

**TRANSFORMING WITNESSES TO ACTORS:
100+ MEN AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

By

ALEXANDRIA SARAH DICK

A thesis submitted to the
Graduate School – New Brunswick
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Graduate Program in Women's and Gender Studies

written under the direction of

Dr. Sarah McMahon

and approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

October 2009

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Transforming Witnesses to Actors:

100+ Men Against Domestic Violence

By **ALEXANDRIA SARAH DICK**

Thesis Director:

Sarah McMahon

In this master's thesis, I examine 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence, a training program that was offered to Rutgers University students, faculty, and staff in September 2008 in New Brunswick, New Jersey. This training program was designed to educate and empower men to end domestic violence in their communities by utilizing the bystander intervention model which aims to change underlying social norms and attitudes that contribute to the problem of violence against women. Ten months following the training program, interviews were conducted with several men that attended the program in order to evaluate the program. Both the training program and the interviews will be examined in this paper.

I will introduce the topic area of violence against women; provide theoretical frameworks in which to examine these issues; outline the 100+ Men Against Violence training program; present the evaluation of the program; and provide further deliberation on the implications of this research and suggestions for the future. This paper particularly focuses on bystander intervention, which is a major component of the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence Program, in order to evaluate the efficacy of its principles as a primary prevention program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to my thesis committee chair, Dr. Sarah McMahon, and readers Dr. Yana van der Meulen Rodgers and Dr. Cheryl Clarke. My gratitude to my committee chair and readers goes beyond the scope of this project. I selected these readers not only because of their exceptional professional work and expertise, but also because all three have been instrumental to my experiences as a Master's student at Rutgers University by way of their wisdom, encouragement, and instruction. I would also like to thank the Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC) at Rutgers University for all the encouragement and support throughout this process, and without whom this project would not have been successful.

DEDICATION

For Hope

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.....	6
How Common Is Violence Against Women?	6
History	11
What Is Violence Against Women?	17
Negative Outcomes of Violence	20
Victim-blaming	21
Race, Class, and Ethnicity.....	24
Domestic Violence Primary Prevention Programs.....	27
Involving Men in Prevention	35
Bystander Intervention Approach	37
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS	46
Why Violence Against Women Happens.....	46
Individual Psychopathology	47
Evolutionary Theory	48
Feminist/Patriarchy Theory.....	50
Social Norms Theory	53
Conceptualizations of Change.....	54
Ecological Model	55
Social Learning Theory.....	58

CHAPTER 4: METHODS	61
Program: 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence	61
Training Curriculum.....	63
Sample.....	65
Face-to-Face Interviews	66
Data Collection.....	66
Instruments	68
Analysis.....	69
Themes	70
Difficulties and Limitations	70
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS.....	73
Overview	73
Attitudes About Women and Violence	73
Long-term Efficacy and Attitudes About Active Bystanders	75
Intervention Behaviors	77
General Feedback.....	79
Discussion	80
Conclusion and Research Implications	83
APPENDIX I.....	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Violence against women is rampant and should be viewed as a widespread societal problem in the United States. Close to two million women in the United States are physically assaulted each year, and 25 percent of women experience an attempted or completed rape during their college years (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). A total of eight-point-one percent of surveyed women reported being stalked during their lifetime. Most violence against women is perpetrated by someone known to the victim such as a friend, partner, or former partner; 64 percent of women surveyed reported that they were raped, assaulted, and/or stalked by a partner, former partner, or date. A total of 22 percent of these surveyed women reported being physically assaulted by a partner, former partner, or date (2000). These figures demonstrate a great need for violence prevention programs and services for victims. This paper will focus on prevention programs and efforts. While domestic violence services for victims are vitally important, ultimately those services do not help prevent the violence from occurring to other women. Thus, an important strategy in domestic violence is to prevent the problem from happening, and decreasing future need for these services.

There are three different types of domestic violence prevention, including primary, secondary, and tertiary. There has been a recent trend to use primary prevention because of its emphasis on eradicating the impetus for the problem to exist, such as focusing on cultural norms and attitudes. Primary prevention means “reducing the number of new instances of intimate-partner violence ... by intervening before any violence occurs” (Harvey, Garcia-Moreno, Butchart, 2007, p. 5). Primary prevention

differs from secondary prevention because it treats the root cause of the problem that leads to the problem—in this case, violence. The underlying cause and risk factors must be identified (2007). Without appropriately identifying the causes and risk factors that contribute to a problem, primary prevention programs will not be properly developed to be successful. Steps must be taken to become involved and intervene against those contributing factors.

Secondary prevention aims to prevent victimization of women with programs such as self-defense classes to reduce their risk of sexual or physical assault. These programs aim to reverse or preclude the harm of exposure to risk factors (Walker & Shinn, 2002). Examples of these programs include self-defense courses, safety-planning, and teaching harm-reduction techniques to avoid victimization. The third type of prevention is called tertiary. These programs aim to *reduce* harm that has been inflicted, rather than reverse it. These programs often include treatment of the aftermath, such as counseling, abuse shelters, sex offender programs, and hotlines for victims. Most approaches to interpersonal violence have typically been secondary or tertiary programs until recently (Harvey, et al., 2007).

While secondary and tertiary programs are effective, they are limited in their scope. Consider the following:

A group of people were being tested for mental health, common sense, and intelligence. They were told that it was essential to keep as much water off the floor as possible to prevent damage. They were issued mops, and a faucet was turned on. The winners in this exercise were not the ones who devoted their lives to mopping as long and hard as they possibly could, but the ones who went over and turned off the faucet (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2009, p. 178)

Secondary prevention programs that focus on harm-reduction, such as taking self-defense classes, are the equivalent of having someone mop the influx of water. Or—perhaps a more applicable metaphor—placing a chair in the room and having individuals stand on the chair. Meanwhile, others are still getting flooded with water, and although some individuals would be able to stand on the chair and remain dry, the problem is not being addressed. This metaphor translates to interpersonal violence—the harm-reduction tactics and other secondary and tertiary programs will help avoid victimization or decrease the effects of victimization, but will not inhibit the cause of the problem. Thus, primary prevention programs have increasingly been used and evaluated.

One approach to the primary prevention of domestic violence is bystander intervention which suggests that community members can make a large impact in society, such as violence against women, because bystanders are usually present before, during, and after the occurrences of violence (Banyard, 2008). The bystander model is considered a primary prevention program because the program, ideally, would inhibit perpetration from the onset (Foshee, et al, 1998).

This paper focuses on the evaluation of a domestic violence primary prevention program that uses bystander intervention. A training program was held at Rutgers University on September 24, 2008 titled “100+ Men Against Domestic Violence”, and was sponsored by the Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC), the Department of Sexual Assault Services and Crime Victim Assistance (SAS/CVA), and the New Brunswick Domestic Violence Awareness Coalition (NBDVAC). This program was an innovative pilot program designed to educate and empower men to take steps against violence in their lives and communities. The goal was to educate men who were

interested in learning more about abusive relationships in order to become mentors for friends, family, and the community. It was anticipated that, after conclusion of the workshop, male participants would be able to examine their own values and attitudes in order to better understand their behavior and how it affects violence against women; be more apt to listen to women in their life regarding how violence had affected them; curb sexist behavior, speech, and attitudes that may help create a climate where forms of abuse are accepted; and instill a sense of responsibility and empowerment that will enable men to take a stand when witnessing instances of abuse (100+ Men, 2008, [Brochure]).

Because of the training program's exploratory nature, an evaluation of the training program was conducted to assess how the messages from the training program resonated with the participants. In order to more efficiently evaluate the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training program, the researchers at the Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC) deliberated that post-interviews should be conducted several months after the training program occurred. Information provided from interviews after this period of time would more aptly demonstrate how much, and what types of, long-term information was retained, rather than only when the information was new and fresh in the program participants' minds. The interviews also assessed other components of the program such as general feedback and suggestions, what was useful about the program, what was not useful, what tools from the program had been utilized, and how the information had otherwise affected the program participants. If the program continues with future trainings, the information gathered from these interviews will help inform any changes in the future to increase efficacy.

This paper will introduce the topic area of violence against women (particularly domestic and dating violence); provide theoretical frameworks in which to examine these issues; outline the 100+ Men Against Violence training program; present the evaluation of the program; and provide further deliberation on the implications of this research and suggestions for the future. It should be noted that although this paper focuses primarily on domestic and dating violence, sexual assault will occasionally be touched on in relation to the topic of violence against women. These forms of violence are inextricably intertwined because they are both caused by the same societal attitudes. Therefore the prevention program discussed would most likely curtail incidences of victimization and perpetration of sexual assault as well as domestic violence. However, for the sake of brevity in this paper, sexual assault will not be discussed at great length.

Additionally, it should be noted that the 100+ Men Against Violence training program and this paper examined violence against women and did not take into account same-sex relationships or violence against men perpetrated by women. Concepts of class, ethnicity, religion, and immigration status are briefly discussed in this paper, but were not included in the 100+ Men Against Violence training program curriculum. This paper is not intended to be a universal one-size-fits-all approach to preventing violence, and is aimed solely at American, white, heterosexual dating violence against women perpetrated by men.

CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

How common is violence against women?

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) performed a wide-scale study to study the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women. A total of 8,000 women and 8,005 men were surveyed utilizing a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (otherwise known as CATI) system in 1995 and 1996. In this study, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) reported that nearly two million women are estimated to be assaulted each year in the United States. A total of 18 percent of American women are victims of a completed or attempted rape at some time in their life, 22 percent were younger than age 12 when they were first raped, and 32 percent were ages 12 to 17. A total of 54 percent of the female rape victims in the survey were younger than 18 for their first attempted or completed rape. Stalking has become an increasing concern, with this report estimating that 8 percent of women have been stalked or will be stalked at some point in their life. Approximately one million women are stalked each year. While men do experience these violent crimes also, the NIJ and CDC findings show that their numbers are substantially lower. A total of 22 percent of surveyed women experienced intimate partner violence compared to 7 percent of surveyed men. The risk and intensity of injuries is significantly higher for female rape victims than for male rape victims, with over 31 percent of female rape victims being injured, compared to 16 percent of male victims. In cases of physical assault not associated with direct sexual assault, 39 percent of female victims reported injury,

compared with 25 percent of male victims (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

Straus and Gelles (1990) report that in 12 to 13 percent of couples, one person had been beaten up by their partner at some point in their relationship. A total of 28 to 30 percent of sampled married couples had experienced domestic violence throughout the marriage. Straus and Gelles concluded that at least nine percent of women in the general population, not accounting for race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, relationship type, had experienced severe domestic violence at least once, and at least 30 percent of women had experienced domestic violence (1990). Though this study is nearly 20 years old at the time this paper was written, it demonstrates that attention has been sorely needed in this area for a long time.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's *Supplementary Homicide Reports* (1999) measured homicide according to gender between the years 1993 and 1999. This report states that ten percent of 12 to 15 year old girls were murdered by an acquaintance, and that twenty-two percent of sixteen to nineteen year old young women were murdered by an acquaintance. In contrast, only one percent of homicides of boys and young men in these same age groups were committed by an acquaintance (1999). These numbers exemplify the highly gendered manner in which interpersonal violence operates.

