex.”*

In both these instances of sexist talk, it is as if the configuration of hegemonic masculinities deployed here entails a lack of awareness of the abusive nature of such language. When speaking about psychologically controlling and abusing their partners, Alex thought that *“a lot of men don’t know what they’re doing wrong.”* In previous feminist research Hearn (1998b:113) indicates some men use a form of quasi-repudiation when discussing abuse against their partners that entails the notion of “not knowing” which involves acknowledging violence by virtue of not specifically denying it. For instance saying, “I can’t remember.” Hearn argues this might be a deliberate lie, or a genuine memory lapse.

Patterns in some men’s narratives reveal a relationship between purpose-agency (Burke, 1969:161). “Not knowing” could be interpreted as a form of agency, a kind of learned ignorance that colludes with the logics of these particular fields (Bourdieu, 1977:124), used to hide abusive practices from teachers and bosses for the purpose of maintaining the hegemonic project in the form of intimate partner abuse.

In the present study, four men said that attending the stopping abuse programme enlightened them about controlling and psychologically abusive tactics that they had never considered to be abusive. Alex said, *“I didn’t know I was so abusive to my wife, verbally abusive, mentally abusive ... until I saw the movie that’s when I felt shame”*. Lazarus reiterated Bill’s view when he said that he did not feel shame for abusing his wife but that:

“It was only until later when I did the anger management course, they brought in a heap of sheets that a battered women’s group had done and there was things there – ‘Even when he’s not punching me the things that he says’ – Just some of the things that it was saying made you think. Then I realised lots of things [and] how bad I had got.” (Lazarus)

Chris added:

“It took probably about the first three weeks when I started realising, ‘Okay I am this, I am violent’... it started to click, ‘Mmm I do that, I do that’... and how it wasn’t just verbal and it wasn’t physical, it could be all of these and I’m sitting there going, ‘I can tick that one, I can tick, tick, tick’ ... ‘Oh, maybe I am’.”
(Chris)

Stopping abuse programmes are the only interventions that go some way to reducing or stopping practices of hegemonic masculinity in the form of psychological abuse and control of women. But previous research conducted by Jones (2004:175) found that some men reverse what they learn about power and control by blaming women for refusing to have sex, or some men make women responsible for ensuring men enact skills learned at the programme.

6.4.2 When control is above suspicion

As a way of exploring men’s views on psychological control of female partners, interviewees were asked what types of things women call abusive and controlling, that men do not agree are abusive and controlling. There were six specific categories of behaviour that interviewees suggested many men do not agree are actually controlling or abusive. These categories of control, and the act of control itself, overwhelmingly characterised the practice of hegemonic masculinities. This self-evident assumption that hegemonic power and control over women is above suspicion can be explained using Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic violence. Bourdieu (2001:1-2, 34) contends that the “relations of domination, its rights and prerogatives, privileges and injustices, ultimately perpetuates itself so easily” and is often “perceived as acceptable and even natural.” This is the result of many men’s internalisation of a “gentle violence” that Bourdieu calls “symbolic violence” exerted by a wide range of institutions and dominant groups “through an act of cognition and of misrecognition that lies beyond – or beneath – the controls of consciousness and will” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:171-172). Accordingly, even men with the best intentions can enact

controlling and abusive talk and behaviour towards women in countless imperceptible ways (Bourdieu, 2001:59).

Seven men said controlling money was not considered abusive or controlling. David said, *“Blokes like to control money, their money”* and Chris added, *“Guys think they earn the money they keep the money.”*

Three men thought restricting women’s social life was not considered abusive or controlling. Lazarus said, *“I know a few of me mates used to try and control their women about where they went and who they spent their time with, and which friends they hung out with... Just keep ’em away from bad people.”* While Sam added, *“You don’t let me go out to the pub with my girlfriends... because they know what you used to be like, when she used to drink.”*

The field of homosocial relations is a dominant backdrop (Burke, 1969:7) that influenced the quality of masculine actions and motivations in this study. The logic of masculine practice inherent in this field entails objectifying women, denigrating women, using and controlling women through any non-physical means possible. These are forms of agency (Burke, 1969:xxi) that men encourage other men to use for the purpose of winning the stakes of the game of positioning oneself favourably on the hierarchy of masculinities. This thesis argues that this particular configuration of interest, stakes and logic of practice in particular fields of homosocial relations – that fit neatly with hegemonic masculinities – is a pivotal scene (Burke, 1969:17) that must be understood, challenged and dismantled for men’s perpetration of intimate partner abuse to be reduced or stopped.

Other men thought monitoring women’s time was not controlling or abusive. Henry said his partner *“had this perception I would be making sure what she was doing every minute of the day, in so far as who she was seeing, where she was going, how long she was out for... I mean there was some friends I didn’t think she could have associated with, but I never really*

stopped her from seeing them.” Sam added that he “used to get shitty when my girl used to go read a book in bed by herself. Go, ‘What the fuck, you’re not spending any time with me. Woo woo, I’m supposed to be number one centre of attention here, not the bloody book’. Now I realise... they just need their bloody time.”

Yet other men thought judging their partners’ mode of housekeeping was not controlling or abusive. Chris reiterated Alex’s words when he said, *“I’d come home, the house is dirty. ‘Clean the house! Do that, you’ve done nothing, you’re watching TV!’”*

Six men said, as James did, that *“yelling, intimidation”* and other physically aggressive behaviours were tactics those men did not agree were abusive or controlling. Peter reiterated other men’s words when he said his wife, *“Used to say the looks I’d give her. Aggressive stares, get close up to her face... A lot of men would say, ‘Well, I’m not hitting them or touching them’ ... they wouldn’t consider that abusive ... the filthy looks and the angry stares.”* Finally, Max was the only interviewee who thought there were men who would consider controlling sex not to be abusive.

According to Bourdieu symbolic violence is exerted not only onto subordinate people, but onto the dominant as well. Internalised in some men’s habitus is the drive “to try to live up to the dominant idea of man” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:173). Controlling the finances, women’s time and social life, monitoring how women do housework, using physical prowess to intimidate women and controlling sex reflect hegemonic masculinities – Connell’s concept of the currently accepted dominant idea of man. The notion that many men in this study do not agree that these behaviours towards women are controlling or abusive reflects the doxic acceptance that men’s domination over women is right and natural, not abusive.

6.4.3 How control wounds women

Men were asked, “When men control things like the finances, how women spend their time and sexual relations, how are women affected?” First, the men named a broad range of negative effects on women. Second, some men said women would not be affected because being psychologically abused and controlled was a normal part of life for women.

Previous research indicates that perpetrators lack empathy for women (Covell et al., 2007:172), or render women and their experiences as invisible or trivialised in their talk (Dobash et al., 1998:401; Eisikovits & Winstok, 2002:689; Goodrum et al., 2001:238; Hearn, 1998b:82; James et al., 2002:7; Ptacek, 1988:145). This was the impetus for directly asking men how women are affected by being psychologically controlled and abused.

6.4.3.1 Control scars women

Astoundingly, the men were very aware of a wide range of negative effects that perpetrators’ controlling behaviours have on women. The possible effects included: *“It’s like putting them to second class citizens... It’s cheating them ... it belittles her”* (Geni); *“Powerlessness”* (Peter); *“Quite severely... Well, she wouldn’t be able to buy clothes”* (Henry); *“It would hurt ’em. It would scar ’em”* (Sam); *“[Disrespected] ... fully affected, emotional needs and respect and love”* (Alex); *“Restrictive and, they’re probably not happy”* (Bill).

This thesis argues that a lack of empathy is not the crux of the problem that prevents many perpetrators from treating their partners with care. Rather, the problem is the fear of making themselves vulnerable. In her article that explains shame resilience, Brown (2006:47) argues that empathy is at one end of a continuum and shame at the other end. Shame resilience entails becoming vulnerable whilst moving away from shame and moving towards empathy. Feelings and experiences that accompany the shame end of the continuum entail powerlessness, isolation, fear, judgements and blame.

Brown's theory of shame resilience means men would have to make themselves vulnerable by moving towards others and developing genuine caring connections that include understanding others' feelings, communicating that understanding empathically to others and identifying and naming common experiences. This means men have to risk moving away from practicing hegemonic masculinities towards a dishonoured form of masculinity. Given the cultural policing that honours hegemonic masculinities and degrades subordinated masculinities, this thesis argues that for perpetrators to engage in a form of counter-sexist politics that pursues equality between men and women, men have to develop emotional resilience to cope with the denigration that occurs when practicing subordinated masculinities. However for change to take place, perpetrators have to be supported to challenge dominant hegemonic social messages exerted by a wide range of institutions including some sporting arenas, media and schools, which continue to uphold the status of men and downgrade the status of women.

Other ways some interviewees described how female partners might be affected by men's perpetration of psychological abuse and control included:

"It'd have to make women feel pretty helpless ... and out of control of themselves to a certain extent... It'd have to be pretty degrading for a woman as a person that they weren't either trusted ... I'd expect the woman ... to have some sort of mental scarring." (James)

"They're affected because they don't know their own identities because they're being stifled... If you're controlling your partner's time... I'm taking something away from who she is... It's gotta stifle who they really are, and that's gonna make them depressed or miserable." (Rick)

"It hurts 'em, it's harder [for women] to forget, or forgive... She said at times she would rather me punch her than say some of the things I say... Probably feel pretty worthless, coz they're not having any input. If they can't make a decision, what is their worth, what's their importance?" (Lazarus)

Reasons the men, as a collective, might have been able to name a broad range of effects on women are first, that domestic violence programme facilitators provided the opportunity for men to hear women's views about harm done to them. And second, that the interviewees had been given

opportunities earlier in the interviews to discuss school bullying and many said they were affected by that bullying when they were young. The act of talking about school bullying stirred up a range of feelings from hurt, sadness to anger. Many men revealed that they themselves had felt the long-term negative psychological impact of being psychologically victimised by other boys when they were young, and by other men as they developed.

Previous research by Gadd (2000:439, 445, 2002:65, 2003:341, 343, 351) concludes that those men who use power games and violence are actually attempting to conceal, or defend against, psychological anxieties, insecurities and vulnerabilities. This thesis argues for a similar conclusion. Until particular men stop psychologically bullying other men into avoiding the full depth and breadth of their emotions, many men in this study who are like this will continue to avoid practicing subordinated masculinities, and avoid any configuration of masculinity that entails challenges against domination over women. Instead they will hide amongst the masses practicing complicit masculinities, or retaliate against men and women by practicing hegemonic masculinities, therefore, as Gadd (2002:66) contends, projecting their vulnerabilities and sense of weakness onto others.

Gadd (2000:439, 445, 2002:65, 2003:341, 343, 351) argues this should be the beginning point of assisting perpetrators to change. Both Gadd and Connell (2005:211) argue that although it is important to take such issues into account, stopping abuse programmes must incorporate any understanding of vulnerabilities into account when educating men about patriarchal structures and exploring ways out of gender hierarchies that breed power and control. This thesis adds to this contention, by proposing that many perpetrators do not lack empathy because of individual psychological problems, rather hegemonic masculinities contain the imperative to suppress empathy in order to dominate others. It is the social support for this suppression of empathy that needs to be addressed for men in programmes.

6.4.3.2 Women aren't affected, they're accustomed to being controlled

When Lazarus was asked if he thought it was common for men to know how women are affected by non-physical control he replied, *"Yeah, but they don't take a lot of notice. Turn a blind eye to it. Because she lets you get away with it, why do women let ya? And if she's letting me it can't be too bad, I must be doing something right if she's letting me do this that and the other."* Geni said that being controlled *"may not affect them because a lot of it, the way these things happen, I don't think the woman would know, but it's sort of wrong."* Likewise, Henry said, *"Affect her? ... there's those that like it, and are quite happy to put up with it, same with domestic violence, same with rough sex. I mean there's all categories of those that do actually enjoy that. And they think it's part of life."* Finally, Bob added, *"For some women, that's probably just a normal way of life and they don't know any different."*

Similar to these findings, research conducted by Wood (2004) indicates that some men believe women tolerate violence based on the fact that some women return to the relationship after leaving, or do not leave at all despite the violence. Wood argues that some men use the belief that women tolerate physical violence to justify violence against her (Wood, 2004:564). Some men interviewed by Levitt and colleagues (2008:443) believe women like being abused because they equate this with the man loving them. These findings support the normative masculine framework described by some men in the current study. The discourse embedded in this framework suggests that if women *"let"* men abuse them then they are not actually being abusive and women are not actually being negatively affected.

Underneath this framework, the idea that many men turn a blind eye means that ultimately they *do* know that what they are doing is wrong and is negatively impacting women. This finding brings into question what men said in the previous section in which some men claim that they do *not* know what they are doing wrong. This contradiction could be explained in two

ways. One might mean some men use lying and hiding as forms of agency (Burke, 1969:xx) to deny the fact that they know their self-evident right to dominate women is actually abusive. Or alternatively, other men's answers might reflect their response to changes in the symbolic backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that has historically naturalised the link between domination and abuse. All the interviewees had recently, or were currently, attending stopping abuse programmes. Before attending, many men might not have realised that their non-physical controlling behaviours were abusive, however after programme attendance men developed varying degrees of understanding about what non-physical behaviours were defined as abusive. Nevertheless, as stated in chapter five, men who have an interest in continuing the pursuit of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990b:53), re-define the terms of successful masculinity to legitimise hegemonic masculinities in the form of coercive control.

Many men's seeming ignorance, that the dominating and controlling behaviours they describe were abusive, can also be explained using Bourdieu's (2000a:205) notion that an ingredient underpinning symbolic violence is a mechanism that ensures the truth of men's domination is concealed from the consciousness of the dominator and the dominated. Men in this study draw from multiple experiences across multiple fields that encourage psychological abuse and non-physical control of women. Accordingly turning a blind eye to women's suffering can be explained by Bourdieu's principle of perpetuation whereby the sustenance of hegemonic masculinities results from the durability of the habitus, along with the constancy of social structures, and the mutual reinforcement between habitus and field (Bourdieu, 1990b:67, 2001:42, 95).

To conclude this discussion of men's psychological abuse and non-physical control of women, men describe a normative masculine framework that entails knowing what they are doing and not knowing what they are doing. This pattern of masculinity reflects a long-time debate from some feminist perspectives. Many men "know" that men hold more social power, that they

are superior, more dominant. This blend of masculinities entails talking as if this is a natural right and that actions stemming from these positions are inevitable, normal, commonsense ways to behave, such as objectifying, denigrating, using, neglecting, controlling and dominating women. It was shown in the last chapter that many men describe bullying amongst boys as a game or a joke, likewise some men describe some forms of objectifying and using women as a game or a joke.

Yet, at the same time, some men are willing to give up being abusive, but the pattern of abusive masculinities in men's narratives includes the imperative to be oblivious (whether this is conscious or not) to the link between power and control as a form of abuse. As a whole, the men are fully aware of the negative impact that abusive and controlling masculinities have on themselves, however "arsehole" configurations of masculinities are honoured for being in charge, in control, for "being the man" in front of real, or imaginary, other men. The men in this study describe abuse, stigmatisation and shame for showing care and love amongst men and towards women. Although the masculine position of "not knowing" can be explained by the notion of symbolic violence that renders invisible the socially constructed aspect of hegemonic domination, this thesis argues that this particular debate is circular and may never be resolved.

Instead, this thesis argues that, for changes in abusive patterns of masculinity to occur, it is better to focus on the issue that some perpetrators desire to give and receive love and care. It may be more productive to understand the social mechanisms that incessantly drive many men *away* from such pro-social desires. The inference in many perpetrators' descriptions of abuse and control of women, is that it results from *avoiding* practicing subordinated masculinities and *avoiding* the negative consequences of abuse, stigmatisation and shame imposed on perpetrators by other men, real and imagined. In turn, some perpetrators move *towards* winning symbolic capital in the form of honour and respect (also bestowed on them from real or imagined other men). A socially encouraged way to achieve this is by practicing hegemonic masculinities in the form of abuse

and control of women. Attempting to cease hegemonic masculinities will never work unless the structures of symbolic and social rewards are dismantled.

6.5 Women in Authority

The final section in this chapter focuses on men's responses to working for a female boss. The impetus for asking men about this topic stems from feminist empirical research using resource theories that find men's intimate partner abuse is more likely in a relationship where women have higher or lower status than men (Anderson, 1997:656; Heise, 1998:271; Kaukinen, 2004:466; Yllö, 1988:31). Research tends to focus on the home/family in order to understand men who abuse their intimate partners, whereas according to Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17; Wacquant, 1989:39), society consists of a number of semi-autonomous fields, which have varying degrees of influence on each other. Exploring men's responses to gender status reversal in the workplace is one means of exploring influences that men take into intimate relationships.

The conflict between hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities was evident in some men's resentment towards female bosses. The first reason for resentment was evident in men's perceptions about real or imagined ways women are promoted. Henry said, "*Huge resentment for a female boss from a male's perspective. Huge... It's about climbing the ladder, it's about getting there first. Bitch has fucking beat me again.*" Peter said, "*The only issue would be for men is if they had some kind of favour system, like having to get so many females in that position.*" Henry added:

"It comes down to being dominant. Or efforts in progressing your careers and if she's got this conviction of working at getting her career on track and she does the hard yard and gets there that's all well and good go for it. But then you get those losers that can't be bothered advancing their careers and, 'Oh shit, how'd she get there so fast? Who's she been fucking?' Sorry to be frank (laughter)... But they're still not happy with the levels of females in higher places, there's still not enough of them (spoken with tone of disdain)... It would be more resentment than anything." (Henry)

It seemed that female bosses were depicted as an abstract scene (Burke, 1969:5), because the normative framework men describe includes hegemonic discourses aimed at keeping women in their place.

The second reason for men's resentment was evident in the way they saw themselves and other men as positioned in relation to women with higher status and the hegemonic discourse that women's management style is inferior to men's. Geni thought:

“99.9 percent of men wouldn't like it at all... It's a power thing, the man gotta be ... this strong, dominant, the man's the boss... I wouldn't have a problem if the female was intelligent and knew more than me. But (laugh) if I had some bimbo that was trying to order me around, I couldn't handle it.” (Geni)

Peter said, *“It's only if they're an idiot, I have an issue with it.”* Bob said women have:

“Got to be up to the challenge ... coz they're women working in a men's environment... if they wanna work on [trade] that's great for them, that's fine by me, but some blokes don't like it. Coz some blokes don't like it, [women have] ... always got something to prove, instead of just doing their job... Like, try and point out mistakes that blokes have made. She's noticed it, trying to get some brownie points ... which can sometimes make it hard to work with her coz, it's almost like there's a hidden agenda that she's gotta try and be better than you.” (Bob)

James said:

“I've heard some have a problem with it, I don't have a problem with it. Absolutely not. I actually prefer in some situations where there's a female boss... I don't get along with people in authority anyway. But it's certainly not a male-female thing for me. It's more a personality thing, the way they treat me and the way they are towards me.” (James)

But the longer he reflected on the issue of female bosses, his self-evident belief in hegemonic masculinities, started to surface *“I'd have to probably say I have a little bit more respect for a male boss than a female boss.”*

James added:

“Maybe I've still got a bit of that old male dominance where I look up to the male as the head of the family Also I feel that, this is just one female boss that I've had, that she was bitchy, very bitchy in the way that she dealt with people and derogatory towards people.” (James)

James's notion that he had more respect for a male boss, simply because of his gender, also relates to the third reason underpinning some men's resentment about working for a female boss. This resentment stemmed from their perceptions that hegemonic masculinities entail knowing more and being superior. David said, "*Blokes think they know more than women a lot of the time. Unfortunately, that's the way it is. They're superior. They think they're superior I should say... That's why they'd have a problem.*"

Motivated by the symbolic backdrop (Burke, 1969:5) that female bosses were threatening the hegemonic project, Bob said some men ostracised female bosses:

"Just a bit stand offish to them, may not accept them into their smoko group. Maybe would put them down a lot, 'Oh what does she know, she's just a stupid Sheila, she doesn't know anything.' Where in fact, she's had more of an education than the fella a lot of the time." (Bob)

Anthony added:

"As long as she's good at what she does... As long as they can do their job... Great, as long as you can treat me like a person. What I have found with some females ... is that they intimidate men, and that's the problem. They know what they want, they know when they want it, and they know who they want it from. And men don't like that. Me, I don't mind... At the end of the day men for some reason like to have the control." (Anthony)

Brendan's response depended, "*on the boss. I've worked with some pretty bad female bosses. Some of them are very controlling, others are just like everybody else... If they're the sort of person that is on a power trip then men don't like that very much at all.*"

Many men had been dominated, bullied and incessantly encouraged by other men to control the women they loved and if they did not adhere to this they were threatened with ostracism. Yet, none of the men *ever* labelled other men as *controlling them*, despite the policing of subordinate masculinities. Brendan was explicit in labelling some female bosses as "very controlling". The purpose (Burke, 1969:xx) underlying this masculine attitude is a need to maintain a position of superiority, dominance and power over women

during a time in history when the male-female gender order is in flux. This shift in women's status represents a symbolic setting (Burke, 1969:5) that could explain contradictions in men's narratives. Many men say they have no problem with working for a female boss, yet underlying their normative masculine framework are expressions of disturbance. However, the male-male gender order is in far less flux. This could explain why the men talk about the relationship between hegemonic and subordinated masculinities as natural and inevitable.

When Brendan was asked if men would react to a female power trip the same, or different, to a male boss on a power trip he replied, "*Different*" because:

"A lot of people I know would tell the male boss what they thought and not be afraid of too many repercussions, however if you confront a female boss on a power trip, they just like to see men suffer. You can lose your job... Blokes just think that there's no hope (laughter)... That we're just drones, that's all women want us to be, is drones basically." (Brendan)

Lazarus said, "*I don't suppose I'd care. A boss is a boss, as long as I'm getting that (fingered gesture of money) the end of the week, I don't care who's telling me what to do.*" Unlike the men above, Lazarus and one other man were the only interviewees who, after saying they had no problem working for a woman, did not then elaborate on reasons why they, or men in general, had problems with this.

To conclude, this thesis argues that men's level of comfort with moving away from hegemonic masculinities differs depending on the depth in which the effects of symbolic violence have on their masculine habitus. For acceptance and adaptation to variations in the gender order to take effect, the conflict embedded in the habitus, must be brought to light through consciousness-raising. Many men readily say they personally have no problem with working for a female boss, but after one or more probes, layers of underlying long-standing hegemonic discourses about men's right to authority begin to surface. It is vital that any domestic violence interventions cannot simply instill new knowledge into men by giving them

skills to stop using physical violence. Rather, perpetrators have to be helped in excavating any deep-seated underlying effects of symbolic violence that grant the right to deploy hegemonic masculinities in the form of power and control over intimate partners and women in general.

6.6 Conclusion

The habitus of many men in this study is oriented towards the desire to share care and love. But the powerful socio-political mechanisms of symbolic violence, that incessantly police subordinated masculinities, orient the masculine *illusio* away from shame and humiliation for showing care and love. Symbolic violence orients the masculine *illusio*, instead, towards seeking acceptance, approval, honour and prestige from real or imagined men who possess symbolic capital, by practicing hegemonic masculinities in the form of domination, control and abuse of women. These internal complexities in individual men in this study, along with their conflicting motivations and multiple masculinities, oppose some feminist views that perpetrators are motivated by one form of masculinity and motivated by the singular goal to gain power and control over women. To find clues that would effect change in men, it is vital that the dynamic relationships amongst masculinities be understood, as it is men's relationships with other men that lead to engaging in hegemonic masculinities in the form of using women as weapons in the pursuit of symbolic rewards from men.

This thesis suggests men's degree of interest in hegemonic masculinities and the pursuit of symbolic capital differs depending on the censoring devices in fields. The lifetime development of the habitus that embodies ideologies that honour hegemonic masculinities is evidenced in the difficulty many men in this study have in naming hopes and dreams for their partners when first moving in together.

Nevertheless interviewees were at various stages in the pursuit of changing masculinities, which can explain why many are better able to name hopes

and dreams for their aggrieved partners now. This indicates those men's dormant ability to empathise has surfaced. It further indicates that society, as a whole, does not have to change for men's dormant ability to consider women's needs to rise to the surface. It is obvious there are patterns of masculinities that have the ability to empathise with women because men were able to name an array of long-lasting negative psychological impacts that psychologically abusive and controlling behaviours have on women. But it is apparent that suppressing empathy results from doxic assumptions, inculcated through face-to-face and ideological messages. These messages shape taken-for-granted practices of hegemonic masculinities that claim more power and more rights than women and claim that it is inevitable, and commonsense to abuse and control women. It then becomes necessary to suppress empathy to practice hegemonic masculinities and establish and maintain that power.

Related to the notion of *illusio*, men's relationships with men, coupled with gender policing at school, sporting arena, the pub and workplace, motivate investing in the hegemonic project and avoiding caring practices. This challenges some views that men's abuse of women stems solely from experience of abuse in the family of origin, rather interests are socially constructed in multiple fields across a lifetime. In many instances these other fields may have stronger influences, especially the homosocial field. Many men's perspectives in this study reveal a habitus oriented to invest in the hegemonic project and to reach for symbolic rewards on offer at the top of the hierarchy of masculinities, which sharpens understandings of the place that resource theory has in men's abuse of women. Many men in this study are driven to avoid subordinated masculinities, this notion then sharpens the understanding that power and control are used as an ultimate resource when men lack an honourable form of masculinity.

It is argued that, for change to occur, it is important to prioritise the fact that there are perpetrators who do want to give and receive love and care and that it is necessary to excavate the blocks to this in the form of socially constructed perceptions about gender and power. It is necessary to challenge

doxic assumptions at all levels of society in order to inspire masculine practices that exit from the hegemonic project to not only safeguard women's safety, but safeguard the safety of boys in future generations whose repertoire of masculinities, at present is prey to abusive and controlling gender policing.

The next chapter will explore the changing socio-political and legal messages that negatively and positively sanction men's abuse and control of women. This will include a discussion of interviewees' changing practices of masculinities in response to: social messages, media campaigns, legislation and bystander interventions that oppose abuse and control of women. It will also include a discussion of the forms of support that men in this study find worthwhile, or ineffectual, in their pursuit to seek help to reduce or stop abusing their partners.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Where Habitus Meets Field: Changing Masculine Practices

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the ways in which the men in this study engage with the issue of change to masculine practices of abuse and control of women. As such, this chapter discusses three specific areas of concern. The first section explores the multiple and contradictory socio-legal messages interviewees are exposed to throughout their lives. These include a strong and consistent social message that the men should control their partners through non-physical means, and a social message that physical abuse against women is a taboo masculine practice associated with weakness. This first section explores how the motivation to control women and win symbolic capital sometimes becomes more important than adhering to the message that it is weak to hit women.

The second section explores men's responses to institutions and individuals who intervene in their relationships. Four forms of domestic violence intervention set scenes against which men are motivated to act (Burke, 1969:13). These are media campaigns, legal interventions, bystander interventions and the intervention of the Child Support Agency. Discussion here demonstrates that interviewees' reactions are entirely dependent on their perception of the field of power. If the intervener is perceived by the men in this study to be taking an inferior or equal position, they tend to surrender to, or merely ignore the intervention. In contrast, when the intervener is perceived to be taking a more dominant position, many men feel that their position as head of the family is being threatened and so respond defensively and aggressively.

The third section focuses on the support the men do, and do not, seek in order to help them to stop abusing women partners. The kinds of formal support interviewees received included counselling and group programmes. Discussion here demonstrates that men in this study were generally irresolute in their informal support seeking, partly due to a lifetime of experience that it is weak to share emotional vulnerabilities, and that if they did so, they would be abused by other boys or men. As a consequence many men developed a lack of safety and trust, to the point that some never created a close social support network. Most men had no respect for the counselling they received because counsellors and psychologists did not challenge their abusive and controlling behaviours. However, when the men attended the stopping abuse programme that referred them to this research project, their behaviours were challenged and many described a sense of safety and trust amongst men in the group. These were described as first time experiences for most of them. Such a venue became an important atmosphere for inspiring change.

Burke's (1969:12) grammar of motives is used to uncover patterns in men's narratives that reveal their current vocabularies of motive. Burke argues that it is first important to understand, in detail, the background underpinning actions. Social messages and domestic violence interventions represent that backdrop. At times, for instance, attitudes that form part of men's habitus also represent the background that shapes the path they take. Patterns in men's narratives are in turn interpreted through a synthesis of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory.

Connell's (2000a, 2002a, 2005) theory of masculinities is relied upon to interpret the changing patterns of masculinities the men practice over time, or in response to a specific domestic violence intervention in the present. The patterns of masculinities range from hegemonic that involves domination over other men and over women, and non-hegemonic masculinities including complicit masculinities that yield to dominating practices without overtly practicing them and subordinated masculinities which entail heterosexual men practicing so-called feminine behaviours

such as help-seeking. Connell also refers to another non-hegemonic masculine practice that engages with exit, or counter-sexist politics (Connell, 2005:220), by practicing pro-social democratic relations amongst men and between men and women.

Throughout this discussion, Bourdieu's (1977, 1986a, 1990b, 2000a) notions of habitus, field, symbolic power, *illusio*, capital and the field of opinion will be relied upon as conceptual tools to provide a more fine-tuned explanation of the socio-cultural mechanisms underpinning men's motivations to practice one configuration of masculinity over another and to explain which social forces render change slow and difficult. Bourdieu's concepts will suggest what mix of individual and social elements may be necessary for change to take hold.

The following discussion of men's talk about social messages and domestic violence interventions does not necessarily depict "facts" or actual experiences, rather entails constructions of particular meaning systems based on current commonsense knowledge about power relations between men as individuals and wider social structures (Silverman, 2006:118, 129). This commonsense knowledge "is embedded in a social web of interpretation and re-interpretation" (Kitzinger, 2004:128 cited in Silverman, 2006:129) that is structured within discourses of multiple conflicted and contradictory hierarchies of masculinities.

7.2 Social Messages

The purpose here is to explore the multiple and contradictory socio-legal messages men in this study are exposed to throughout their lives. The first part will explore social messages that endorse abuse of women including the notion that "bad boys get the girls" and other men's encouragement to abuse and control partners. The second part will explore social messages against abusing women including the domestic violence legislation and the notion that "bad boys don't hit girls". Given the multiple and contradictory

messages many men are faced with, it will be shown why, and how, some men acquiesce to the messages that encourage abuse and control of partners, and why, and how, other men challenge people who endorse such messages.

7.2.1 Social messages endorsing abuse of women

This discussion focuses on social messages and practices that endorse men's abuse and control over women. The hegemonic discourse that bad boys get the girls legitimises use and abuse of women, whilst perpetrators describe other men actively encouraging perpetrators to coercively control and psychologically abuse female partners. Men's response to this encouragement sometimes entails acquiescing, whilst at other times entails challenging such encouragement.

7.2.1.1 Bad boys get the girls

Men were asked if girls or women care where boys or men came on the hierarchy of masculinities. Several men's descriptions infer a hegemonic discourse that some girls and women do care, in fact Max said that fighting at school *"when I was young, 16 or 17 ... running around on the streets we used to get into discos... You got attention ... and I got popular. Girls liked me, and I liked it because girls liked me coz I had nothing much to offer... That's the old saying, 'good girls like bad boys'."*

Bill said, *"The girls were obviously there for the boys to impress. 'Who's going to be my girlfriend?' kind of thing."* Rick thought that *"at school the girls were attracted to the popular boys."* Bob also said, *"There was always a big group of the footy chicks, that used to go to all the footy matches from all the girls' schools. You weren't playing, they weren't interested in you, at all. It definitely mattered"* where boys were on the hierarchy. This hegemonic discourse legitimises the practice of hegemonic masculinities via the use of women as weapons in the pursuit of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990b:53).

Connell (1987:183; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:848) calls women's complicity to patriarchy "emphasised femininity", which entails accommodating to particular men's interests and desires. The following extracts indicate the hegemonic discourse that women benefit from such accommodation. Three men describe girls or women wanting relationships with males high on the hierarchy because masculinities practiced there are better suited to providing protection. Sam said, "*That's why some women went out with me and used me over the years because they knew if some guy hurt them, I'd hurt [the guy], so they knew the pecking order.*"

However, Connell (1982:316) pointed out that despite adolescent girls often being bigger and stronger than boys, various socio-cultural strategies create an environment in which girls are made to feel fear and act passively in relation to boys. While simultaneously, boys are made to feel inferior for expressing femininity and to feel superior for expressing hypermasculine behaviours. Included in this is the development of the man-as-protector model. Geni said, "*Girls would traditionally look for muscular he-man type male.*" Alex said this was because "*Some women ... feel secure maybe ... he's not a wimp, if I get into trouble he'll look after me.*"

Previous research analysed female Australian rugby rules fans and indicates that women have sex with footballers, not necessarily because they want to, but that they feel compelled to have sex because of the men's status as footballers. None of the women condoned men's aggressive misconduct, but some believed women's desire to have sex with footballers was a possible cause of some men's abuse (Mewett & Toffoletti, 2008:170-172).