While these statistics are grim, they are most likely a conservative estimate because of the tendency for women to not report, or to underreport acts of domestic violence. Straus and Gelles recall that many "minor" incidents of violence may not be recalled by women during an interview or survey for the simple fact that their memory did not summon the incident, or because the violence does not stand out in their mind

because it was contextualized as part of a normal couple's argument and thus became too "common" to be remembered (Wilt & Olson, 1996, p. 78).

Underreporting incidents of interpersonal violence is caused by women's fears surrounding the violent incident on a number of levels (Fugate, Landis, Riordan, Naurekas, Engel, 2005). One significant factor is fear for her safety or her children's safety if she reports the crime. The abuser would become even angrier after learning of the police report and the violence would escalate. Another factor is economics—many women rely on their partners for their shelter and food. If children are present, this is an additional concern of how to take care of the children without the partner's income. Women who experience economic abuse—that is, control of their finances or ability to earn an income—have a higher risk of being unable to report due to economic factors. Other reasons for underreporting include fear of not being believed by police or other authorities, and a sense of futility when witnessing others seek help unsuccessfully—either because the abuser was not arrested and charged, or because abusers often violate restraining orders (2005).

Although all women, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, religion, class, or sexual orientation are at risk and experience domestic violence, many of these factors for underreporting indicate that vulnerable populations such as immigrants, non-whites, and low-income have additional barriers that inhibit reporting violence (Raj & Silverman, 2002; Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, Baig-Amin, 2003; Hancock, 2006; Gillum, 2008). Some of these limitations include having fewer resources to access information about domestic violence services, lacking transportation to travel to a domestic violence agency or police station to report, having increased economic dependency on the abuser, fear of

deportation for immigrant populations, and differing cultural values about the definition and severity of domestic violence. These populations and their cultural differences will be discussed at greater length in a following section.

In addition to underreporting by victims, it is difficult to obtain an accurate picture of the incidence of domestic violence due to measurement issues. One of the most prominent forms of measuring domestic violence is the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) created by Straus (1979). The National Family Violence Survey (NFVS) was created in order to conduct a national study on violence. This instrument is intended to measure how disputes in a relationship are resolved, such as the reasoning techniques employed, verbal or nonverbal acts that may threaten or wound their partner—emotionally or physically, and the use of physical force. These three categories are simplified with the terms “Reasoning”, “Verbal Aggression”, and “Violence” (Straus, 1979, p. 189). The scale is not intended to survey the content of the dispute or even if the dispute is resolved; rather, the scale indicates how the disputes are carried out. Straus maintains that conflict is inherent to all human relationships. He notes that conflict is not highly problematic when encountered in a family situation and a system such as Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) can be helpful when determining if the context is “high conflict” (Straus, 1976, p. 192). Straus’ CTS made it possible for violence against women to be surveyed on a wide scale in order to reveal underlying patterns and trends with this information.

A random sample of 2000 couples were surveyed in 1975 using the CTS designed to measure the violence between the couples (Eigenburg, 2001). The study was also performed with 6000 couples in 1985. There was little increase in violence between

couples between 1975 and 1985. However, the findings report that women were slightly more violent with their male partners than male partners were with their female partners (2001).

A limitation of the CTS is that it does not provide the context of the abuse, such as the cause and meaning of the violence acts (Straus, 2005, p. 195). The survey does not distinguish between acts of violent aggression and those of self-defense (Eigenburg, 2001). The circumstances leading to the violence provides the contextualization necessary in order to properly measure instances of abuse. However, critics of the CTS and the NFVS point out that the measurements failed to take into account frequency and use of force. For example, if a man severely batters his partner continuously in various parts of her body, and she bites him on the arm, they would be viewed by the CTS as both committing the same level of violence. Because the surveys were only conducted by one individual of the couple, perceptions may interfere with the reliability of the results. An experience of violence may be described as more or less violent than another person would have deemed (2001).

A study conducted on teenage dating violence in a Los Angeles high school found an insignificant difference in perpetration of violence according to gender (O'Keefe, 1997; Watson, 2001). A total of forty-four percent of girls surveyed reported perpetrating an act of violence, compared to 39 percent of boys. Upon closer examination, it was found that boys reported using violence as a primary means to express anger and resolve problems, whereas the majority of girls used violence as self-defense against violence being inflicted on them (1997). Unlike the National Family Violence Survey and the Conflict Tactile Scale, O'Keefe's survey looked deeper to

obtain the contextualization necessary in order to better understand the breadth of the problem. An analysis of this context is pertinent in order to responsibly develop prevention programs. Studies such as O'Keefe's indicate that studies should include justifications for the violence reported in the surveys.

Understanding the CTS is important because it lends an example of how important it is to examine a methodology and determine its utility in diagnosing a problem correctly. If the CTS were left unexamined, prevention programs could look starkly different, perhaps targeting women instead of men. It also emphasizes the need for more qualitative studies that would fill in the gaps and answer questions regarding the types of violence and under what circumstances the violence was perpetrated.

History

Attention was first paid to domestic violence during the Temperance Movement in the 1840's and 1850's which was a social movement that sought the end of alcohol consumption (Pleck, 1987). The Temperance Movement attracted many female activists who urged men to abstain from alcohol consumption, many arguing that drunkenness led to domestic violence. While the primary objective of the Temperance Movement was not to end domestic violence, many women recognized that alcohol abstinence would lead to decreased violence against women (1987). Domestic violence was subsumed under the umbrella that contained the many harmful effects of alcohol. Branching from this, many women activists involved in the Temperance Movement also fought for legislation to obtain divorce for their husband's drunkenness, as well as a woman's right to earn her own living (1987). Increasingly, the family unit was becoming more and more privatized

and less vulnerable to public inquiry and concern; the result of this was that domestic violence was not viewed as a public problem, but rather as a private family matter. This view of the family unit as private and therefore not of public concern may be the cornerstone of why domestic violence has been minimized and ignored throughout time.

The Protective Agency for Women and Children was founded in 1885 by women from Chicago's Moral Education Society one of the first, and most significant, agencies that appealed to victims of domestic violence (1987). The agency provided legal aid and assistance to women and children who were victim to violence or sexual assault.

Legislation to protect domestic violence victims was first introduced in Massachusetts in 1879, 1883, and 1891, and would give a battered wife the right to apply for legal separation, acquire financial support for herself and children, and award her custody of the children. Lucy Stone, a suffragist, introduced the legislation three times—however all three times the legislation failed to pass (1987). The legal separation would have helped battered women in a myriad of ways—Catholic women who opposed divorce might look more favorably on a legal separation compared to a divorce; many women could not hire a lawyer required to have a divorce and the legal separation would not cost anything; and women did not have to attend court to obtain custody, spousal support, or the separation order which made the process easier for her to negotiate. Objections to this bill stated that men ordered to pay financial support would flee the state and that women would not utilize the legal separations—and that if they did, the legal separations would be too easy to obtain. Above all, the legislation—and Lucy Stone—was viewed as a threat to the family unit (1987). Even if the legislation has been passed, it would only have been applicable for married women—not other types of

relationships or abuses. After the failure of the legislation to pass, Stone turned her attention to women's suffrage with the argument that cultural attitudes needed to change in order to secure legal protection. She asserted that men would be less likely to perpetrate violence against their wives when the regard for women increased, and securing women's right to vote would improve society's regard for women. In addition, if women had the right to vote, they would also have greater political power in order to achieve legislation success in the future (1987).

Female suffrage was granted in 1920 (Pleck, 1987); however, violence against women was an ongoing problem. Without any studies conducted, it is impossible to know whether female suffrage caused a decline in domestic violence, though it is safe to assume that Lucy Stone's estimations were at least partially accurate. If the law and society were to cease viewing women as men's property, and if women were given greater political power to wield, violence against women should decrease. Unfortunately, there were no studies conducted during this time to adequately resolve the issue. What is known for sure is that violence against women continued, as is demonstrated by the continuous police reports, court proceedings, personal accounts, and newspaper clippings from that period to the present.

The 1920's were successful in one regard—the courts were increasingly paying attention to domestic violence. However, the approach to domestic violence did little to curtail the problem. Court judges, public officials, social workers, and psychiatrists were enlisted to “solve” the domestic dispute, rather than punish the perpetrator of a violence crime. Often, the domestic dispute was relegated as the wife's fault for provoking the incident. Complaints were dismissed and couples were advised to work out their

problems privately. This approach was “curative” rather than “punitive” with the idea that families must remain intact for the best interest of the children—the children’s interests being of greater importance than the wife’s (Pleck, 1987, p. 126). Family violence was treated with emphasis placed on safeguarding the family unit—a male-headed family unit.

The first court of domestic relations was established in Buffalo, New York in 1910 (1987). This court addressed issues such as child support payment, domestic assault, and other criminal matters that related to issues of the family. By the 1920’s, most large cities had established a similar court for issues of domestic relations. It was thought by many that having a separate court system from the “police courts” would better treat the delicate family issues, and offer a less punitive, and less criminal, way to treat the issues without criminalization (Pleck, 1987, p. 137). This approach still favored reconciliation between the wife and husband, in favor of mending the family unit for the sake of the children. By having a less punitive approach to domestic violence, the message to society, and to perpetrators, was that violence against women was acceptable. Having this leniency in the court systems demonstrated the greater cultural sentiment toward the problem that violence against women was not important and should not be curtailed. Instead, the blame was secured on the shoulders of the women who were victimized by the violence. This example exemplifies how, even with women’s suffrage and with legal attention, the manner in which things are carried out has great weight. In other words, even though greater attention was being directed towards the problem, the cultural attitudes regarding violence against women had not changed radically, and

without societal condemnation of violence against women efforts to end violence against women would not be successful.