In the current study, some boys and men knew that dominating masculinities could impress certain girls, so according to Bill "*you had to be higher up*" on the hierarchy of masculinities to get a girlfriend. Chris said:

"There was certain girls that hung around with the tough guys, there was always the nice looking young girls, all the good ones that everyone wanted to be with... [Males] wanted a bit of drive to get up with the tough guys to be with the

good-looking girls. It's more status... You got approval from girls as well as guys." (Chris)

According to Lazarus "*getting the women [would] to a certain extent*" encourage some men to choose to practice behaviours suited to the middle, or upper, echelons of masculinities.

Bourdieu (2001:114) notes that some feminists argue against the notion of women's complicity with hegemonic masculinities, fearing that women will be blamed for their own victimisation. Bourdieu (2000a:171) argues however, that women's complicity is not voluntary, conscious or deliberate. Rather, the prolonged incessant social messages become embodied in the form of dispositions to admire dominant, tough men, and these schemes of perception open the way to comply with more of the same ideological ideas. Bourdieu (2000a:172) argues further that consciousness-raising through psychoeducation is only part of the solution to breaking this cycle of complicit masculinities and women's complicity with complicit and hegemonic masculinities. Bourdieu asserts that change for women and changing masculinities is slow given the inertia of social structures embedded in the habitus.

Max then added, "*If I had my way again I'd probably be that quiet boy.*" However according to Max a quiet boy would "*not [get] a good-looking [girl]. We'd be at the clubs, nightclubs, discos... A lot of the girls used to come to us. Not skiting or bragging, but they were quite attractive, we had the better taste in town at the time.*"

The doxa is defined as a set of fundamental beliefs (Bourdieu, 2000a:15) which become embodied in both men's and women's habitus as a result of experiences across a wide range of social situations. These beliefs are exerted by dominant groups using their symbolic power to impose taken-for-granted representations of dichotomous gendered divisions that serve to naturalise hegemonic masculinities as superior and women as weak and in need of protection, and thus defend this gender order by representing it as

natural and acceptable (Bourdieu, 2000a:100). It is for this reason that some women appear complicit with hegemonic practices.

Given that the masculine habitus portrayed by some interviewees included the discourse that some boys and youth believe attractive girls are highly motivated to be with rough, tough, violent, bullying boys, this discourse, according to Bob gives some boys the freedom to practice hegemonic masculinities by mistreating girls. He said the boys at school:

“That are higher would tend to . . . ‘it’s their way or the highway’. All the guys on the footy team, often a common saying was, ‘Treat ’em mean, keep ’em keen’... So they’d be, not intentionally mean to girls, but not real nice to them either. They went, ‘I’m on the footy team, I’ll get another girl’, so they didn’t really care.” (Bob)

Despite the seeming certainty that the good-looking girls were keen to befriend boys high on the hierarchy, Rick was singular in his view that hierarchical dominance amongst males outside their relationship with women was irrelevant to women:

“Obviously girls do not care whether or not you can fight. They’re just interested in whether or not you’re a nice guy or not. So obviously [the violent boys] didn’t get any accolades [from the] female population [because] it wasn’t important there.” (Rick)

Other men held varying understandings about whether girls and women cared where men came on the hierarchy of masculinities. Alex thought bullies have “*got to put this image on where they’re tough, they’ve gotta impress the girls and impress all their mates.*” However he qualified this saying, “*I don’t know if it really does impress the girls but they think it impresses the girls.*”

These mixed views about women’s accommodation to hegemonic masculinities suggest a plurality of femininities amongst girls and women, along with a possible blurring of masculine practices by women. It was the 1970s and 1980s during interviewees’ youth that this plurality of practices amongst girls and women was evident. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005:848) suggest that such gender hierarchies are increasingly being

influenced by “new configurations of women’s identity and practice, especially among younger women”. However, such changes may incorporate moves away from, or towards, complying with the hegemonic project.

James said women sought security from hegemonic masculinities so was asked if this meant that a man had to be capable of violence. He replied, “*I don’t think so (laugh) these days, but I did when I was younger... And that you had to be in control and if the ones he was responsible for fell out of line then it was his right to be violent to change the behaviour.*” James added that, “*I’ve found over time that girls tend not to be so impressed by violence as what boys were.*” However in the past James said that his experience of women represented “*a bit of a cross section*” of either opposing men’s violence, or having girlfriends “*who absolutely agree with [men’s violence] in a fit.*”

Some men were confused about what patterns of masculinity women sought in men. Many men were unable to firmly take the position that women might be seeking relationships with egalitarian, non-controlling, non-abusive, caring masculinities. Drawing on Burke’s (1969:xv, 3) notion of purpose, the underlying logic of what some men were saying appears to lead some men to hold onto the option of practicing bad boy bullying as surety that women would be attracted to them. Holding tight to this option depicts a mechanism that supports the ongoing resilience of hegemonic masculinities (Connell, 2005:76). Peter also struggled with deciding if women cared where boys and men came on the hierarchy of masculinities:

“... masculinity it gets a bit of a blurred issue ... coz masculinity, aggression ... you can’t express that ... the traditional image of masculine, as in being the aggressor, the provider all that, I don’t think, is around any more. There’s a more reasonable view of it, in terms of standing up for yourself. But if you’re talking about women and girls ... if they’re choosing a partner, I don’t think, wimpish type blokes are gonna be high up ... in their sights.” (Peter)

Then Peter added:

“A lot of girls think the antics a lot of boys ... they’re dickheads. They’re not really into that, and maybe they think they can change them or mould them slightly, they see potential there. But I don’t think they’re sucked into that macho sort of masculinity thing.” (Peter)

Finally, Bob appeared to hold to the notion that girls and women would be attracted to violent and dominating masculinities, but the logic of some masculine practices appeared to be influenced by the particular behaviour that might be acceptable to girls:

“If the girl saw one of the guys picking on a weaker guy, it would make it a lot harder for them, coz the girls would feel sorry for the weaker guy. So you’d have to try play your cards right in that regard... no they definitely didn’t like that.” (Bob)

Many men would manage their choice of masculinities based on the purpose (Burke, 1969:xv, 3) of ensuring positive pay-offs. The logic of some masculine practices entailed bullying boys if it earned positive attention from girls, or not bullying boys if that was what earned positive attention.

7.2.1.2 Other men encourage non-physical abuse and control of partners

Very little research has explored psychological abuse and control and structural control from the perspective of men perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. This gap was the impetus to focus at length on social influences on men’s non-physical forms of power and control over their partners. It will be shown that many male peers constantly goad men by joking, or by using direct statements about how they should control their partners.

Men in this research suggested that most jokes constantly entailed querying whether or not they were “under the thumb”. These comments from other men entailed active encouragement to practice hegemonic masculinities (Carrigan et al., 1985:592) and avoid practicing subordinated masculinities.

Lazarus for instance said, *“I cop that all the time. I’m pussy whipped... They just rag on me. ‘Why don’t I grow a set of balls?’”*

Previous research, in the masculinities discipline, in settings such as universities, sports teams, drinking-centred peer groups and the military, consistently indicates that some male peer cultures prioritise men’s relationships with men over relations with women and actively encourage domination and sex abuse against women (Flood, 2008:344).

Hearn found in his study that perpetrators’ male networks tended to provide direct or indirect support for men’s continuation of physical violence against known women, in fact some men expected their friends to use physical violence against their partners and were suspicious if they did not (Hearn, 1998a:154, 157, 1998b:190).

Likewise, the current study found some men were suspicious of other men who did not perform a masculinity that deployed psychological or structural control over their partners. David said, *“If the boys are going to the pub after work, you just say, ‘No, no, I’m going home’, they’ll usually throw that one in, ‘Are you under the thumb?’”* Sam said this was because *“all your mates think you’re settling down, ‘You’re not going to be any good to us, you can’t come to the pub, she’ll say this, she’ll say that’. And she’s not saying anything. But your mates are in your ear.”*

Given that men who coax other men to control women hold symbolic capital, they have the symbolic power to ensure their voice is adhered to without question (Bourdieu, 1989:23, 2000a:242). Most men in this research thought such coaxing and joking amongst men was as Geni said, *“I’ve heard it for years. It’s always been a male thing, dominant thing. Like the wife might want to go home early from somewhere, ‘Oh who’s the boss of your house?’”* This encouragement for many men to spend time with men and ignore or control their wives, according to Max occurred *“especially when I was back at 20 like, ‘Who wears the pants in your house mate? You’ve got the skirt, she’s got the pants’.”*

Some men in previous studies also talked about male peers encouraging them to hit their partners (Levitt et al., 2008:444) and goading them to dominate female partners by saying they should be wearing the pants (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:367).

Five men in the current research said “are you under the thumb?” comments were just a joke. While Rick concluded it was more to do with ensuring men experience a form of masculinity entailing freedom and independence before shifting masculine practices when marrying:

“I can remember the under the thumb comments being around 21, 22, 3. I was doing that to my friends, because I was of the belief that you shouldn’t be restricted in a marriage, that marriage being under the thumb, was more for when you were older 28, 29, 30.” (Rick)

The rules of the joking relationship amongst men create closeness without having to disclose personal vulnerabilities or opinions. Rather, hostile sexist joking is a strategy of male bonding that creates barriers to women’s participation and provides a way to cope with fears of commitment and intimacy by decreasing intimacy with women and transforming them into sex objects (Haenfler, 2004:90; Messner, 2001 cited in Harris III, 2006:21; Kaplan, 2006:571, 582; Lyman, 1998:172, 178).

This thesis argues that these “jokes” represent homosocial policing of masculinities, which results in symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2000a:170-171, 2001:1-2, 116) that leads many men to perceive such joking to be an attack on their manhood, which, according to James, was “*a little bit humiliating.*” Homosocial policing and the resulting feelings of humiliation lay out a particular scene that provides motivation for action, and the action chosen will likely be “consistent with the scene” (Burke, 1969:7). Although men have a repertoire of masculinities to choose from as a result of being humiliated by other men, such choices occur within the constraints of the censorship of the field (Bourdieu, 1993:90), which contributes to shaping masculine *illusio* (Wacquant, 1989:41). This *illusio* represents men’s interests in the stakes in the game, interests which are specific to position on

the hierarchy of masculinities, and which ultimately influence the way men express their position-taking (Wacquant, 1989:42).

Men may have a degree of flexibility as to whether they pursue particular masculine interests; however the ability to make alternative choices requires a reflexive disposition to break the influence of the field. This thesis argues that the close alignment of habitus with the field orients practices of hegemonic masculinities that ensure they win symbolic capital as this better guarantees the avoidance of further humiliation (Bourdieu, 2000a:168, 243).

James reflected on the confusion he faced during times when other men confronted him with the question as to whether he was under the thumb:

“I had a friend who used to rib me about my girlfriend not wanting me to go to the pub so much and to slow down my drinking. ‘What’s wrong with you, you can decide to go to the pub if you want and she can’t control your life like that.’ So, I didn’t. I really wanted to believe her but I also believed my friend at the time, so it played on my mind a bit. And probably at the time I maybe pretended to agree with his thoughts at the time but really felt that my girlfriend did have a point (laugh), but still over time played on my mind that letting her have control over me in that way was making me be perceived as maybe being weak.”
(James)

Aggressive joking amongst men creates a shared group identity, whilst subsuming men’s individualised sense of themselves. This occurs partly because the content of the jokes does not necessarily equate to the joker’s individual opinion, nor does it mean the man who acquiesces agrees with the joke. Acquiescing would be a strategy for James to cope with his lack of confidence in his own judgement and to avoid being shamed for showing caring behaviour towards his partner (Messner, 2001 cited in Harris III, 2006:21; Kaplan, 2006:582; Lyman, 1998:176, 179).

Confusion as to whether to listen to other men, or to listen to female partners’ viewpoints, is indicative of the hegemonic project which appears to sustain itself by exerting social messages that create chasms between the categories of man and woman and between hegemonic and subordinated masculinities (Carrigan et al., 1985:590; Connell, 2005:242). These messages become embodied in the habitus in the form of socially

constructed beliefs (Bourdieu, 1989:14). These beliefs claim there is only one exemplary form of masculinity and that women's opinions are inferior. These beliefs claim that complexities should be ignored, including complexities such as gender identity, relations amongst masculinities, and relations between masculinity and femininity (Connell, 1987:183, 2005:131). Such embodied beliefs include the notion that the collective opinion and practices of hegemonic masculinities are more valid than an individual man's personal opinion.

7.2.1.3 Acquiescing to others' encouragement to abuse and control partners

Given the interdependence of the scene-act ratio, this section focuses on two contradictory patterns in men's vocabularies of motive in response to the scene (Burke, 1969:7). The first pattern entails acquiescing to other men's goading and the second pattern entails challenging that goading. These two ways of negotiating the policing of hostile joking are discussed in separate sections.

In this section, some men acquiesce, not only to other men's encouragement to control women, but also acquiesce to encouragement from men and women to use physical violence against their partners. For example, James said that men and women had congratulated him on hitting his partner *"saying yeah good on you she deserved it... It was something that I didn't agree with at the time, but it was something that was made out that it was okay to keep your partner in line and that violence was okay."*

Despite his awareness that there was a repertoire of masculinities for how to relate to his partner, James was an active agent in choosing to practice hegemonic masculinities. This was also the case for Lazarus who sought help from his mother and brother to cease abusing his wife but *"they were a bit biased towards me, being their flesh and blood... I used to think about that too, wondering whether or not they were just on my side"* and Lazarus

said that they would maybe understand why he did it *“instead of saying it just shouldn’t have happened.”*

Whereas some feminists argue that people’s internalisation of socio-cultural messages involve a one-way influence (Connell, 2005:37), this thesis argues that men are active agents in a complex interplay between habitus and field (Wacquant, 1989:39). Power relations amongst masculinities and between masculinity and femininity are more intricate and dynamic when viewed from this perspective. Men in this study actively constitute particular patterns of masculinity and gender relations within the bounds of particular fields (Connell, 1987:55, 62).

Chris voiced his confusion about the response he received from his father-in-law when he confessed to hitting his wife. Nonetheless he acquiesced by not challenging his father-in-law’s hegemonic/complicit masculine position-taking. He said, *“I told my wife’s father what I’d done ... and he goes, ‘Don’t worry, it’s okay I understand, it’s good’ ... got up, ‘Good bloke’ and tapped me on the back... It was kind of acceptable for me to hit. ”*

Some men’s response to the others’ encouragement to abuse women is to remain silent in the face of taunts, laugh them off and generally ensure they *appear* in charge of women in front of other men. According to Brendan it is best to remain silent and *“laugh it off”* when other men joke about them being under the thumb. Lazarus was adamant many men do not challenge blokes who make jibes about being under the thumb because those men would *“sound too bloody girlie! You don’t talk like that to the boys! It’s just, ‘Gotta get home, the boss’s said only allowed down here for a little while’. And then you cop all the shit and you go, ‘Yeah yeah yeah’. And go home like a good little girl.”* Geni thought many men acquiesced to other men’s encouragement to control women because *“they’re portrayed as the big masculine type, but in fact they’re not, if they were the big masculine man type they would challenge wouldn’t they?”*

Male bonding is a shame culture. Sexist jokes “are the theatre of domination” (Lyman, 1998:172) aimed at reinforcing hegemonic masculinities and testing each other’s masculine position-taking. If men show any signs of weakness they open themselves to being denigrated and shamed (Kaplan, 2006:582; Lyman, 1998:176, 180).

Many men in this study describe a framework of masculinities that entails the drive to avoid appearing weak and girly in front of other men. Submission denotes femininity, therefore the irony is that by submitting to other men they are practicing subordinated masculinities. This form of submission paradoxically engenders honour as opposed to humiliation. The relations of resistance, submission, ambiguity and tension here point to overlapping and blurring of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities which makes the hegemonic project more effective (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:838). This configuration of masculinities orients men to seek symbolic capital from those believed “capable of consecrating” it (Bourdieu, 2000a:243). As Joe said:

“You’ve gotta be a man’s man in front of your mates. You’ve gotta be a bloke’s bloke... a lot of men do, ‘Oh no I can’t. Oh stuff it, I’ll tell her to jam it, I’ll stay and have a beer’. But then there’s some guys who’ll just, ‘Oh no, I’ve gotta be home by six’. So there is a lot of front in front of your mates, ‘Oh stuff it, I’ll turn my phone off’, and show your mates you’ve turned your phone off, and you say it in front of them.” (Joe)

Although it appears men in this study are making a rational choice at this juncture, instead Bourdieu (1990b:55-56) argues such “choices” actually stem from a selection of masculine options deemed most reasonable given the regularities which are likely to be approved of in the homosocial field. The importance of being a “man’s man” in front of peers means many men avoid challenging men who “jokingly” encourage control of women.

Sam said that challenging peers “*does cross your mind*” but what “*does play on your mind [more is that] my mate can’t see that soft side.*” It was vital for many men to practice hegemonic masculinities by appearing in command of their partners. Sam said, “*So then you try and change it. When*

she rings, 'What're you doing, ringing me? Don't want you to ring me when I'm out with my mates'. So you put wall and defence up. Your mates've seen the soft side of you, you don't want that."

Men are using women as weapons in the struggle to win symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2001:43). Joe agreed "*some guys want to prove*" they are in charge of women "*to make themselves feel better in front of their mates... necessary to show 'I'm in charge here'.*" Peter agreed that "*the first reaction*" would be for many men to prove to other men that they were not under the thumb "*because it's an attack on their manhood ... the man should be running his own race, he should be the one in control ... it's a whole pride thing too ... no bloke wants to ... have the perception he's under the thumb.*"

Hostile jokes reinforce male bonding by ameliorating vulnerabilities. Men who need acceptance from particular men will acquiesce to avoid being shamed (Goodey, 1997:411; Haenfler, 2004:90; Kaplan, 2006:580; Lyman, 1998:178, 180).

According to Bob, a pattern of masculinity that pursues symbolic capital and maintains a hegemonic position, means deflecting the "attack" that they might be under the thumb, by making a joke out of relationships with women. Bob said, "*If somebody said that to me it'd be like, 'Better go and ask the boss see if I'm allowed to go and have a beer with me mates.'* It's only a joke."

Men in this study acquiesce to other men's encouragement to control their partners because they do not want to lose male friendship, and they want to sustain their social capital (Bourdieu, 1986b:248). Joe said that a consequence of not proving to other men that you're "*the man in the relationship*" was "*probably not being liked... Their opinion of you might change ... they mightn't ask you out for drinks as much.*" Max said that he would "*just go with the flow to keep the peace at the workplace*" by

agreeing with men that women, “*Do sometimes don’t they, they do drive you up the wall.*”

Men who engage in hostile joking suspend the rules of relating to women in everyday life, but do so in “rule governing ways”. The purpose of the joking is to gauge the reactions of the male participants, to test whether they follow the rules, that is to test their conformity to hegemonic masculinity in the form of shared aggression against women as “the other” (Kaplan, 2006:580; Lyman, 1998:172, 178).

This thesis argues that many men practice a paradoxical blend of masculinities that acquiesces to men who encourage them to control women. They simultaneously practice hegemonic masculinities in relation to women by laughing at hostile jokes and they practice subordinated masculinities in relation to men by submitting to the rules of the joking relationship. This submission renders their inner strength invisible, because they fear the consequences if they do not play the game. This paradox is driven by a determination to maintain and increase social capital. Social capital entails connections, networks, obligations, and membership of a group. It is a resource that can be converted into economic, cultural or symbolic capital in the form of financial exchanges, information or recognition and honour (Bourdieu, 1986b:243, 248-250). Men’s homosocial networks can provide individual men with collectively owned credentials, privileges and rights such as the socially constructed right that men practicing hegemonic masculinities have to exert power and control over women.

7.2.1.4 Challenging other men’s encouragement to abuse and control partners

This section discusses the second pattern of men’s responses to other men’s goading that they should control their female partners – that is some men challenge such goading.

According to Lazarus, instead of worrying whether other men thought he was a sissy for wanting to spend time with his partner, he reshaped his pattern of masculinity by separating courage and inner strength from domination and control (Connell, 2000a:226). He did this by asserting his needs to a friend who was taunting him:

“Me mate ... said, ‘What do you want to go home for, you got grog at home?’ I said, ‘No, just going to the missus, spend a couple of hours with her before I go to [game]’. He said, ‘You just frightened you don’t want to get into trouble, that’s all it is’. I said, ‘No, just want to spend some time’. He said, ‘You got no balls you bastard, you got no balls’. And I just told him where to go. And he dropped me off at home.” (Lazarus)

This form of courage is not based on cowardice (Bourdieu, 2001:52), rather is based on a firm sense of character. Such assertiveness is a strategy that avoids subordinated masculinities. It is not complicit in maintaining hierarchies of masculinities and it is a counter-sexist move that argues against domination over women. Max, for instance said he used to have to prove to the other bloke that he was a man but, “*not now, but I have in the past. Now I’m getting more ... ‘youse are partners. She does more for me than what I do really’. She’s done heaps.*”

Joking relationships amongst men constantly challenge hegemonic masculinity, which “requires considerable effort to maintain” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:844). Equally, for men who are motivated to gain the symbolic rewards associated with hegemonic masculinities, many of those men may experience considerable effort in developing respectful relationships with women. Such change requires challenging other men and exposing themselves to potential rejection, humiliation and loss of symbolic capital. Reshaping or exiting from hegemonic masculinities, according to Joe requires:

“A bit more guts, bring you up front. Like me mate that day said, we went out Saturday night and he goes, ‘I won’t be able to do that again, I’ve got me little family. I enjoy having a beer with you, but we won’t go out’... It’d take him a lot for him to say that to me.” (Joe)

Many men's submission to symbolic power, exerted by hegemonic groups, does not occur voluntarily (Bourdieu, 2000a:171), however in order to break the fit between habitus and field and stand up against such submission, those men have to develop a reflexive masculinity and, as Joe added, "*The whole thing here is ... changing and just doing it in front of your mates and going with the consequences.*" Sam stated the necessity to switch from previous masculine loyalty to his mates to a new form of loyalty with his partner:

"A guy says you're under the thumb, 'Oh you can't come out with the boys?' You've chose to be with that woman, so really in a way you are under the thumb... If I had to choose between my mates and my female, female would lose every time. These days, my mates will lose." (Sam)

Depending on the circumstances, Max would sometimes choose a pattern of counter-sexist masculinity that challenged other men when they joked about him being under the thumb. At other times he chose not to challenge men, for fear of the consequences. He said:

"A quick comment like, 'Yeah, but man you can be a pain too... 'No wonder she's cranky at you man, you've been drinking the last week'... It depends, if it's gonna stir things up between 'em, it's best not to say anything." (Max)

Although Chris believed his brother-in-law was "*a great dad, he's a great provider*", Chris had experienced pressure from his brother-in-law to hit and control his wife:

"He'll talk about, 'If she doesn't do as I told her I give her a clip across the head'. Like when I went through this [stopping violence programme] he's going, 'What are you doing that for?' When [my wife] and I first went to the court house, he's going, 'You're bloody crazy, she should have just done what you told her to do and it would've been all over'... Sometimes the more that gets said to you the easier it would be to accept what you did to her was right. I'm glad I was capable of not listening to that and continue on." (Chris)

When asked if there was a time Chris would have listened he replied, "*Oh definitely, but depending on how I saw acceptance.*" Patterns in men's narratives fit with Burke's (1969:443) attitude-act ratio. The inference is that, when men's attitudes change, their actions can change. Some men in this study describes bitterness associated with a lack of acceptance by male

peers and most men's habitus contained motives to do what it takes to gain symbolic capital in the form of acceptance (Bourdieu, 1990b:53).

However many men had come to have less need for such acceptance, or if they did still have such a need, were more willing not to abuse their partners in order to gain that acceptance. In order not to abuse women, many men had to withstand domination from other men and thereby lose status and lose capital – social and symbolic. This thesis argues that the more men in this study develop a reflexive counter-sexist masculinity, the more they are able to withstand the symbolic violence that has previously encouraged investment in the stakes of the game among homosocial relations. Instead, reflexivity opens the way to defy incessant messages from other men, and to reflexively choose not to consent to ongoing enticements to use women as weapons as a means of gaining the stakes of social and symbolic capital in the homosocial game (Bourdieu, 2000a:167, 170, 244, 2001:43).

Sam discussed the issue that moving away from hegemonic masculinities in the form of physical violence entailed dealing with negative consequences from other men:

“If somebody's pushing you into that corner you can get out of it. You might walk away, someone might call you, ‘Yellow’ or ‘A dog’. It's only a name. But 15 years ago that name to me was, ‘Nah, you don't call me that name’. Now I just, I don't care, I don't care what anyone thinks of me.” (Sam)

Given that many other men incessantly encouraged men in this study to control their partners, this would be a strong motivator not to attend a stopping abuse programme. However, some interviewees, such as Alex, had no hesitancy in challenging colleagues who called him *“a bit of a sissy at work ... because I go to this group... ‘Oh you're off to your wanker's class tonight’.*” Alex would challenge them saying, *“‘Yeah I am, I love it, you should come along, you'd learn a lot.’ They just laugh at me, but I really don't care what they think of me.”* Lazarus said despite some men laughing at him for attending the stopping abuse programme, he thought there was *“nothing wrong with it. Like I was never ashamed of it.”* He said other men

would not attend the group because *“they might look at it like they’re wimping out. But I didn’t care, I told every man and his dog.”*

To conclude this discussion on interviewees’ responses to social messages that endorse domination, control and violence against women partners, some men become entrapped in a vicious circle based on their belief that women are complicit with abusive patterns of hegemonic masculinity, although this was not the case for all men. Some men conflate the role of protector to the role of master, disciplinarian and prison warden. Those men in this study who choose to listen to men over and above women are motivated by social messages that represent hegemonic masculinities as superior, whilst representing women’s opinions as unworthy. Many men engage in a blend of paradoxical masculinities entailing variously acquiescing and/or challenging encouragement to abuse and control women. It is paradoxical that submission to hegemonic masculinity in the form of goading gains honour and respect. Connell (1987:187) argues that “the option of compliance is central to the pattern of femininity”. Therefore challenging this goading to abuse women is done at the risk of losing hegemonic status and losing social and symbolic capital. Taking such risks requires a pattern of non-hegemonic masculinity that practices courage and reflexivity and an interest that orients men to benefit from egalitarian caring relations with women, but this interest is not a predominant form of logic in the homosocial field, nor is it currently bestowed with cultural honour.

7.2.2 Social messages against abusing women

Discussion in this section explores the influence that the domestic violence legislation and the social message that boys should not hit girls have on men’s perpetration of abuse against female partners.

7.2.2.1 The domestic violence legislation

Men were asked what they understood about the domestic violence legislation before they began attending the stopping abuse programme.

Some interviewees knew the Queensland domestic violence legislation (Queensland Government, 2003:3-4) defined certain controlling and dominating behaviours as wrong. Max said he *“just knew that a [domestic violence order] was put on you and you can’t go round to your spouse’s place, if you get there the cops’ll get ya. You have to be on good behaviour, you can’t go off, you can’t damage property, you can’t even if it’s yours.”* Brendan *“thought domestic violence was somebody who’s domineering and controlling, won’t let their partners do what they want”* and Henry said that, *“in the back of the mind there was the financial stuff.”* Sam *“knew that if you abuse somebody or send text messages that you’d go up for an order.”*

When it came to men’s understanding of the physical violence aspect of the legislation, James raised the issue that the legal profession has not always taken violence against women seriously:

“I used to think at the time that there was a level of violence that was justified to a certain extent in those days. And that assault on a partner was not the same as an assault on anybody else in society. It wasn’t treated the same, it was treated on a lower level. Like an assault on your partner wasn’t as serious as assault on somebody in the street.” (James)

James’s understanding of the legislation fits with findings from a study conducted by Douglas and Godden (2002:2, 2003:33) which tracked domestic violence cases through two Queensland Magistrates’ Courts and found that the predominant social message about men’s physical violence against their live-in female partners was that such violence was considered less serious than violence perpetrated outside domestic relationships. In the current study Bill’s response to the domestic violence legislation reflected mixed messages associated with public versus domestic forms of crime:

“We were never taught, ‘If you bash your wife you can go to jail’. You know about it coz it’s illegal... You’re never told that you can’t do it you just know that it’s illegal, that’s why you do it behind closed doors you bash your wife at home. But you can’t steal at home coz it’s yours, you have to go out there and steal, so when you steal you get caught then you get in trouble but if you bash your wife at home nobody knows.” (Bill)

The domestic violence legislation can be referred to as a scene that shapes and constrains how men will act (Burke, 1969:443). These extracts suggest

many men are ambivalent about the legislation as a forceful deterrent. This ambivalence can be explained by Bourdieu's (1990b:54) principle of continuity and regularity, which specifies that current practices cannot be understood without accounting for historical practices. There is a 1500 year legal history in the west which supported husbands' physical violence against partners to bring women into line with the rule of the husband (Straton, 2002:107).

This long history is set against a relatively short history of legislation in Queensland against the use of violence to control partners. In the 1970s feminists began advocating for a criminal response to men's violence against their partners, however given the requirement for a "high level of proof" (Douglas & Godden, 2002:4-5, 2003:34) to prosecute perpetrators, the Queensland State Government introduced civil legislation in the form of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 1989 which was aimed instead at introducing domestic violence orders (DVOs) to protect victims. DVOs lay down conditions that perpetrators must adhere to and if these conditions are breached it is then that a criminal charge can be laid. However it is very rare that breaches are prosecuted as crimes (Douglas, 2008:450; Douglas & Godden, 2002:1, 2003:32), or if they are, the method of punishment often lacks a deterrent or rehabilitative effect (Douglas, 2007:8). Moreover, in Queensland very few convictions are recorded, thereby enabling perpetrators to hide the reality of their behaviours from others (Douglas, 2008:464). This then contributes to social complicity by preventing other men, women or institutions from rebuking perpetrators' abuse of women.

Chris said one of the norms practiced by police and a court judge supported hegemonic masculinities:

"When the police first came around, 'Oh mate, it's just domestic violence, it happens all the time, we do these all the time, just sign the form and sort it out later, it's okay... You'll go to court, you deny it, it'll all go through'. And I thought that was strange, I didn't like that at all... For some reason it just didn't feel right." (Chris)

Coupled with the legal history that condoned control over female partners, this contemporary response by the police provides a backdrop that steers many men's continued abusive behaviours (Burke, 1969:443). The police are in a position of social authority and thus are credited with symbolic capital, which authorises them with the power to exert representations of social reality. As agents of the state, police have the power to reproduce representations of a hierarchical gender order, or the power to transform such representations (Bourdieu, 1989:23). In the above case Chris experienced the police attempting to buttress and reproduce representations of men's domination over women. Research indicates trivialisation and minimisation by police and court judges is common. For instance Queensland police data records of 350 breach files indicate that of the assault, criminal damage and stalking cases examined only 4%, 2% and 0% respectively, were found guilty (Douglas, 2008:450).

The effect of this symbolic power meant Chris *"would've done what the policeman told me to do, 'Oh okay, I'll have to deny it'."* However Chris said, *"I was lucky, coz [my wife] sat down with me and she goes, 'You need to accept responsibility for what you've done'. She goes, 'I want you to agree to it and accept it'."* The reason Chris listened to his wife and not the police was because *"that was kind of, 'You're not coming back to this house', that was kind of the big jug. I'd better do as I'm told."*

Chris added that rather than the legislation acting as a motivator not to abuse women, it was instead the social message that "boys don't hit girls" that was a superior deterrent:

"I don't think the illegal part was the bit that worried me. It was more I was brought up, 'You're not allowed to hit a girl, it's wrong'. That's the bigger thing, I wasn't worried about the legal side I don't think. That was part of what came into my thought, was more, 'You're not allowed to hit girls, it's wrong, you just don't do it'... If you hit a girl it was taboo." (Chris)

Any challenge to the 1500 year history of legal support for hegemonic masculinities in the form of abusing wives occurs in what Bourdieu (1977:164-169) calls the field of opinion. This field is divided into two

realms, namely orthodoxy, which defends doxic assumptions that naturalise the deployment of an abusive configuration of hegemonic masculinity, and the realm of heterodoxy, which questions and challenges this doxa. It has only been 40 years of consistent heterodoxic challenge by feminists consistently calling for legal protection for women. Dominant groups have no incentive to support challenges to the hegemonic project, which can explain the inertia of legal processes to consistently and effectively uphold the legislation. It further explains many men's feeling of a lack of pressure by the contemporary legislation, rather their preference to adhere to real or imagined male peers' messages.