A more contemporary impetus to address domestic violence in the United States stemmed from the Women's Movement of the 1960s and 1970s—the time known as the “second wave”. The first wave of feminism was in the mid-1800's to early 1900's when women fought for voting rights in the United States, finally achieving them in 1920 when Congress ratified the nineteenth amendment (Shaw & Lee, 2007). The second wave of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s addressed a host of other issues—reproductive rights, gender norms, violence, equal pay for equal work, sexual harassment, among many others. This was also the time of the Civil Rights and Gay Liberation Movement, a period of great change for United States society. The Women's Movement and feminist goals and perspectives are important to the discussion of violence against women because many theories suggest that women's empowerment, or lack thereof, may directly impact rates of violence and victimization. A further explanation of feminist frameworks and violence will be discussed in the following chapter.

The anti-rape movement preceded the battered women's movement, providing an entry-way to address domestic violence because there were many common “enemies” for both movements such as misogyny, patriarchy, public apathy, victim-blaming, underreporting, and police practices (Pleck, 1987, p. 185). Police practices were first to be criticized; reports surfaced and were publicized that police officers had a “stitch” rule—that the police only needed to become involved if the injuries inflicted on the woman required stitches (1987). Police officers often suggested that the husband and wife work out their problems, rather than arrest the perpetrator or otherwise protect the

victim. Arrest was viewed only as a last resort for very severe cases of domestic violence (1987). In 1976, female lawyers from Oakland, California and Fields, Woods, and other legal advocates in New York City, brought a class action suit against the police in order to confront the larger problem of how police treat domestic violence cases (1987).

The first battered women's shelter in the United States was opened in Minnesota in 1974 (Dobash & Scheter, 1987). Although many feminists felt that the battered women's movement would not be helped by sending women into hiding while the perpetrating husbands walked free, there was no denying that there was an urgent need to offer housing for battered women. Battered women's shelters emerged across the country following this, and by the early 1980s, shelters in the United States were serving approximately 270,000 women and children. The first rape crisis center opened in 1972 to provide care and services to rape victims (Shaw & Lee, 2007). By 1980, all but six states had passed state laws regarding wife abuse, and providing funding for shelters, improved reporting procedures, and more effective criminal court procedures (Pleck, 1987). The approach to help domestic violence had less focus on reconciliation and more emphasis on rehabilitating the abuser who shouldered the responsibility for the violence. Services for batterers were first developed in 1975; these programs aimed to rehabilitate the abuser so that they were no longer violent (1987).

During the late 1970's and into the early 1980's, explanations for the cause of spousal abuse were circulated. It was argued that more than just policies, laws, services, and criminal treatment must change; theories involving women's subordination and the patriarchal family were favored. Dobash and Dobash, in their book *Violence Against Wives* (1979) proposed that marriage was an institution predicated on male dominance

and that wife abuse was a symptom. Modern psychology addressed violence against women, arguing that there were other emotional factors involved with spousal abuse, such as decreased self-esteem, depression, and isolation---factors that would contribute to the abuse victim's failure to leave an abusive situation (1987). These issues will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

In 1994, the National Organization for Women (NOW) Legal Defense Fund and other grassroots organizations were successful in passing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in Congress with bipartisan support. The four subtitles of the Act denote areas of concern: Safe Streets, Safe Homes for Women, Civil Rights for Women, and Equal Justice for Women in the Courts, and Protections of Battered Immigrant Women and Children. VAWA was successful in changing rules of evidence, law enforcement procedures, court procedures, and also allocated greater funding for prevention and training (Shaw & Lee, 2007). VAWA was reauthorized in 2000, and was set to expire in 2005; the new VAWA of 2005 included additional provisions such as more funding for prevention efforts, developing culturally- and linguistically-specific services, and broadening services to include victims with disabilities, children, teenagers, and cultural and ethnic minorities (NNEDV; Public Law, 2005).

What is violence against women?

There are numerous forms of violence against women, including sexual assault, stalking, and domestic violence. Domestic violence is typically defined as physical assault committed by an intimate partner, cohabitant, spouse, or ex-intimate partner (Intimate Partner, 2002). However, domestic violence occurs in many other ways such as

economically, emotionally, and psychologically (2002). Victimization do not necessarily include direct physical assault to be considered abusive. Often the term “abuse” is centered on notions of power, control, and coercion, though physical assault can certainly manifest from these. “The batterer asserts his power over the victim through the use of threats, as well as actual violence. Violence is simply a tool, within this framework, that the perpetrator uses to gain greater power in the relationship to deter or trigger specific behaviors, win arguments, or demonstrate dominance” (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Other nonphysical types of abuse include intimidation, economic control, threats, and abuse of children, pets, or other family members, or the threat of. Controlling the victim’s finances, preventing her from attaining or maintaining employment, and withholding necessary resources are also included in the definition of domestic violence. Other examples of violence include stalking, intimidation, harassment, obscene phone calls, cyberstalking, road rage, or other patterned behaviors that exhibit control and abuse (1992).

Income levels, economic dependency, and financial resources can often have an effect on the likelihood domestic violence will occur, and if the victims have means to leave an abusive relationship. Battering and poverty frequently coexist for a large percentage of women on welfare (Brush, 2004). “Barrier abuse” is often present during an abusive relationship which refers to the attempts of the abuser to control the victim by interfering with her employment. The abuser may do this through a variety of means but some forms may include battering so that physical marks are visible and she cannot attend work; preventing her from leaving to work by physically preventing her through violence, the threat of violence, or by controlling access to transportation or others means

necessary to attend her employment; harassing her at her location of employment; and otherwise impair her ability to comply or meet with her employer's requests (2004). This type of abuse is utilized in order to further control the victim and reduce the resources she would otherwise have to leave the abusive relationship. Often, as a result of the abuse itself, women may experience decreased self-esteem that would inhibit her ability or confidence to properly perform a job and take care of her own finances (Tolman & Raphael, 2000).

Recently, there has been a push to refer to this violence as “intimate partner violence”, because “domestic violence” tends to conjure thoughts of violence in marriage (Barnett, Miller-Perrin, and Perrin, 2005). Some individuals believe that intimate partner violence conveys a more accurate sense of the identities of the perpetrators and victims— young or old, married or unmarried, and of any sexual orientation, race or class. Also, “domestic violence” may sometimes include child or elderly abuse; the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) suggests the term “intimate partner violence” because the focus is centered squarely on “actual or threatened physical or sexual, or psychological or emotional abuse” committed by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend, ex-boyfriend, or ex-girlfriend, or date. This type of violence expands to include acquaintance rape, domestic abuse, and spouse abuse (Intimate Partner, 2002). The term “interpersonal” redirects the attention to particular relationships. This is important to primary prevention programs because of the need to properly study and diagnose the causes and risk factors that contribute to violence. If “domestic abuse” is too broadly defined, it is more difficult to narrow down these causes and risk factors. A more accurate depiction of the causal factors for violence is clearer when examining

certain types of relationships. The term “domestic violence,” “dating violence,” and “intimate partner violence” will be used interchangeably for this thesis.

Negative outcomes of violence

Domestic and sexual violence have myriad potential negative consequences that range from physical to psychological and emotional. These negative outcomes emphasize how important domestic violence prevention is in order to reduce the amount of women affected by interpersonal violence. Leidig (1992) lists the following as common consequences of victimization: flashbacks, generalized anxiety, mistrust and/or social isolation, difficulty in forming and/or maintaining nonexploitive relationships, chronic depression, dissociative features, impulsivity, self-defeating thoughts and/or behavior, death, sexual and reproductive symptoms (chronic pelvic pain, urinary tract infections, fertility problems, trauma-specific pain or difficulty, and orgasmic difficulty), physical trauma (bruises, fractured and/or broken bones, head injury, etc.), headaches, body aches, high blood pressure, hyperalertness, sleep disorders, gastrointestinal disorders, eating disorders and self-mutilation.

Female victims of sexual or domestic abuse may frequently suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Formerly, PTSD was an affliction of war veterans, but has since been considered a major affliction of child abuse, sexual assault, and domestic violence survivors (Hughes & Jones, 2000). The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) defined PTSD as “the development of characteristic symptoms following exposure to an extreme traumatic stressor involving actual or threatened death or serious injury, or other threat to one’s physical integrity . . .” (DSMV-

IV, as cited in Hughes & Jones, 2000, p. 5). The above consequences of domestic or sexual abuse may be manifestations of the post-traumatic stress disorder. In a study across varied samples such as hospitals, shelters, and community agencies, 31% to 84% of victimized women exhibit PTSD symptoms (Jones, Hughes, & Unterstaller, 2001). PTSD involves re-experiencing the traumatic event through various means: flashbacks, intrusive thoughts, dreams, or intense distress. PTSD does not necessarily entail these specific manifestations and can include other means of anxiety-related symptoms, such as internalizing the experience, numbing, and avoiding the experiences or memories of the experience, and the PTSD manifests itself in other ways, such as destructive behaviors that include difficulty sleeping, depression, mood swings, hypervigilance, decreased concentration, and substance abuse. PTSD leads to an increased risk of suicide, and approximately thirteen percent of rape victims will attempt suicide when compared to those who have not been victim of a crime (p. 190). These psychological effects can interfere with the victim's daily life functions.

The negative effects outlined in this section emphasize the imperative need to eradicate domestic violence. Prevention programs such as 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence are needed to inhibit incidences of violence from happening, thus requiring less services oriented to female battered victims for these negative effects.

Victim-blaming

Often in a domestic violence situation, the woman is blamed for remaining in the situation, with little to no regard for the other factors that cause her to remain in the situation. Additionally, many women in domestic or dating violence situations do not

identify as being abused until they are offered a description of violence in the home and relationship (Gelles & Straus, 1988, p. 19).

A typical public sentiment is that women have the choice to remain in an abusive relationship. Whether or not a woman has the “choice” to remain in a relationship is debatable. The act of “choosing” an option suggests that the individual with the decision has freedom in their choice. Depending on the circumstances of the domestic violence victim, there is often little freedom. Often, there are a wide array of barriers that prevent the victim from leaving the situation that range from emotional to financial to physical. The more obvious types of barriers include fearing future episodes of violence, or even homicide; not having the financial resources to leave; and a decreased feeling of self-worth. During the abusive relationship, control is often gained by the abuser by inflicting psychological abuse (McGee and Wolfe, 1991). Another common consequence of abuse is isolation of the victim, which leaves little support or available resources for the victim to use to leave the abuser.