7.2.2.2 Boys don't hit girls

The social message that "boys don't hit girls" provides another background that orients men's motivations to act (Burke, 1969:15). However, before discussing the influence this discourse has, it is necessary to acknowledge that men are motivated by two further conflicting social messages. There are actually three "scenic containers" from which men draw their motivations to act (Burke, 1969:15).

Firstly, inherent in the scenic container (Burke, 1969:15) "boys don't hit girls" is the commonsense perception that the physicality of heterosexual relations is divided into two clearly marked categories – those who are strong (boys/men) and those who are weak (girls/women). Embodied in the habitus of many boys and men is the rule that they should not use their physical strength against those who are physically weaker, otherwise such actions result in accusations that practicing subordinated masculinities is gutless, so is defamed, leading to a sense of shame.

The second scenic container (Burke, 1969:15) that motivates many men, is the long-held legal and social history of condoning physical and non-physical forms of control over women partners. It was shown in the last section that despite changes in this legal history, many men are aware that

the legislation is rarely enforced against perpetrators. This scene blends smoothly with the third scene.

The third scenic container (Burke, 1969:15), as discussed in the previous section, is that men should control their partners and that to do so is honourable and acceptable. Given the symbolic capital awarded to men who control women, this form of cultural policing can act as a stronger motivator than the message “boys don’t hit girls.”

These three scenic containers are embodied in interviewees’ habitus, inculcated through the act of symbolic power by dominant groups, the legal institution, among others including the education system and the state (Bourdieu, 2001:34). The resulting symbolic violence creates a “false clarity” (Bourdieu, 1990a:52) that orients the interests of men in this study, firstly, in men’s domination over women, secondly, in winning the stake of symbolic capital and thirdly, in avoiding appearing gutless in the eyes of real or imagined other men (Wacquant, 1989:41).

The remainder of this discussion outlines two main ways men in this study act in response to hitting women. Some men describe disgust in themselves for acting gutless and they experience shame, which is couched in terms of not wanting other men to know what they have done. This section shows the two ways in which men cover their tracks. Firstly, they deny their violence, or they hide their violent practices from view. Secondly, they justify their violence by manipulating the meanings of masculinity and femininity. Importantly, it will be shown that the purpose (Burke, 1969:xv, 3) implied in both of these methods of covering their tracks is the need to adhere to the other two scenic containers, that is men should *control* women and there is a long legal history that condones this.

Chris said he struggled with reconciling the conflict between hitting his wife with the social message not to hit girls:

“Coz after I had my fall out, or my incident with my wife, I did hit her, I couldn’t tell myself I did it. I remember something happening, but what I remember is, ‘She did this first and that’s why that happened. She hit me so I hit her back’, or, ‘It wasn’t my fault’. I tried to blame someone else, and we always try to blame someone else... because if you hit a girl it was taboo. I was always brought up like that, you never hit a girl.” (Chris)

David said, *“I’ve only been violent with my wife the once, but if I had been violent with my wife before I couldn’t have talked to my mates, because I’d be too ashamed.”* Bob added, *“It’s way too embarrassing for me to, tell some of my very close friends, I don’t want them to know, coz their opinion of me may change”* and that *“after I hit my wife I could hardly even watch the [domestic violence TV] ad from shame. Certainly that was the case when other people were around.”*

Inherent in the message “boys don’t hit girls” is the message it is wrong – *not* that it is wrong to harm girls and women, but that it is wrong to act in weak gutless ways. Which may be why Rick said, during a discussion about men’s reactions to the domestic violence advertisements that the message that opposed violence against women bought on feelings of shame:

“It’s not okay Australia. It’s a pretty hard slogan, ‘Australia says no to violence against women’... It just puts guys like myself... on the back foot... Like you straight away feel dirty, you feel like you’re one of those people that Australia says no to... It’s a shame thing, I feel shame. Completely.” (Rick)

In Hearn’s (1998b:109, 134) research he notes that most men’s confessions about their physical violence against their partners entail two themes, namely, men’s “real power”, or their “real self.” Hearn concludes that expressions of “real power” occur when men describe unabashed examples of misogyny and control of women. Whereas expressions of their “real self” entail presenting themselves as non-violent, which means any violence creates feelings of shame.

From the viewpoint of the current thesis, the notions of “real power” and “real self” could be accounted for by explaining the ways men deal with conflicting social messages that simultaneously condone and discourage particular forms of control over women.

In order to understand interviewees' position-taking, this thesis argues that the reaction of shame is not in response to harming women, but rather in response to weakness associated with the practice of subordinated masculinities. Other researchers have explored the link between feelings of weakness and the use of physical violence from the opposite angle. Instead of the act of physical violence resulting in a feeling of weakness, other researchers contend that feelings of weakness cause physical violence. These authors note that certain social conditions throughout men's lives cause some men to develop feelings of weakness and vulnerability. Causes of these vulnerabilities include unstable and fluctuating social expectations of masculinities, as well as feeling controlled by women and/or a changing legal and social system that men perceive to now be biased in women's favour. Gadd (2000, 2002, 2003), Anderson and Umberson (2001), Mullaney (2007), Levitt and colleagues (2008) and Thurston and Beynon (1995) interpret men's accounts to mean that the resulting feelings of weakness and vulnerability motivate men in their studies to attempt to gain, or regain, their desired form of masculinity by using physical violence against their partners.

This thesis argues that, although some men use physical violence to achieve control over women, this is not a legitimate hegemonic masculine practice in contemporary western societies. The perpetration of physical violence is only considered to be a practice of hegemonic masculinity if it is bestowed with cultural consent and honour (Connell, 2000a:10, 2005:214; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:841). Violence against women is considered weak in contemporary terms, so is therefore practicing subordinated masculinity. Nevertheless, the contemporary social imperative to control women can legitimately be achieved by practicing hegemonic masculinities in the form of *non*-physical strategies of domination and abuse, which ensures men can safely claim symbolic capital.

Therefore those men who use violence are acting in accord with long-held historical messages that physical violence is a legal and socially legitimate way to control women. To reconcile this historical legitimacy with the

contemporary illegitimacy of physical violence against women, men utilise three strategies to support the belief that they are still entitled to claim symbolic capital. These strategies include: firstly hiding evidence of violence from other men; second, adapting the definition of particular behaviours practiced by women to fit with masculinity, thereby suggesting they are hitting a man not a woman; and third, arguing that the legitimate practice of using physical violence amongst men as a survival strategy spills over as a survival strategy in relation to female partners.

The following extracts explore the first strategy some men use to reconcile using physical violence against women and to deal with subsequent feelings of shame and weakness, that is, some men hide evidence of their physically violent practices from men who would potentially disapprove. Lazarus said he did not think he had *“met a bloke that’s ever been proud of beating on his woman. That shame thing, keeps it quiet.”* Those men wear a cloak of secrecy. Joe and Peter talked about hiding their physical violence against their partners. For example Joe said that while violence against men was conscious and intentional, violence against women was due to a loss of control, thus implying a lack of consciousness. However, later in the interview he said that, *“when the right people were around, I did the right things.”* When it was pointed out that this statement was not congruent with losing control he said, *“Yeah yeah you look at it, it’s an easy target as well.”* Peter also spoke about hiding his weakness from other men saying it was:

“Pretty piss weak to hit a woman, really... I certainly wouldn’t be doing it anywhere else... I wouldn’t do that out in the street... bloody piss weak.... Cowardly... I was very cunning about the violent side I displayed at home... I would be appalled if people knew the extent, yeah. So I kept it rather quiet, and did the public façade.” (Peter)

Hiding weaknesses may represent part of the embodied feel for the game that ensures acceptance and heroic status amongst men. Therefore this thesis argues that strategising may be the outcome of pre-reflexive practices that emerge when habitus and field meet (Bourdieu, 1990b:53, 2000a:129, 139).

In order to reconcile the chasm between the message “boys don’t hit girls” and the message “men should control women”, the second rationale men use is to adapt their definition of which behaviours practiced by women fit with their definitions of masculinity. This device of endowing women with masculine qualities equips those men with a socially legitimate reason to use physical violence – they are not hitting a woman, they are hitting a man. Henry reiterated five men’s views when he said:

“You know you don’t hit girls and that’s the thing... You’re not really supposed to hit guys either really are you? But it just seems to be the thing, that’s what men do. It’s accepted to ... bash your mate when you get pissed off with them.” (Henry)

Joe said, *“I’ve always grew up to believe women are not as strong or can’t defend themselves like we can.”* Although Joe knew violence against women was wrong he said, *“As I got older I’ve had women that are been butt pushers, it’s really, really, pissed me off, saying the wrong things to me, hurtful things. And that’s why I’ve retaliated.”* Bill said:

“It comes back to the bully thing. I mean you just turn your back and walk away and the next day, you hope for the best, and the bully comes at you just like the wife comes at you, nag, nag, nag and what are you, I don’t like to say it, but what are you supposed to do, turn around and hit them?” (Bill)

Max also defined ways his partner was behaving like a man in order to justify using physical violence to control her:

“I thought ... ‘If you can use your mouth like a man, and treat me like a man, you want everything else like a fucking man, I’ll treat you like a man.’ ... ‘You wanna speak like a man, you wanna act like me, you wanna do what I’m doin’, I’ll treat ya like me’ ... She was in my face like a male would do.” (Max)

Hearn (1998b) notes from his study that men use a form of quasi-repudiation that entails distinction and debate. This comprises admitting to physical violence, while making arguments that discount or exclude some forms of physical violence, while naming others as acceptable (Hearn, 1998b:116). As was the case in the current research, men in Hearn’s study made distinctions between the rules for hitting women and the rules for

hitting men saying, “I control it, not like a fella laying into a fella, something tells you to keep back” (Hearn, 1998b:136).

Despite this distinction, Anthony in the current study described a third rationale for using physical violence against women. Whilst discussing his need to use violence to survive in the worlds of boys and men, he rationalised his violence against women by wondering whether this well-practiced acceptable form of violence led to his lack of hesitation to use violence against women. He said, *“Part of me feels that it was the only defence mechanism I had, my violence [against boys/men] was the only thing that kept me alive. You take that to dealing with a relationship issue with your wife, you think that instantly because that’s the most subconscious thought.”*

Anderson and Umberson (2001) note in their research with perpetrators that when men gave accounts of their woman partners using violence against the men, men felt humiliated. In order to deflect the feeling of humiliation men positioned themselves as fearless in the face of what they considered was women’s ineffectual, irrational, hysterical, out-of-control violence. The authors concluded that men trivialised women’s violence in these ways as a practice of erasing the masculine in violent women by claiming that women’s violence was only dangerous to themselves (Anderson & Umberson, 2001:363-367). Although this is a different situation than that described by Max above, the manipulation of the definition of women’s behaviours as masculine or feminine in order to justify the illegitimate use of physical violence to attain the legitimate purpose of controlling women represents Dworkin’s (1981 cited in Barnett, 1997:124; 1981:13-24 cited in Edwards, 1987:25) notion that men are endowed with the “power of naming” which fits with Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic power, in which dominant groups have the symbolic capital that grants them the authority to define reality, and thus defend their hegemonic position (Bourdieu, 2000a:170-171, 2001:1-2, 116).

In conclusion, interviewees' ambivalence about the domestic violence legislation, and sometimes lack of enforcement of it by police and court judges, indicates that the legal system is at times an ineffectual force in preventing or stopping some men's abuse against women. It is argued men's ambivalence is due, in part, to the relatively short history of heterodox challenges to the much longer history of legal support for hegemonic masculinity in the form of physical violence and coercive control of women partners. Legal professionals are charged with the symbolic power to either reproduce, or transform the gender order, hence when professionals encourage perpetrators to deny their abusive practices, this leads some men to adhere to such professional advice. The more potent message that "boys don't hit girls" acts as a greater deterrent for some men than does the existence of the legislation.

On the surface, it could appear that some men are acting like chameleons adapting to their environment. But this is not the case. Under the surface, many men have dispositions that entail holding tight to a stable and clear set of rules about how to *appear as if* they are practicing the currently accepted strategies of hegemonic masculinities. That is, it is honourable and acceptable to show they are controlling women, and it is honourable and acceptable to be seen hitting men. Inherent in these strategies is the imperative to avoid appearing to practice subordinated masculinities.

Discussion earlier in this chapter showed that some men encourage men to use physical violence to control women. Some men acquiesce to such encouragement, whilst others challenge it. The issue of homosocial policing of hegemonic masculinities is rife with contradictions. But it is clear that contemporary hegemonic masculinities still honour non-physical forms of control over other men and over women. It is also clear that physical violence against weaker people – male or female – is considered a weakness. Given that it is weak and shameful to use physical violence against a female partner – and that such behaviour fits with practicing subordinated masculinities – this explains why some men attempt to hide physical violence against women from other men, and why some men re-

define women's behaviours as masculine to fit with the rule that it is okay to use physical violence amongst men. The caveat here is that dominating masculinities are perceived as the prerogative of men, not women, but temporary manipulation of the definition of who is practicing dominating behaviour is a legitimate hegemonic masculine strategy to maintain symbolic capital.

7.3 Masculine Position-Taking in Response to Domestic Violence Interventions

This section explores men's responses to institutions and individuals who intervene in men's relationships. Interventions including media campaigns, legal interventions and bystander interventions that oppose men's abuse of women set a scene against which men are motivated to act (Burke, 1969:13). A fourth intervention that sets this scene is the entrance of the Child Support Agency into the lives of men as a result of ex-partners seeking institutional support to mediate child maintenance payments. This section explores the interrelation between the scene, men's interpretation of the scene, and men's actions in response to their interpretations.

7.3.1 Responding to media campaigns

This section explores men's position-taking in response to media campaigns against domestic violence. More specifically, in 2006 and 2007, at the time the interviews were conducted for this research, a national multi-media campaign in Australia went to air. Despite a \$3.53 million government funded research project that found there was a need to depict images of psychological abuse and control, as well as physical violence and sexual abuse, the federal government withdrew the launch at the last minute. The psychological abuse and control aspect of the campaign was withdrawn. The original slogan "No Respect, No Relationship" was replaced with "Violence Against Women, Australia Says No" (McKenzie, 2005:12-13). Some men

in this study said, as Geni did, that he did not relate to the ads *“because they’re the violent side of it, I’m not violent see.”*

These advertisements represent heterodoxic challenges to the doxic realm (Bourdieu, 1977:164). The doxic assumption that it is honourable and acceptable to control women is not challenged, but the doxic assumption that physical violence and sexual abuse are acceptable as methods of control is challenged in the realm of heterodoxy. Doxic assumptions are embodied in the habitus that orients hegemonic masculinity in the form of controlling female partners.

Geni thought, *“Most men would be quite shocked... They’re pretty full on ads but I don’t think the majority of males would admit anything, they’d deny it, the macho, the, ‘It’s not me’. Denial.”* Which is something Anthony said about himself before he started the change process, *“I probably would’ve ignored [TV ads] and laughed.”* Sam said men say, *“it’s a crock of shit. But because it’s a lot of crock of shit, it’s pressing buttons.”* Rick added that, *“When I see an ad like that it makes me ashamed of myself, that I’m a part of that.”*

Finally, Henry thought the reason men ignored, or laughed at, the heterodoxic challenge posed by the ads was because *“a lot of guys think or live on the belief that [abusing their partners is] an accepted thing to do, so they don’t really care about [the ads] at all.”* In the making of public campaigns, it is important to take account of the contradiction between believing it is acceptable to control women, but feeling shame for hitting women. Patterns of contradiction in men’s narratives fit with Burke’s (1969:443) notion of attitude-agency. Many men in this study have the attitude that they must avoid appearing weak. Hitting women is weak and shameful, therefore they react by denying or justifying their abuse, which means many men will not respond favourably to the ads. Or they react against weakness and shame in order to regain a sense of honourable masculinity by engaging in more physical violence against their partners.

7.3.2 Responding to legal interventions

This section explores men's response to legal interventions against men's intimate partner abuse. Burke's (1969:443) notion that the scene has an impact on individuals' actions is prevalent in men's narratives, in that men variously take a position that resists or surrenders to an intervention, depending on the position the men perceive is taken by police, court judges, the court system, or solicitors.

The legal profession is defined as a field, with its own historically changing logic and regularities that influences the family field variously across time. However, it is also an institution that holds an objective position alongside the objective position held by perpetrators, within the broader field of power. The introduction of a legal intervention to the field of power meant interviewees' habitus was destabilised, "generating suffering." However the men in this study responded by attempting to reproduce the social structures to which their habitus was most aligned (Bourdieu, 2000a:160-161), and they did this by jostling for a hegemonic position in relation to the legal institution. Interviewees' actions differed according to whether they judged the legal institution to hold an inferior position, an equal position, or a superior position.

Viewed from Burke's (1969:5) notion of scene-attitude, James portrayed police as having an inferior despised position: "*When police bash you you've got no respect for the law... I can't see how someone in a police uniform can justify to me that violence is wrong when they've committed that same violence against me.*"

Other men portrayed the legal institution as holding an inferior and inconsequential position. Chris said, "*The legal system didn't help me, or didn't even push me in a direction, they didn't offer anything, it was just a process that I had to go through. It was just bang, sign, see you later, bye.*"

Max said that:

“There’s nothing in jail for domestic violence, there’s no courses. So you’re jailed for six months, you sit there and you wait and you do your time and you get out and you’ve gotta restart. It’s more of a cool-off period.” (Max)

Yet other men appeared to depict the legal scene as holding an equal non-threatening position, hence the legal system held no significance in their desire to stop abusing their partners. Bob said *“getting into trouble from the police was certainly not a big deal for me at the time”* He said it would not *“have changed me in any way.”* James too thought any threat that he might *“go to jail for six months, that’s the last thing I think of at that time. I don’t feel that the legal system, whether it’s the police or the lawyers or the jail system, has really had an effect on me.”* Possibilities inherent in this scene (Burke, 1969:443) that shapes men’s attitudes may include a normative frame of response by the legal system that often entails not enforcing punitive consequences, or that any negative consequences that are enforced lack the power to change many men, or that the positive benefits of abusing and controlling their partners outweighed any possible costs associated with the legal system.

Other men depicted the legal scene to be superior and threatening. Peter said that becoming involved with legal professionals meant perpetrators would:

“Be feeling powerless. It’s in someone’s hands now ... lawyers, solicitors and the like, they’re always very vulture like, they’ve always gotcha at a weak moment... I’d say there’s a feeling of powerlessness there and the fact the system’s screwing ’em.” (Peter)

Patterns in men’s talk show a different interplay between scene-attitude-action in this instance (Burke, 1969:443). Now that the scene is depicted as threatening, men deploy actions associated with hegemonic masculinities against the legal professionals. Sam said a:

“Police officer served me a domestic violence order ... he was the one that stuck his nose in my business that had nothing to do with him... That’s how males come across, they feel threatened and scared.” (Sam)

Likewise, when the police intervened after Geni terrified his wife with verbal abuse, he said *“The police were standing there ... all very authoritarian ... with a gun on his hip... You feel trapped, like and ‘I’m frustrated, can’t do anything about this’.”*

The response to feeling trapped and powerless, in the form of hegemonic masculinity meant, according to Peter, that it gave these men *“someone to blame. Blame wife, blame the lawyers.”* Sam *“wanted to smash him to the ground”* when a police officer served him with a domestic violence order so *“then I’d come out, ‘Fuck you’, baseball bat and be the hero.”* Likewise, when the police arrived in response to Geni’s wife’s call for help, he displayed his hegemonic credentials by verbally abusing the police and in his trapped state he thought, *“Will I pull [the policeman’s] gun out and shoot him?’ ... I’ll shoot this bugger’. Bang.”*

Other practices of hegemonic masculinity deployed in relation to the threatening scene (Burke, 1969:443), were to manipulate and challenge the law. Sam said he *“knew how far to push the law before they could get me.”* Anthony said when he went to court to have a domestic violence order placed on him *“I stood in front of the magistrate, I wouldn’t say I lied but I pretty much told him what they wanted to hear.”*

7.3.3 Responding to bystander intervention

This section examines men’s responses to bystander intervention by other men. Interviewees respond by taking the position that they have the hegemonic right to control their partners and that the relationship is no one else’s business. Many men in the study also become defensive over other men’s intervention, because they fear being made to feel weak and vulnerable in the eyes of other men, and some men physically attack the male bystander.

Some men deliberately hide their violence and verbal aggression. But this is not always the case, so Max reiterated others’ views when he said his

response to a bystander intervening was, *“I felt a bit, ‘Fuck off, none of your business’ ... I thought, ‘This is our relationship no one else’s business’.”*

Hearn (1998b:146-155) concludes from his study that, embedded in perpetrators’ subtexts is the implied need to maintain private closure of their intimate relationship. He notes that some men justify their violence on the basis of women’s sexual infidelity, or women’s rejection of the man. Taken-for-granted private closure of men’s heterosexual intimate relationships appears to be the case in the current study.

David said the perpetrator would *“probably knock them out of the way... Usually blokes like that don’t like being told what to do by other people. Also a lot of blokes see their wives as a possession. And another bloke can’t tell me how to treat my wife.”* Brendan added that, *“They won’t let their spouse control them so why should anybody else try to control them.”*

The hegemonic belief that intervention was not the bystander’s business coupled with the belief they possessed their wives, set the scene for men’s physically violent reactions (Burke, 1969:443). However, it seems ironic that ten perpetrators in this study did not believe other men had a right to control them given that throughout their narratives they had discussed many instances in which they had submitted to other men’s encouragement to control partners. However, men bystanders were encouraging the opposite message – do not control your partners. Rick described the effect such a message has on defending hegemonic masculinities:

“It’s just that pride of ... you feel belittled ... you’re being schooled... Or ... you’ve caught your wife cheating on ya ... and you’re abusing her, do you think you’re gonna take anyone’s advice that you shouldn’t be abusing her? As opposed to, you started all the crap about something... Any guy that’s being abusive towards their partners is justifying it ... ‘Bitch’s done this to me again’.”
(Rick)

Alex said, *“It’s the macho image ‘How dare you step in and say something like that in front of my partner and say that I’m wrong in front of my partner.’ It’s a very dangerous thing to do.”* Likewise, Anthony thought

men would not appreciate bystander intervention because they did not want to open “*themselves up to ridicule and harassment [because] the guy who starts telling things about himself tends to be the butt of a lot of jokes.*”

Patterns in men’s talk about bystander intervention show a complex interplay between scene-attitude-act-purpose (Burke, 1969:443). The attitudes men hold about bystander intervention stem from needs to maintain hegemonic status and symbolic capital. If men submit to bystander intervention they would be making themselves vulnerable, they would be showing weakness in the form of practicing subordinated masculinities, and the consequences could be humiliating.

Not all men agree with violence against women (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003:110-111), but “the majority of non-violent men do not challenge other men who are violent” (Pease, 2008:4). It is difficult to judge the configuration of masculinity being practiced by male bystanders. Their actions may be motivated by empathy and care for women so could be considered as counter-sexist (Connell, 2005:55) moves aimed at protecting women from victimisation. That form of masculinity does not invoke symbolic capital in the homosocial field, so according to Katz (2006 cited in Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2008:183) men who intervene may be motivated by years of being silenced “for fear of not being manly”. On the other hand, male bystanders may actually agree that men should control female partners, and so may be practicing hegemonic masculinity by discrediting the soft tactics of physical violence and verbal aggression that the perpetrators are using. Interviewees’ narratives do not indicate that bystanders lose status for intervening, rather it is the perpetrator who appears to fear a loss of status. Moreover, bystander intervention does not preclude those men from engaging in their own perpetration of intimate partner abuse (Pease, 2008:4). Indeed some of the interviewees in this study said they have stepped in to stop other men’s abuse against women. It is not uncommon for the schemes of habitus and positions occupied by men to entail conflicting, ambivalent attitudes and desires (Connell, 2000a:219), rather Bourdieu argues contradictory attitudes have varying degrees of

integration (Bourdieu, 2000a:160). Without knowing bystanders' views about the nexus of their own habitus-field-capital, it is impossible to know what mix of subjective and objective structures have to be present to motivate bystanders to intervene. This is an important area for future research.

Hearn (1998b:146-155) observes in his study that some men intervene in an attempt to stop perpetrators from abusing their partners. He concludes from this that any violence perpetrators use against the bystander is aimed at excluding them from the relationship. Likewise, in the current study men discuss defending their territory by using violence to exclude bystanders.

Sam said he *“was arguing with my missus and ... someone stuck their nose in, I'd just break their nose, break their face. 'Fuck off, it's got nothing to do with you.’”* Bob said:

“This fella's come over, said, ‘I don't like the way you're talking to her' ... One thing led to another and there was a few punches... When I was fighting with that chap ... I certainly did think that it was my right to abuse my wife if I saw fit...” (Bob)

Henry called this hegemonic response *“the big ball syndrome, or the control freak stuff because it's his domain. A lot of them think she's mine.”* Sam thought such a response stemmed from *“the pecking order. You are in charge. You are the lion, you are the king of that jungle.”*

Exclusion can be explained by the notion that heterosexual men exist as rivals competing to win women as sexual partners (Carrigan et al., 1985:586). Some men could assume that their female partners might perceive a man bystander is taking the position of “knight in shining armour” who has come to rescue a damsel in distress. This would further explain many men's defensive reactions in response to bystander intervention.

Despite interviewees' resistance to bystander intervention, such intervention may plant seeds in the backs of perpetrators' minds (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2008:183) and contribute to developing a discourse of non-violence and non-control that later motivates developing patterns of counter-sexist politics, along with a willingness to relinquish symbolic capital. Max said that looking back at when "*me mate grab me, pull me back, he said, 'Don't fucking be doing that shit here'. When I look back at it, he was well on his right, he done me a favour.*" Bystander intervention represents a heterodox challenge to the hegemonic self-evident right to control and abuse female partners. This challenge to the doxic order creates instability in the habitus in the form of dispositions towards practicing hegemonic masculinity, so decreases its durability (Bourdieu, 1977:165-166, 1990b:60, 2000a:220). This instability in perpetrators' habitus opens the way to creating new masculine interests, expectations and beliefs, which, in turn, help produce new social structures of power relations that encourage an egalitarian gender order.

7.3.4 Resisting the Child Support Agency

discussion in this section focuses on men's responses to the Child Support Agency's² intervention into their lives. The section is set out in two parts. The first part sets the scene and the second part outlines men's actions in response to the scene. In the first part men describe a masculine framework which positions men as believing the Child Support Agency is taking a dominating position, thereby the scene that is painted by many of the men entails a threat to their hegemonic status. In the second part, men outline their hegemonic position-taking in response to this perceived threat to their position as head of the family.

The Child Support Agency is a form of intervention despised by many men. Some men believe power and control over partners and children is

² The Child Support Agency was formed by the Australian Federal Government in 1988 to assist separated parents to take responsibility for the financial support of their children (Child Support Agency, 2006).

threatened when requested to pay child maintenance through the Child Support Agency (CSA). Some men spoke at length with tones of anger and resentment about how the CSA took too much money from men, took money illegally from men, did not listen to men, that men were “*getting ripped off*” (Peter/Rick) and was generally biased against men in favour of women. Perceptions that ensue from this framework of masculinities indicate that intervention by the CSA creates a loss of hegemonic control over their children, their finances and their partners. Together, these issues set the scene (Burke, 1969:5) that motivate many men’s resistance to cooperating with the CSA.

James said not all men “*have a problem with it at all, absolutely not*”, and were happy to pay child maintenance through the CSA. However, those men who did have a problem never mentioned that their physical violence, or psychological and structural control against their partners, had contributed to this new situation, rather they repeatedly said as Max did, “*I’m not there to support my ex, she’s taken her direction in life.*”

Many men thought the intervention by the CSA led to a loss of control over their children. James described a normative framework of masculinities in which many men believe “*they’re controlled by a government agency over the kids that maybe they feel they own themselves... It’s a loss of control thing, their own personal property.*” Max said the pride he had in being a provider no longer existed when he had to support his child financially through the CSA. He said the difference between the two forms of providing was that “*someone else is taking control of my finances. They’re presuming how much that child needs.*”

Men’s separation from their children as a result of abuse against the children’s mother meant the cycle of maintaining the symbolic order of relations within the family, including the passing on of symbolic capital between the generations, was hindered (Bourdieu, 2000a:244). This thesis argues that, rather than considering children to be humans deserving of love

and affection, many men considered their children as chattels to be used in winning power in the form of accumulation of capital.

Many men thought the intervention by the CSA led to a loss of control over their finances. Henry said, *“It all comes down to how much control you have over your income.”* Max said, *“They don’t support children, they’re collecting wages from people taking it out of their bank accounts without even telling them.”* With the entry of the CSA into the family field, the discourse embedded in the framework of masculinities orients men to believe that the CSA is circumventing their hegemonic position as financial providers for their children.

Max described resentment about the CSA taking money from his overtime because *“overtime is my time... Take child support on a ... weekly 38-hour week, fine, not an argument. Why do men do overtime? Have to do overtime to make up for child support payments getting taken out. What about my life, my new life that I’m starting?”* Anthony added to this understanding of the perceived threat to men’s hegemonic position saying that the CSA system was *“a bit one-sided, that men tend to be screwed ... they can take everything from the man... So you think by depriving them of everything, not a fair amicable amount, but everything, depriving them of everything, is going to improve the situation?”*

The state has a history of shaping and supporting dominant representations of the family, through social welfare and tax policies which financially advantage families that conform to the dominant representation and strengthens members who conform to that representation (Bourdieu, 1996:24, 2000a:186; Connell, 2002a:103). Conversely, the CSA is supporting a non-dominant representation of the family, thus according to the extracts above, separated men were no longer experiencing the support previously received for their position to which they had become accustomed, and were experiencing a loss of capital.

Men thought the intervention by the CSA led to a loss of control over their ex-partners. Peter thought many men believed *“their ex-partner is getting the best of both worlds, she’s got another bloke, look at them getting money, and he’s still paying, and she’s going overseas and all this.”* Max agreed saying, *“she owns a house, she owns a 45 thousand dollar four wheel drive, she’s never married, she’s been with different men and she’s taking them for a ride.”* These extracts indicate that perceptions ensuing from the habitus entail the belief that women’s new partners are taking up the hegemonic position previously held by the interviewees, thus, rather than consider the wellbeing of their children, many men engage in a struggle to uphold their hegemonic position over their ex-partners.

Max pondered, *“How do we know that money’s going for the child? We don’t and we never. It doesn’t... She could be drinking it, she could be, ‘Oh cool, child maintenance I’m buying a car’. Of course they do it, you’d be blind.”* Henry agreed saying many men *“don’t see it as paying money for their children, they see it as paying money for her, because she’ll spend it on anything.”* Lazarus was adamant his children were not getting the money he paid:

“I wouldn’t have a problem with ’em, if me kids were getting the benefit out of it... She just, neglect is an understatement. She’ll shoot off to her boyfriend’s house and leave my kids with no food, and go buy them takeaway.” (Lazarus)

Brendan said, *“It’s more the fact that [men] feel as though they can’t get out of the situation even though they want to, they are still being controlled by the female partner.”*

The ways that interviewees positioned themselves within broader relations of gender led to the inference that they had lost control over their children, their finances and their partners, and that the CSA and women’s new partners had circumvented their hegemonic position – to which they believed they should still hold – set the scene that contained the motivation to react by practicing hegemonic masculinities (Burke, 1969:15-16). The notion of attitude-purpose-act (Burke, 1969:443) explains how this

subjective position motivated the deployment of hegemonic masculinities to struggle with the CSA for the accumulation of power, and for the maintenance of their taken-for-granted historically given institutionally guaranteed right to the position as head of the family (Bourdieu, 1993:74). They practiced hegemonic masculinities using four different methods.

The first strategy of hegemonic masculinity entails establishing solidarity amongst other resentful perpetrators, as a means of buttressing their hegemonic position, by adhering to messages from men's rights groups; second, some men hunt down their partners and abuse them; third, some men withhold payments; fourth, some men make recommendations for how they could re-establish their hegemonic role as owner and provider to their children by circumventing any relationship with their ex-partner.

First, Brendan said, *“That’s why there’s support groups like Dads in Distress. Groups like that that are starting to spring up, trying to fight for men’s rights.”* ‘Dads in Distress’ is an Australian group that provides support to men to help prevent suicide. On the surface that has no relation to men fighting the CSA. However, under the surface, it appears the group is aimed at maintaining hegemonic status. According to the founder of this fathers’ rights organisation (Miller, 2008, 6 January), the prevention of men’s suicide, *“Is simple, Stop spending millions advertising us as all being perpetrators and abusers (domestic violence is non gender specific) and stop fencing bridges and start using the money for some real research into what’s happening to our men!”*

The second strategy of hegemonic masculinity entailed going to extremes to reinstate hegemonic position. Anthony thought the perception that the CSA is ripping off men meant some men were *“going to be more inclined to hunt down their ex-partner and do something nasty.”* Empirical research indicates that separation abuse is common (Robertson et al., 2007b:269), that separated women are at 30 times the risk of violence than married women. Research indicates that, one reason this occurs, is when men have to support their ex-partner financially (Brownridge et al., 2008:118, 129).

The family is a central site for the accumulation of capital (Bourdieu, 1986b:251, 1993:33, 1996:23), including economic and social capital, and men's position as head of the family provides men with greater access to these forms of capital, along with symbolic capital. Thus, it is argued that separation entails, for many men, a loss of, not only their position, but a loss to varying degrees of capital that accompany that position. This thesis argues that subsequent separation abuse is aimed at restoring those men's hegemonic position along with some of that lost capital.

Third, according to Henry, another strategy of hegemonic masculinity to maintain hegemonic position entails *"guys who go out of their way not to pay it."* Henry said he had agreed to pay child maintenance direct to his wife, but that when she went against this and told him, *"Oh, they told me it was better to do it that way coz then there's guarantee it will get paid'."* Henry's retort was, *"Well, that's not the case, because you don't pay CSA they don't get paid anyway. And they only pay them once a month. So, a lot of what she's going through now is her own choice."* Lazarus withheld payments because he was adamant that his ex-partner did not use the money that he paid through the CSA for the benefit of his children. He said the CSA, *"take money off me occasionally. Then I changed jobs... I'm not giving her money to drink with. So as soon as they start taking money out of my wages, I quit and change jobs ... probably every eight months."*

According to The Hon Senator Ludwig (2008:3), in July 2008 the Australian child support debt was \$1 billion, a debt that has been incurred, in part, because some parents refuse to comply with requests to support their children through the scheme. Bourdieu (1993:74) argues that newcomers (such as the CSA) to the game in the family field, have to pay an entry fee in the form of recognition of the value of the game and its functioning. As the above extracts show, there are loopholes in the CSA system, that enable some men to continue their power and control over their partners, by not paying child maintenance. This loophole could indicate that the CSA, upon entry to the game in the family field, was oblivious to the strategies of hegemonic masculinities that perpetrators were capable of using to win

power, or alternatively, that they were aware, and therefore colluded with hegemonic masculinities by not having policies and practices in place to predict and combat those strategies (Connell, 2005:212-213). In fact a review of the government CSA policy found the government placed more emphasis on child poverty than irresponsible behaviours of fathers (Fehlberg & MacLean, 2009:16).

The fourth strategy of hegemonic masculinity to re-establish position was to provide a wish list, for alternative ways to support children directly that meant avoiding going through the CSA, or circumventing the money from being filtered through ex-partners. Brendan said that these suggestions would mean separated perpetrators would be *“allowed to be a parent. And make decisions for the child.”*

Lazarus told the CSA and his ex-partner, *“I’ll buy food, or I’ll pay a couple of bills, but I’m not giving you money coz I know exactly where it’ll go”* and similarly Max said, *“They should change it from money going into accounts to a clothes voucher, where I know the child has got the money.”*

Brendan said he asked the CSA:

“Can I buy private health insurance?’ That’s the same annual value and that way she’s covered, even though I don’t want her to be covered coz I can’t stand to look at her anymore, but my son will be covered for that. Or to put it into a trust account for him when he’s older, or for extra tuition when he’s going to school, or school camps that his mum doesn’t want him to go on or can’t afford.”
(Brendan)

By avoiding paying money to support their children, men are able to accumulate economic capital. By continuing to dominate women via such means, men are able to accumulate symbolic capital, in the form of honour and prestige, bestowed on them from other men who hold hegemonic positions (Bourdieu, 1985:725, 2000a:244). Men practicing hegemonic masculinities, who support men’s rights groups such as Dads in Distress, have the power to withhold symbolic capital from the CSA as an institution, by denouncing the CSA’s policies and practices. Such a denouncement

represents a habitus that orients some men to express their hegemonic position in relation to the CSA.

To conclude, the symbolic violence imposed onto many men's habitus that hegemonic masculinities include the right to control women and children, is at odds with media campaigns, legal interventions, bystander interventions and the Child Support Agency seeking child maintenance. Men in this study respond to interventions variously depending on their perception of the position occupied by the intervener. No matter what form the intervention takes, if men believe their hegemonic position is being threatened, many will act to defend it. Nevertheless bystander intervention plants seeds for future change amongst masculinities. But for interventions to hold greater relevance, so that perpetrators respond more willingly, it is imperative that the honour associated with hegemonic masculinity underpinning many men's resistance, is taken into account. The Child Support Agency is not just dealing with bad deviant men, they are dealing with men who have lost position, lost control, lost capital, lost power and lost support previously bestowed on a dominant configuration of the family. It is not just perpetrators that have to change. Change must take place within institutions and individuals attempting to intervene and protect women.

7.4 Men's Support Seeking

Discussion in this section focuses on many men's desire for freedom to be vulnerable without being stigmatised and abused, and it explores what men find useful and not useful when seeking help to change from formal organisations. The two major forms of help admired by most interviewees entailed being challenged by stopping abuse programme facilitators and by other male group participants.

7.4.1 Desiring the freedom to be vulnerable

Many boys learn early never to share emotional vulnerabilities otherwise they may suffer verbal abuse or physical violence. Seeking help is a subordinate masculine practice and the desire to avoid abuse for such practices sets the scene (Burke, 1969:443) that causes some men not to seek help to stop abusing their partners. Chris reiterated others' views saying, *"I've never sat with a guy and told him how I feel, or what's happening."* Henry added that sharing vulnerabilities amongst men was *"this big hush hush. 'Oh no men don't talk about those things'."*

David reiterated others' views saying that revealing vulnerable feelings amongst boys *"wasn't encouraged. You were a bit of a sissy or you were soft if you talked about your emotions... Usually picked on."* Being picked on represents one version of the policing of the heterosexual form of subordinated masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832, 844) which leads some men such as James to believe they *"didn't feel there was anyone I could trust with my personal emotions or feelings or thoughts."*

This lack of safety and trust amongst men meant some men became socially isolated. Joe reiterated others' words when he said he did not *"let people close to me. Never talked to family and friends about my problem."*

Nevertheless, some perpetrators desire the freedom to express emotional vulnerabilities in safety, or indeed despite a lack of safety, amongst other men. This desire is indicative of the desire to mitigate the underlying costs that some men experience as a result of the battle to adhere strictly to hegemonic masculinities (Bourdieu, 2000a:241; Connell, 2005:220). Henry said that not being allowed to express vulnerabilities around other men was *"bullshit. It's crap. Men do need to talk about things."*

Although other interviewees agreed that it was important for men as a collective to change so they could feel comfortable sharing their vulnerabilities amongst each other, Bob said, *"Doing that might be*

difficult". Peter questioned, "*But how do you do it? Culturally, like how long? There have been changes over the last decade in terms of that. Not impossible but it would be a very long process.*" Here, Peter's comment implies many men's understanding that practices of hegemonic masculinity represent the current most honoured way of being a man (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005:832) and that this is in flux. Chris added to this understanding:

"Trying to get the guys around it there, that they're *allowed* to talk to somebody about their issues would be the hardest part. They have to realise it's okay, it's acceptable to have a weakness as they see it." (Chris)

James thought it would be great for men to "*maybe to being more open about their objection to violence.*" He went on to suggest:

"If a man's objecting to violence, to me that is a good thing... I feel men need to communicate more with each other about how important their partners or their family is to them, and the positive things in their life, rather than the negative aspects of their relationship." (James)

Six men never sought help from any organisation before attending the stopping abuse programme that referred them to the current research. Other men believed there was limited, or no support for men even if they wanted it. Conversely, several men sought one-on-one, or couple's counselling, or attended anger management programmes, but found these to be ineffectual mainly because the normative response encountered by those men was that the counsellors, psychologists and group facilitators did not challenge their controlling, dominating and abusive behaviours. Many men in this study had no respect for this lack of challenge.

According to Robertson and colleagues (2007b:269), counselling in relation to intimate partner abuse is a specialist sphere, necessitating an understanding that men's accountability, and women's safety, should take precedence over common counselling goals. Studies have repeatedly found that counsellors, psychologists and so forth, who are not appropriately trained in the dynamics of domestic violence collude with perpetrators (Adams, 1988:177; Gondolf, 1993:236-237).

This thesis argues that human service practitioners who are not trained in the dynamics of domestic violence are in danger of operating within the realm of doxa because of the lack of available discourse (Bourdieu, 1977:170, 2000a:15) about the dynamics of power and control perpetrated by many men, as well as discourse about the danger this holds for women. While crisis is a necessary condition for a questioning of doxa (Bourdieu, 1977:169; Connell, 2002a:71), it is not, in itself, a sufficient condition for the production of critical discourse (Bourdieu, 1977:169) for practitioners, or for perpetrators. Nor do some practitioners possess a habitus with the reflexive capacity to name, and challenge that which is taken-for-granted by perpetrators and non-perpetrators alike.

7.4.2 Men's respect for being challenged

The purpose here is to discuss the two main features that men in this study respected about attending the stopping abuse group programme. First, they respected having perspectives from both male and female facilitators and more importantly they respected having their behaviours and attitudes challenged. Second, they respected the challenges made by fellow group participants against abusing women. Given that the men who volunteered to be interviewed for this research are most likely at later stages in their change process than other perpetrators, it needs to be stipulated that this could be why some men in this study discussed this degree of respect.

Chris said that going to the stopping violence programme “*was about the only place*” he had the option of showing weakness “*which was good.*” Anthony said that, “*to actually be with other men and talk about things, that was probably the very first time I've been able to do that in a counselled situation.*”

Some men developed the ability, and desire, to share vulnerabilities relatively quickly once they started the stopping abuse programme. This relative speed may appear surprising after a lifetime of not sharing, and of not feeling safe to do so. The pattern in men's narratives that indicate a

speedy shift in practices fits with Burke's (1969:17) conceptualisation of the interrelation of the scene-act ratio. The stopping abuse programme represents a scene, or situation aimed at changing hegemonic masculine practices. Some forms of masculinity contain motivation to act in congruence with that situation. This indicates that if men do stop abusing their partners, while they are experiencing the support of the stopping abuse programme, this may be related to the democratic, supportive, safe and trusting environment. However, this support is not enough to stop intimate partner abuse. Once men leave programmes there may be no other environments that contain qualities that nurture counter-sexist politics. Rather, environments in which the men socialise such as pubs, sporting environments and workplaces are more likely to represent scenes that promote competitive, dominating and controlling patterns of hegemonic masculinities.

7.4.2.1 Respect for group facilitators

Many interviewees discuss respect for both the male and female facilitators. James said many men benefited from the presence of a female facilitator by providing a context in which a form of masculinity could be practiced that did not entail blaming women:

“To show a little bit more respect towards women. As in, without a woman there, I believe men would tend to be more derogatory towards women... Having a female there is confronting to yourselves. Having a female there helps you not to blame women for just being women.” (James)

Previous studies highlight perpetrators' tendency to blame women (Dutton, 1986:389; Gadd, 2000:440, 2002:71, 2003:343; Levitt et al., 2008:438; Winstok et al., 2002:135). Hearn (1998b:122) notes that when men make excuses for their violence, they accept the blame, but not the responsibility, whereas confessions entail recognition of violence and fully, or partially, accepting both blame and responsibility (Hearn, 1998b:109, 134; Mullaney, 2007:237).

In the current study James said men further benefited from the presence of a female facilitator because of her style of keeping men focused:

“If it was an all male group it would tend to get a bit like the back bar of the pub, where it’d tend to lose control, but a female seems to be able to herd a group of men, and to focus a little bit better on the issues.” (James)

Sam said men benefited because:

“She’d put her point of view across as a female, but not fully, as she put it across as a counsellor and also made us feel comfortable. She didn’t judge us, like a lot of females have, she was like a friend... And that’s what shocked us as much... Why isn’t she judging us when ... every other female in the world judges? And that’s taught us a few things... Okay there are people ... who do listen ... a female kind and gentle side. It made you feel safe.” (Sam)

Conversely, Henry would have preferred to have a female facilitator who was “*just a bit more forceful*” because he did not believe “*the ability to handle female aggression was tested... A lot of them saw her as probably unpredictable and probably didn’t know how to take her.*”

The strength of having a male facilitator, who courageously challenges men from a firm position of integrity with democratic values, opens the way to practice subordinated masculinities and counter-sexist masculinities, in a non-threatening atmosphere. This meant they were able to discuss knowledge and understandings that, according to Bourdieu (2000a:199) can only be communicated between people who are constituted, through the exertion of symbolic power, with the same cognitive structures, and are capable of recognising each other as worthy of being heard. The men in this study bestowed the male facilitators with the authority to speak. Thus, many men agreed to engage in the debates within the realm of heterodoxy.

Given interviewees’ recognition that men as a collective have the monopoly over defining which gendered practices are legitimate (Bourdieu, 1989:21), it is vital that perpetrators recognise that male facilitators hold symbolic capital in the form of prestige. Given the importance that symbolic capital has in the habitus of men who practice hegemonic masculinities, it is possible that some men perceived that male facilitators granted the female

facilitators with equal authority to speak. This could explain why some men said that it was important for changing masculine patterns to hear the viewpoints of women in general, and abused women in particular, and that the masculine patterns employed in the programme entailed a willingness to take on board what they heard:

“You need that female opinion... When they brought out sheets that women had wrote, that had suffered from domestic violence ... that really was hitting home, how they were feeling during certain situations. She would sit there and talk to us about those... To make us think more about the other, instead of being selfish pricks.” (Lazarus)

“She’s good coz she actually says what she thinks being a female. She sorta says... ‘This is what women would like, have you tried this with women?’ And it’s a good angle, coz ... how would we know what a woman wants? ... For some unknown reason even your girlfriend or wives they don’t actually tell you. How can we as men treat you as women the way you want when you don’t tell us?” (Bill)

“Female facilitator is good coz ... she brings something in, like a story last one about a girl ... what related to me is it reminded me so much of meself... ‘Hey fuck that reminds me why’d she stay with him?’ I was antsy [agitated] and I was thinking whoa whoa, ‘Hang on, why did my wife stay with me?’ ... She stands by me and I’ve asked her, ‘Why, should you, do you think I’m worth standing by, like really? I want to be with you, that’s without doubt.’ But I’ve been violent and I could be violent again it can happen.” (Max)

Max said it was beneficial that facilitators challenged men intellectually:

“He really drills you, but in a good way. Makes you work, makes you think. He’s very comfortable ... he sits back and thinks about our questions. Doesn’t answer straight away ... he controls the group in a manner.” (Max)

Many men respected both male and female facilitators for encouraging reflexive analysis of their doxic taken-for-granted assumptions about hegemonic masculinities in the form of control over women (Bourdieu, 2001:89) and for challenging them to take on new perspectives, by challenging them to go to intellectual and emotional depths beyond their comfort zone, and by challenging their abusive behaviours. Peter said men appreciated having their behaviours challenged:

“The coordinators were very good because they’d challenge people if they were trying to minimise or blame... They challenge you, they’re very knowledgeable... Couldn’t get by with just a flippant answer, they really delved

deeper into what was really going on. Which was a bit of an unusual, so they'd be put on line particularly in front of group of people." (Peter)

Given that behaviours are always a compromise between habitus on the one hand and habitus and field on the other, several assumptions can be made about interviewees' apparent willingness to engage in a process of changing beliefs and practices that alter the dominant gender order. For instance, interviews were conducted at the premises where men attended the programme, men might have wanted to portray a sense of enthusiasm for change to an interviewer, and the men freely volunteered their time to be interviewed which could all shape their favourable inferences about the programme and about change.

A previous study concludes that instability and fluctuating masculinities contribute to some men's motivation to use violence against their partners. Anderson and Umberson (2001:375) indicate that men who experience uncertain masculinities due to changes in the gender order use violence against their partners as a strategy to regain "masculinity".

This thesis argues that the respect some men had for women, who had been granted authority to speak by respected male facilitators, influenced many interviewees to engage in an opportunity to change. For instance Anthony, who had walked out of previous group programmes because he did not respect the facilitators, said men respected strong female and male facilitators who stood up to the men:

"[Female facilitator] is no shrinking violent, she's straight up and in your face (laugh) ... and this is one of the big things I said to [male facilitator], 'I've gotta feel like I respect you and that you have enough guts to pull me into line... I was, 'Fuck I'm outta here' I went out the door, 'I'm sorry, I can't stand this bullshit anymore'. Coz a lot of them were to me quite foolish in the way they were thinking. Then [male facilitator] called me up and we were talking. He was saying, 'People are not at the same level'. He really made me aware of what was going on and I started feeling more comfortable and went back to the group." (Anthony)

Sam said:

“My personal space is if you get right here in front of me, as a male, I feel uncomfortable, I feel threatened. And we did that as a demonstration, and I felt very uneasy [sic], he was in my personal space. Everybody needs their personal space but I never saw that... Like the male counsellor, he'd talk and he'd go, 'If this is offending you let me know'. Right. I've never heard that in my life. Sometimes I felt like grabbing him by the throat and choking him, coz he just drilled me and opened up doors, I didn't want doors opened. But he kept going... But he'd get that door open.” (Sam)

7.4.2.2 Respect for group members

The most commonly cited reason interviewees found for why the stopping abuse programme was worthwhile was being in a group of men. This was worthwhile for several reasons. It meant their controlling and abusive behaviours were challenged in ways that would normally not occur; they learned non-violent strategies from other men; and being amongst other perpetrators broke down long-held stereotypes. Importantly, it was the first time men in this study had ever experienced an ability to make themselves vulnerable in front of other men, because there was a sense of safety and trust, which was rarely experienced amongst men outside the group.

Some men said that once they gained a level of ease with group members they were able to challenge each other about their abusive behaviours, something Chris thought was an important dimension *“instead of sitting in a classroom with two teachers at the front.”*

This thesis argues that, given that perpetrators in this study recognise that each group participant brings to the stopping abuse programme an accumulation of symbolic capital in the form of kudos, men grant each other the right to orchestrate new ways of communicating amongst men (Bourdieu, 1989:23), that does not denigrate subordinated masculine practices, such as sharing emotional vulnerabilities and that supports consideration of new masculine beliefs and practices aimed at egalitarian relationships, amongst themselves, and with women.

Whilst some men are motivated to change when their partners threaten to leave, Peter implied that such a threat may not have the potency that facing male peers in the group at the stopping abuse programme provide for other men. This can be explained by the willingness of men in this study to listen to those who hold symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1989:23), and it is predominantly men who are bestowed with such capital (Bourdieu, 2000a:167), thus Peter said it was the first time he had ever been amongst a group of males that were saying “*No*” to violence against women and that he respected this challenge:

“What was useful, was getting challenged... With that whole men’s group ... you are being held accountable by other men ... there’s an element of humiliation ... you gotta face up to what you’ve done to a bunch of other blokes with check ins and stuff. The blokes wouldn’t let you get away with, they’d really interrogate what was behind what you’re saying, so it’s being made to be accountable would be the important aspect of that, to your peers... It probably took me a month before I got comfortable enough, and I still didn’t get comfortable, but enough to open up and do my check-in. So it was a fairly unique situation, something I haven’t experienced in my life before that. Just very life changing.” (Peter)

Three men said sharing ideas amongst men in the group was profitable, for example Bill said:

“The main thing that I enjoy and get out of it is when all the men, they put all their stories in the middle of the room, and they talk about it and other people question it and answer it and help, and you actually pick up ideas of what happens in this situation, or what happens in that situation.” (Bill)

Based on his study with perpetrators, Hearn (1998a) warns that the ambiguous nature of men’s social support networks – whereby men support each other to increase each other’s power and whereby they compete against each other to limit each other’s power – must be taken into account when formulating intervention strategies (Hearn, 1998a:172).

Four men in the current study said it was beneficial to know that other men were experiencing similar issues. Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:72) contends that true reflexivity entails the analysis and subsequent realisation that issues such as men’s domination over women are not personal issues, rather reflect shared socio-political historically based

collective practices. Sam said he “*needed to hear that I wasn’t just the only one*” and as David said, “*A lot of the feelings I’ve had, other blokes in all walks of life have had. So I didn’t feel like I was by myself.*” While James thought “*it’s good knowing that men don’t have the opinions of those old days where it was okay to be in control, and it’s nice to hear, but it’s comforting to know that other people have done the same thing, but also are wanting to change that.*” Whereas Chris said the differences among men helped him broaden his definition of what constituted abuse:

“It was interesting to see different attitudes, different ideas of what they see and through it you could see different types of violence. That’s what helped me, ‘Well okay there’s all these different types of violence, so what I think is not violent, *is* violent’. It’s verbal, physical, or mental abuse.” (Chris)

Based on his findings, Hearn (1998b:196-197) suggests that feelings of similarity in such a group may help some men decide to stop being violent, or that feelings of difference may lead some men to stop being violent, because other men are not. Additionally, feelings of difference could lead yet other men to continue being violent, because they deny their similarity to the other men.

Lazarus thought that, “*knowing Joe Blow over there is going through similar shit that I’m going through. Puts you at ease a little bit.*” Six other men talked about the relative ease of practicing subordinated masculinities in the form of revealing vulnerability to a group of men compared with the relative difficulty of doing so outside the group. Peter said such revealing entailed:

“Confession, but it was confession to other men, you’d never get that. Never get a group of blokes talking about emotions, what they are feeling... Even with my close mates, been mates with for 20 or so years ... we don’t really talk about those sort of things ... no bloke wants to look like a dingo, or cowardly ... there’s the big admission that you’re pretty piss weak.” (Peter)

The stopping abuse programme provided men in this study with an extremely rare, and safe, opportunity to critique the arbitrariness of these doxic masculine assumptions. For instance Joe said he had “*never really had [any mates] I’m close to [but] for some reason it’s easy here ... coz*

everyone's in the same situation ... they're not gonna judge." David said, *"I don't think a lot of my mates'd really understand what goes through my mind about what happened. Whereas these guys, they'd been there or were there, and it was good to, talk to 'em... Hearing what they had to say."*

It is not enough that objective crises open the space for heterodox challenges, about the reality that taken-for-granted gendered relations are in fact socially constructed. Masculine habitus may not fit with the objective structures created as a result of crises (Bourdieu, 1977:169, 2000a:161). Burke's (1969:443) concept that attitude motivates action is evident in men's narratives, as it was noted that, not only do men in this study need to see some legitimacy in the new objective structures (Bourdieu, 1977:169, 2000a:236), it is apparent that *safety* and *trust* are vital elements necessary for some men to be *willing* to take advantage of the openings created by crises in gendered relations, which are brought about by feminist challenges (Bourdieu, 1977:168-169, 2000a:485, 160, 2001:88; Connell, 2005:85) and for these men to let go of long-held notions of taken-for-granted hegemonic masculinities that deploy abuse and control over women.

Four men said that attending a stopping abuse programme with a range of other men broke down long-held stereotypes of what they thought constituted a perpetrator of domestic violence. Symbolic power, as exerted by dominant groups, using the media as a vehicle, for example, disguises the reality that men from all walks of life may engage in hegemonic masculinities in the form of domination, control and abuse of female partners. This occurs by enforcing dominant, but false, representations (Bourdieu, 1977:169).

Jones (2004:224) cites evidence of the influence of stereotypes in her study of South Australian print media which portrayed perpetrators as deviant men driven by alcohol, stress, drugs or jealous tempers. This explains why Henry in the present study said, *"It was quite surprising to see that there was quite an older guy there older than me. A man in his sixties (laugh) ... well you'd think they'd have something sorted out by now."* The range of

different men was the first thing Chris noticed *“from a guy that was an economist driving a Ferrari, to another guy that was living in a cardboard box under a bridge... We expect it to be like the people that live in the cardboard box to have these issues, not us.”* These descriptions reflect those of the men in Jones’s (2004:253-254) study who also described surprise at the diversity, and normality, of men in the group when they attended stopping abuse programmes.

In the present study, Peter too said, *“The range of jobs, and the range of socioeconomic ... blew me away ... it was across the board... Shit, this is really widespread this stuff. Yeah, this ... goes on all the time ... it’s like hidden obviously, from society. A lot of women suffering and a lot of kids suffering.”* Max said the:

“Useful part [of the programme] is, violent men come in all shapes and sizes. And they look all different. Just because he goes to church on Sunday, and looks good, he says hello his neighbours and he helps them he’s out there gardening, it does not mean he’s not violent ... there is clean cut people in our group, would not think they’re violent towards their partners, but they are... You can’t take someone on face value... I always thought most people that were violent towards their partners were drug users, alcoholics, but it’s everyone... You could have the perfect career, perfect life, but you’ve got the same problem as me... We’re not the same you might verbally hurt your wife, not physically, but we’ve both done it they’ll remember it, and they’re hurt by it they’re scarred by that.” (Max)

To conclude, for perpetrators in this study to engage in changing, they want abusive hegemonic masculine practices to be challenged, they need to respect the challenger, and an environment of safety and trust is a vital part of these needs. Some men in this study want women’s perspectives, but those women may need to be authorised to speak by men whom perpetrators respect. This thesis argues that it is vital for men who abuse and control their partners to define themselves as perpetrators. Without such a definition they would feel free to continue hegemonic masculinities previously perceived as legitimate. Until definitions of social reality imposed by dominant groups are challenged within the heterodoxic realm, in the field of opinion (Bourdieu, 1977:164), the development of wide-spread counter-sexist politics will be slow. The social honouring of hegemonic masculinities, the dishonouring of subordinate masculinities and the doxic

assumptions that hierarchies of masculinities are necessary and natural needs to be challenged. Given that the habitus influences the logic and practices of the field, and the field influences the habitus, changes are required by many men, whether they abuse women, or not, by many women, whether they are victims, or not, and by institutions including the state.

7.5 Conclusion

The early feminist notion that men are exposed to a homogeneous sexist society is challenged by this research. This research observes that many men are exposed to contradictory and changing social messages about how to relate to women. While the one incessant and dominant message, which orients many men's habitus, is the right and imperative to engage in hegemonic masculinities to control women, many men also learn that it is gutless to engage in subordinated masculinities by hitting women. Long-term socio-political and legal supports exist for these seemingly contradictory messages. Whilst 40 years of feminist heterodox challenges oppose physical, sexual, psychological and structural abuse and control of women, these challenges need to extend to challenging the consecration of symbolic rewards for practicing hegemonic masculinities.

The up-take of feminist challenges against abusing and controlling women has been uneven. Much of the endorsement for men's abuse and control of women stems from institutions imposing symbolic power onto the habitus of men, and women, alike. Not only do many men, but also police, court judges, and so forth develop a habitus that is disposed to believing it is natural for hegemonic masculinities to dominate, and natural that women are subordinate. The state supports men's non-physical control of women, as evidenced in the national media campaign, yet the state intervenes in relationships by acting as a go-between to collect child maintenance from non-resident parents. The degree to which men defend hegemonic masculine abusive practices varies depending on their perception of the

position taken by the domestic violence intervener. Some men do, while other men do not, oppose interventions. It is only by unravelling men's perceptions of the historical and contemporary contradictions inherent in the individuals and institutions doing the intervening, that progress can be made in effecting perpetrators' motivation to engage in non-hegemonic masculinities and to maintain that change.

Many men do hit women. The resulting experience of shame for some men is not necessarily related to harming women, but is related to the shame of appearing gutless and weak in the eyes of real or imagined men. This is a pivotal argument of this thesis, that men in this study are driven to avoid practicing subordinated masculinities, and the most enticing option is the practice of hegemonic masculinities through the control of women. Such actions gain those men symbolic capital in the form of honour and prestige from real or imagined other men. While paradoxical masculinities are ignored theoretically and men's perceptions of non-physical abuse and control are empirically ignored, it will remain impossible to conceptualise why men hit women when there are contemporary laws and cultural taboos against it.

While some feminists argue that men benefit from patriarchy, findings in this research suggest two other significant factors make many men resistant to change. First, abuse of boys and men who practice subordinated masculinities leads to a lack of safety and trust for men in this study, hence many of those men become isolated and afraid to make themselves emotionally vulnerable – a problem that stops many perpetrators from seeking help to change. Second, many women are complicit with men's violence and psychological abuse, a finding that challenges some feminist views, but a finding that must be acknowledged if deep and broad change is to be effected.

Some men do seek support to change, but find some counselling and group programmes ineffectual, mainly because some human service professionals do not challenge hegemonic masculinities partly because they lack training

in the dynamics of men's power and control over women. It is imperative that human service staff seek such training otherwise their work will be swayed by the same doxic assumptions that perpetrators operate from, and so continue to render women unsafe.

By studying men's relationships with men it is apparent that, not only do many other men encourage men to abuse and control women, but it is to these relationships that society needs to focus. Because of the symbolic power bestowed on many men through their control and abuse of women, this, paradoxically, is the more potent force in promoting democratic relationships between men and women. This finding supports movements engaging men in the drive to promote change amongst men (Douglas, Bathrick, & Perry, 2008; Ferguson et al., 2004; Flood & Fergus, 2008; New Zealand Government, 2009; Pease, 2008; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2008).

Given that some men in this study experience a sense of safety and trust amongst men at stopping abuse group programmes, it is important to note this influences those men to share vulnerabilities they would never otherwise do in other fields. This need for safety and trust, provides a clue to the need for society to open its eyes to the narrow ways the honouring of hegemonic masculinities and dishonouring of subordinated masculinities limits the ways men are "allowed" to behave, whether they perpetrate abuse against women or not.

Lying dormant in some men's habitus is a desire to voice and understand the part of themselves that wants caring democratic relationships with other men, as well as with women. Yet men in this study have been surrounded by years of support for a narrow range of hegemonic masculinities, restricted to antisocial competitive, abusive, violent and controlling practices that not only harm victims, but also harm the perpetrator. There is no guarantee interviewees reduced or stopped abuse against other men, or against women. Nevertheless these three findings chapters point to several complex clues to the role paradoxical, conflicted and hierarchical masculinities have that

opens the way towards innovative interventions that will increase the safety of women.

The next chapter will summarise the major empirical and theoretical findings of this research, will outline the possible practical implications of the current research and conclude by providing ideas for future research.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Concluding Remarks

8.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outlay the major theoretical and empirical findings of this thesis, practical implications stemming from the findings and suggestions for future research. By using a synthesis of Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory, which are compatible with feminist theories, and by engaging with men's voices, this chapter will show in which ways the dominant perspectives of intimate partner abuse can be strengthened to advance change in the field.

8.2 Major Theoretical and Empirical Findings

By using Connell's theory of masculinities and Bourdieu's field theory this thesis is able to challenge the orthodoxy of many feminist, psychological and sociological views, by showing that male perpetrators engage in hegemonic masculinities in the form of intimate partner abuse and control regardless of whether they position themselves low, medium or high on the hierarchy of masculinities in other fields. Men's psyches are not separate from social contexts, rather homosocial and cultural policing shape their behaviours and simultaneously men shape social contexts. If the logic of practice, and censorship of that practice, changes in any given field, many men are able to adapt their habitus when they enter that field. These findings build theoretical bridges across multiple levels of the ecological framework.

Patterns in men's narratives show they do not lack control over the use of physical violence, rather are able to strategise who, where, when and how to abuse someone as a means of gaining, or maintaining, a desired position on

a hierarchy of masculinities and, as a means of acquiring symbolic and social rewards associated with that position. Men spoke of purposefully abusing and controlling other boys and girls (when they were younger) and men and women (later in life) out of sight of authorities. On the other hand, men also named many instances in which abusive practices were condoned by some teachers, sports coaches, workplace management, police and court judges. This enables physical violence, psychological bullying, and control, amongst males and by men against women.

Perpetrators' lack of communication skills does not solely reflect individual men's capacities, rather many men influence other men to speak the language of hegemonic masculinities in order to avoid ostracism. Many men incessantly taunt other men for communicating with caring tones and loving language to their partners, which leads some men to change masculine communication styles to women in order to avoid abuse from other men. This abuse amongst the men points to not only hierarchical relations between hegemonic and subordinated configurations of masculinities, but also to hierarchical relations that indicate multiple configurations within hegemonic masculinities.

Against early feminist notions that all women are real or potential victims, this research indicates that some men perceive some women to be complicit with men's domination, men's power, bad boy behaviour and use of physical violence. Doxic and orthodoxic assumptions that render certain patterns of masculinity superior and valued, over and above others, contribute to women's complicity.

By using Connell's and Bourdieu's nuanced theories, it is evident that when some men realise that perpetrators of intimate partner abuse do not fit media-driven stereotypes, but are similar to themselves, they may then accept that they are actually abusive. It is only at the point that some men define themselves as perpetrators that they may become willing to engage in changing masculine practices.

In support of some feminist views, the logic of many fields including the homosocial, political, legal, sports and human service fields impinge on the marital/family field by actively encouraging, condoning or colluding with men's abuse and control of intimate partners. It is because of this historical and ongoing support for men's domination over women, that many men attempt to maintain a hegemonic position in the face of domestic violence interventions from these same fields.