Blame may also be attributed to the victim for precipitating the violence. A study conducted by Bryant and Spencer (2003) examined how students at a public university in upstate New York attributed blame to victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. A total of 357 surveys were collected from students participating in required health and wellness university courses. A total of 64 percent of the sample were women. The respondent ages ranged from 18 to 49 years old. Twenty percent of the sample were members of fraternities or sororities. A total of 68 percent of the sample were white. The questionnaire included questions that represented the victim, perpetrator, societal and situational variables common to domestic violence situations. Male students, members of

fraternities and sororities, and individuals with a prior history of family violence were found to be more likely to attribute blame to the victim for provoking her husband. Students were also assessed for their own use of violence in relationships, and how that correlated to their blame attribution. Students that used minor violence in relationships were less likely to assign blame to victims of domestic violence; whereas students that used more severe forms of violence in their own relationships were more likely to assign blame to the victims. In addition, it was found that dating violence occurred in the last twelve months preceding the study for 39 percent of the students. Bryant and Spencer conclude that students that used violence in their own relationships were less likely to examine to acknowledge their own behaviors that correspond to violence (2003).

Another study conducted by Harrison and Esqueda (2000) found that race and alcohol consumption negatively affect blame attribution. Just over two hundred participants from a Midwestern university participated in this study; solicited from an introductory psychology course for partial credit. A total of one hundred and thirty were female; seventy were male; one hundred and ninety were white; two were black; 4 were Asian; and 4 were Latino. Eighty-two percent considered themselves to be middle-class, nine percent as working or lower class, and nine percent as upper class. Students were randomly assigned to different vignettes that depicted varying domestic violence situations, perpetrator and victim race, and victim drinking behavior. The vignettes feature interviews between a police officer and the domestic violence perpetrator and victim. An opening paragraph explained the race of the victim and the perpetrator and stated if the victim had been drinking before the violent incident. A questionnaire rated the participants' perceptions regarding the culpability of the perpetrator and victim.

Results from this study showed that the victim's drinking behavior preceding the violent event negatively affected their rates of culpability. In other words, vignettes depicting an intoxicated victim increased the attribution of blame for the violent incident. Victims who had not drunk were assigned less blame. It was indicated by participants that the drinking behavior may have provoked the perpetrator's violent behavior. Results also indicated the race of the perpetrator and victim plays a role in assigning culpability for violence. If the perpetrator was white and the victim was black, less culpability was assigned to the perpetrator. Correspondingly, if the perpetrator was black and the victim was white, more blame was assigned to the perpetrator. In both vignettes, only race was changed; thus revealing how race can be a primary motivating factor when deciding culpability for domestic violence.

Race, Class, and Ethnicity

Violence against women is experienced by all races, classes, religions, ethnicities, and communities. Research is inconclusive whether violence increases depending on race or cultural background; however, people with lower-incomes are more likely to experience violence (Gillum, 2008). However, it is impossible to know the exact rates when taking into consideration the varying cultural attitudes and norms that would reflect different rates of violence due to participants' differing perceptions in study results. For example, different racial groups are more or less tolerant of abusive behaviors; as is one family to the next. This increases the difficulty in properly studying rates of violence in varying cultures and contexts. Other cultural factors affect help-seeking behavior and perceptions of violence, as well as access to resources in the community. Non-white

women are at an increased risk of poverty, which lessens their ability to access resources and may increase their dependency on others to support themselves or their children (2008).

Non-white women often have additional complications and barriers and have fewer resources with which to leave an abusive situation (Raj & Silverman, 2002; Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, Baig-Amin, 2003; Hancock, 2006; Gillum, 2008). Numerous factors such as cultural attitudes, access to transportation, income-level, private resources, public resources, and immigration status affect how domestic violence is perceived by the community and how women respond when they experience violence. It is essential to understand these cultural differences in order to effectively provide services and tailor prevention programs that fit the needs of various communities.

African-American women are dually oppressed—by their gender, and by their race. Patricia Hills Collins (2000) argues that there are stereotypes of African-American women that may be relevant when exploring the causes of violence in their community. Popular stereotypes portray African-American as mummies, jezebels, overbearing matriarchs, over-sexualized, and welfare mothers (2000). These stereotypes, Collins argues, allow African-American men to control and objectify African-American women which stem from the slave era of the United States. While feeling their own racial oppression, African-American men may desire to control and oppress in their personal relationships the “insubordinate” part of their community, in order to fulfill traditional “white” notions of power and masculinity (2000). This type of control and power can be exercised in the form of interpersonal violence.

Immigrant women have culturally-relevant barriers as well. Many cultures have an increased emphasis on the family model. Notions of femininity and masculinity may be more rigidly defined with family models placing men as the household leader (Hancock, 2006). Because many immigrant women, especially first generations, have not assimilated to the United States, they have additional barriers such as difficulty speaking English or finding someone that speaks their native language, knowing where to access resources for help—if they even know there are resources available—and being able to define their experience as domestic abuse. Immigrant women who are not legal, or who are dependant on their partner for their legal status, are fearful to be deported if they reach out to the authorities (2006).

Additionally, help-seeking behavior is also different for various cultures. Hispanic women are more likely to turn to church, family members, friends, or other community members or leaders than to a domestic violence hotline or shelter for help. Often, communities of racial or ethnic populations are very isolated—either geographically due to lack of transportation access or due to racial tensions with neighboring “white” communities (Raj & Silverman, 2002; Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, Baig-Amin, 2003; Hancock, 2006; Gillum, 2008). Mistrust of “white” mainstream agencies may deter women from seeking help that stems from cultural-insensitivity on the agencies’ part. Government-funded agencies allocated to immigrant, racial, and ethnic communities are often overburdened and unable to identify and refer women for services (Hancock, 2006). Lower-income communities, regardless of race or ethnicity, have less private resources, and less access—such as knowledge of, transportation to, and availability of—services (2006).

These differences outlined between “white” mainstream dominant society and other non-white or lower-income communities highlight the need to offer culturally-sensitive services and prevention programs. A universal one-size-fits-all does not successfully prevent or treat violence for the reasons outlined in this section. Using the hegemonic model to treat and prevent violence will be underutilized and, therefore, wasteful and unsuccessful.

Domestic Violence Primary Prevention Programs

The first part of this paper has outlined the necessity for domestic violence prevention programs. Before evaluating the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training program, let us briefly examine other prevention efforts. Many preventative programs have focused on school-based programs that focus on education and awareness, conflict mediation, and effective communication. A fundamental tenet of domestic or dating violence prevention is to alter cultural norms that condone or encourage violence in relationships. Unfortunately, changing cultural norms and values is not an easy task. School-based programs are often utilized because adolescents are still developing their identities, communication skills, and engaging in romantic relationships for the first time.

Safe Dates is a series of school and community activities that promote both primary and secondary prevention (Foshee, Bauman, Arriaga, Helms, Koch, Linder, et al, 1998). As outlined earlier in this paper, primary prevention refers to prevention that targets the initial perpetration of a problem, such as targeting those that might be sexual or physical offenders before a crime is committed. Efforts may include consciousness-raising, education, and programs that seek to change cultural norms. Secondary

prevention is an effort to lower the rate of victimization from the crime, for example, dissuading potential perpetrators with the risk of criminal punishment. Tertiary prevention is, mostly, after-the-fact treatment that may curtail the problem through inhibiting repeated occurrences. This may take place through sex offender rehabilitation programs and services for victims of physical or sexual assault (Meyer, 2000).

This prevention program was aimed at both preventing perpetration as well as victimization rates. School activities in Safe Dates include a theater production performed by peers, ten 45-minute sessions conducted by health and physical education teachers, and a poster contest. Community activities include services provided for adolescents in abusive relationships such as crisis hotlines and support groups, and community service provider training. It is predicted that these programs may lead to a decrease in dating violence because the program's tenets seek to change the norms associated with intimate partner violence; decrease gender stereotyping; and improves conflict management skills to provide alternative manners in which to solve problems without using violence. Many of these activities are thought to improve the awareness of services for victims, and help-seeking behavior. Safe Dates was targeted at both male and female as both genders would benefit from receiving this information.

The Safe Dates Project is a randomized controlled trial that was used in order to gauge the effects of a school-based intervention for the prevention of dating violence (Foshee, Bauman, Ennett, Linder, Benefield, Suchindran, et al. 2004). The program and study took place in a rural North Carolina county public school and adolescents in the eighth grade in fall of 1994 were eligible for the study. Information was collected at various times; one month following the Safe Dates; and then yearly thereafter. At the end

of year two, half of the sample received a booster in order to compare long-term efficacy between those who did and those who did not receive a booster. The booster consisted of an 11-page newsletter mailed to participants homes, as well as a follow-up telephone call conducted by a health educator four weeks following the mailing of the newsletter. The newsletter contained information regarding types of abuse, effective means of communication, and safe-dating tips. Four-weeks after this mailing, the telephone call by the health educator offered to answer any of the participant's questions regarding the newsletter, and took note if the participant read all the components of the newsletter. If the all sections of the newsletter had been determined to have been read by the participant, ten dollars was sent to the participant. Eighty-two percent of participants in the booster group had read all sections of the newsletter (Foshee et al., 2004).

All groups of the study reported less perpetration of sexual and dating violence at the four-year follow-up. Less victimization of psychological abuse was also reported by participants at this time. Those that participated in the booster group—that received the newsletter and follow-up telephone call—did not show a significant difference in rates of perpetration and victimization of physical, sexual, or psychological violence. Further discussion suggests there the Safe Dates program was equally effective for all racial and ethnic groups, and both males and females. Compared with control groups at surrounding schools that did not receive the Safe Dates program, students experienced 56 percent to 92 percent less dating violence victimization and perpetration. This program is being administered across the United States, but this rural town was the first to have published its evaluation results (2004).

Another prevention program, titled “Love, Sex, and Power” (LSP), was modeled after a successful college rape prevention that utilizes service-learning activities (Klaw & Ampuero, 2007). Campus students signed up for the LSP course as a scheduled semester class, and were required to run one prevention workshop for community members and peers, as well as participate in two other service-learning activities, such as participating in an anti-violence march. The curriculum of the workshops covered differences between healthy and unhealthy relationships, types of abuse, creating awareness of the severity of the problem, and offered tips to help others who might be experiencing abuse in a relationship (2007). Workshops include a variety of tools in order to communicate the curriculum such as through films, special lecturers, and readings. Students signed up for the course are required to write a critical paper on the topic of intimate partner violence. These papers are then disseminated to the campus community by means of presentations, dialogue sessions, and poster fairs. All workshop material is translated into Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, and Tagalog in order to reach certain immigrant populations on campus and in the community. In addition to providing awareness and changing scripted cultural norms, this type of service-learning program enables students to build their public speaking, leadership, and mentoring skills. Many students who have taken the LSP course and taught their own workshop have graduated and become leaders in the anti-violence movement. The LSP program has provided over one-hundred workshops to the community and campus (2007).