Rather than rely on the voice of women, this thesis has engaged with the voices of men because only then is it possible to realise that some perpetrators want to show love, care and empathy for others, but many are ostracised, taunted, denigrated, abused and shamed for showing weakness and vulnerability. Therefore some men are driven to avoid the stigma of subordinated masculine practices of showing love, care and empathy. Yet paradoxically this avoidance entails submitting to other men. Submission is also a subordinate masculine behaviour.

In listening to men's voices it can be seen that many men are honoured for practicing physical violence and are honoured for dominating others by psychologically bullying, abusing and controlling them. Some men are caught in a cycle that entails submitting to other men and monitoring which practices will better ensure acceptance and recognition. Hence some men perpetrate physical and psychological abuse in various fields throughout their lives, while others are both perpetrators and victims.

Patterns in men's narratives reveal conflict and contradiction are inherent in their normative masculine frameworks. Embedded in these frameworks are: motives that seek power and control over women, but also include conflicting desires in relationship with women; motives that desire close partnerships, whilst simultaneously desiring freedom and independence; feelings of shame for showing weakness in the form of physical violence against a woman, whilst feeling no shame for harming the woman and no shame for controlling women's lives. Interviewees position themselves in the broader relations amongst men in which they infer that other men's

encouragement to control and objectify women and use women as servants is an overarching influence on many men's abuse of female partners. Inherent in this encouragement is an enticement. That is, an understanding that using women as weapons is a legitimate strategy to gain rewards of honour, prestige, recognition and acceptance from real and/or imagined men.

Whereas some feminists argue that men benefit from patriarchy, by engaging with men's voices it is evident that hegemonic masculine practices lead to an array of short and long-term psychological costs such as a lack of safety and trust and avoidance of seeking help to change. Therefore, some perpetrators describe particular patterns embedded in a normative framework of masculinities that are required to motivate change. This framework contains particular desires including: a need to be challenged by respected people; having a sense of safety and trust; requiring viewpoints from women to help draw out any suppressed ability to empathise; and, knowledge that the women offering those views have been bestowed with the authority to speak by respected men. Ironically, this framework reveals the paradox that men influence men to abuse women and on the other hand it is men that influence men to change patterns of abusive masculinities.

Many men are affected by doxic and orthodoxic assumptions that hegemonic masculinities are prestigious and exemplary, that complying with various configurations of these masculinities is a safe and honourable option, and that practicing subordinated masculinities is taboo and should be avoided. It seems that men's degree of interest in these representations of masculinities, and their degree of investment in pursuing acceptance by men who are thought to hold symbolic capital, determines which social discourse men follow. Men's degree and form of interest explains why some men abuse and control women, why others are complicit and why yet others challenge the hegemonic project. Nevertheless, it is political, cultural and homosocial gender policing that shapes many men's degree and form of interest. And, in turn, men's investment in those interests sustains the credibility of discourses and other systems of gender policing.

Although many contemporary workplaces have changed policies that provide negative consequences such as loss of job and income for practicing physical violence, many workplaces still condone non-physical forms of abuse and control. This means those workplaces continue to condone the hegemonic project. The reward of symbolic capital is still available to those who use psychologically abusive and controlling behaviours in many workplaces. Thus, although some men readily adapt their habitus in the workplace and cease using physical violence, many know they can continue to participate in the hegemonic project.

Men in this study developed a habitus that includes the belief that domination and control are natural requirements of hegemonic masculinities, so tend not to associate this with being abusive. Yet, some of those men are keen to give up being abusive, but not ready to give up a high position on the hierarchy of masculinities. Although men in this research are attempting to reduce, or stop, using physical violence against other men and against women, they are not willing to give up their position mid to high on the hierarchy and the accompanying social and symbolic rewards. So some men modify their definition of “successful masculinity” to exclude physical violence, but continue to include, or increase the use of, psychologically abusive and controlling practices.

8.3 Practical Implications

This thesis strongly supports the movement to engage men generally in stopping men’s violence against women, but two issues must be addressed. First, physical violence is only one tactic of intimate partner abuse and control, and often it is never used as a tactic. Therefore men must take a stand against power and control over women in its physical *and non-physical* forms. Second, high profile men such as sports stars and government dignitaries who are asked to stand against physical violence, for example the white ribbon campaign (Ferguson et al., 2004:41), may actually perpetrate non-physical forms of power and control over their partners. The

issue here is that they are portrayed as innocent. But if the crux of intimate partner abuse is to be addressed, such men have to announce that they are reflexively examining the extent to which they might be perpetrating taken-for-granted non-physical tactics of abuse and control against their partners and if they are, that they are actively deconstructing those hegemonic masculine practices. This pattern of reflexive masculinities should also be made mandatory practice for professionals charged with intervening in intimate partner abuse.

It is difficult to name possible solutions to psychological abuse and structural control. If the metaphor of a hierarchy is a triangle, then there are only a few spaces for hegemonic masculinities at the top, which means most people are at the base. If all those people, men and women, grouped together and walked away, those at the top would fall – perhaps this is the notion of a revolution. Ending gender injustice may be a pipe dream, nevertheless the feminist movement has shown change can and does happen. Dismantling power and control must continue to be a public matter. Many schools and workplaces are adopting anti-bullying policies, but the mechanisms that sustain power and control have to be dismantled at all levels of the institution and throughout society, otherwise such policies will only focus on so-called deviant individuals.

Given complicit masculinities and some women's complicity in men's intimate partner abuse, change has to be addressed at the local and collective level of both men and women so that their face-to-face relations are addressed as well as their complicity in generating, and agreeing to, ideological gender policing. Men have to start challenging so-called jokes about being under the thumb, and conversations that objectify women.

Whilst school and workplace programmes could be devised to re-educate boys, girls, men and women, such consciousness-raising is only part of the solution. The structures of power and control embedded in institutions that condone hierarchies of masculinities and femininities have to be understood and dismantled. One place where such dismantling could begin would

necessitate men as individuals, and as a collective, to firstly acknowledge, and secondly voice out loud, the costs of the social pressures to conform to a narrow set of masculine practices. Television advertisements are rife with hegemonic masculinities and emphasised feminine stereotypes. It is imperative that advertising standards are challenged and changed.

Of the perpetrators who seek help, most choose counselling, but this research highlights that some counsellors do not challenge male perpetrators' behaviours, so it is vital that counsellors, psychologists and other human service professionals receive specific training in the dynamics of intimate partner abuse.

Given many perpetrators' strategising, it is important, if anger management programmes are to continue, that they incorporate information about the social pressures on many men to abuse and control women. Stopping abuse programmes that already do this must ensure a solid foundation is laid that challenges notions of non-physical power and control, not only by perpetrators, but also in society generally, as there is plenty of evidence in men's narratives that such challenges are inadequate. Men's narratives indicate many continue to believe, despite influences from other men, that their practices stem from individual psychological problems.

Further, given perpetrators' desires to share loving, caring, empathetic relationships with a female partner, and indeed the desire to be vulnerable amongst men, it is important that discussions of subordinated masculinities including so-called soft desires and the requirements of safety and trust, be incorporated into stopping abuse programmes.

Likewise media campaigns must include depictions that oppose non-physical forms of abuse and control. The issue of some men's shame for hitting women must be accounted for in campaigns otherwise there is danger that those men will feel subordinated which can lead to retaliating by further abusing women. Campaigns should deconstruct the practices

associated with hegemonic masculinities that underlie incessant encouragement never to be “under the thumb”.

8.4 Future Research

Given the stigma and threat of ostracism many men experience for showing care and love, coupled with the incessant encouragement to use, abuse and control women, and social and symbolic rewards on offer for doing so, future qualitative in-depth research needs to explore what specific *illusio* orients other men *away* from abusing and controlling their female partners. Do they take the stakes in the homosocial game less seriously? What about men who have trouble showing care and love? What about men who do not care what other men think of them – do they abuse and control their partners?

For change to occur, it is important that future research focus on the issue that there are perpetrators who want to give and receive love and care. Therefore it would be productive to further understand the social mechanisms that incessantly drive many men away from such pro-social desires.

If many men’s power over others partly derives its existence from other men’s perceptions, change has to occur in those men who condone that power. Future research could explore complicit men’s motivations for overtly, or covertly, supporting perpetrators. A research project that explores community readiness to change could seek to know what has to happen for complicit men to allow and respect vulnerabilities, in themselves and other men, and to exalt cooperative caring relationships amongst themselves and between men and women. This line of research could include researching professionals that are charged with intervening in intimate partner abuse as well as teachers, sports coaches, neighbours and workplace colleagues and managers.

The strong link between homophobia, and the constant discrediting of so-called femininity, in heterosexual men requires further research. How is gay men's intimate partner abuse similar or different to heterosexual men's? What interweaving of masculinities is at play in gay men's intimate partner abuse? What has to happen for the fear of the feminine to shift amongst particular men and many men's fear of masculinity in women?

The domestic violence research literature and the masculinities' research literature predominantly focus on physical violence. It is impossible to fully understand how men engage in relations amongst themselves, or with women, unless all future research with perpetrators includes explicit examination of *non*-physical forms of power and control, whether that entails quantitative or qualitative methodologies. Comparison groups of so-called non-violent men must be screened for a wider range of psychologically abusive and structurally controlling behaviours than the Conflict Tactics Scale allows.

The issue of self-defence needs to be explored further. Given that many perpetrators do not see any honour in walking away and that men must stand up for themselves by doing whatever it takes, new research could seek to understand which of women's behaviours fall into the category that warrants men's defence of their hegemonic position.

Future research could apply the same synthesis of Connell's and Bourdieu's theories, but to other races, specifically to perpetrators of Aboriginal and Māori origins and to men influenced by multi-ethnic and racial environments.

The current study did not explore the possible ways fellow group participants at the stopping abuse programmes may have encouraged other men to continue to abuse their partners, thus this thesis warns that although many men here claim the group experience was vital to enhancing their desire and ability to engage in change, future research should take into account that the opposite may occur.

Future research needs to excavate what perpetrators think has to change in themselves, other men and women, institutions, professionals who work in institutions, and society in general, for them to be willing to expand their humanity towards broader definitions of how to be a man. This same research could be conducted with men teachers, sports coaches and other professionals who are not categorised as perpetrators.

Because many men avoid stigma of weakness for hitting women, future research needs to seek men's views on how interventions could best approach men so that the intervention itself does not inadvertently drive men to regain status by retaliating against women and therefore avoid facing change.

Some of the issues that arose in this research that need to be explored more widely, more closely and in greater depth include: the cost-benefit ratio men invoke in their decisions to act; the manner in which men respond to sexist jokes amongst men when female partners are present; research into bystanders' views about the nexus of their own habitus-field-capital to understand motivations to intervene; a study that compares the normative framework of masculinities between men, who are never physically violent or psychologically abusive and controlling outside of their intimate relationships, with men who are; a study that focuses more closely on men's resistance to homosocial and cultural discourses that condone intimate partner abuse; a study that further explores the contradiction and conflict between the discourses "bad boys get the girls" and "boys don't hit girls"; a deeper exploration of the complex relations between provider/protector and master/slave practices; and, a more nuanced exploration of men's differing degrees of interest in hegemonic masculinities.

8.5 Conclusion

By utilising Connell's theory of masculinities in combination with Bourdieu's field theory, and by interviewing perpetrators in-depth, and by

focusing on non-physical tactics of abuse and control, this thesis has been able to excavate nuanced, complex understandings of masculinities and society. These findings and theoretical propositions both challenge and extend feminist, psychological and sociological perspectives, and give credence and strength to the ecological framework.

This has been achieved by noting the influence that other men and political and cultural policing of gender have on intimate partner abuse, and by showing the complex interplay between individual and collective masculinities, with society at face-to-face and ideological levels. It was revealed that many perpetrators do not singularly seek power and control over women, but many desire to share love, care and empathy and have the ability to do so. But a pivotal finding was that love, care and empathy are subordinated masculine practices that can lead to shame and humiliation in the eyes of other real or imagined other men. Many male perpetrators are driven to avoid such humiliation so suppress their abilities to love, care and empathise. These findings have practical implications for men, women, including those in authority, as well as for institutions. Power and control is central to men's intimate partner abuse – not just power and control perpetrated by men who abuse their partners – but power and control perpetrated against men through homosocial and cultural policing of masculinities. Therefore it is the issue of power and control that has to be challenged at the individual and society-wide levels. Ideas for future research were explored, with one of the future goals to be to deepen understandings of the mechanisms that are required for counter-sexist politics to gain socio-cultural-political kudos aimed at reformulating hegemonic masculinities in the form of egalitarian practices.

REFERENCES

- Abrar, Stefania, Lovenduski, Joni & Margetts, Helen. (2000). Feminist ideas and domestic violence policy change. *Political Studies*, 48, 239-262.
- Acker, Joan. (2006). Introduction: "The missing feminist revolution" symposium. *Social Problems*, 53, 444-447.
- Adams, David. (1988). Treatment models of men who batter: A profeminist analysis. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 176-199). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Adams, Peter J., Towns, Alison & Gavey, Nicola. (1995). Dominance and entitlement: The rhetoric men use to discuss their violence toward women. *Discourse & Society*, 6, 387-406.
- Adkins, Barbara. (2007). Logic of discovery. Personal Communication, 15 March, QUT, Brisbane.
- Adkins, Lisa. (2003). Reflexivity: Freedom or habit of gender? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(6), 21-42.
- Adkins, Lisa. (2004). Introduction: Feminism, Bourdieu and after. *Sociological Review*, 52, 1-18.
- Allen-Collinson, Jacquelyn. (2009). A marked man: Female-perpetrated intimate partner abuse. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 8, 22-40.
- Allison, Colleen J., Bartholomew, Kim, Mayseless, Ofra & Dutton, Donald G. (2008). Love as a battlefield: Attachment and relationship dynamics in couples identified for male partner violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, 125-150.
- Alston, Margaret. (1997). Violence against women in a rural context. *Australian Social Work*, 50, 15-22.
- Amnesty International Australia. (2008). Setting the standard: International good practice to inform an Australian national plan of action to eliminate violence against women. Retrieved 4 November, 2008, from

http://www.amnesty.org.au/images/uploads/svaw/NPOA_report_-_Master_13June_opt_rfs.pdf

- Anderson, Kristin L. (1997). Gender, status, and domestic violence: An integration of feminist and family violence approaches. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 655-669.
- Anderson, Kristin L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64, 851-863.
- Anderson, Kristin L. (2005). Theorizing gender in intimate partner violence research. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 52, 853-865.
- Anderson, Kristin L. & Umberson, Debra. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender & Society*, 15, 358-380.
- Anglin, Kimberly & Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy. (1997). Comparing the responses of maritally violent and nonviolent spouses to problematic marital and nonmarital situations: Are the skill deficits of physically aggressive husbands and wives global? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 11, 301-313.
- Arendell, Terry. (1997). Reflections on the researcher-researched relationship: A woman interviewing men. *Qualitative Sociology*, 20, 341-368.
- Ashe, Fidelma. (2004). Deconstructing the experiential bar: Male experience and feminist resistance. *Men and Masculinities*, 7, 187-204.
- Australian Government. (2008). Homelessness: A new approach. Retrieved 3 February, 2008, from [http://www.facsia.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/vIA/new_approach/\\$File/homelessness_a_new_approach.pdf](http://www.facsia.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/vIA/new_approach/$File/homelessness_a_new_approach.pdf)
- Balsam, Kimberly F. & Szymanski, Dawn M. (2005). Relationship quality and domestic violence in women's same-sex relationships: The role of minority stress. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 258-269.
- Barnett, Hilaire. (1997). *Sourcebook on feminist jurisprudence*. London: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Baumgartner, Mary Pat. (1993). Violent networks: The origins and management of domestic conflict. In R.B. Felson & J.T. Tedeschi (Eds.), *Aggression and violence: Social interactionist perspectives*

- (pp. 209-231). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Beasley, Christine. (2008a). Reply to Messerschmidt and to Howson. *Men and Masculinities*, 11, 114-115.
- Beasley, Christine. (2008b). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world. *Men and Masculinities*, 11, 86-103.
- Bergen, Raquel Kennedy & Bukovec, Paul. (2006). Men and intimate partner rape: Characteristics of men who sexually abuse their partner. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 1375-1384.
- Berkowitz, Alan D. (2004). Working with men to prevent violence against women: An overview (part one). Retrieved July, 2005, from http://www.vawnet.org/DomesticViolence/Research/VAWnetDocs/AR_MenPreventVAW1.pdf
- Berns, Nancy. (2001). Degendering the problem and gendering the blame: Political discourse on women and violence. *Gender & Society*, 15, 262-281.
- Bettman, Catherine Gilda. (2005). *Patriarchy: The predominant discourse and font of domestic violence*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Victoria University, Melbourne.
- Bevan, Emma & Higgins, Daryl J. (2002). Is domestic violence learned? The contribution of five forms of child maltreatment to men's violence and adjustment. *Journal of Family Violence*, 17, 223-245.
- Bible, Andrea, Dasgupta, Shamita Das & Osthoff, Sue. (2002). Guest editors' introduction. *Violence Against Women*, 8(12), 1420-1423.
- Blake, Pam. (1998). Theory, critical thinking, and introductory women's studies. *Feminist Teacher*, 12, 119-136.
- Bograd, Michele. (1988a). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse: An introduction. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 11-26). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Bograd, Michele. (1988b). How battered women and abusive men account for domestic violence: Excuses, justifications, or explanations? In G.T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J.T. Kirkpatrick & M.A. Straus (Eds.), *Coping with family violence: Research and policy perspectives* (pp. 60-77). Newbury Park: Sage.

- Bograd, Michele. (1999). Strengthening domestic violence theories: Intersections of race, class, sexual orientation, and gender. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 25, 275-289.
- Boje, David M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Boswell, A. Ayres & Spade, Joan Z. (1996). Fraternities and collegiate rape culture: Why are some fraternities more dangerous places for women? *Gender & Society*, 10, 133-147.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society*, 14, 723-744.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986a). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986b). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1988). Program for a sociology of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 153-161.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7, 14-25.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990a). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology* (M. Adamson, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990b). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1993). *Sociology in question* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1996). On the family as a realized category. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 13(3), 19-26.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. (2000a). *Pascalian meditations* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (2000b). The politics of protest. An interview by Kevin Ovenden. *Socialist Review*, 242, 18-20 Retrieved August, 2006, from <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/sr242/ovenden.htm>
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (2001). *Masculine domination* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre & Wacquant, Loïc J.D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bowker, Lee H. (1998a). Introduction. In L.H. Bowker (Ed.), *Masculinities and violence* (pp. xi-xviii). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bowker, Lee H. (1998b). On the difficulty of eradicating masculine violence: Multisystem overdetermination. In L.H. Bowker (Ed.), *Masculinities and violence* (pp. 1-14). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Brook, Heather. (2002). Stalemate: Rethinking the politics of marriage. *Feminist Theory*, 3, 45-66.
- Brown, Brené. (2006). Shame resilience theory: A grounded theory study on women and shame. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 87, 43-52.
- Brownridge, Douglas A. (2006). Partner violence against women with disabilities: Prevalence, risk, and explanations. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 805-822.
- Brownridge, Douglas A., Chan, Ko Ling, Hiebert-Murphy, Diane, Ristock, Janice, Tiwari, Agnes, Leung, Wing-Cheong; et al. (2008). The elevated risk for non-lethal post-separation violence in Canada: A comparison of separated, divorced, and married women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 117-135.
- Buchbinder, Eli & Eisikovits, Zvi C. (2004). Between normality and deviance: The breakdown of batterers' identity following police intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 443-467.
- Burke, Kenneth. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Busch, Ruth, Robertson, Neville & Lapsley, Hilary. (1992). *Domestic violence and the justice system: A study of breaches of protection orders*. Wellington, NZ: Victims Task Force.

- Buttell, F. P. (2003). Exploring the relevance of moral development as a treatment issue in batterer intervention. *Social Work Research*, 27, 232-241.
- Buttell, F. P. & Jones, C. (2001). Interpersonal dependency among court-ordered domestic violence offenders: A descriptive analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 16, 375-384.
- Calhoun, Craig & Wacquant, Loïc J.D. (2002). Everything is social: In memoriam Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002). *ASA Footnotes 30-2 (February 2002)*: 5, 10. [long version] Retrieved 19 May, 2007, from <http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/wacquant/index.bak.php>
- Campbell, Jacqueline C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *Lancet*, 359, 1331-1336.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C., Webster, Daniel W. & Glass, Nancy. (2009). The danger assessment: Validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 653-674.
- Campbell, Rebecca & Salem, Deborah A. (1999). Concept mapping as a feminist research method. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 65-89.
- Carmody, Moira. (2003). Sexual ethics and violence prevention. *Social and Legal Studies*, 12, 199-216.
- Carmody, Moira & Carrington, Kerry. (2000). Preventing sexual violence? *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 33, 341-361.
- Carrigan, Tim, Connell, Raewyn & Lee, John. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14, 551-604.
- Carrington, Kerry & Scott, John. (2008). Masculinity, rurality and violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, 48, 641-666.
- Carrington, Kerry & Watson, Paul. (1996). Policing sexual violence: Feminism, criminal justice and governmentality. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 24, 253-272.
- Carrington, Victoria, Mills, Martin & Roulston, Kathy. (1999). A feel for the game: Strategic deployments of masculinity. *Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference*. Retrieved May, 2006, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/99pap/mil99094.htm>

- Cattaneo, Lauren Bennett & Goodman, Lisa A. (2005). Risk factors for reabuse in intimate partner violence: A cross-disciplinary critical review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 6, 141-175.
- Cavanagh, Kate, Dobash, R. Emerson, Dobash, Russell P. & Lewis, Ruth. (2001). 'Remedial work': Men's strategic responses to their violence against intimate female partners. *Sociology*, 35, 695-714.
- Cavanagh, Kate & Lewis, Ruth. (1996). Interviewing violent men: Challenge or compromise? In K. Cavanagh & V.E. Cree (Eds.), *Working with men: Feminism and social work* (pp. 87-112). London: Routledge.
- Cavanaugh, Mary M. & Gelles, Richard J. (2005). The utility of male domestic violence offender typologies: New directions for research, policy, and practice. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 155-166.
- Chang, Valerie Nash. (1996). *I just lost myself: Psychological abuse of women in marriage*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda. (2006). Patriarchy, crime, and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1, 6-26.
- Child Support Agency. (2006). The child support scheme. Retrieved 9 August, 2007, from http://www.csa.gov.au/guide/1_1_1.htm
- Chodos, Howie & Curtis, Bruce. (2002). Pierre Bourdieu's *Masculine Domination*: A critique. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 39, 397-412.
- Choi, Susanne Y.P. & Ting, Kwok-Fai. (2008). Wife beating in South Africa: An imbalance theory of resources and power. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 834-852.
- Christie, Nigel C. (1996). Comment: Thinking about domestic violence in gay male relationships. Retrieved 22 June, 2008, from http://www.waikato.ac.nz/law/wlr/special_1996/8_christie.html
- Chung, Donna. (2001-2002). Questioning domestic violence orthodoxies: Challenging the social construction of women as victims and as being responsible for stopping male violence. *Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal*, (11), 7-15.
- Coleman, Karen H. (1980). Conjugal violence: What 33 men report. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 6, 207-213.

- Collins, James J. (1989). Alcohol and interpersonal violence: Less than meets the eye. In N.A. Weiner & M.E. Wolfgang (Eds.), *Pathways to criminal violence* (pp. 49-67). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2004). *Violence against women: Australia says no*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Connell, R. W. (1990). The state, gender and sexual politics. *Theory and Society*, 19, 507-544.
- Connell, R. W. (2003). The role of men and boys in achieving gender equality. Retrieved April, 2006, from <http://www.ashanet.org/focusgroups/sanctuary/articles/Connell-bp.pdf>
- Connell, Raewyn. (1982). Class, patriarchy, and Sartre's theory of practice. *Theory and Society*, 11, 305-320.
- Connell, Raewyn. (1983). *Which way is up? Essays on sex, class and culture*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, Raewyn. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. (1996). Politics of changing men. *Australian Humanities Review*. Retrieved 24 February, 2007, from <http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/AHR/archive/Issue-Dec-1996/connell.html>
- Connell, Raewyn. (1997). Men, masculinities and feminism. *Social Alternatives*, 16(3), 7-10.
- Connell, Raewyn. (2000a). *The men and the boys*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, Raewyn. (2000b). Understanding men: Gender sociology and the new international research on masculinities. *The Clark Lecture, University of Kansas* Retrieved April, 2006, from <http://toolkit.endabuse.org/Resources/UnderstandingMen>
- Connell, Raewyn. (2002a). *Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. (2002b). On hegemonic masculinity and violence: Response to Jefferson and Hall. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6, 89-99.

- Connell, Raewyn. (2002c). Preface: Masculinities: The global dimension. In S. Pearce & V. Muller (Eds.), *Manning the next millennium: Studies in masculinities* (pp. vii-xiv). Bentley, WA, Australia: Black Swan Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, Raewyn. (2007). Masculinities, power and the epidemic: Messages of social research. *Politicising Masculinities: Beyond the Personal: An international symposium linking lessons from HIV, sexuality and reproductive health with other areas for rethinking AIDS, gender and development; 15-18th October, Dakar* Retrieved May, 2008, from http://www.siyanda.org/docs/Connell_epidemic.doc
- Connell, Raewyn & Messerschmidt, James W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society, 19*, 829-859.
- Corbin, Juliet M. & Strauss, Anselm L. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Cosgrove, Lisa. (2003). Feminism, postmodernism, and psychological research. *Hypatia, 18*(3), 85-112.
- Costello, Mayet. (2004-2005). The disappearing 'f' word: Feminism and Australian government violence against women policies? *Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal, (17)*, 41-50.
- Covell, Christmas N., Huss, Matthew T. & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Jennifer. (2007). Empathic deficits among male batterers: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 165-174.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Forum, 139-167*.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. (1990-1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*, 1241-1300.
- Cribb, Jo & Barnett, Ross. (1999). Being bashed: Western Samoan women's responses to domestic violence in Western Samoa and New Zealand. *Gender, Place and Culture, 6*, 49-65.

- Crichton-Hill, Yvonne. (2001). Challenging ethnocentric explanations of domestic violence: Let us decide, then value our decisions - a Samoan response. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 2, 203-214.
- Crowe, Ann H., Sydney, Linda, DeMichele, Matthew, Keilitz, Susan, Neal, Connie, Frohman, Sherry; et al. (2009). Community corrections response to domestic violence: Guidelines for practice. Retrieved July, 2009, from <http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/pubs/CCRDV.pdf>
- Cunradi, Carol B., Caetano, Raul & Schafer, John. (2002). Socioeconomic predictors of intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Family Violence*, 17, 377-389.
- Cupchik, Gerald. (2001). Constructivist realism: An ontology that encompasses positivist and constructivist approaches to the social sciences. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research (Vol 2, pp. 11)*. Retrieved December, 2008, from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/968/2113>
- Dasgupta, Shamita Das, Osthoff, Sue & Bible, Andrea. (2003). Guest editors' introduction. *Violence Against Women*, 9, 4-9.
- Date, Ann L. & Ronan, George F. (2000). An examination of attitudes and behaviors presumed to mediate partner abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 1140-1155.
- Day, Andrew, Chung, Donna, O'Leary, Patrick & Carson, Ed. (2009). Programs for men who perpetrate domestic violence: An examination of the issues underlying the effectiveness of intervention programs. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 203-212.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. (1990). Male peer support and woman abuse: The current state of knowledge. *Sociological Focus*, 23, 129-139.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S., Donnermeyer, Joseph F., Schwartz, Martin D., Tunnell, Kenneth D. & Hall, Mandy. (2007). Thinking critically about rural gender relations: Toward a rural masculinity crisis/male peer support model of separation/divorce sexual assault. *Critical Criminology*, 15, 295-311.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. & Dragiewicz, Molly. (2007). Understanding the complexities of feminist perspectives on woman abuse: A commentary on Donald G. Dutton's 'Rethinking Domestic Violence'. *Violence Against Women*, 13, 874-884.

- DeKeseredy, Walter S. & Schwartz, Martin D. (1993). Male peer support and woman abuse: An expansion of DeKeseredy's model. *Sociological Spectrum*, 13, 393-414.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. & Schwartz, Martin D. (1998). Measuring the extent of woman abuse in intimate heterosexual relationships: A critique of the Conflict Tactics Scales. Retrieved July, 2005, from http://www.vawnet.org/DomesticViolence/Research/VAWnetDocs/AR_ctscrit.pdf
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. & Schwartz, Martin D. (2002). Theorizing public housing woman abuse as a function of economic exclusion and male peer support. *Women's Health and Urban Life*, 1(2), 26-45.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S., Schwartz, Martin D. & Alvi, Shahid. (2000). Role of profeminist men in dealing with women abuse on the Canadian college campus. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 918-935.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S., Schwartz, Martin D., Fagen, Danielle & Hall, Mandy. (2006). Separation/divorce sexual assault: The contribution of male support. *Feminist Criminology*, 1, 228-250.
- Demetriou, D.Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society*, 30, 337-361.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. (1990). Talking and listening from women's standpoint: Feminist strategies for interviewing and analysis. *Social Problems*, 37, 96-116.
- Di Bartolo, Lawrence. (2001). The geography of reported domestic violence in Brisbane: A social justice perspective. *Australian Geographer*, 32, 321-341.
- Di Bartolo, Lawrence & Carpenter, Belinda. (2001). Domestic violence in the urban fringe. *Urban Policy and Research*, 19, 347-366.
- Dobash, R. Emerson & Dobash, Russell P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dobash, R. Emerson & Dobash, Russell P. (1992). *Women, violence and social change*. London: Routledge.
- Dobash, R. Emerson & Dobash, Russell P. (1998). Violent men and violent contexts. In R.E. Dobash & R.P. Dobash (Eds.), *Rethinking violence against women* (pp. 141-168). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Dobash, R. Emerson & Dobash, Russell P. (2000). The politics and policies of responding to violence against women. In J. Hanmer & C. Itzin (Eds.), *Home truths about domestic violence: Feminist influences on policy and practice: A reader* (pp. 187-204). London: Routledge.
- Dobash, R. Emerson, Dobash, Russell P., Cavanagh, Kate & Lewis, Ruth. (2004). Not an ordinary killer - just an ordinary guy: When men murder an intimate woman partner. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 577-605.
- Dobash, Russell P. & Dobash, R. Emerson. (1981). Community response to violence against wives: Charivari, abstract justice and patriarchy. *Social Problems, 28*, 563-581.
- Dobash, Russell P. & Dobash, R. Emerson. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships: Working on a puzzle. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*, 324-349.
- Dobash, Russell P., Dobash, R. Emerson, Cavanagh, Kate & Lewis, Ruth. (1998). Separate and intersecting realities: A comparison of men's and women's accounts of violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 382-414.
- Douglas, Heather. (2007). Not a crime like any other: Sentencing breaches of domestic violence protection orders. *Criminal Law Journal, 31*, 220-233.
- Douglas, Heather. (2008). The criminal law's response to domestic violence: What's going on? *Sydney Law Review, 30*, 439-469.
- Douglas, Heather & Godden, Lee. (2002). The decriminalisation of domestic violence. Retrieved December, 2005, from <http://www.griffith.edu.au/centre/slr/pdf/reports/dvreport.pdf>
- Douglas, Heather & Godden, Lee. (2003). The decriminalisation of domestic violence: Examining the interaction between the criminal law and domestic violence. *Criminal Law Journal, 27*, 32-43.
- Douglas, Kay. (1998). *Invisible wounds: A self-help guide for New Zealand women in destructive relationships*. Auckland, NZ: Penguin.
- Douglas, Ulester, Bathrick, Dick & Perry, Phyllis Alesia. (2008). Deconstructing male violence against women: The men stopping violence community-accountability model. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 247-261.