A post-study of this program determined that it was successful in changing the way students viewed interpersonal violence which would lead to a decreased rate of victimization and perpetration. The evaluation of this program concluded that semester-

long programs are highly successful in changing norms and beliefs because of the longer-term connection that students have to the dating violence material (2007).

Another program, PREVENT, operated in a slightly different manner. The National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) funded the Domestic Violence Prevention and Enhancement and Leadership Through Alliances (DELTA) program and the Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) program with a greater emphasis on primary prevention (Martin, Coyne-Beasley, Hoehn, Matthew, Runyan, Orton, & Royster, 2008). The NCIPC has funded a total of fourteen DELTA programs that are run in local and state domestic violence programs. NCIPC has also funded RPE programs in all fifty states of the United States. It was determined that DELTA and RPE practitioners needed more training on primary prevention. It was because of this need that the NCIPC established the Preventing Violence through Education, Networks, and Technical Assistance (PREVENT). This program was run by a collaboration between the University of North Carolina Injury Prevention Research Center on behalf of the National Training Initiative in Injury and Violence Prevention and the NCIPC. The main focus of PREVENT was not to disseminate information to the public; rather, this program was indicated to train practitioners how to engage with and teach their own primary prevention programs. By training others that can then, in turn, train more groups, the aim to prevent violence can be furthered even more with larger numbers of primary prevention efforts (Martin, et al., 2008).

In order to establish what training needed to be provided, key DELTA and RPE staff were asked to complete an interview before the training program took place. Seventeen people, representing thirteen different programs, participated and completed

an interview via telephone or by filling out a survey. Three focus groups were also conducted via telephone or conference call. These focus groups included directors and program coordinators from DELTA and RPE; those that had participated in interviews were ineligible to participate in the focus groups (2008). The interviews and focus groups overwhelmingly demonstrated that there was a high demand for more knowledge concerning primary prevention of violence against women. However, most participants indicated that they did not feel properly equipped to provide these trainings themselves. Another key interest indicated by participants was to learn not just how to design or implement a primary violence prevention program, but also how to evaluate it. Other desired skills included being able to access, analyze, and present research and data; provide information to stakeholders, policy makers and the media; become a violence prevention resource for the community; obtain funding for prevention efforts; and create and enhance anti-prevention collaborations with agencies and organizations (2008).

A serious deterrent to practitioners being able to learn these primary prevention techniques at workshops was cost; most participants expressed a lack of financial resources to pay for course fees, travel, and hotel costs. PREVENT eliminated this barrier by providing stipends to participants to handle costs.

A significant benefit to the PREVENT trainings was the collaboration of teamwork and ideas—during the training, each team designed its own primary violence prevention program. The program included hands-on activities, fact sheets, “train-the-trainer” tools, and networking opportunities to collaborate in the future. This type of engaged, active-learning was shown to be highly successful in transmitting ideas of

primary prevention to practitioners who may, in turn, use those to inform their own practices when establishing primary prevention programs in their community.

Another program, Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) was developed by Katz in 1993 at Northeastern University's Center for the Study of Sport in Society. The goal of the program was to create male peer-to-peer conversation among high school and college students regarding violence against women and other violence such as gay-bashing (Katz, 2006). The MVP trained student athletes and other student leaders to use their role in the campus community to speak out against violence and sexist behavior. The second year, a female component was added to train female student athletes and other student leaders on the same issues. MVP became a widely used violence primary prevention program across the United States on numerous campuses and was implemented in the military for their first ever violence prevention program in 1997 (2006). The model was first developed for student athletes, but can be implemented in any group of individuals. The MVP uses interactive discussion in a co-educational or single-sex setting. Each setting has its advantages and disadvantages. Co-educational settings foster better relationships and communication between men and women. However, single-sex settings provide for better comfort and enable individuals of the sessions to better open up and be receptive to the program's message. These sessions often work to dispel victim-blaming statements, such as asserting that women deserve rape if they dress provocatively. Student leaders of the session question the men's assertions such as these, and engage the group in dialogue with each other. Empathy-building is also a large component of the program; session leaders ask the individuals of the group to imagine violence being perpetrated on a female loved one, and to envision

another male witnessing the violence take place. Through a series of questions, the individuals of the session often realize that they can be engaged bystanders and help in situations like these. (2006). This type of model is effective because instead of admonishing men for not doing enough or treating them like potential perpetrators, it instills a sense of empowerment and responsibility as leaders in their community.

Programs such as Safe Dates, LPS, PREVENT and MVP are successful for primary prevention strategies because patriarchal ideologies and cultural norms and practices that condone violence must be changed in order to eradicate violence. Gender inequalities and sexist attitudes contribute to the problem of domestic violence; without addressing these, prevention strategies will most likely fail. Societal attitudes are difficult to change, but these programs show significant promise in the field of primary violence prevention. Because many prevention efforts are focused on younger individuals such as high school and college-aged students, interesting and thought-provoking educational sessions are vitally important to increasing the efficacy of these programs, such as theatrical performances and interactive group discussions. The utilization of peer mentoring can also be more effective because of the increased receptivity the target audience may experience from hearing it from someone similar in age and demographics. On the other hand, receiving knowledge from an authority figure such as a distinguished lecture speaker, agency or organization leader, professor, or other person of greater professionalism may increase the credibility that is given to the subject matter.

Programs like PREVENT will most likely have a greater rate of long-term efficacy because of its design to influence a greater amount of people through dispersion.

Training others to train about domestic violence is an important model to incorporate because of this increased efficacy to reach more people. Trainings that incorporate degrees of peer mentoring and being a role model will most likely experience greater and more wide-spread results because the information does not solely affect the individual, but those around the individual as well. For example, if a student attend a workshop, but does not discuss it with anyone, the results will only affect that individual and that individual's relationships. But if you have an individual not only trained about domestic violence, how it can be stopped, and also on how to be a role model to end domestic violence in their social circles, places of employment, and larger communities, it can be estimated that the effects of the training modules will be felt by a larger number of people.

More programs such as these should be developed in order to capture the greatest methods of preventing violence through education and dispersal of information to others so that the benefits of these programs can be maximized.

Involving Men in Prevention

It is vitally important that prevention programs incorporate men for a few reasons. The first and perhaps most important being that men may be perpetrators of violence and may benefit from receiving education and training regarding domestic violence to enhance the quality of their relationships and diminish the risk of victimization for their partner in a relationship. Another important reason is that men are often affected by violence—if not directly, then indirectly. Men are often friends to victims of domestic violence, or sons, or brothers, or fathers. Many men can benefit from knowing how to

respond to loved ones who have suffered from domestic violence. Yet another reason is that men comprise about half of our society, and are simultaneously both contributors to, and influenced by, shifting cultural attitudes and beliefs. Male participants in these programs are subject to these attitudes and beliefs, as well as participate in perpetuating them. Therefore, by reaching this audience, perhaps the attitudes and beliefs of society can be shifted to be less condoning of violence against women.

Studies indicate that some groups of men are at an increased risk to perpetrate violence against women such as fraternities, athletes, and the military (Katz, 2006). These groups are highly masculinized because of their increased emphasis on traditionally “male” traits such as aggression, dominance, and physical strength in order to compete. These traits are commonly found throughout society, but are over-exaggerated in these groups of men because of the higher level of value attributed to these traits (2006). Unfortunately, asserting masculinity can often be linked to misogynistic attitudes towards women which, combined with a greater tendency to be aggressive and violence, equates with a greater likelihood of interpersonal and sexual violence.

Additionally, even if you have established a population or group that is at greater risk to commit violence such as fraternities or athletic groups, there is a problem of implementation. For instance, when I first began analyzing rape prevention rhetoric, I would occasionally converse with male friends and share my research. When I arrived to the part that suggested that all men and women should attend anti-violence programs because the message needed to reach potential perpetrators, I was scoffed at. I was surprised at the, at times, emotionally-violent reactions that my suggestions elicited.

After all, by suggesting that all men attend an anti-violence workshop, I was implicating that these men were also potential perpetrators. Even when targeting a high-risk group such as male athletes, the ability for these men to be receptive to these ideas was severely lessened because of their immediate and very negative reaction to being implicated for a sexual crime. I returned to the books, and to theorizing, ways to get around this conundrum.

Enter Sarah McMahon, Ph.D., professor and Associate Director of the Center on Violence Against Women and Children at Rutgers University. She introduced me to the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence and the tenets that it is founded on: the bystander intervention model. This model finds a back alley to sidestep the problem of accusing all men of being violent offenders, and instead, enlists their help in a community problem. By using this ideology to frame the problem and advertise the programming, more male participants are likely to engage with the subject. As a bonus, even the men who are potential perpetrators can be addressed, but without implicating that anyone is a perpetrator before a crime has been committed, thus alienating someone from being truly receptive to the information.

Bystander Intervention Approach

The bystander intervention approach was first premised on the murder of a young woman named Kitty Genovese who was stabbed to death in the middle of a New York City residential street surrounded by 38 people (Darley & Latane, 1968). This situation prompted a conversation about the motivation of people to respond and intervene at the scene of a crisis. Darley and Latane suggested that responsibility for intervention may

have been too diffuse with numerous people; each individual assured themselves that another person would intervene (1968). In a situation where only one bystander is present, intervention is more likely to happen. Multiple bystanders can often rationalize that someone else is already doing something and that an action taken by them would be redundant. Therefore, Darley and Latane hypothesized that the more bystanders present at a crisis scene, the less likely any one bystander would be to intervene.

To test these theories, Darley and Latane created a study in which students were made aware that another test subject was experiencing an epileptic seizure. The student knew that other participants were aware of the seizure as well, but could not see or talk to them to know if they were intervening. The variable of the study was the length that the student took to report the emergency. An independent variable was the number of people the participant thought to be in the group that knew of the seizure (1968). Fifty-nine female and thirteen male students participated in this study, solicited through required class participation for an Introductory Psychology course at New York University. Participants were led to believe that the study was regarding types of student personal problems. Students participated in the fake focus group session, using a communication system where those in the focus group could talk but not see the others. It was through this communication system that it was made aware to the students that one of the participants was having a seizure by mimicking the sounds of a seizure and explaining that they needed help because “I’m gonna die-er-er-I’m . . . gonna die-er-help-er-er-seizure-er [chokes, then quiet]” (1968, p. 379). While the microphone was on for one participant, all other microphones were deactivated so that only one person could speak at a time. Therefore, the person having the fake seizure was the only one audible to the

others, and the group participants had no way of speaking to one another or knowing if help was being made to the seizure victim. Students were in different-sized groups, to help determine if more bystanders equated with less reaction time to the incident. Results indicated that in the six-person groups, only sixty-two percent of participants reported the seizure within a six-minute time frame (1968). “More subjects from the two-person groups responded than from the three-person groups, and more from the three-person groups than from the six-person groups” (p. 380). The results indicated that Darley and Latane’s hypothesis was correct. The more bystanders, the less likely they are to respond to a crisis. Some of the participant’s reactions, such as nervousness, trembling, and sweating, indicated that the participants did not choose to *not* respond; but, rather, they were indecisive and conflicted. Darley and Latane suggest this indecision stems from not wanting to appear as an overreacting fool, while also feeling distress and guilt regarding the fake victim’s well-being. Gender had no discrepancy on reaction time, regardless of whether the subject was male or female, or whether the fake victim was a male or female voice.

Darley and Latane suggested that indecision was a primary factor when a bystander was needed to intervene. What would happen if bystanders felt equipped to make a decision, and knew the proper course of treatment for the situation? Would more bystanders be likely to intervene? The bystander intervention theory was then reviewed by Victoria Banyard when applied to other social problems. The bystander intervention approach has since been applied to crimes such as child abuse, adolescent bullying behavior, interpersonal violence, and assault. This model attempts to understand behavior of individuals and groups based on their interactions with others, and is based

on the assumption that how an event is interpreted by an individual is greatly influenced by an individual member's peers (Banyard, 2008). By extending this model to violence against women, the assumption is now that violence is a community problem, and that by inhibiting a culture that condones or approves of sexual assault, more bystanders will conduct "prosocial bystander intervention" and intervene in a sexist or violent situation. Bystanders can intervene with a variety of violent or sexist behaviors that range from correcting sexist attitudes or beliefs (correcting a peer when they make a sexist joke or comment, or refusing to use sexist language themselves), during the act of the sexual assault (intervening when witnessing an assault occurring), and after the assault has occurred (providing support to the victim, not engaging in victim-blame behavior, or speaking up for them). By addressing preventative means such as sexist behavior and language, it is argued that the environment will become less conducive to encouraging and condoning violence against women. Furthermore, when applying bystander intervention program models to violence prevention, studies have indicated that after leaving the program men have had positive changes in their attitudes such as a greater likelihood of believing a victim, offering emotional support to a victim, and refraining from sexist language and commentaries (Foubert and Perry, 2007).

Shotland and Straw (1976) performed a study in which the response of bystanders to a violent scene between a man and a woman was analyzed. An independent variable was the type of relationship between the abusive man and the abused woman. Subjects intervened less when the relationship between the victim and the abuser was more pronounced, such as when a staged argument preceded the violence, relegating the entire incident as a "lover's quarrel" that should not be intervened with (p. 990). A higher rate

of intervention was experienced for the abused women when they appeared or were thought to be strangers to the assailant. However most physical assaults incurred on women are perpetrated by someone intimate to the victim, creating a decrease in the likelihood of outside intervention..

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Shlien-Dellinger, Huss, and Kramer (2004) developed a study that examined the how the perpetrator-victim relationship influenced an onlooker. Seventy-three men and one-hundred and eight women were randomly selected from a mid-western college. Abusive depictions were shown on video and the participants were asked questions about the conflict observed in the video. Two different videos were used; the first featured psychological abuse of a husband swearing and yelling at his wife, the second featured the husband raising his fist ready to strike his wife. Written vignettes were also used that depicted two scenarios and depicted the wife as being married to a guest at dinner, and the host of the party inflicting the violence on the coworker's wife. Questions were asked regarding the culpability of the characters in the depiction. Men in the study increasingly gave more responsibility for the violence than did women. The results of this study indicate that the prior relationship between the victim and perpetrator has a direct correlation on how the conflict is perceived. Furthermore, the sex of the bystander influences how the situation will be read and whether the victim is deserving of intervention. However, contrary to Shotland and Shaw's study, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. found that the married victim was rated to be more psychologically-damaged by the experience than the acquaintance victim, suggesting that further contextual analysis should be made. It may suggest, as noted in the study, that society is better-informed than in the past. However, I would suggest that the married victim was viewed as being

more psychologically-damaged because when surveying the emotional hurt being inflicted from a stranger versus a loved, the hurt may have been expected to be greater when inflicted from someone the victim cared for. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. also suggests that the increase in rating may also have been rationalized in the bystander's mind as being an ongoing and frequent abuse that would result in more psychological harm because of its repeated use, rather than a one-time infliction from a stranger (2004).

In order to better pinpoint why bystanders do not intervene, Burn (2008) created a correlational study based on Latane and Darley's (1968) that would measure five barriers to bystander intervention during crisis situations. A total of 378 female and 200 male undergraduate students from sixty majors at a public California university were surveyed. A total of one-third of participants were first-year students, 24 percent were second-year, 20 percent were third-year, 16 percent were fourth-year, and eight percent were in their fifth-year or more. A total of 73 percent of the participants were white. Burn sought to prove whether some barriers were more likely than others, or had greater influence than others, and this information could then influence prevention programs that were premised on bystander intervention. These five barriers included: "failure to notice incident, failure to identify the situation as high-risk, failure to take responsibility for intervening, failure to intervene due to a skills deficit, and failure to intervene due to audience inhibition (p. 783). Measures also indicated how the participant rated the victim's "worthiness" such as sexual provocation or intoxication. Results of this study indicated that "failure to notice" was the first barrier to bystander intervention. This implies that educational efforts that alert people to the signs and warnings of potential crisis situations may improve bystander participation. The study also demonstrated that women were

more likely to intervene in a crisis situation than men, with the exception of the “failure to intervene due to a skill deficit” category. Burn proposes that these differences may be explained because women have an increased awareness of their sexual and physical assault risk (2008). Men in the study indicated that they would be more likely to intervene if they knew the perpetrator. Burns suggests that bystander intervention might be more successful when it emphasizes male and female “friendships” and using collectivist social identities such as “brotherhood” or “sisterhood” because of the greater affinity these associations create (p. 788).

Another related incident features a 15-year old girl that was unconscious when she was gang-raped at a party by four perpetrators in October 2002 with six bystanders present. When questioned about the crime, the bystanders indicated that they did not intervene because they would have been ridiculed by the others (Carlson, 2008). Carlson, in the article “I’d Rather Go Along and Be Considered a Man: Masculinity and Bystander Intervention” begs the question: what does masculinity have to with bystander intervention in crisis situations? Carlson uses the term crisis situation to mean an instance in which “violence is being directed toward another individual in the presence of an onlooker” (p. 3). And what are the dynamics between gender, power, and violence that influence bystanders? Carlson asked 20 young men between the ages of 18 and 19 who attended California State University, Chico (CSUC) about hypothetical situations that depicted crisis situations. Carlson reported that the majority of men reported that they did not want to appear weak in front of other men and that this was the primary motivation not to intervene in the hypothetical crisis situations. Carlson found several similar themes amidst the men’s responses such as men must not cry, men should be big

and powerful, men must fight, men must protect women, men should engage in heavy drinking, and that these men thought that they differed from their peers. A substantially dominant theme appeared repeatedly during the course of the interviews: men cannot be weak, seem weak or show weakness, because to be so would mean the man was a “pussy” (p. 7). Tying back to my discussion of how feminine and masculine traits are valued, Carlson found that feminine traits were the characteristics the men considered least masculine, such as crying, indecisiveness, compassion, and passivity. This study concluded that bystander behavior is intrinsically linked to how masculinity is constructed and maintained in society and provides incentive to examine how bystander behavior and masculinity influence each other.

The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence heavily employs bystander intervention theory. It is expected that by educating men about domestic and dating violence, as well as providing the tools in which to fight them, bystanders of domestic violence and of violent precursors will be prompted to take action, thus being a primary prevention means to end domestic violence.

Another great advantage to the bystander intervention model is the accessibility to men and women, potential victims, perpetrators, and bystanders, without casting blame or causing individuals to become alienated from the messages of the program. By utilizing a bystander intervention approach, it moves the focus away from merely perpetrator/victim dichotomies, and enhances the exchange of ideas for the community (Banyard & Moynihan, 2004). One of the difficulties in many prevention programs when they focus on potential perpetrator/victim education is that the audience is less likely to be receptive of the information, causing the program to lose some of its efficacy. The

bystander model seeks to dispel ambiguities that would have formerly prevented the bystander from intervening. By providing a platform that is accessible to people and educates them so they feel prepared to engage in action, the bystander intervention theory has a promising outlook in the field of primary violence prevention.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Why violence against women happens

When questioning why violence against women happens, the leading theories tend to point to behaviors and attitudes of the perpetrators. Overwhelmingly, violent incidents are perpetrated by men in 99 percent of incidents against both men and women, which include domestic violence, sexual assault, robberies, and other physical assaults such as burglaries and assault (Katz, 2006). Numerous theories are proposed to explain why violence is inflicted on women by men. In this paper I will outline the most notable theories. It is fundamental to understand why domestic violence occurs because it is only through this understanding that effective primary prevention strategies can be employed. Primary prevention programs must utilize an ideological basis on which to premise its goals. For example, if violence is caused by biological traits, it would not be useful to prevent violence through teaching methods if it has been shown that people are born violent. The theoretical framework should be used when developing and implementing a primary prevention program.

Most of these theories fall under two distinct categories: individual or societal. I will begin with the individual determinants—individual pathology, evolutionary, and physiological. Following, I will introduce the societally-determinant theories—social norms and patriarchal. Many of these theories, particularly of the latter group, are heavily interwoven.

Individual Psychopathology

Individual psychopathology attempts to understand how an individual's different skills, temperament, personality, childhood, experiences and physiology influence their behavior (Pagelow, 1984). This theory suggests that men who are violent have a type of "mental illness" or pathology that predisposes them to become an abuser. Another tenet of this theory is to examine characteristics that are patterned in both abuser and victims, to understand why certain people are violent or more apt to become victimized and what the similarities could mean for prevention. Focusing more on the individual, this theory deemphasizes violence as a social problem and maintains that the causal force in violence is on a case-by-case basis. Using this approach, primary prevention programs such as 100+ Men Against Violence would not be effective.

In support of this theory is research that correlates a high incidence of personality disorders, such as antisocial personality disorder, borderline personality disorder, and posttraumatic stress disorder with physical assault (Dutton et. al., 1994). Sexual offenders are often diagnosed with psychiatric or personality disorders as well (Prentky, 1990). However, a study conducted on the personalities of men in prison found that all prisoners, found no difference between men who had committed crimes of a sexual or violent natures compared to those who had not, thus pointing out that perhaps these personality traits or disorders may be more indicative of which men are caught, prosecuted, and jailed than the personalities of violent men. This assumption was made based on the idea that most men in prison have little to no education and come from a low-income background (Quinsey et al., 1980; Langevin, 1983; Crowell & Burgess, 1996).