- Dozier, Raine. (2005). Beards, breasts, and bodies: Doing sex in a gendered world. *Gender & Society*, 19, 297-316.
- Dragiewicz, Molly. (2008). Patriarchy reasserted: Fathers' rights and anti-VAWA activism. *Feminist Criminology*, 3, 121-144.
- Dunn, M.C. (2004-2005). Fathers' rights activists: Does their behaviour stand up to scrutiny? *Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal*, (16), 22-26.
- Dutton, Donald G. (1986). Wife assaulters explanations for assault: The neutralisation of self punishment. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 18, 381-390.
- Dutton, Donald G. & Bodnarchuk, Mark. (2005). Through a psychological lens: Personality disorder and spouse assault. In D.R. Loseke, R.J. Gelles & M.M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 5-18). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dwyer, Diane C., Smokowski, Paul R., Bricout, John C. & Wodarski, John S. (1995). Domestic violence research: Theoretical and practice implications for social work. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 23, 185-198.
- Easteal, Patricia E. & Feerick, Christine. (2005). Sexual assault by male partners: Is the licence still valid? *Flinders Journal of Law Reform*, 8, 185-207.
- Edin, Kerstin E., Lalos, Ann, Högberg, Ulf & Dahlgren, Lars. (2008). Violent men: Ordinary and deviant. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 225-244.
- Edmiston, Marian D'Angelo. (2005). *Learning to change: Identifying elements of transformation in formerly abusive men*. Unpublished Doctor of Education thesis, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Edwards, Anne. (1987). Male violence in feminist theory: An analysis of the changing conceptions of sex/gender violence and male dominance. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 13-29). Houndmills, UK: MacMillan Press.
- Edwards, Susan & Hearn, Jeff. (2004). *Working against men's "domestic violence": Priority policies and practices for men in intervention, prevention and societal change: Integrated Project 2: Responses to violence in everyday life in a democratic society*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

- Ehrensaft, Miriam K., Cohen, Patricia, Brown, Jocelyn, Smailes, Elizabeth, Chen, Henian & Johnson, Jeffrey G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*, 741-753.
- Eisikovits, Zvi C. & Enosh, Guy. (1997). Awareness of guilt and shame in intimate violence. *Violence and Victims, 12*, 307-322.
- Eisikovits, Zvi C. & Winstok, Zeev. (2002). Reconstructing intimate violence: The structure and content of recollections of violent events. *Qualitative Health Research, 12*, 685-699.
- Ellsberg, Mary & Heise, Lori. (2002). Bearing witness: Ethics in domestic violence research. *The Lancet, 359*, 1599-1604.
- Fabiano, Patricia M., Perkins, Wesley, Berkowitz, Alan D., Linkenbach, Jeff & Stark, Christopher. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health, 52*, 105-112.
- Fanslow, Janet. (2005). Beyond zero tolerance: Key issues and future directions for family violence work in New Zealand. Retrieved August, 2005, from <http://www.familiescommission.govt.nz/download/family-violence.pdf>
- Fanslow, Janet & Robinson, Elizabeth. (2004). Violence against women in New Zealand: Prevalence and health consequences. *The New Zealand Medical Journal, 117*(1206), 1-12.
- Fehlberg, Belinda & MacLean, Mavis. (2009). Child support policy in Australia and the United Kingdom: Changing priorities but a similar tough deal for children? *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family, 23*, 1-24.
- Ferguson, Harry, Hearn, Jeff, Holter, Øystein Gullvåg, Jalmert, Lars, Kimmel, Michael, Lang, James; et al. (2004). Ending gender-based violence: A call for global action to involve men. Retrieved June, 2005, from <http://www.sida.se/content/1/c6/02/47/27/SVI34602.pdf>
- Fergusson, David M., Boden, Joseph M. & Horwood, L. John. (2008). Developmental antecedents of interpartner violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*, 737-753.
- Field, Craig A., Caetano, Raul & Nelson, Scott. (2004). Alcohol and violence related cognitive risk factors associated with the

- perpetration of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 249-253.
- Fine, Michelle. (2007). Expanding the methodological imagination. *Counseling Psychologist*, 35, 459-473.
- Fitzroy, Lee. (2001). Violent women: Questions for feminist theory, practice and policy. *Critical Social Policy*, 21, 7-34.
- Flax, Jane. (1987). Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12, 621-643.
- Flax, Jane. (1992). The end of innocence. In J. Butler & J.W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 445-463). New York: Routledge.
- Flood, Michael. (2002-2003). Engaging men: Strategies and dilemmas in violence prevention education among men. *Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal* (13), 25-32.
- Flood, Michael. (2008). Men, sex, and homosociality: How bonds between men shape their sexual relations with women. *Men and Masculinities*, 10, 339-359.
- Flood, Michael & Fergus, Lara. (2008). An assault on our future: The impact of violence on young people and their relationships. A White Ribbon Foundation Report. Retrieved 18 November, 2008, from www.whiteribbonday.org.au/media/documents/AssaultonourFutureFinal.pdf
- Flood, Michael & Pease, Bob. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 10, 125-142.
- Fortune, Marie M. & Enger, Cindy G. (2005). Violence against women and the role of religion. Retrieved 11 November, 2005, from http://www.vawnet.org/DomesticViolence/Research/VAWnetDocs/AR_VAWReligion.pdf
- Fowler, Bridget. (2003). Reading Pierre Bourdieu's Masculine Domination: Notes towards an intersectional analysis of gender, culture and class. *Cultural Studies*, 17, 468-494.
- Fox, Greer Litton, Benson, Michael L., DeMaris, Alfred A. & Van Wyk, Judy. (2002). Economic distress and intimate violence: Testing family stress and resources theories. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64, 793-807.

- Francis, Becky. (2002). Relativism, realism, and feminism: An analysis of some theoretical tensions in research on gender identity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 11, 39-54.
- Funk, Jeanne B., Baldacci, Heidi Bechtoldt, Pasold, Tracie & Baumgardner, Jennifer. (2004). Violence exposure in real-life, video games, television, movies, and the internet: Is there desensitization? *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 23-39.
- Gadd, David. (2000). Masculinities, violence and defended psychosocial subjects. *Theoretical Criminology*, 4, 429-449.
- Gadd, David. (2002). Masculinities and violence against female partners. *Social & Legal Studies*, 11, 61-80.
- Gadd, David. (2003). Reading between the lines: Subjectivity and men's violence. *Men and Masculinities*, 5, 333-354.
- Gadd, David. (2004). Making sense of interviewee-interviewer dynamics in narratives about violence in intimate relationships. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 7, 383-401.
- Galvani, Sarah. (2006). Alcohol and domestic violence: Women's views. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 641-662.
- Galvani, Sarah (2004). Responsible disinhibition: Alcohol, men and violence to women. *Addiction Research and Theory*, 12, 357-371.
- Gavey, Nicola. (1992). Technologies and effects of heterosexual coercion. *Feminism & Psychology*, 2, 325-351.
- Gelles, Richard J. (1987). *The violent home: Updated edition*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Gelles, Richard J. (1993). Through a sociological lens: Social structure and family violence. In R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 31-46). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Gelles, Richard J. (1994). Research and advocacy: Can one wear two hats? *Family Process*, 33, 93-95.
- Gelles, Richard J. & Cavanaugh, Mary M. (2005). Association is not causation: Alcohol and other drugs do not cause violence. In D.R. Loseke, R.J. Gelles & M.M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 175-189). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Glaser, Barney G. & Strauss, Anslem L. (2004). Theoretical sampling. In C. Searle (Ed.), *Social research methods* (pp. 226-231). London: Routledge.
- Glowa, Patricia T., Frasier, Pamela York & Newton, Warren P. (2002). Increasing physician comfort level in screening and counseling patients for intimate partner violence: Hands-on practice. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 46, 213-220.
- Godenzi, Alberto, Schwartz, Martin D. & DeKeseredy, Walter S. (2001). Toward a gendered social bond/male peer support theory of university woman abuse. *Critical Criminology*, 10, 1-16.
- Goldner, Virginia. (1992). Making room for both/and: Moving past our polarized debate about domestic violence. *Family Networker*, March/April, 55-61.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (1985). Anger and oppression in men who batter: Empiricist and feminist perspectives and their implications for research. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 10, 311-324.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (1987). Changing men who batter: A developmental model for integrated interventions. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 335-349.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 3, 187-203.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (1993). Male batterers. In R.L. Hampton, T.P. Gullotta, S.R. Adams, E.H. Potter III & R.P. Weissberg (Eds.), *Family violence: Prevention and treatment* (pp. 230-257). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (1995). Alcohol abuse, wife assault, and power needs. *Social Service Review*, 69, 274-284.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (1999). MCMI-III results for batterer program participants in four cities: Less "pathological" than expected. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 1-17.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs: A difficult task showing some effects and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 605-631.
- Gondolf, Edward W. (2007). Theoretical and research support for the Duluth model: A reply to Dutton and Corvo. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 644-657.

- Gondolf, Edward W. (2009). Implementing mental health treatment for batterer program participants: Interagency breakdowns and underlying issues. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 638-655.
- Gondolf, Edward W. & Hanneken, James. (1987). The gender warrior: Reformed batterers on abuse, treatment, and change. *Journal of Family Violence, 2*, 177-191.
- Gondolf, Edward W., Heckert, D. Alex & Kimmel, Chad M. (2002). Nonphysical abuse among batterer program participants. *Journal of Family Violence, 17*, 293-314.
- Gondolf, Edward W. & Williams, Oliver J. (2001). Culturally focused batterer counseling for African American men. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 2*, 283-295.
- Goodey, Jo. (1997). Boys don't cry. *British Journal of Criminology, 37*, 401-418.
- Goodrum, Sarah , Umberson, Debra & Anderson, Kristin L. . (2001). The batterer's view of the self and others in domestic violence. *Sociological Inquiry, 71*, 221-240.
- Gordon, Linda & Hunter, Allen. (1998). Not all male dominance is patriarchal. *Radical History Review, (71)*, 71-83.
- Gough, Brendan & Peace, Paul. (2000). Reconstructing gender at university: Men as victims. *Gender & Education, 12*, 385-398.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell, Trans.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Haenfler, Ross. (2004). Manhood in contradiction: The two faces of straight edge. *Men and Masculinities, 7*, 77-99.
- Hagemann-White, Carol. (1998, 26 November). Keynote speech for the information forum of the Council of Europe: "Ending domestic violence". *Bucharest*. Retrieved 17 October, 2005, from <http://www.paedagogik.uni-osnabrueck.de/lehrende/hagemann/english/public/public.htm>
- Hampshire, Kate, Hills, Elaine & Iqbal, Nazalie. (2005). Power relations in participatory research and community development: A case study from Northern England. *Human Organization, 64*, 340-349.

- Hanmer, Jalna. (1990). Men, power and the exploitation of women. In J. Hearn & D. Morgan (Eds.), *Men, masculinities and social theory* (pp. 21-42). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Hanmer, Jalna. (2000). Domestic violence and gender relations: Contexts and connections. In J. Hanmer & C. Itzin (Eds.), *Home truths about domestic violence: Feminist influences on policy and practice: A reader* (pp. 9-23). London: Routledge.
- Hanmer, Jalna & Hearn, Jeff. (1999, 7-8 October). Gendering research on men's violence to known women. *Seminar: Men and Violence Against Women, Strasbourg, France*. Retrieved July, 2005, from <http://www.eurowrc.org/13.institutions/3.coe/en-violence-coe/05.en-coe-oct99.htm>
- Hanmer, Jalna, Radford, Jill & Stanko, Elizabeth A. (1989). Policing, men's violence: An introduction. In J. Hanmer, J. Radford & E.A. Stanko (Eds.), *Women, policing, and male violence: International perspectives* (pp. 1-12). London: Routledge.
- Hanson, R. Karl, Cadsky, Oto, Harris, Andrew & Lalonde, Coralie. (1997). Correlates of battering among 997 men: Family history, adjustment, and attitudinal differences. *Violence and Victims, 12*, 191-208.
- Harne, Lynne. (2005). Researching violent fathers. In T. Skinner, M. Hester & E. Malos (Eds.), *Researching gender violence: Feminist methodology in action* (pp. 167-189). Cullompton, Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Harne, Lynne. (2006). Personal communication, 12 January.
- Harris III, Frank. (2006). *The meanings college men make of masculinities and contextual influences on behaviors, outcomes, and gendered environmental norms: A grounded theory study*. Unpublished Doctor of Education thesis, University of Southern California.
- Hearn, Jeff. (1993). Researching men and researching men's violences. Research Paper No. 4. Retrieved 10 June, 2005
- Hearn, Jeff. (1996). Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities. In M. Mac an Ghail (Ed.), *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas* (pp. 202-217). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hearn, Jeff. (1998a). Men will be men: The ambiguity of men's support for men who have been violent to known women. In J. Popay, J. Hearn

& J. Edwards (Eds.), *Men, gender divisions and welfare* (pp. 147-180). London: Routledge.

Hearn, Jeff. (1998b). *The violences of men*. London: Sage.

Hearn, Jeff. (1999, 20-26 June). The violences of men: Men doing, talking and responding to violence against known women. *Women's Worlds 99: GenDerations: 7th International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women*. Retrieved June, 2005, from http://www.skk.uit.no/WW99/papers/Hearn_Jeff2.pdf

Hearn, Jeff. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory*, 5, 49-72.

Hearn, Jeff & Collinson, David L. (1994). Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 97-118). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hearn, Jeff, Pringle, Keith, Müller, Ursula, Oleksy, Elzbieta, Lattu, Emmi, Chernova, Janna; et al. (2002). Critical Studies on Men in Ten European Countries: (1) The state of academic research. *Men and Masculinities*, 4, 380-408.

Hearn, Jeff & Whitehead, Antony. (2006). Collateral damage: Men's 'domestic' violence to women seen through men's relations with men. *Probation Journal*, 53, 38-56.

Heckert, D. Alex & Gondolf, Edward W. (2000). The effect of perceptions of sanctions on batterer program outcomes. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37, 369-391.

Heckert, D. Alex & Gondolf, Edward W. (2005). Do multiple outcomes and conditional factors improve prediction of batterer reassault? *Violence and Victims*, 20, 3-24.

Heise, Lori L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 262-290.

Herzog, Sergio. (2007). An empirical test of feminist theory and research: The effect of heterogeneous gender-role attitudes on perceptions of intimate partner violence. *Feminist Criminology*, 2, 223-244.

Hightower, Nikki R. & Gorton, Joe. (2002). A case study of community-based responses to rural woman battering. *Violence Against Women*, 8.

- Hoffman, Pat. (1984). Psychological abuse of women by spouses and live-in lovers. *Women & Therapy*, 3(1), 37-47.
- Hogg, Russell & Brown, David. (1992). Policing patriarchy: Unwelcome facts on domestic violence. *Australian Left Review*, 144, 8-9.
- Holder, Robyn. (2001). *Domestic and family violence: Criminal justice interventions*: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Issues Paper 3.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy, Bates, Leonard, Smutzler, Natalie & Sandin, Elizabeth. (1997). A brief review of the research on husband violence: Part I: Maritally violent versus non-violent men. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 2, 65-99.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy, Meehan, Jeffrey C., Herron, Katherine, Rehman, Uzma & Stuart, Gregory L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 1000-1019.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy, Smutzler, Natalie & Bates, Leonard. (1997). A brief review of the research on husband violence: Part III: Sociodemographic factors, relationship factors, and differing consequences of husband and wife violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 2, 285-307.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy & Stuart, Gregory L. (1994a). The relationship standards and assumptions of violent versus non-violent husbands. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 18, 87-103.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy & Stuart, Gregory L. (1994b). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 476-497.
- Hotaling, Gerald T. & Sugarman, David B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 101-124.
- Huisman, Kimberly, Martinez, Jeri & Wilson, Cathleen. (2005). Training police officers on domestic violence and racism: Challenges and strategies. *Violence Against Women*, 11, 792-821.
- Hunnicut, Gwen. (2009). Varieties of patriarchy and violence against women: Resurrecting "patriarchy" as a theoretical tool. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 553-573.

- Hydén, Margareta & McCarthy, Imelda Colgan. (1994). Woman battering and father-daughter incest disclosure: Discourses of denial and acknowledgement. *Discourse & Society*, 5, 543-565.
- James, Genevieve. (1999, 21 October). *Psychological theories that influence violence against women*. Paper presented at the Domestic Violence Training for Tribal Court Judges, Anchorage, Alaska.
- James, Kerrie, Seddon, Beth & Brown, Jac. (2002). *"Using it" or "losing it": Men's constructions of their violence towards female partners*: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, University of New South Wales.
- Jefferson, Tony. (1994). Theorising masculine subjectivity. In T. Newburn & E.A. Stanko (Eds.), *Just boys doing business? Men, masculinities and crime* (pp. 10-31). London: Routledge.
- Jefferson, Tony. (2002). Subordinating hegemonic masculinity. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6, 63-88.
- Jewkes, Rachel. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *Lancet*, 359, 1423-1429.
- Jewkes, Rachel, Levin, Jonathan & Penn-Kekana, Loveday. (2002). Risk factors for domestic violence: Findings from a South African cross-sectional study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 55, 1603-1617.
- Johnson, Holly. (2000). The role of alcohol in male partners' assaults on wives. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 30, 725-740.
- Johnson, Michael P. & Ferraro, Kathleen J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990's: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 948-963.
- Jolliffe, Darrick & Farrington, David P. (2004). Empathy and offending: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 441-476.
- Jones, Ann & Schechter, Susan. (1992). *When love goes wrong: What to do when you can't do anything right: Strategies for women with controlling partners*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Jones, Michelle. (2004). *'A fight about nothing': Constructions of domestic violence*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Adelaide, Adelaide.

- Jurik, Nancy C. & Siemsen, Cynthia. (2009). "Doing gender" as canon or agenda: A symposium on West and Zimmerman. *Gender & Society*, 23, 72-75.
- Kaplan, Danny. (2006). Public intimacy: Dynamics of seduction in male homosocial interactions. *Symbolic Interaction*, 28, 571-595.
- Katz, Jackson. (2003). Building a "Big Tent" approach to ending men's violence. Building Partners Initiative. United States Department of Justice. Retrieved 29 September, 2005, from <http://endabuse.org/bpi/discussion1/Discussion1-long.pdf>
- Kaufman, Michael. (1998). The construction of masculinity and the triad of men's violence. In M.S. Kimmel & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed., pp. 4-17). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kaukinen, Catherine. (2004). Status compatibility, physical violence, and emotional abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 66, 452-471.
- Keddie, Amanda. (2005). On fighting and football: Gender justice and theories of identity construction. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18, 425-444.
- Kelly, Liz. (1987). The continuum of sexual violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 46-60). Houndmills, UK: MacMillan Press.
- Kelly, Liz. (2005). Inside outsiders: Mainstreaming violence against women into human rights discourse and practice. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7, 471-495.
- Kenney, Sally J. (2005). Domestic violence intervention program: Unconditional shelter? *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 16, 221-243.
- Keys Young Pty Ltd. (1999). Ending domestic violence? Programs for perpetrators: Full report. Retrieved December, 2005, from http://www.ncavac.gov.au/ncp/publications/pdf/no5_fullreport.pdf
- Kimmel, Michael S. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119-141). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kirkwood, Catherine. (1993). *Leaving abusive partners: From the scars of survival to the wisdom for change*. London: Sage.

- Kitzinger, Celia. (2009). Doing gender: A conversation analytic perspective. *Gender & Society*, 23, 94-98.
- Koss, Mary P. (2005). Empirically enhanced reflections on 20 years of rape research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 100-108.
- Koss, Mary P., Goodman, Lisa A., Browne, Angela, Fitzgerald, Louise, Keita, Gwendolyn Puryear & Russo, Nancy Felipe. (1994). *No safe haven: Male violence against women at home, at work, and in the community*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Kozol, Wendy. (1995). Fracturing domesticity: Media, nationalism, and the question of feminist influence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 20, 646-667.
- Krais, Beate. (2006). Gender, sociological theory and Bourdieu's sociology of practice. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23, 119-134.
- Krug, Etienne G., Dahlberg, Linda L., Mercy, James A., Zwi, Anthony B. & Lozano, Rafael. (2002). World report on violence and health. Geneva: World Health Organisation Retrieved January, 2005, from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/full_en.pdf.
- Laing, Lesley. (2000). *Progress, trends and challenges in Australian responses to domestic violence*: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Issues Paper 1.
- Laing, Lesley. (2003). Domestic violence and family law. *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Topic Paper*, 1-21.
- Laing, Lesley. (2004). Risk assessment in domestic violence. *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Topic Paper*. Retrieved December, 2005, from http://www.austdvclearinghouse.unsw.edu.au/topics/topics_pdf_files/risk_assessment.pdf
- Laing, Lesley & Bobic, Natasha. (2002). *Economic costs of domestic violence*: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, University of New South Wales.
- Lammers, Marianne, Ritchie, Jane & Robertson, Neville. (2005). Women's experience of emotional abuse in intimate relationships: A qualitative study. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 5(1), 29-64.

- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Jennifer, Huss, Mathew T. & Ramsey, Sandra. (2000). The clinical utility of batterer typologies. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, 37-54.
- Laws, Sophie. (1990). *Issues of blood: The politics of menstruation*. Houndmills, UK: MacMillan Press.
- Lawson, David M. (2008). Attachment, interpersonal problems, and family of origin functioning: Differences between partner violent and nonpartner violent men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 9*, 90-105.
- Leach, Mike. (1994). The politics of masculinity: An overview of contemporary theory. *Social Alternatives, 12*(4), 36-38.
- Lee, Deborah. (1997). Interviewing men: Vulnerabilities and dilemmas. *Women's Studies International Forum, 20*, 553-564.
- Lees, Sue. (2000). Marital rape and marital murder. In J. Hanmer & C. Itzin (Eds.), *Home truths about domestic violence: Feminist influences on policy and practice: A reader* (pp. 57-74). London: Routledge.
- Lehrner, Amy & Allen, Nicole E. (2009). Still a movement after all these years? Current tensions in the domestic violence movement. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 656-677.
- Leibrich, Julie, Paulin, Judy & Ransom, Robin. (1995). *Hitting home: Men speak about abuse of women partners*. Wellington, NZ: Department of Justice.
- Levitt, Heidi M., Swanger, Rebecca Todd & Butler, Jenny B. (2008). Male perpetrators' perspectives on intimate partner violence, religion, and masculinity. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 58*, 435-448.
- Lewis, Ruth. (2004). Making justice work: Effective legal interventions for domestic violence. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*, 204-224.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. & Guba, Egon G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Lorber, Michael F. & O'Leary, K. Daniel. (2004). Predictors of the persistence of male aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*, 329-338.
- Loseke, Donileen R. (2005). Through a sociological lens: The complexities of family violence. In D.R. Loseke, R.J. Gelles & M.M. Cavanaugh

- (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 35-47). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lovell, Terry. (2000). Thinking feminism with and against Bourdieu. *Feminist Theory, 1*, 11-32.
- Lundgren, Eva. (1995). *Feminist theory and violent empiricism*. Aldershot, UK: Avebury.
- Lundgren, Eva. (1998). The hand that strikes and comforts: Gender construction and the tension between body and symbol. In R.E. Dobash & R.P. Dobash (Eds.), *Rethinking violence against women* (pp. 169-198). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lusher, Dean & Robins, Garry. (2009). Hegemonic and other masculinities in local social contexts. *Men and Masculinities, 11*, 387-423.
- Lyman, Peter. (1998). The fraternal bond as a joking relationship: A case study of the role of sexist jokes in male group bonding. In M.S. Kimmel & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed., pp. 171-181). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mac an Ghail, Máirtín. (2000). Rethinking (male) gendered sexualities: What about the British heteros? *Journal of Men's Studies, 8*, 195-212.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. (1983). Feminism, Marxism, method, and the state: Toward feminist jurisprudence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*, 635-658.
- MacPhee-Sigurdson, Mel. (2004). Exploring perceptions of men who completed a group program for partner abuse. *Envision: The Manitoba Journal of Child Welfare, 3*(2), 14-25.
- Maharaj, Amritha Sobrun, Ryba, Ken & Tie, Warwick. (2000). Bullying as school violence: Prevention and elimination. *The Bulletin: The New Zealand Psychological Society, 98*, 42-48.
- Maiuro, Roland D. & Eberle, Jane A. (2008). State standards for domestic violence perpetrator treatment: Current status, trends, and recommendations. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 133-155.
- Mankowski, Eric S., Haaken, Janice & Silvergleid, Courtenay S. (2002). Collateral damage: An analysis of the achievements and unintended consequences of batterer intervention programs and discourse. *Journal of Family Violence, 17*, 167-184.

- Margolin, Gayla, John, Richard S. & Foo, Louise. (1998). Interactive and unique risk factors for husbands' emotional and physical abuse of their wives. *Journal of Family Violence*, *13*, 315-344.
- Markowitz, Fred E. (2001). Attitudes and family violence: Linking intergenerational and cultural theories. *Journal of Family Violence*, *16*, 205-218.
- Marshall, Linda L. (1999). Effects of men's subtle and overt psychological abuse on low-income women. *Violence and Victims*, *14*, 69-88.
- Martin, Del. (1976). *Battered wives*. San Francisco: Glide Publications.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Connell's masculinities. *Gender & Society*, *12*, 424-474.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey. (2003). "Said and done" versus "saying and doing": Gender practices, practicing gender at work. *Gender & Society*, *17*, 342-366.
- Martin, Susan E. (1992). The epidemiology of alcohol-related interpersonal violence. *Alcohol Health and Research World*, *16*, 230-237.
- Mason, Jennifer. (2002). *Qualitative Researching* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Mauricio, Anne Marie & Gormley, Barbara. (2001). Male perpetration of physical violence against female partners: The interaction of dominance needs and attachment insecurity. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 1066-1081.
- McCall, Leslie. (1992). Does gender fit? Bourdieu, feminism, and conceptions of social order. *Theory and Society*, *21*, 837-867.
- McCall, Leslie. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *30*, 1771-1800.
- McCarry, Melanie. (2007). Masculinity studies and male violence: Critique or collusion? *Women's Studies International Forum*, *30*, 404-415.
- McClelland, Joan C. (2005). Domestic violence between same-gender partners: Recent findings and future research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*, 149-154.
- McCloskey, Laura Ann. (1996). Socioeconomic and coercive power within the family. *Gender & Society*, *10*, 449-463.

- McDonald, Maryon. (1994). Introduction - A social-anthropological view of gender, drink and drugs. In M. McDonald (Ed.), *Gender, drink, and drugs*. Oxford, Providence, RI, USA: Berg.
- McHugh, Maureen C., Livingston, Nichole A. & Ford, Amy (2005). A postmodern approach to women's use of violence: Developing multiple and complex conceptualizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 323-336.
- McKee, Lorna & O'Brien, Margaret. (1983). Interviewing men: 'Taking gender seriously'. In E. Gamarnikow, D. Morgan, J. Purvis & D. Taylorson (Eds.), *The public and the private* (pp. 147-161). London: Heinemann.
- McKenzie, Mandy. (2005). What happened to respect? How a national violence prevention campaign went off the rails: The state of play. *NTV Journal*, 4(1), 12-15.
- McMahon, Anthony. (1993). Male readings of feminist theory: The psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature. *Theory and Society*, 22, 675-695.
- McMahon, Martha & Pence, Ellen. (2003). Making social change: Reflections on individual and institutional advocacy with women arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 9, 47-74.
- McNay, Lois. (1999). Gender, habitus and the field: Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16, 175-193.
- McNay, Lois. (2000). *Gender and agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- McNay, Lois. (2004). Agency and experience: Gender as a lived relation. *The Sociological Review*, 52, 175-190.
- Melzer, Scott A. (2002). Gender, work, and intimate violence: Men's occupational violence spillover and compensatory violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64, 820-832.
- Messerschmidt, James W. (2007). Goodbye to the sex-gender distinction, hello to embodied gender: On masculinities, bodies, and violence. In A.L. Ferber, K. Holcomb & T. Wentling (Eds.), *Sex, gender, and sexuality: The new basics* (pp. 71-88). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Messerschmidt, James W. (2009). "Doing gender": The impact and future of a salient sociological concept *Gender & Society*, 23, 85-88.

- Messner, Michael A. (1998). The limits of "the male sex role": An analysis of the men's liberation and men's rights movements' discourse. *Gender & Society, 12*, 255-276.
- Messner, Michael A. (2005). Still a man's world? Studying masculinities and sport. In M.S. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men & masculinities* (pp. 313-325). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mewett, Peter & Toffoletti, Kim. (2008). Rogue men and predatory women: Female fans' perceptions of Australia footballers' sexual conduct. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 43*, 165-180.
- Michalski, Joseph H. (2004). Making sociological sense out of trends in intimate partner violence: The social structure of violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 652-675.
- Miles, Matthew B. & Huberman, A. Michael. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Miller, Tony (2008, 6 January). Welcome to my diary. Retrieved 21 September, 2008, from <http://www.dadsindistress.asn.au/diary.html>
- Millett, Kate. (1971). *Sexual politics*. London: Virago Press.
- Mills, Martin. (2001). *Challenging violence in schools: An issue of masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Minichiello, Victor, Aroni, Rosalie, Timewell, Eric & Alexander, Loris. (1995). *In-depth interviewing: Principles, techniques, analysis* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Longman.
- Mirchandani, Rekha. (2006). "Hitting is not manly": Domestic violence court and the re-imagining of the patriarchal state. *Gender & Society, 20*, 781-804.
- Moi, Toril. (1991). Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist theory and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of culture. *New Literary History, 22*, 1017-1049.
- Morrison, Todd G. & Halton, Marie. (2009). Buff, tough, and rough: Representations of masculinity in action motion pictures. *Journal of Men's Studies, 17*, 57-74.
- Mouzos, Jenny & Makkai, Toni. (2004). Women's experiences of male violence: Findings from the Australian component of the

International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS). Retrieved February, 2006, from <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/rpp/56/index.html>

Mullaney, Jamie L. (2007). Telling it like a man. *Men and Masculinities*, 10, 222-247.

Murphy, Clare. (2002). Women coping with psychological abuse: Surviving in the secret world of male partner power and control. *Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ* Retrieved December, 2007, from <http://www.nzfvc.org.nz/PublicationDetails.aspx?publication=13113>

Murray, Suellen. (2005). An impossibly ambitious plan? Australian policy and the elimination of domestic violence. *Just Policy*, 38, 28-33.

Murrell, Am R., Christoff, Karen A. & Henning, Kris R. (2007). Characteristics of domestic violence offenders: Associations with childhood exposure to violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22, 523-532.

Murty, Susan A., Peek-Asa, Corinne, Zwerling, Craig, Stromquist, Ann M., Burmeister, Leon F. & Merchant, James A. (2003). Physical and emotional partner abuse reported by men and women in a rural community. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 1073-1075.

Nash, Shondrah Tarrezz & Hesterberg, Latonya. (2009). Biblical framings of and responses to spousal violence in the narratives of abused Christian women. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 340-361.