This theory has since been expanded a great deal so that most researchers, psychologists, and social scientists look at all factors that contribute to a person's behavior ranging from the individual (micro-levels) to larger-scale environments (macro-level) (Pagelow, 1984). Using this, individual psychopathology is still employed when examining what risk factors are present for perpetrators and victims of violence.

Individual psychopathology is very narrow in its focus; it does not account for the wider cultural phenomenon that explains why violence against women happens in such large numbers and frequency. This theory suggests that violent men are mentally-ill outcasts of society; when, in fact, many violent men are functioning members of society. Other factors such as culture, learned behavior, and how society affects the behavior of people, such as gender norms and values.

Evolutionary Theory

The evolutionary perspective posits that behavior is derived from genetics and instincts passed down through the ancestral line and may cause an instinct to rape or commit violence against a woman (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). The premise of this theory is that violence is perpetrated in order to achieve paternity assurance, and to do so may require force or violence if a female partner is unwilling. This behavior would then spill over into a social relationship, as individuals and society has advanced and grown more complex, into forms of control in order to maintain a female as "property" in order to guarantee reproduction. In other words, because it is hardly appropriate in contemporary times to club a woman over the head and have sex with her (think cavemen depictions), modern men have developed, on a near-instinctual level, skills such as abuse

and control in order to maintain a relationship that will provide them with sexual opportunity and a chance to procreate. Thus, violent behavior is explained as a mechanism to ensure reproductive success (Walker, 2005). A supporting notion for this theory is that most violence perpetrated is committed by men, and that men are naturally more physically powerful than women, which may be explained by evolutionary theory.

In the evolutionary perspective, violence is not a learned behavior nor a societal problem and therefore cannot be addressed as such through prevention programs. Critics of this theory state that violence is subjective to cultural norms and gender expectations, which is supported by the idea that rates of violence and rape are different depending on the specific culture and context (2005). Evolutionary theory does not account for the instances in which rape is committed without reproduction as an end goal (e.g. condom usage, oral sex, no ejaculate, etc.) (2005). This theory has also used women's biology to preclude them from public institutions such as politics or sports, making feminists unfriendly to evolutionary theory.

Like other individual-determinant theories, the evolutionary perspective lacks a well-rounded look at contributing factors such as culture, institutions such as economics and politics, and gender norms. Additionally, most men are able to conduct their lives without feeling a need to control or otherwise terrorize and abuse women in their lives; thus, evolutionary theory does not account for this discrepancy. While most perpetrators are men, most men are not perpetrators—which means that most men are not affected by their evolutionary instincts and biology of their body that would induce violence, indicating that the evolutionary theory does not explain why violence against women persists.

Feminist/Patriarchy Theory

Social attitudes and values play a crucial role in how women are treated (Lorber 1994). Feminist theory posits that violence against women is the result of deep-rooted social traditions and norms in which men dominate the political, social, and economic realms (Brownmiller, 1975; Ellis, 1989). Women are considered unequal participants in these realms and are often relegated to be property of their male counterparts (Ellis, 1989). Thus, according to this theory, the reduction of these social, political, and economic inequalities would curb incidences of sexual assault and domestic/dating violence. Feminist theory also posits that race, class, and gender intersect, such that they are the mechanisms that distribute power and resources in society (Kimmel & Messner, 2004).

Feminist theory begins by examining women's social conditions of injustices, oppression, social control, and discrimination. Violence against women is, therefore, considered to be a product of the patriarchal system which privileges men at women's expense (Brownmiller, 1975; Gill, 2006). Patriarchy is defined as a "systematic form of domination and social control of women by men" (Dobash & Dobash, 1979, ix).

Feminist theory examines institutions such as education, politics, economics, and laws that enable men to stay in positions of power in society (Hunnicut, 2009). Though some of these institutions may seem unrelated to the topic of violence against women, often it is through these institutions that women suffer from violence. For example, when a batterer is apprehended by the criminal process, how he is handled depends on institutions that were created, and controlled, by men. If the institutions are male-dominated, they are not likely to represent or acknowledge women's rights or needs.

These institutions, because they are male-dominated, reflect the hegemonic norms and values that deprive women of their right to equality in these institutions, in society, and in relationships.

Men and women observe how society functions as they grow up, and learn through these observations what their role in society is (Lorber, 1994; Shaw & Lee, 2007). Therefore, men learn that they have power and privilege over women, and women learn that they are second-class citizens and not deserving of equal respect or rights. Characteristics are divided into two categories: male and female. Traditionally masculine traits such as aggression, strength, and leadership are highly regarded and rewarded by society; whereas, traditionally feminine traits are devalued such as compassion, nurture, and women are viewed as both physically and emotionally weak, as well as illogical and hysterical. Men are traditionally viewed as being more logical and fair (Shaw & Lee, 2007). Straus (1976) asserts that cultural norms that condone or encourage violence to be perpetrated against women are caused by compulsive masculinity in which it is a “requirement” of sorts for boys and men to prove their manliness by being disdainful of feminine attributes.

Feminist theory also supports the notion that messages about violence are transmitted through popular culture and affect cultural attitudes regarding women’s status, and may encourage violence against women, such as through music lyrics and videos, advertisements, magazines, movies, television programs, and video games (Katz, 2006). Our culture often rewards men for their aggression, dominance, and violent behavior, such as playing violent sports. Conversely, women’s sports tend to be more focused on teamwork or individual performance and exclude violent interactions with

opposite team members (Shaw & Lee, 2007). There are exceptions to this, such as rugby, basketball, and lacrosse in which women regularly take part of. However, the majority of female sports include volleyball, swimming, tennis, and track. Men are less likely to compete in these sports and are over-represented in more competitive, violent sports such as football and hockey. By encouraging violent behavior, society sends the message that violence is not only acceptable, but prized. An individual's self-worth is often derived from the expectations set forth by society for your ascribed role; therefore, men may highly value more masculine traits in their own character such as aggression, dominance, and violence and be more likely to engage violently with others, including women.

Because men dominate politically, socially, and economically, women have less resources to be able to leave an abusive situation. It is argued that violence against women may be lessened if women hold more positions of power and politics in society, have better- (equal-) paying jobs that would allocate them greater financial resources, and had greater recourse for crimes committed against their gender in criminal proceedings.

Criticism of this theory asserts that feminist theory relies too heavily on sociocultural factors and does not give enough credence to individual factors such as individual psychopathology attributes and child abuse that might predispose a person to commit violence (Eigenberg, 2001). Another criticism is that feminist theory, in relation to how it argues the cause of violence against women, does not take into account that only a small proportion of men commit violence, and that the vast majority have not and would not. My contention with this criticism is that violent behavior and misogynistic attitudes and values are on a continuum; those that commit violence are placed on one

extreme, and this explains why men with more misogynistic views will commit more violence than those who do not commit violence (Katz, 2006).

The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence program is a feminist-based program that is premised on this theory that cultural norms need to change in order for violence against women to be curtailed. The majority of violence prevention programs are based on feminist theory and try to acknowledge the cultural stereotypes or values that contribute to causing violence against women.

Social Norms Theory

The social norms theory does not deviate far from feminist theory; rather it branches off from it. Social norms theory is more gender-neutral; however, it can be viewed from a feminist lenses and used accordingly.

This theory has the premise that people act or behave according to the way they perceive others to act or behave (Perkins, 2003). People are then influenced by this perception of what others are doing or thinking and their behavior is changed accordingly. Unfortunately, this means that men may misperceive that their peers are misogynistic or that they condone and/or encourage violence against women. With this misperception, a confrontation against these types of behaviors, attitudes, and language that reflects these values is less likely and the misogyny and violence will persist in a continuous cycle.

Berkowitz (2005) performed a study on college student use of alcohol in 1989, positing that college students overestimate their peers' use of alcohol, and drink more accordingly. Berkowitz called this misperception a "false consensus" (p. 194). He states,

“the majority is silent because it thinks it is a minority and the minority is vocal because it believes that it represents the majority” (p 194). By providing college students with the accurate information regarding college student alcohol use, Berkowitz estimated that this cycle can be broken. These social norms programs have been utilized across the United States since 1989, and it is reported that they have a success rate of cutting down heavy drinking by twenty percent within one- to two years following initiating the program on a campus (2005).

Thus, the social norms theory posits that programs to correct misperceptions may be successful when attempting to create a healthier social norm. Berkowitz also suggests that this same theory applies to homophobic and sexist comments. If men were made aware that their peers were also uncomfortable with this type of language, they would be more likely to confront the language (2005). This theory has extended itself to sexism and sexual violence. The social norms theory has two implications for sexual and domestic violence: (1) men who witness violent acts and/or precursors to violent acts will be less likely to try to stop it, and (2) men will be influenced to consider violence against women “normal” and be more likely to perpetrate it.

Conceptualizations of Change

The following theoretical frameworks will be considered when examining how to address the problem of domestic violence: feminist, ecological, and social learning. Each of these frameworks is useful when considering why and how the training program 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence was developed, what its anticipated outcomes are, and for the discussion of the interview results.

Ecological Model

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1994) introduced the ecological model in the 1970s as a response to the limited type of research performed by developmental psychologists. This conceptual and operational framework has two propositions. The first implicates that human development is complex, static, and reciprocal between persons and other persons, objects, and symbols in its immediate environment. Some interactions occur on a fairly frequent basis. Bronfenbrenner coined these “proximal processes” and lists examples such as parent-child relationships and the school environment (1994, p. 38). The second proposition states that these influences may interact in a static and fluid fashion—“the form, power, content, and direction of the proximal processes effecting development vary systematically as a joint function of the characteristics of the developing person; of the environment—both immediate and more remote—in which the processes are taking place; and the nature of the developmental outcomes under consideration” (1994, p. 38). Another stronghold of the ecological model is recognizing microsystems and macrosystem, as well as the systems in between. Bronfenbrenner enlists the example of a set of Russian dolls in which each set beholds another set within.

The microsystem would be the smallest Russian doll of the set, from which smaller dolls cannot be extracted. Examples of microsystems include the family, school environment, friends, and work environment. The microsystem is

a pattern of activities, social roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given face-to-face setting with particular physical, social, and symbolic features that invite, permit, or inhibit engagement in sustained, progressively more complex interaction with, and activity in, the immediate environment (p. 39).