National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence. (n.d.). Lesbian/gay power and control wheel. Retrieved March, 2008, from www.ncdsv.org/images/Lesbian-GayPCwheelNOSHADING.pdf

National Council. (2009). Time for action: The National Council's plan for Australia to reduce violence against women and their children, 2009-2021. Retrieved April, 2009, from http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/women/pubs/violence/np_time_for_action/national_plan/Pages/default.aspx

National Health Advisory Committee. (2002). Report on a review of literature on the epidemiology of violence in rural and remote Australia and resources to the management of violence. Retrieved August, 2006, from http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/publications/_files/hp16lit.pdf

- Nayak, Madhabika, B., Byrne, Christina A., Martin, Mutsumi K. & Abraham, Anna George. (2003). Attitudes toward violence against women: A cross-nation study. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 49, 333-342.
- Nelson, Elizabeth. (2007). Victims of war: the first world war, returned soldiers, and understandings of domestic violence in Australia. *Journal of Women's History*, 19(4), 83-106.
- Nes, Janet A. & Iadicola, Peter. (1989). Toward a definition of feminist social work: A comparison of liberal, radical, and socialist models. *Social Work*, 34, 12-21.
- New Zealand Government. (2009). Super Maori fullas ride gainst domestic violence. Retrieved 15 February, 2009, from http://www.areyouok.org.nz/whats_new.php&news_id=191
- NSW Ombudsman. (2006). Domestic violence: Improving police practice. Retrieved January, 2007, from <http://www.ombo.nsw.gov.au/publication/PDF/specialreport/DV%20Improving%20police%20practice%20dec%202006.pdf>
- O'Donnell, Lydia, Stueve, Ann, Myint-U, Athi, Duran, Richard, Agronick, Gail & Wilson-Simmons, Renée. (2006). Middle school aggression and subsequent intimate partner physical violence. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 35, 693-703.
- O'Hearn, Holly Garcia & Margolin, Gayla. (2000). Men's attitudes condoning marital aggression: A moderator between family of origin abuse and aggression against female partners. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 24, 159-174.
- O'Leary, K. Daniel. (1993a). Issues in conceptualization. In R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 1-5). Newbury Park: Sage.
- O'Leary, K. Daniel. (1993b). Through a psychological lens: Personality traits, personality disorders, and levels of violence. In R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 7-30). Newbury Park: Sage.
- O'Leary, K. Daniel & Murphy, Christopher M. (1992). Clinical issues in the assessment of spouse abuse. In R.T. Ammerman & H. Michel (Eds.), *Assessment of family violence: A clinical and legal sourcebook*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- O'Neill, Damian. (1998). A poststructuralist review of the theoretical literature surrounding wife abuse. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 457-490.
- O'Neill, James M. & Harway, Michele. (1997). A multivariate model explaining men's abuse toward women: Predisposing and triggering hypotheses. *Violence Against Women*, 3, 182-203.
- Office of Economic and Statistical Research. (1998-1999). Crime and justice statistics Queensland 1998-99. Retrieved 15 August, 2007, from <http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/queensland-by-theme/society/crime-justice/regular-publications/crime-justice-stats-qld/crime-justice-stats-qld-1998-99.shtml>
- Olssen, Erik. (1999). Families and the gendering of European New Zealand in the colonial period, 1840-1880. In C. Daley & D. Montgomerie (Eds.), *The gendered Kiwi* (pp. 37-62). Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Orme, Joan , Dominelli, Lena & Mullender, Audrey (2000). Working with violent men from a feminist social work perspective. *International Social Work*, 43, 89-105.
- Owen, Julie M. (1995). Women-talk and men-talk: Defining and resisting victim status. In R.E. Dobash, R.P. Dobash & L. Noaks (Eds.), *Gender and crime* (pp. 246-268). Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- PADV. (2000). Working with men: Key findings. Partnerships Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved December, 2005, from http://ofw.facs.gov.au/downloads/pdfs/d_v/working_with_men.pdf
- Paechter, Carrie. (2006). Masculine femininities/feminine masculinities: Power, identities and gender. *Gender and Education*, 18, 253-263.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Paymar, Michael & Barnes, Graham. (2006). Countering confusion about the Duluth Model. Retrieved July, 2009, from [http://www.theduluthmodel.org/userfiles/Countering%20Confusion\(2\).pdf](http://www.theduluthmodel.org/userfiles/Countering%20Confusion(2).pdf)
- Pease, Bob. (2000). *Recreating men: Postmodern masculinity politics*. London: Sage.
- Pease, Bob. (2008). Engaging men in men's violence prevention: Exploring the tensions, dilemmas and possibilities. Retrieved 15 August, 2008,

from

http://www.adfvc.unsw.edu.au/PDF%20files/Issues%20Paper_17.pdf

- Pence, Ellen. (1999). Some thoughts on philosophy. In M. Shepard & E. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence* (pp. 25-40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pence, Ellen & other contributors. (1984). Response to Peter Neidig's article: "Women's shelters, men's collectives and other issues in the field of spouse abuse". *Victimology: An International Journal*, 9, 477-482.
- Pence, Ellen & Paymar, Michael. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York: Springer.
- Phillips, Jock. (1996). *A man's country? The image of the Pākehā male: A history*. Auckland, NZ: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Phillips, Ruth. (2006). Undoing an activist response: Feminism and the Australian government's domestic violence policy. *Critical Social Policy*, 26, 192-219.
- Prince, Joni E. & Arias, Ileana. (1994). The role of perceived control and the desirability of control among abusive and nonabusive husbands. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 22, 126-134.
- Próspero, Moisés. (2008). Effects of masculinity, sex, and control on different types of intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23, 639-645.
- Ptacek, James. (1988). Why do men batter their wives? In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 133-157). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Queensland Government. (2003). *Legislation: The Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 1989*: Department of Communities, Queensland Government.
- Queensland Government. (2006). Corrective Services Act 2006, Act No. 29 of 2006. Retrieved March, 2007, from http://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/Acts_Passed/Acts_Passed_NUM_2006.htm
- Ragg, D. Mark. (1997). *Dimensions of self-concept as predictors of men who assault their female partners*. Paper presented at the 5th

International Family Violence Research Conference, Durham, NH, USA.

- Ramazanoglu, Caroline. (1992). What can you do with a man?: Feminism and the critical appraisal of masculinity. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 15, 339-350.
- Raphael, Jody. (2004). Rethinking criminal justice responses to intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 1354-1366.
- Rees, Susan & Pease, Bob. (2006). Refugee settlement, safety and wellbeing: Exploring domestic and family violence in refugee communities. Retrieved June, 2009, from http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~media/ProgramsandProjects/MentalHealthandWellBeing/DiscriminationandViolence/ViolenceAgainstWomen/CAS_Paper4_Refugee.ashx
- Reinharz, Shulamit. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reitz, Ronda Redden. (1999). Batterers' experiences of being violent: A phenomenological study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 143-165.
- Ricoeur, Paul. (1994). *Oneself as another* (K. Blamey, Trans. Reissue ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Riessman, Catherine Kohler. (2002). Narrative analysis. In A.M. Huberman & M.B. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 217-270). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ritchie, Jane & Ritchie, James. (1993). *Violence in New Zealand*. Wellington: Daphne Brazell Associates Press and Huia Publishers.
- Robertson, Neville. (1999a). Reforming institutional responses to violence against women. *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Hamilton, NZ.*, from <http://www.nzfvc.org.nz/PublicationDetails.aspx?publication=12130>
- Robertson, Neville. (1999b). Stopping violence programmes: Enhancing the safety of battered women or producing better-educated batterers? *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 28, 68-78.
- Robertson, Neville & Busch, Ruth. (1998). The dynamics of spousal violence: Paradigms and priorities. In M. Pipe & F. Seymour (Eds.), *Psychology and family law: A New Zealand perspective* (pp. 47-66). Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.

- Robertson, Neville, Busch, Ruth, D'Souza, Radha, Lam Sheung, Fiona, Anand, Reynu, Balzer, Roma; et al. (2007a). Living at the cutting edge: Women's experience of Protection Orders: Volume 1: The women's stories. Retrieved August, 2007, from <http://research.waikato.ac.nz/CuttingEdge/VolOne.pdf>
- Robertson, Neville, Busch, Ruth, D'Souza, Radha, Lam Sheung, Fiona, Anand, Reynu, Balzer, Roma; et al. (2007b). Living at the cutting edge: Women's experience of Protection Orders: Volume 2: What's to be done? A critical analysis of statutory and practice approaches to domestic violence. Retrieved August, 2007, from <http://waikato.researchgateway.ac.nz/bitstream/10289/431/3/CuttingEdgeVolTwo080522.pdf>
- Rosen, Leora N., Dragiewicz, Molly & Gibbs, Jennifer C. (2009). Fathers' rights groups: Demographic correlates and impact on custody policy. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 513-531.
- Rosen, Leora N., Kaminski, Robert J., Parmley, Angela Moore, Knudson, Kathryn H. & Fancher, Peggy. (2003). The effects of peer group climate on intimate partner violence among married male U.S. army soldiers. *Violence Against Women, 9*, 1045-1071.
- Rosenbaum, Alan & Leisring, Penny A. (2003). Beyond power and control: Towards an understanding of partner abusive men. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 34*, 7-23.
- Russell, Diana E.H. (1982). *Rape in marriage*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Sabo, Don F., Gray, Philip M. & Moore, Linda A. (2000). Domestic violence and televised athletic events: "It's a man thing". In J. McKay, M.A. Messner & D.F. Sabo (Eds.), *Masculinities, gender relations, and sport* (pp. 127-146). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- SafeNetwork: California's Domestic Violence Resource. (1999). Herstory of domestic violence: A timeline of the battered women's movement. Retrieved August, 2009, from <http://www.mincava.umn.edu/documents/herstory/herstory.html>
- Salazar, Laura F. & Cook, Sarah L. (2002). Violence against women: Is psychology part of the problem or the solution? A content analysis of psychological research from 1990 through 1999. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 12*, 410-421.
- Saunders, Daniel G. (1992). Woman battering. In R.T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Assessment of family violence: A clinical and legal sourcebook* (pp. 208-235). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Saunders, Daniel G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process-psychodynamic treatments for men who batter: Interaction of abuser traits and treatment models. *Violence and Victims, 11*, 393-414.
- Saunders, Daniel G. (2004). The place of a typology of men who are "maritally" violent within a nested ecological model: A response to Holtzworth-Munroe and Meehan. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 1390-1395.
- Schechter, Susan. (1982). *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the battered women's movement*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Schofield, Janet Ward. (1993). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Social research: Philosophy, politics and practice* (pp. 200-225). London: Sage.
- Schumacher, Julie A., Slep, Amy M. Smith & Heyman, Richard E. (2001). Risk factors for male-to-female partner psychological abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6*, 255-268.
- Schwartz, Martin D. (2000). Methodological issues in the use of survey data for measuring and characterizing violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 6*, 815-838.
- Schwartz, Martin D. & DeKeseredy, Walter S. (2008). Interpersonal violence against women: The role of men. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 24*, 178-185.
- Scott, Marvin B. & Lyman, Stanford M. (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 46-62.
- Scully, Diana. (1988). Convicted rapists' perceptions of self and victim: Role taking and emotions. *Gender & Society, 2*, 200-213.
- Scutt, Jocelyne A. (1983). *Even in the best of homes: Violence in the family*. Ringwood, Vic, Aust: Penguin.
- Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence. (2004). Transforming whānau violence: A conceptual framework. Retrieved June, 2009, from <http://www.nzfvc.org.nz/goodpracticedocument.aspx?doc=4>
- Sev'er, Aysan, Dawson, Myrna & Johnson, Holly. (2004). Guest editors' introduction: Lethal and nonlethal violence against women by intimate partners: Trends and prospects in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 563-576.

- Silva, Elizabeth B. (2005). Gender, home and family in cultural capital theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56, 83-103.
- Silverman, David. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Silverman, David. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Sims, Christy-Dale L. (2008). Invisible wounds, invisible abuse: The exclusion of emotional abuse in newspaper articles. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 8, 375-402.
- Skeggs, Beverley. (2004). Context and background: Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of class, gender and sexuality. *The Sociological Review*, 52, 19-33.
- Skinner, Tina, Hester, Marianne & Malos, Ellen. (2005). Methodology, feminism and gender violence. In T. Skinner, M. Hester & E. Malos (Eds.), *Researching gender violence: Feminist methodology in action* (pp. 1-22). Cullompton, Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Smith, Michael D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 257-273.
- Snow, David L., Sullivan, Tami P., Swan, Suzanne C., Tate, David C. & Klein, Ilene. (2006). The role of coping and problem drinking in men's abuse of female partners: Test of a path model. *Violence and Victims*, 21, 267-285.
- Social Research Association. (2002). A code of practice for the safety of social researchers. Retrieved 9 November, 2005, from http://www.the-sra.org.uk/stay_safe.htm
- Sokoloff, Natalie J. & Dupont, Ida. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence Against Women*, 11, 38-64.
- Spencer, Liz, Ritchie, Jane, Lewis, Jane & Dillon, Lucy. (2003). Quality in qualitative evaluation: A framework for assessing research evidence. Retrieved October, 2004, from http://policyhub.gov.uk/docs/qqe_rep.pdf
- Stamp, Glen H. & Sabourin, Teresa Chandler. (1995). Accounting for violence: An analysis of male spousal abuse narratives. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23, 288-302.

- Standards Council. (2006). New Zealand Standard: Screening, risk assessment and intervention for family violence including child abuse and neglect. Retrieved June, 2009, from <http://www.police.govt.nz/resources/2006/nzs-8006-2006/nzs-8006-2006.pdf>
- Stark, Evan. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stark, Evan & Flitcraft, Anne. (1996). *Women at risk: Domestic violence and women's health*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stets, Jan E. (1990). Verbal and physical aggression in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 501-514.
- Stewart, Anna. (1999). *Domestic violence: Deterring perpetrators*. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the 3rd National Outlook Symposium on Crime in Australia, Mapping the Boundaries of Australia's Criminal Justice System convened by the Australian Institute of Criminology and held in Canberra, 22-23 March.
- Stewart, Julie. (2005). *Specialist domestic/family violence courts within the Australian context*: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Issues Paper 10.
- Stillar, Glenn F. (1998). *Analyzing everyday texts: Discourse, rhetoric, and social perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stith, Sandra M., Rosen, Karen H., Middleton, Kimberly A., Busch, Amy L., Lundeberg, Kirsten & Carlton, Russell P. (2000). The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 640-654.
- Stith, Sandra M., Smith, Douglas B., Penn, Carrie E., Ward, David B. & Tritt, Dari. (2004). Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10, 65-98.
- Straton, Jack C. (2002). Rule of thumb versus rule of law. *Men and Masculinities*, 5, 103-109.
- Sugarman, D.B. & Frankel, S.L. (1996). Patriarchal ideology and wife assault: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11, 13-40.

- Swan, Suzanne C. & Snow, David L. (2006). The development of a theory of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 1026-1045.
- Taylor, Betty. (2008). Dying to be heard: Domestic and family violence death reviews: Discussion paper. Retrieved March, 2009, from www.wlsq.org.au/documents/publicat/.../dvdrag%20%20ver%202.pdf
- Taylor, Betty & Sullivan, Brian. (2007). *The Duluth Model: What it is and is not: Clarifying and correcting common misconceptions*: Available from the authors.
- Taylor, Karen. (1996). Keeping mum: The paradoxes of gendered power relations in interviewing. In E. Burman, P. Alldred, C. Bewley, B. Goldberg, C. Heenan, D. Marks, J. Marshall, K. Taylor, R. Ullah & S. Warner (Eds.), *Challenging women: Psychology's exclusions, feminist possibilities* (pp. 106-122). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Tencheff, Caroline E., Serbin, Lisa A., Martin-Storey, Alexa, Stack, Dale M., Hodgins, Sheilagh, Ledingham, Jane; et al. (2008). Continuity and pathways from aggression in childhood to family violence in adulthood: A 30-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*, 231-242.
- The Hon Senator Ludwig, Joe (2008). Address to Child Support Agency's international debt summit, Hobart, Ministerial Speech, Minister for Human Services. Retrieved 17 September, 2008, from <http://www.mhs.gov.au/resources/speeches/2008/080729-CSA-International-Debt-Summit.pdf>
- Thurston, Richard & Beynon, John. (1995). Men's own stories, lives and violence: Research as practice. In R.E. Dobash, R.P. Dobash & L. Noaks (Eds.), *Gender and crime* (pp. 181-201). Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Tjaden. (1998). Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. Retrieved February, 2006, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/172837.pdf>
- Tomsen, Stephen. (1997). A top night: Social protest, masculinity and the culture of drinking violence. *British Journal of Criminology, 37*, 90-102.

- Tweed, Roger G. & Dutton, Donald G. (1998). A comparison of impulsive and instrumental subgroups of batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 13, 217-230.
- Umberson, Debra, Anderson, Kristin L., Williams, Kristi & Chen, Meichu D. (2003). Relationship dynamics, emotion state, and domestic violence: A stress and masculinities perspective. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65, 233-247.
- United Nations. (2008). Good practices in legislation on violence against women. Retrieved February, 2009, from [http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/vaw_legislation_2008/Report%20EGMGPLVAW%20\(final%2011.11.08\).pdf](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/vaw_legislation_2008/Report%20EGMGPLVAW%20(final%2011.11.08).pdf)
- United Nations: Division for the Advancement of Women. (2006). Ending violence against women: From words to action: Study of the Secretary-General. Retrieved 12 March, 2009, from www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/launch/english/v.a.w-exeE-use.pdf
- Verhesschen, Piet. (2003). 'The poem's invitation': Ricoeur's concept of mimesis and its consequences for narrative educational research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37, 449-465.
- Wacquant, Loïc J.D. (1989). Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, 7, 26-63.
- Walby, Sylvia. (1990). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Walby, Sylvia. (2002). Feminism in a global era. *Economy and Society*, 31, 533-557.
- Walker, Lenore E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, Lenore E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Waltz, Jennifer, Babcock, Julia C., Jacobson, Neil S. & Gottman, John M. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 658-669.
- Warde, Alan. (2004). Practice and field: Revising Bourdieusian concepts. *CRIC discussion Paper No 65, Centre for Research on Innovation & Competition, The University of Manchester*. Retrieved June, 2006, from <http://les1.man.ac.uk/cric/Pdfs/DP65.pdf>

- Washington State Department of Health. (2008). Domestic violence and pregnancy: Guidelines for screening and referral. Retrieved 25 May, 2009, from <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/mch/documents/DVPgGuide82008.pdf>
- Watts, Charlotte & Zimmerman, Cathy. (2002). Violence against women: Global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet*, 359, 1232-1237.
- Webster, Amy. (2007). The re-conceptualisation of domestic violence under the Howard Government since 1996. *Lilith: A Feminist History Journal* 16, 57-68.
- Weedon, Chris. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weisz, Arlene, Tolman, Richard M. & Saunders, Daniel G. (2000). Assessing the risk of severe domestic violence: The importance of survivors' predictions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 75-90.
- West, Candace & Fenstermaker, Sarah. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender & Society*, 9, 8-37.
- West, Candace & Zimmerman, Don H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125-151.
- West, Candace & Zimmerman, Don H. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 23, 112-122.
- White, Robert J. & Gondolf, Edward W. (2000). Implications of personality profiles for batterer treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 467-488.
- Whitehead, Antony. (2005). Man to man violence: How masculinity may work as a dynamic risk factor. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44, 411-422.
- Whiteley, Kate. (2006). Personal communication, 8 May.
- Widiger, Thomas A. & Mullins-Sweatt, Stephanie N. (2004). Typology of men who are maritally violent: A discussion of Holtzworth-Munroe and Meehan. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1396-1400.
- Williams, Christine L. & Heikes, E. Joel. (1993). The importance of researcher's gender in the in-depth interview: Evidence from two case studies of male nurses. *Gender & Society*, 7, 280-291.

- Winstok, Zeev, Eisikovits, Zvi C. & Gelles, Richard. (2002). Structure and dynamics of escalation from the batterer's perspective. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 83, 129-141.
- Winters, Jason, Clift, Robert J. W. & Dutton, Donald G. (2004). An exploratory study of emotional intelligence and domestic abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 255-267.
- WINZ. (2009). Family violence intervention programme. Retrieved August, 2009, from <http://www.workandincome.govt.nz/community/a-z-grants-and-other-help/family-violence-intervention-programme.html>
- Wirth, Uwe. (n.d.). What is abductive inference? Retrieved 5 March, 2009, from <http://user.uni-frankfurt.de/~wirth/inferenc.htm>
- Wolf, Naomi. (1994). *Fire with fire: The new female power and how it will change the 21st century*. London: Vintage.
- Women's Health Gouldburn North East. (2004). A powerful journey: A research report: Women reflect on what helped them leave. Retrieved 13 December, 2005, from http://www.whealth.com.au/pdf/apj_report.pdf
- Wong, Sylvie Lo Fo, Wester, Fred, Mol, Saskia & Lagro-Janssen, Toine. (2007). "I am not frustrated anymore": Family doctors' evaluation of a comprehensive training on partner abuse. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 66, 129-137.
- Wood, Julia T. (2004). Monsters and victims: Male felons' accounts of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21, 555-576.
- World Health Organization. (2001). Putting women first: Ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. Retrieved June, 2005, from <http://www.who.int/gender/violence/womenfirtseng.pdf>
- World Health Organization. (2004). Handbook for the documentation of interpersonal violence prevention programmes. Retrieved January, 2005, from <http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2004/9241546395.pdf>
- Yllö, Kersti A. (1988). Political and methodological debates in wife abuse research. In K.A. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 28-50). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

- Yllö, Kersti A. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power and violence. In R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 47-62). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Yllö, Kersti A. (2005). Through a feminist lens: Gender, diversity, and violence: Extending the feminist framework. In D.R. Loseke, R.J. Gelles & M.M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 19-34). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Yu, Chong-ho. (1994). Abduction? Deduction? Induction? Is there a logic of exploratory data analysis? *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April, 1994* Retrieved 27 February, 2009, from http://www.creative-wisdom.com/pub/Peirce/Logic_of_EDA.html
- Zhang, Yuanyuan, Dixon, Travis L. & Congrad, Kate. (2009). Female body image as a function of themes in rap music videos: A content analysis. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, OnLine First DOI 10.1007/s11199-009-9656-y*.

APPENDICES

Appendix One: Request to Recruit Research Participants



Queensland University of Technology
School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Kelvin Grove Campus,
Brisbane, QLD 4059, Australia
Clare Murphy Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

Request to Recruit Research Participants

PhD Research Project:
“Intimate Partner Abuse: Social, Relational and Personal Factors”
Clare Murphy
School of Justice, Faculty of Law
Phone Email

25 August 2006

Decision-maker’s Name
Organisation
Address
Queensland

Dear

Further to speaking with you, this letter serves to formally request your approval to use your organisation’s programmes to recruit participants in my PhD research project. I am also simultaneously approaching other domestic violence perpetrator programmes and counselling agencies between Gympie and the Gold Coast in order to recruit 12-18 men. Men being sought will have perpetrated physical violence and/or sexual, psychological or financial abuse against their female partner. They should be of European descent and be born and schooled in Australia or New Zealand. They should be 18 years of age or over and should not be on parole.

Description of the Project

Two separate in-depth interviews will be conducted with 12-18 men and the interviews will be audio-taped. Interviews are confidential and all identifying details will be removed from the transcripts. Men’s participation is voluntary and they may refuse to answer any question and may pull out of the project at any time. The second interview will follow-up the first by clarifying and extending issues raised. The questionnaire (Appendix 1 attached) will be guided by three research questions.



1. What are the personal and social ingredients that shape men's controlling practices in their intimate relationships with female partners?
2. How do men's relationships with men influence their motivations to abuse or not abuse female partners?
3. What aspects of interventions, policies and laws inspire or discourage change?

The project will investigate perpetrators' motivations to use violence and control against female partners and they will be asked personal questions about their background including school, sports, work, family life and social activities. Throughout the interviews men's relationships with other men will be discussed in order to explore the influences other men have on perpetrators' behaviours. Questions will explore men's perceptions of the positions they take in relation to violence and aggression in various contexts as well as the logic of the practices surrounding violence and aggression in situations such as sports, schools, pubs and the family. They will not be asked to account for personal acts of violence and abuse, rather they will be asked to discuss circumstances surrounding such acts.

Possible Benefits to Your Organisation

This project will not entail an evaluation of your programme. However, men will be asked to describe what aspects of domestic violence interventions inspire or discourage change. Their opinions will be sought in relation to possible future actions they believe society might need to take that would motivate perpetrators to stop abusing women and develop equality in relationships with men and women.

The research covers many gaps in what is understood about domestic violence perpetrators' motivations, social networks that encourage abuse of women as well as men's perspectives on what works and does not work to inspire change. Findings may have the capacity to contribute to theory of the circumstances surrounding domestic abuse and this will potentially enhance the effectiveness of future interventions including perpetrator programmes, policies and laws to help prevent domestic violence.

What is Required From You?

First, if you agree to allow access to recruit participants, would you please sign the attached "Statement of Consent for the Conduct of Research Under the Auspices of this Organisation".

Second, would you please return the signed Statement of Consent in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope to Clare Murphy as consent is required prior to the research commencing.



Third, following receipt of your Statement of Consent I will send you a stipulated number of participant information sheets and participant consent forms. A sample of these is attached for your information (Appendices 2 and 3). Men will be asked to contact Clare Murphy directly to make enquiries about the research project and to make an appointment to be interviewed.

Fourth, in the event of a man volunteering to be interviewed from your organisation I would like to request the use of a room at your premises to conduct the interviews. I make this request for my own safety and for the convenience of the men who volunteer. The first interview may take up to two hours and the second interview may take one hour. If you do not agree to this, or if it is impossible to make a time when staff are present I will arrange to interview men elsewhere.

Fifth, before I accept a man as a participant for the research project I would like to seek an opinion from one of your staff members as to whether it is thought the man seeking to volunteer might pose any possible risk of danger to myself. I will not require access to men's personal records held by your organisation.

Sixth, if I interview a man from your organisation I would like to gather generic information about your service. The types of questions I would envisage asking are attached (Appendix 4).

Seventh, I would like to request that your agency provide support for that man if he requires it as a result of being interviewed in-depth.

Questions / Further Information

I have attached a copy of my CV (Appendix 5) showing my background in working with domestic violence victims. I will phone you in the next few days to answer any questions you have about this project and about the role I am asking you to play in this. In the meantime you are welcome to contact me by telephone (...) or email (...).

Concerns / Complaints

Please contact the Research Ethics Officer on 07-3864 2340 or ethicscontact@qut.edu.au if you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project.

Yours sincerely

Clare Murphy

Appendix Two: Statement of Consent – The Organisation



Queensland University of Technology

School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Kelvin Grove Campus, Brisbane,
QLD 4059, Australia

Clare Murphy Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

Statement of Consent For the Conduct of Research Under the Auspices of this Organisation

PhD Research Project:

“Intimate Partner Abuse: Social, Relational and Personal Factors”

Clare Murphy

Statement of Consent

By signing below, you are indicating that you:

- are aware of the PhD project being conducted by Clare Murphy from QUT and what it entails;
- have had any questions answered to your satisfaction;
- understand that if you have any additional questions you can contact the researcher by telephone (....) or email (....);
- understand that you can contact the Research Ethics Officer on 07-3864 2340 or ethicscontact@qut.edu.au if you have concerns about the ethical conduct of the project;
- approve of the research being conducted under the auspices of this organisation;
- agree to provide access to potential volunteers by handing out participant information sheets and participant consent forms to clients who might fit the participant criteria;
- agree to negotiate the use of space to conduct interviews in the event of a man volunteering from this organisation.

Name

Organisation

Signature

Date

___ / ___ / ___

Appendix Three: Participant Information Sheet



Queensland University of Technology

School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Kelvin Grove Campus, Brisbane, QLD
4059, Australia

Clare Murphy Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

Participant Information Sheet

PhD Research Project:

“Intimate Partner Abuse: Social, Relational and Personal Factors”

Clare Murphy

Phone: Mobile: Email:

Description

I am seeking your voluntary participation as part of a PhD project for Clare Murphy.

The purpose of this project is to explore men’s life experiences in different situations such as school, work, family, sports and other leisure activities. The aim will be to explore ways boys learn to become men in Australian or New Zealand society and it will explore men’s perspectives on how they relate to men and women.

In order to participate you must meet the following criteria:

- Admit to having been physically violent and/or emotionally, intellectually, sexually or financially controlling of a live-in female partner
- Be of white European ancestry and be born and schooled in either Australia or New Zealand
- Be 18 years of age or over
- Must not be on parole

Participation

Your participation will involve two interviews. The first interview will take approximately 2 hours and the second interview will take about 1 hour. The interviews will take place between you as the participant and myself as the researcher. The interviews will be conducted at the premises of the agency that handed you this information and at a time that is convenient for you.



Expected benefits

It is expected that a possible benefit of participating in this project may be that you might learn more about yourself, your relationships and the reasons for your behaviours.

Risks

There are no specific risks associated with your participation in this project except the personal nature of the subject may cause some psychological discomfort.

Confidentiality

All comments and responses are anonymous and will be treated confidentially. Only the researcher will know your identity. The interviews will be audio taped and a typist will transcribe them. The typist will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement. All your identifying details such as name and occupation will be changed and no identifying details will be used when the PhD report is written. The information relating to the study will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher's office at the university.

Voluntary participation

Your participation in this project is voluntary. You will be asked to sign a consent form (attached) before beginning your participation. If you do agree to participate you may refuse to answer any questions asked during the interviews and you can withdraw from participation at any time during the project without comment or penalty. Your decision to participate will in no way impact upon your current or future relationship with QUT.

Questions / further information

Please contact Clare Murphy by telephone (...) or email (...) if you require further information about the project, or to have any questions answered. If you decide to volunteer, a time and place for the first interview will be discussed.

Concerns / complaints

Please contact the Research Ethics Officer on 07-3864 2340 or ethicscontact@qut.edu.au if you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project.

Yours sincerely
Clare Murphy

Appendix Four: Statement of Consent – Participants



Queensland University of Technology
School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Kelvin Grove Campus, Brisbane,
QLD 4059, Australia
Clare Murphy Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

Research Participant Statement of Consent

PhD Research Project:
“Intimate Partner Abuse: Social, Relational and Personal Factors”
Clare Murphy
Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

Statement of Consent

By signing below, you are indicating that you:

- have read and understood the information sheet about this project;
- have had any questions answered to your satisfaction;
- understand that if you have any additional questions you can contact the researcher by telephone (...) or email (...);
- understand that you are free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- understand that you can contact the Research Ethics Officer on 07-3864 2340 or ethicscontact@qut.edu.au if you have concerns about the ethical conduct of the project;
- understand that the project will include audio recording; and
- agree to participate in the project.

Name

Signature

Date

____ / ____ / ____

Appendix Five: Interview Schedule – The Organisation

Interview Schedule for the Organisation that Referred the Research Participant

Organisation's Name

TOPIC: The format, philosophy and context of your service

- What types of service do you offer perpetrators?
- What is the theoretical/philosophical basis of your service? (e.g cognitive behavioural, feminist, psychodynamic).
- Rationale for programme rolling over or for men starting at week one?
- How many sessions do your programmes/counselling sessions run for and over what period of time?
- Are men required to attend a particular number of sessions? If so how many?
- Who funds your programme? Is funding sourced from more than one place? How often are the funding rounds? How is it decided which programmes get funding? Are they competing with other men's programmes or women's services? How much control do men's programmes have over getting yearly funding?
- How long have you been running?

TOPIC: The men who use your service

- What size population does your agency draw men from e.g. city of 60,000, rural area of 5,000
- What is the criteria of men accepted for your programme/counselling
- What are the demographics of men who attend – their age, race, socioeconomic status
- Does your programme/counselling service cater for men with alcohol and/or drug problems?
- What proportion of men are white/western European ancestry?
- Are men mandated to attend by the court, or is attendance voluntary or a mixture?
- What percentage of men are mandated vs self-referred vs other referral source?
- What percentage of men attend following their initial inquiry about your service?
- Do you turn men away? If so what are the rates and reasons for men not receiving your service?
- Is your service free or do men have to pay to attend, if so how much?
- How many men attend your programme/counselling sessions each year?
- What percentage of men complete the programme/required number of counselling sessions?
- At what stages do men drop out and what percentage drop out at each given stage?
- How many men repeat programmes/reattend counselling after a break?

Appendix Six: Interview Schedule Participants'

First Interview

Interview Schedule – First Interview

In this interview I want to explore your experiences as a boy, and as a young man growing up in Australia

I also want to explore questions about sports and violence. And also to ask you your ideas about the kinds of interventions that society puts in place to encourage men to relate to women differently.

We'll be about two hours so if you want to stop at any time to take a break just let me know.

Every now and then I'm going to check that this is recording and I'll stop it and start it again when we change topics.

What I'd like you to do is choose a pseudonym for yourself.

PART ONE:

First I'd like to start by asking details about yourself – like your age, occupation and education.

1. WHAT'S YOUR AGE?
2. DO YOU HAVE ANY INTEREST IN SPORTS?
What kind of sports do you play or watch?
What about as a boy?
3. WHERE DO YOU LIVE?
Is that rural, a regional town or a city?
How long have you lived there?
4. ARE YOU EMPLOYED?
What's your occupation?
If unemployed previous occupation
If unemployed, length unemployed
How many hours do you work? Is that full-time – part-time – casual?
Are you self employed or work for someone else?
What type of place do you work at?
What's your income?
Do you own your own home or rent?

5. DO YOU HAVE A RELIGION?

What is your religion?

If not did you grow up with a religion?

6. TELL ME ABOUT YOUR EDUCATION:

Where did you go to school – primary and secondary

Were they rural, a regional town or a city?

What type of primary and secondary schools? Were they public, religious, private, boarding?

Did you have any tertiary education?

Did you do an Apprenticeship in anything?

7. DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN?

How many children?

How many boys or girls?

How old are they?

Who do they live with?

Is their mother your current or past partner?

Do you have current contact?

Are you paying child maintenance to the Child Support Agency or direct to the mother?

8. I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE FAMILY YOU GREW UP WITH:

Do you have any brothers or sisters?

Did you live with your parents when you grew up?

What about your father where was he born – is he of western European descent?

Where did he go to school – If Australia/NZ what town If not Australia/NZ what country?

What was his occupation?

What about your mother where was she born – is she of western European descent?

Where did she go to school – If Australia/NZ what town If not Australia/NZ what country?

What was her occupation?

How long have your parents lived together? – still married/separated/divorced?

Did you have any step parents?

TELL ME ABOUT THE AGENCY THAT REFERRED YOU:

How long have you been going there?

What made you go there? Was it voluntary or were you mandated?

Who referred you?

Is this the first time you've been there or have you been there before?

DV ORDER / CRIME:

Do you have a domestic violence order against you?

Who is the aggrieved party?

Have you had any in the past?

If so, was the aggrieved the same or a different person?

Have you ever been arrested or convicted for domestic violence?

Do you have a criminal history for anything other than domestic violence?

11. AGGRIEVED PARTNER:

I'd like to learn a little about your partner such as her age, religion, education and employment.

Are you currently living together?

If separated – how long?

Are/Were you married or in a defacto relationship?

How long have/did you live together?

How old is she?

What is her race?

Does she have a religion?

Does she work or is she unemployed?

What's her occupation?

If unemployed previous occupation

If unemployed, length unemployed

Hours worked? Is that full-time – part-time – casual?

How much does she earn?

What level of education did she reach?

If any income, job status or education is of higher status than yours how does that affect you?

12. HAVE YOU HAD ANY:

mental health issues?

issues with a physical disability?

drug or alcohol issues?

PART TWO:

I'm interested in making sense of what men think about violence, aggression and abuse and control in different situations.

I'd like to ask you about what's socially acceptable in one situation and what's unacceptable in another situation.

1.1 Let's take sport for example

As a boy playing and watching sport how did boys know how much violence and aggression was acceptable on the sports ground?

Differences between players and spectators?

Rewards and punishments for violence and aggression?

What about school (primary/secondary) was violence and aggression part of school life?

Bullying? Discipline?

Did the rules and aims change between the two situations (sports/playground)?

What about young men in pubs, sports, work and dating situations?

Is the role of aggression in boys' lives any different for young men in these situations?

Motivations? Rules? What about when men get married?

Is men's violence, aggression and control towards their partners the same or different to these other situations? Men's influence on men?

PART THREE:

I'd like to ask you about interventions that society has put in place to encourage men to treat their female partners differently.

HELP SEEKING:

You were referred to this interview by agency.

What did you expect it would be about before going there?

In what ways has it been useful?

Not useful?

2.2 What motivated you to volunteer for this research project?

2.3 Have you sought help from any other organisations? Or From family or friends?

What was useful? What was not useful?

Reasons for not seeking help?

Reaction to bystander intervention?

MEN'S RESPONSE TO DV INTERVENTIONS:

Have you had experiences with the legal system?

Was there anything about this experience that made you want to behave differently towards your partner? Resist change?

How do men respond to other DV interventions like TV ads, Child Support Agency, DV Law?

Do these interventions make men want to treat their partners differently?

PART FOUR:

Now I'd like to talk about marriage.

3.1 What did boys grow up expecting from marriage?

Why do men get married?

What do men believe the role of husband entails?

If there was an unwritten marriage contract what would it say?

Are men good at negotiating do they even think about negotiating?

What expectations are and are not met?

What types of things do women call abusive that men do not agree is abusive?

What does 'love' mean to men?

3.2 How do men react to working for a female boss?

ANYTHING FURTHER TO ADD BEFORE WE FINISH?

Appendix Seven: Interview Schedule

Participants' Second Interview

Interview Schedule – Second Interview

SUCCESSFUL MASCULINITY

I'd like to start by asking you about masculinity.

What does successful masculinity mean to boys at school?

Prompt: characteristics & behaviours that give status

Was bullying or violence a way to get girls?

Were the schools you went to more sports or academically inclined?

Did that make a difference to what was seen as successful masculinity?

What about men at work, what is successful masculinity there?

Does it matter what type of work you do whether you use your physical body or your mind?

Prompt: characteristics & behaviours that give status

If one type of masculinity has higher status than another where did you fit in at school? At work?

Prompt: Need for acceptance? By whom? Why?

How do boys/men decide where they want to fit on the hierarchy?

Men at work?

Prompt: Need for acceptance? By whom? Why?

Who decides what type of masculinity has higher status than another?

Does boys' and men's place on the hierarchy effect how they treat women?

Do girls or women care where boys or men come on the hierarchy of masculinity?

What were the benefits and costs of being part of the popular group at school? At work?

What were the benefits and costs of not belonging to the popular group? (school/work)

Men have said that one of the costs of being a boy or man is that they can't show psychological or physical weakness around other men or they'll be destroyed. And that attending the stopping abuse programme was probably the only time men could feel a sense of trust and safety with other men.

What about other places, how did boys handle this lack of safety and trust around other boys? What about men around other men?

Have you experienced that sort of closeness with your wife?

NON-VIOLENCE

I notice for men that being a new boy after moving schools often meant getting bullied.

or

I notice that being bullied at school was pretty common for men.

Were there other ways of being accepted than using violence?

Prompt: Being really good at sports? Does it matter which sport?

Having a big body?

Joining a group of boys that didn't bully?

How important is displaying physical prowess of music, art, or academic prowess?

If a boy was really good at sports did that mean he did not have to prove his masculinity by being violent?

How were you able to prove your physical prowess and masculine status if:

Your body was the wrong size to play rugby? (Anthony)

You did not enjoy rugby?

You were not allowed to play rugby? (father not let Anthony)

Physical violence seems to have a lot of status among certain boys. When boys use mental or verbal abuse, does that have the same masculine status?

At school which type of bullying was punished if boys were caught - the physical violence or the mental and verbal abuse?

Which is worse for the victim – physical or mental abuse?

Did teachers do anything to make sure bullying never happened in the future or did they just stop the current situation?

Is mental abuse effective on the victim if they don't think it's going to be followed up by physical violence?

A man who has a very small body told me about a strategy he used when boys were bullying him. Everyone was in the class and the teacher was up front teaching and a group of boys stole his pencil case and were breaking all the pencils. This bloke very loudly pushed his chair out from the desk, stood up and held his hand out like this and he said nothing. The teacher stopped talking, the bullies one by one put the pencils back, zipped his pencil case. The victim sat down and the teacher started teaching again. He said he was never bullied ever again.

I was wondering if you had used a non-violent strategy like that as a kid how do you think it might have affected your life course?

What's your aim regarding use of physical violence (abuse mentioned by ea man) in the future? Is it to be non-violent in all circumstances or specific circumstances?

What about if you were a police officer and you had done a stopping abuse programme would that change the way you behaved as a police officer?

If there was a war and you were conscripted what would you do?

How do men react when someone calls them wussy or gay?

I notice it's common for men who don't use violence to be thought of as sissies.
What does that mean for men after attending stopping violence programmes who stop using violence are they sissies now?
What does it mean for the way they relate to men now?

I notice some men talk about violent men as if they're animals.
Does that mean choosing non-violence is civilised or intelligent?
What about verbal and mental abuse is that being an animal or is it more civilised than physical violence? Thinking of mental abuse compared with using physical violence is one more superior than the other?

How do you know when violence is abusive or not? Is it violating?
What about verbal and mental abuse are they always abusive? Are they violating?

MAKING FEMININITY VISIBLE - MEN

When blokes have other men on about being under the thumb do blokes agree or do they pretend they agree?
Do any men challenge these blokes to stop talking that way?

If men are willing to relinquish being head of the house, how does that affect their masculinity?
Does it mean they're no longer a successful man?

In the eyes of men isn't being loving and showing that you're being loving to a woman and family wussy?
How do you think that affects their ability to care about women?

When men talk about bullying at school they talk about it as a game or a joke. I'm wondering how victims are affected?

What does caring about someone else mean to boys?

How do boys and men know that someone cares about them?

Men said they feel shame about being violent towards women. Do men feel shame when they are in denial that they were doing anything wrong? Or does shame come later?

MAKING WOMEN VISIBLE

If a man was being violent or exploding with anger at his wife and someone stepped in to say hey mate take a look at yourself – why do men not accept people stepping in and stopping them from abusing their partners?

If men were going to listen when a man or woman stepped in would they be more likely to listen to the man or the woman? Why?

Men say their relationship was working until they got a DVO or until their partners threatened to leave – what was working about their relationship?

When men first start living with their partners what hopes and dreams do they have for her?

When men control things like the finances, how women spend their time and sexual relations how are women affected?

How do men care about women?

What hopes and dreams do you have for your partner/ex-partner now?

EXTRA QUESTIONS IF THERE'S TIME -

Do you think there are men who are violent at the pub but not violent at work?

Do you have a support network?

How long have your parents lived together? (still together)

Who referred you to the men's stopping abuse programme?

Thinking about what you knew about the DV law before you attended What behaviours did you think it covered?

Before men start making changes what expectations get met for them in marriage?

Appendix Eight: Typist Information Sheet



Queensland University of Technology
School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Kelvin Grove Campus, Brisbane,
QLD 4059, Australia
Clare Murphy Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

Typist Information Sheet

PhD Research Project:

“Intimate Partner Abuse: Social, Relational and Personal Factors ”
Clare Murphy

The researcher, Clare Murphy, requests your assistance in transcribing 24-36 audio taped interviews which are part of her PhD project.

Description of the Project

In-depth interviews will be conducted with 12-18 male perpetrators of domestic violence. Men will be interviewed twice. The project will investigate social, relational and personal circumstances relevant to domestic violence perpetrators' motivations to use violence and control against female partners. Participants will be asked personal questions about their background including family life, school, sports, work and social activities. They will be asked to talk about friendships and relationships with men and women in the past and in present time. Questions will explore men's perceptions of the positions they take in relation to violence and aggression in various contexts as well as the logic of the practices surrounding violence and aggression in situations such as sports, schools, pubs and the family. They will not be asked to disclose personal acts of violence and abuse, rather will be asked to explore circumstances surrounding such acts.

Risks

Although men will not be asked to disclose specific acts of violence, it is possible they may discuss stories of physical, sexual and psychological abuse. Hearing such stories may cause psychological distress; therefore, it is important that you do not accept the role of transcribing the audio tapes if you do not want to hear these stories. If you wish to withdraw your service after volunteering, you are free to do so at any time.



Transcription Requirements

Although no definite dates can be named at this point, it is envisaged that 12-18 interviews will be conducted between September-December 2006 and the second interviews may take place in January. Each interview will last 2 hours. Deadlines for turnaround of transcripts will be negotiated between the typist and the researcher when the interviews commence. The typist will be required to email completed transcripts to the researcher's email address: c2.murphy@qut.edu.au.

The researcher will arrange to personally collect the audio recordings after they have been transcribed. A system will be set in place to monitor receipt of transcripts and audio recordings.

Confidentiality

Men will be asked to use a pseudonym which will be recorded on the audio tapes. However, other identifying details will be used such as where the men live, their occupation and possibly their partners' name. Therefore if you take on the role of transcribing the tapes you will be asked to sign the Confidentiality Agreement attached.

Questions / further information

Please contact Clare Murphy by telephone (...r email (...f you require further information about the project, or to have any questions answered.

Yours sincerely

Clare Murphy

Appendix Nine: Typist's Confidentiality Agreement



Queensland University of Technology
School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Kelvin Grove Campus, Brisbane,
QLD 4059, Australia
Clare Murphy Phone: . . . Mobile: . . . Email: . . .

**PhD Research Project:
“Intimate Partner Abuse: Social, Relational and Personal Factors”**

Typist Confidentiality Agreement

By signing below, you are indicating that you:

- agree not to print, copy, or use any of the information
- agree not to disclose any information
- will notify the researcher if there is any conflict of interest
- will take all reasonable measures to ensure audio recordings and electronic transcripts are not accessible to people other than the researcher
- delete all electronic copies of the transcripts and audio recordings when instructed to do so by the researcher

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____ / _____ / _____

Appendix Ten: Methodological Strategies

Appendix Ten extends the discussion in Chapter Four about the strategies used to recruit volunteers, delays in recruitment due to constraints faced by a series of gatekeepers, strategies used to arrange and re-arrange interviews, ethical considerations and safety strategies used throughout the research process.

1. Recruiting volunteers

Because staff at stopping abuse programmes and generic counselling services are busy, the literature suggests that the best way to seek permission and support to access men through these agencies is to use a combination of phone, face-to-face and written contact (Edmiston, 2005:86). An existing list of appropriate agencies, could not be located, so several face-to-face meetings and several hundred phone calls were made to find Queensland organisations that might have potential sources of research participants. A list of 46 organisations was compiled, 20 of which gave initial verbal support for the project. Six months later, following ethical approval for the research plan, the 20 organisations were re-contacted by phone. At this time, a clearer idea about the research questions was possible, and meant that the organisations were better informed about the project's objectives and specifically what was required of them. The staff member spoken to provided the contact details so that an information pack could be emailed or posted to the appropriate decision-maker authorised to sign the written consent form (Appendix 2).

At this stage it was decided to attempt to recruit participants in two stages. The first stage involved sending written information to organisations located in South East Queensland in towns accessible within two hours of driving time from Brisbane. The remaining six organisations were located at further distances around Queensland. It was decided to manage the research budget and time constraints by only attempting to recruit men from locales closer to Brisbane in the first instance.

In early August 2006 the decision-maker at 14 Queensland organisations was sent a letter (Appendix 1) outlining the project objectives, the number and type of research participants being sought, and information about what was expected from the organisation, should they choose to become involved. Along with this, they were sent the following samples: the information sheet that was to be handed to potential research participants (Appendix 3); the participant questionnaire (Appendix 6); the questions for the referring organisations (Appendix 5); the consent form for the men (Appendix 4); and the consent form the organisation was to sign before any recruitment of participants could begin (Appendix 2). Also included with the above information package, was a copy of my curriculum vitae. This outlined my work as a counsellor, group facilitator and researcher in the field of domestic and family violence. This was included in an attempt to maximise acceptance by the organisations.

On the whole, the information pack was successful in helping organisational staff and potential volunteers understand the research objectives and what was expected of them. Very few clarification questions were required. The major problems faced in recruiting men arose when dealing with organisations and their staff. It quickly became apparent that the research progress was being delayed by a series of gatekeepers that had the power to withhold or delay access to potential participants and the power to delay room bookings (Minichiello et al., 1995:171).

1.1 The gatekeepers

At the top of the hierarchy of gatekeepers was a range of decision-makers, which variously included several members of a management team, or a single person. The second level of gatekeeper was the person who signed the consent form and gave the names of the liaison person. In five of the organisations this person was the head facilitator of the stopping abuse programme. At one of the larger organisations a third gatekeeper was responsible for the overall management of all the stopping abuse programmes run by that organisation. In addition to this, there was a branch manager at each programme location, whose approval had to be sought before liaising with the programme facilitators. This meant there was often a fourth and fifth layer of gatekeeping at particular organisations. The final layer of gatekeeping across all the organisations was the receptionist, whose role it was to make room bookings to conduct the interviews.

Delays occurred at every level of gatekeeping. First, as is common in other research of this nature (Hearn, 1993:9), ideological problems occurred at the decision-making level. Many generic counselling agencies gave verbal consent to the idea of allowing access to possible volunteers. However when they received the written information package outlining the criterion – that men must admit to using violent and/or controlling behaviours against their female partners – all but one counselling agency refused permission.

Like generic counselling agencies, many anger management programmes that were not dedicated to domestic violence gave verbal consent over the phone, but once they received the written information, all but two would not give consent to recruiting men, because of confidentiality issues. Their philosophy was that men who attended their programmes did not have to admit to their behaviours during the course of the programme. I asked if the information sheets could be handed to all men privately so that if a man, who did fit the criteria, wanted to volunteer, he could phone me in confidence. However, they further declined to give consent to this because they believed that interviewing men at the organisation's premises would raise confidentiality problems. Fifteen of the 16 participants in this research were referred from programmes where a major criterion to gain entry to the programme was that they must admit to their abusive behaviours. Only one of the referring programmes tried to dedicate their service to men who abused their female partners. The other five, though their major focus was on this population, also took men who were angry or violent at work or towards other men in non-intimate situations. In the end, none of the

programmes could claim to be dedicated domestic violence programmes. Apparently there is only one Queensland programme with such a dedication, however that programme and one other programme with a major focus on educating male domestic violence perpetrators declined to allow access to men because research was already being conducted with their male participants.

It took six weeks to receive written consent from all the decision-makers who were willing to allow access to potential participants. Some of the decision-makers had been on leave for several weeks, others worked part-time and worked across various geographic locations. Some had to wait for management meetings, for a decision to be made, and others would not give approval until they gained support from programme facilitators, who were on leave between the end and start of programmes.

Once signed consent was received from the decision-maker, facilitators were contacted to recruit participants. Facilitators represented the next layer of gatekeeping. The main causes of delays in recruiting men to interview were facilitators' busy workloads, staff going on leave and staff resigning from their jobs. For example, two weeks after a facilitator handed out information sheets to men attending a programme, a follow-up call was made to find out if any men had shown an interest. In this instance, the facilitator had gone on leave for a fortnight. A week later another phone call was made and a new facilitator informed me that no men had shown any interest.

Two main problems arose due to staff being absent on leave. First, some organisations would only allow liaison with a specified person, so when they were on leave no progress could be made. For example, the second manager on the hierarchy at a large organisation was on leave for several weeks and the local branch managers could not be contacted without her permission. After six weeks of waiting, it was decided to seek permission from the manager above her to liaise directly with the branch managers. Permission was given. Second, at the programme facilitator level, if I was allowed to liaise with substitute facilitators, those staff were either, not informed about the research project, or were ill informed. This meant no progress was made in recruiting men until the designated facilitator returned from leave, or in one case, no interest was shown, so no men were recruited from that organisation. Alternatively, the written information pack was sent to a substitute staff member and lengthy delays occurred while they found time to familiarise themselves with the research project.

Another major cause of delay in recruiting men was that several stopping abuse programmes were between funding, or the next scheduled programme was not due to start for several weeks or months. However, some facilitators agreed to contact men from past programmes. Some were successful in recruiting men this way, whilst others were not.

Although it was not explicitly stated, some facilitators seemed uncomfortable with the role of informing men about the research and

seeking volunteers. It was preferred that I did not attend groups to seek volunteers due to confidentiality issues and also because it was deemed that men would be more willing to listen to such a request from facilitators with whom they had developed a rapport. In fact, five men who were interviewed implied that they volunteered because they liked or trusted the male facilitator who asked them to volunteer, or as Rick stated more explicitly:

“[The male facilitator] asked me and I have kind of a lot of respect for him so usually if he thinks things are a sensible idea, it’s worth giving it a go. There’s more to learn about yourself [by agreeing to this interview]. That was the main thing.”

Yet another man, Bob, said he volunteered because:

“I just wanted to give something back coz they’ve helped me, I figured I’d try and help somebody else.”

Facilitators took on the role of attempting to recruit men with varying enthusiasm. The least likely way to recruit men was when facilitators informed men about the project, handed them the information sheet then left it up to the men to contact me directly. This had been the original plan to recruit men but failed to recruit any men.

The most successful strategy involved facilitators giving me a list of names and phone numbers of men who said they were interested in volunteering. I contacted the men directly, discussed whether they definitely fitted the criteria, answered any questions about the research and arranged an interview time. This strategy was 100% successful in recruiting men.

Facilitators at one programme did ask me to talk directly to a group of men to tell them about the research. One man left the room before I arrived because he did not want to be identified. I felt very uncomfortable taking on this task and perceived that most men in the room behaved defensively. Until this opportunity, I had felt powerless not being able to hand out the information sheet and when the opportunity arose to do so the result was unsuccessful.

Recruiting men was an iterative process. The first facilitator to refer men was enthusiastic, fast and used an effective strategy. It seemed that key ways to maintain other facilitators’ interest in aiding the recruitment process were to keep them informed about the success of interviews after they took place and to inform them that the logistics of using a room at various organisations worked well with minimal disruption. Frequent, though not too frequent, assertive and jovial follow-up contacts worked well, especially if I acknowledged the facilitators’ tremendous workload and asked the facilitator how best I could assist them in making the recruitment happen. It seemed important to use the facilitators’ preferred mode of contact, and keeping strict records of times the facilitators were most able and willing to be contacted was vital.

The final layer of gatekeeping on the organisational hierarchy was the receptionist whose role it was to book a spare room when I called to make a time. Most receptionists worked in part-time job share roles. Often only one of the receptionists was informed about the research project and designated to liaise with me. Delays in scheduling appointments always happened when the designated person was on leave, and delays of several days would happen if the receptionist was too busy to return calls. Otherwise the process of booking and using organisations' rooms worked seamlessly.

The attempt to recruit participants began on 7 August 2006 and it had been decided to break the process into two stages. The first stage involved an attempt to recruit 12-18 participants from organisations that were located within two hours of driving time from Brisbane. However, by 31 October only eight men had been interviewed and one more interview was scheduled. It was decided to attempt to recruit more men by contacting the remaining organisations located at further distances around Queensland.

However, in this situation, one organisation's stopping abuse programme was preparing to open for the first time, another was between programmes, another programme had not been successful in getting funding that year so their next programme was not due to start for four more months, and yet another programme attempted to contact men who had attended their previous group but was unsuccessful in making contact.

During the week before Christmas, four organisations from towns within easy driving distance to Brisbane referred 14 more men. Of these referrals three did not fit the criteria and two could not be contacted. Interview appointments were scheduled with the other nine men.

By 4 January 2007 (five months after starting the recruitment process) 12 men had been interviewed and six men were scheduled to be interviewed. The original plan was to recruit 12-18 men. This indeterminate number allowed for the opportunity to access a minimum number of men who were forthcoming with in-depth material (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:202). It was decided these numbers had been reached so I wrote to all the facilitators who were still actively attempting to recruit participants and informed them that volunteers were no longer needed. Thank you letters were sent to all the organisations that attempted to recruit men. Once the thesis was completed a summary of findings was sent to all organisations that showed an interest in the research, and talks on the findings to any interested organisations were also offered.

2. Arranging and re-arranging interviews

The next major hurdle was arranging and re-arranging the interviews. Several factors had to be managed to make interviews happen. These included safety plans, managing men's tendency to forget appointments, managing men's regular need to re-schedule due to work commitments, matching men's availability with room availability at times that coincided with the presence of staff. It also included managing logistics to make it

easier for some men to attend, and liaising with the AV support service at the university to borrow a digital audio recorder.

Twenty-six men's names were put forward as potential volunteers. The next step was phoning them to check if they fitted the sampling criteria, to answer any questions they had and to schedule an interview time. Four men did not fit the criteria, two were unable to be contacted and of the 20 who did fit the criteria, interviews were scheduled with 19 men. One man was too busy and said he might consider it if he was paid. I declined his offer.

The consent form (Appendix 4) was enclosed with the information sheet (Appendix 3) that had been handed to men by the stopping abuse programme facilitators, and they were asked to sign the form at the beginning of the interview. All the men were very obliging on the phone and asked few questions. After the men signed the consent forms they were stored along with the organisations' signed consents in a locked cabinet in my office at the university.

Other male and female researchers have found men to be unreliable and reluctant participants whether they are perpetrators or not. As has happened to other interviewers (Harne, 2005:177; Ptacek, 1988:140; Taylor, 1996:115), some participants in this research turned up late, cancelled at the last minute, or did not show up at all. When I took the bus out-of-town to interview three men, one did not turn up. The next time I went out-of-town, this same man, who was re-scheduled for interview, phoned to cancel the moment the bus pulled into the bus terminal. On a third visit out-of-town, yet another man did not turn up to his appointment. All these problems meant, as Ptacek (1988:140) experienced, making hundreds of phone calls scheduling, and rescheduling, interview times. Conversely, most men were on time and some were early. One man started work early in the morning to ensure he would be on time to the interview, and in fact he arrived 45 minutes early.

In an attempt to prevent men from forgetting appointments I used mobile text messages, or direct phone calls, the morning or evening before, to remind every man about their appointment. This was an effective strategy for some men, because some said they had forgotten, and that now that they had been reminded, they would definitely attend. Other men used the opportunity to change the interview time, and it would seem that the men who did not show up the following day did not use the opportunity to verbally withdraw their willingness to be interviewed. Some men were very enthusiastic participants, but even those men would often have to re-schedule several times due to (mostly) work commitments and would need many phone calls to remind them. When arranging an interview time with one man, he was hesitant about being able to find parking, so it was agreed that I would purchase a parking voucher to make it easier for him to attend. I emailed him with a map and instructions for using the voucher. Despite this effort, he arrived 15 minutes late for the interview and parked at a meter outside the building. The man said it was easier for him to park there than

use the free parking voucher. Many men did not use opportunities during phone conversations to actually say what they wanted and needed.

As other researchers have experienced (Hearn, 1993:10), I had to muster a great deal of patience and assertiveness to deal with the stress that most definitely arose as a result of ten and a half months of arranging, and re-arranging, interviews with the men. Luckily, the stress was countered by a number of the men's very jovial responses during the arrangement processes. Despite the extensive effort involved in making interviews happen, or indeed because of that effort, of the 19 interviews scheduled in the first round of interviews, 16 eventuated, which is an attendance rate of 84%. In the second round of interviews 11 were scheduled and only one man did not show up, which is a 91% attendance rate. These attendance rates are impressive considering that male perpetrators have a reputation for being unreliable.

I experienced both negative and positive feelings during the interview process, which was something reported by other researchers. Male interviewers from other research projects found that interviewing male perpetrators was, in part, an awkward, unpleasant (Hearn, 1993:14) and dangerous experience (Gadd, 2004:388). Female interviewers found it heart wrenching and came away feeling confused, disappointed, frustrated, depressed, infuriated and disgusted (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:108, 110). Likewise, women who interviewed non-violent men experienced the process as painful and wearying and felt angry, upset (Laws, 1990:216-217), guilty and shamed (Taylor, 1996:119). I experienced a contradictory range of emotions. I experienced anger when some men attempted to save face throughout the interview while simultaneously revealing underlying misogynist tendencies. I experienced sadness when some men appeared to genuinely wish they had been more caring human beings throughout their lives. Boredom set in when I started to be able to predict men's answers. Bemusement occurred when I perceived men's interpretations to be completely different to those of abused women. And fear happened following the interviews with two men whose superior and arrogant attitudes were disturbing. Three men cried when they were being asked questions about what love meant to men. I had to hold back tears a couple of times. One man was so melancholy throughout the entire interview and gave such short answers that I found it extremely difficult to probe deeply as his manner was rather mesmerising. Finally, I enjoyed some of the interviews and laughed a lot with some of the men, whilst at all times I was aware that, although some men were fun to interview, there was an abusive side to them that was impossible to ignore.

3. Ethical considerations

During the recruitment process men were handed an information sheet (Appendix 3) by their stopping abuse programme facilitator, which outlined a number of ethical considerations men could expect when volunteering. These included guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity, their right to refuse to answer questions and that interviews would last 1-2 hours.

Before interviews commenced, men were asked to choose a pseudonym as a means of securing anonymity. When recording the interviews, their real name was not used and in most cases their chosen pseudonym was recorded at the beginning of the audio recording. A typist was engaged to transcribe the audio recordings. Because this potentially posed a problem regarding men's anonymity, men were asked not to use names during the interview. Further, the typist signed a statement of confidentiality (Appendix 9) and the men were informed that only the typist and myself would listen to their recorded interview. Men were not offered access to the audio recordings or transcripts. Other feminist researchers have made this decision too (Harne, 2006; Laws, 1990:219; Spencer et al., 2003:77). The reason was that men might have wanted to change the transcripts in ways that save face and maintain their symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1989:23).

Only one man exercised his right to refuse to answer questions. He did not want to reveal his occupation on the audio recording. The questionnaire was designed in an attempt to limit the length of interviews to a maximum of two hours. Men had been notified both on the information sheet and during the phone call scheduling their first interview, that interviews would last one to two hours. In reality, interviews lasted between one hour 10 minutes and two hours 45 minutes. Most lasted just under two hours. The effort was made to limit the length of interviews because during the recruitment process several practitioners warned that domestically violent men have short attention spans and probably would not be able to last two hours. However, during and after the interviews none of the men disapproved of the length of time they took. Some asked to take cigarette breaks and willingly returned in timely fashion. Many commented afterwards that they would have been willing to continue longer if needed.

Indeed some men said they benefited from participating in the research. As a way of selling the research project to potential participants they were told that a possible benefit of participating could be that they might learn more about themselves, their relationships and the reasons for their behaviours. During interviews some men mentioned that being interviewed was the only time they had talked about some issues and that doing so aided insight into their lives. When asked why they volunteered, two men said they thought it would aid in helping them understand themselves more. Eleven men said they wanted to help "someone else", some specifically wanted to help other men become non-abusive. No men complained about the process, though this does not mean hidden negative feelings may have existed. It is possible that negative feelings might have influenced the four men who were not available to be interviewed a second time.

4. Safety strategies

Other interviewers, both men and women, have experienced problems with their safety before, during and after interviews with men. A number of intimidating and dangerous events have occurred when researchers have interviewed violent (Gadd, 2004:396) and non-violent men in their homes (McKee & O'Brien, 1983:158; Taylor, 1996:112). Men have "pestered" a

lone female researcher for days after interviews were completed (McKee & O'Brien, 1983:158) and, when interviews have been conducted late at night with non-violent men, lone female interviewers have been blocked from leaving the man's house (Taylor, 1996:113), intimidated in the car by the man when he drove her to the train (McKee & O'Brien, 1983:158) and stalked by strangers on an empty train carriage on the late night journey home (Taylor, 1996:114). Some men have asked female researchers personal information about themselves during interviews (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:107), but because researchers often felt that self-disclosure diminished their power (Laws, 1990:220; Lee, 1997:561; Owen, 1995:255; Reinhartz, 1992:42). The policy not to disclose personal information was adopted in this project. Following Harne's (2005:174) suggestion, men were only given access to my university email address, university phone number and a mobile number, which was purchased especially for the duration of the research.

Other researchers found that when perpetrators and non-violent men have been interviewed at their place of work, or at stopping abuse programmes, some have treated female researchers as sex objects and sexual prey, causing women to feel intimidation and fear of attack (McKee & O'Brien, 1983:157-158; Taylor, 1996:113). The current research strategy was devised to cope with potential problems that might arise (Hearn, 1993:10) so that I maintained "as much control as possible" (Cavanagh & Lewis, 1996:106).

It was decided to ask all referring organisations to provide access to interview space during hours when their staff would be present. This is a common practice cited in the literature (Harne, 2005:176; Ptacek, 1988:135). All referring organisations agreed and this ensured I felt safe and had the added advantage that men already knew where to go and it better ensured anonymity and confidentiality (Harne, 2005:176, 2006; Hearn, 1993:11).

There was one exception to the interview venue strategy. One man who was willing to volunteer could not be interviewed at the premises of the referring organisation. However, that particular organisation had a number of services at various locations and it was arranged to interview the man at a fully staffed venue that was accessible to him. Staff members at the premises were not informed of the nature of the interview so anonymity was assured. I felt safe to the degree that many staff were present in the building, but nervous because it was assumed that none were trained in dealing with domestic violence issues. However, as a further safety measure the referring organisations were asked for their estimate of a volunteer's potential for dangerousness during the research process. All stopping abuse programme facilitators assured me that they did not put forward the name of any man they felt would be dangerous. I did feel safe with this particular man at both interviews. The fact that men were screened for potential dangerousness, has implications for construction of knowledge discussed in the interview.

Some interviews were cut short because the organisation was closing its doors for the day. A couple of men offered their willingness to continue the

interview at another venue. This would have proven convenient, however following Laws (1990:217), I was “perversely” determined to maintain charge of the safety protocol, so insisted that all interviews were to be conducted at the referring organisation’s premises and this was readily accepted by all the men. The only problem with this was that matching room availability with times staff were present and with men’s availability often meant waiting weeks to be able to schedule an appointment. It also meant, as mentioned earlier, not being able to finish some interviews before the room closure. When this occurred, enough time was scheduled at the time of the second interview to cover previously missed questions.

Following advice in the literature, it was planned to cancel a scheduled interview before it commenced if it was felt that a situation was dangerous (Taylor, 1996:121) and it was planned to end an interview, while in process, if a man became abusive, or if I felt fear (Ellsberg & Heise, 2002:1601; Harne, 2005:182; Hearn, 1993:10; Social Research Association, 2002:6; Taylor, 1996:115). The definition of safety was left to my own interpretation (Hearn, 1993:10; Lee, 1997:563; Taylor, 1996:121) and it was decided that, if it was felt that any withdrawal was necessary, this would be done decisively and quickly (Social Research Association, 2002:6). Following further advice from the literature, someone was kept informed of the place and timing of the interviews (Ellsberg & Heise, 2002:1601; Owen, 1995:259; Taylor, 1996:120) and a taxi was used to and from the train, or direct to my home, following interviews that ended after dark (World Health Organization, 2001:14).

Although no concrete threat of harm occurred, I did experience fear after interviewing two men. These two men were determined to talk off topic about people in their lives whom they despised. The contemptuous ways they spoke about women unnerved me. Following recommendations cited in the literature I had some debriefing sessions with my supervisor, and university counsellors, to deal with any negative psychological impact that occurred throughout the research process (Ellsberg & Heise, 2002:1601; Lincoln & Guba, 1985:308; Patton, 2002:406; Reinhartz, 1992:36; Skinner, Hester, & Malos, 2005:16; Social Research Association, 2002:7; Taylor, 1996:120; World Health Organization, 2001:21).

Overall, 26 interviews were conducted spanning 48 hours. Although none of the warnings of danger highlighted by other researchers occurred, it is believed that because I followed the World Health Organisation’s (2001:10) suggestion to strictly adhere to safety procedures, this may have ensured this experience of safety. Making all decisions based on the safety protocols definitely gave me more control and confidence.