A mesosystem is the linkages taking place between two or more settings of the individual, such as the relationship between the home environment and the school environment, or the school and the work environment. In contrast, the exosystem comprises two or more settings, but one or more cannot include the individual and must reside from outside the individual. The setting that does not include the individual must indirectly influence processes within the immediate setting in which the individual resides. An example of this would be a child's home environment and their parent's workplace. The parent's workplace certainly influences the home environment, but the child does not belong to that setting (1994).

The macrosystem is an overarching umbrella that encompasses the meso-, micro-, and exosystems. Bronfenbrenner writes that it "consists of the overarching pattern of [the system's] characteristic of a given culture or subculture, with particular reference to the belief systems, bodies of knowledge, material resources, customs, life-styles, opportunity structures, hazards, and life course options that are embedded in each of these broader systems" (p. 40). He coins the macrosystem as a "societal blueprint" for a particular culture or subculture.

The systems and ecological perspective maintains that an individual is made up of social connections and relationships (Payne, 2005). It is derived from the biological theory that views all organisms as systems made up of subsystems, that are also part of super-systems. This theory allows for us to view individuals, and societal problems, in a context-specific manner in order to better examine and understand the multi-processes that make up the individual or the problem.

The ecological model is essential when understanding violence against women, and more specifically, the training program 100+ Men Against Violence, because of the multiple processes and levels that contribute to the societal problem of violence against women and to its resolution. Male perpetrators of violence are not “sick” or “deviant” individuals—rather, they are part of a more complex system that influences their individual behavior (Katz, 2006, 149).

Jackson Katz (2006) states:

... Men who rape are not simply a handful of “sick” or deviant individuals. They are instead the products of a culture that glorifies and sexualizes male power and dominance, and at the same time glorifies and sexualizes female subservience and submission. Rape must be understood not as an aberration in such a cultural environment but as simply the extreme end on a continuum of behaviors (p. 149).

The perpetrators of violence against women reflect within them the values, attitudes, and beliefs of our culture. As the ecological model suggests, we can therefore not only treat the perpetrators and individuals, but we must examine the entire macrosystem, as well as the encompassing exosystems, mesosystems, and microsystems, that comprise the problem of violence against women. If the cause of the problem happens on a number of levels, from the microsystem to the macrosystem, it should then be treated on all these levels. The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training program incorporates this theory by confronting male participants’ cultural values that make up the macrosystem and manifests itself in individual outcomes and behaviors. It is the hopes of the training program that the macrosystem can be altered so that violence against women is neither condoned nor encouraged by creating active bystanders that will engage with others when they witness violence or precursors to violence. Therefore, the

ecological model would indicate that bystander intervention models of trainings would be highly successful as a primary prevention program.

Social Learning Theory

The basic premise of this theory is that people learn mostly through their perceptions of experiences and relationships outside themselves. People observe the behavior and thoughts of those around them and learn what is acceptable and/or encouraged behavior for themselves. Encompassed in social learning theory is conditioning, which refers to the learning that occurs between an action and a stimulus. If a behavior is connected with a positive stimulus (e.g. rewards, praise, etc.), it reinforces that this was a good behavior. Similarly, if a behavior is connected with a negative stimulus (e.g. punishment, social derision, isolation, etc.) the person will negatively associate that behavior (Skinner, 1953).

The social learning theory, when applied to violence against women, indicates that violence is learned by a process of socialization. For instance, if an individual experiences violence during their childhood, they learn that violence is an appropriate behavior. This behavior is then carried over into their family when they have children. It is also suggested that individuals who have been abused during childhood will associate love with being abused (1953).

Albert Bandura (1977) explains that human behavior, according to social learning theory, is a “continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental determinants” and further states that “both people and their environments are reciprocal determinants of each other” (p. vii). He asserts that most human behavior

is learned observationally through modeling; this “coded information” is stored and becomes a guide for future behaviors (p. 22). When a man, especially a developmentally young man, views his peers degrading women—whether by jest, through words, or in action—this information is recorded and stored as a guide for future scripts of appropriate behavior.

Bandura (1978) further states that aggression is learned from three main sources: (1) culture, (2) primary relationships such as family and peers, and (3) the media. The media has played an increasing role because of its relative increase in popularity. The media portrays realistic displays of aggression; however, these displays of aggression are not met with customary social response or constraint that would be shown in real-life, ranging from police response to facial expressions of bystanders. The media also desensitizes viewers to violence through repeated exposure and teaches viewers to “rationalize” and “excuse personal responsibility” for acts of aggression (Bandura, 1978).

The media is another source that we learn and model appropriate behavior. Violent scenes in movies, television programs, commercials, pornography, and news broadcasts can desensitize viewers to the pain, fear, and humiliation associated with violence, as well as perpetuate rape myths (Ellis, 1989). By repeatedly viewing acts of violence towards women, violence becomes normalized. Patriarchy, gender ideology, and the normalization of violence against women are transmitted to viewers through depictions of society in the media and play a crucial role in men and women’s understanding of how to behave, and what is acceptable of others on how to behave (Katz, 2006).

If violence against women is normalized through social learning, it does not mean

that those who learn the behavior is acceptable will become rapists and batterers, but it does lead to a decrease in outrage at violent acts. This is where the notion of bystander intervention is increasingly important. If violence is not normalized, not condoned, not encouraged, and treated as a moral outrage in society, instances of violence against women will be considerably less. The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training programs seeks to disrupt former social learning that has instilled a normalization of violence in society and, in its stead, provide a new script in which to act. The training program incorporates the notion that social norms are learned and contribute to the cause of violence against women; by having a training program that attempts to change these social norms, the 100+ model should then be successful in reducing rates of domestic violence.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODS

Program: 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence

The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence was created to train men about domestic and dating violence, and how sexist behaviors, language, and attitudes can help foster a climate in which violence against women is condoned or encouraged. Through a collaboration between the Community Health Promotion Program (CHPP) from the Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital (RWJUH) and other community-based organizations, the New Brunswick Domestic Violence Awareness Coalition (NBDVAC) was formed. The mission of the NBDVAC is to promote healthy relationships to support individuals, families, and the needs of the community through advocacy and education and includes taking a stand against all types of violence. In 2005, the NBDVAC was allocated funds from the Healthier New Brunswick 2010 Core grant initiative. Part of these grants funds were used to develop the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence campaign. Other programs included in this grant and developed by the NBDVAC include training for clergy and health educators of the community; development of a domestic violence awareness theater project titled “Love Does Not Hurt/El Amor No Duele”; and a domestic violence protocol training for community-based organizations (Schwartz, 2008).

The recruitment campaign sought to enlist “100+” local male community leaders and residents in New Brunswick, New Jersey to become ambassadors of domestic violence in their places of employment, in their family, among their peers, and elsewhere

in the community. Four workshops were held throughout the community and there were a total of 48 participants. The training programs were approximately two hours long.

The first training program took place at New Brunswick High School for a sports program for teenage males titled “Play It Safe”. The second took place at the Suydam Street Reformed Church (SSRC). The third took place for Artists Mentoring Against Racism, Drugs and Violence (AMAR), a 5-week prevention program for kids 10-16 years old. The fourth, and final, workshop during this period took place at Rutgers University for male faculty, students, and staff of the university community.

In addition to the workshops, other forms of outreach were employed to reach additional people to become involved and increase their knowledge about domestic violence. Written pledges were distributed during the New Brunswick Domestic Violence Awareness Coalition March and Rally that was held in October 2008. Pledge participants agreed that they understood the following: that what they do and say can either encourage or discourage stereotypes that may contribute to violence against women; that domestic violence can happen to anyone regardless of class, race, or sexual orientation; that domestic violence can be prevented; that most offenders, overwhelmingly, are men; that men play a critical role in disrupting the cycle of abuse; that men should not take advantage of their social, economic, or physical power to hurt people they care for; to promise to take a stand and never commit, condone, accept, or remain silent about any type of violence against women; to challenge other men to do these same things; to challenge other men to realize that they do not need to take power away from others in order to be more powerful; and to encourage men to work with women as their allies, not enemies (Schwartz, 2008). These pledges were distributed at

the March and Rally, as well as other community events and via email. A total of 59 pledges were attained from participants who did not attend one of the four training programs (p. 8). A total of 117 community members were reached through this campaign through trainings or pledges; ten of these were anti-violence advocates in the community.

Training Curriculum

The training included general knowledge about domestic violence, how sexism and sexist attitudes affect violence against women, and how to become mentors and active bystanders in the community. The program was intended to teach participants about abusive behavior, and what to do when encountering violence in the community.

The training program varied slightly between the ones administered in the community of New Brunswick and the Rutgers University affiliates. The New Brunswick community training began with a group discussion of domestic violence and what it means to them. From there, the training facilitators provided information on domestic violence, including prevalence, types of abuse, and patterns of violence. Because the training in the New Brunswick community included Latino males, an “Immigrant Perspective” was provided when discussing why victims stay in abusive relationships. Culture, fear of deportation, lack of knowledge of support, and lack of job skills and/or employment authorization were all discussed in addition to other factors that inhibit victims from leaving, such as fear, dependency, family values, hope for change, and lack of support. Characteristics of a perpetrator and abusive behavior are discussed, and differences between assertive, aggressive, passive, and passive aggressive behavior is discussed with the training group. This exchange provided alternative ways to handle

confrontation that did not include violence, or an escalation of violence through aggressive or passive-aggressive behavior or statements. The training facilitators handed out scenarios for the group and had the men discuss what they thought they should do in these scenarios. This gave the men an opportunity to engage with the material, and to “practice” for real-life scenarios. Another aspect of the program was to teach the group of men how to be mentors for others, especially younger boys, such as listening techniques, being a role model, and discussing issues surrounding violence against women. The final segment of the program included asking participants to set personal goals for themselves.

The Rutgers University training began the same as the New Brunswick training with a discussion of what domestic violence is and several facts about it such as prevalence and types of abuse. The next part deviated by having the men perform an activity called “Gender Box” in which gender constructions are analyzed with a hands-on activity. After the activity, participants were invited to discuss how these constructions and expectations contribute to gender discrimination and violence against women. After conclusion of this discussion, the term “active bystander” was introduced via a film about the Men for an End program. The training participants were asked what they would do if they witnessed violence committed against a woman and what the corresponding answers meant to how society views women and domestic violence. The men were asked to discuss how their actions might be different if they became an active bystander. Tips were then offered that confronted sexist behavior and language, such as disrupting a friend’s misogynistic joke, challenging someone that is abusing their partner, and being supportive to someone experiencing abuse. Male participants were encouraged to

become mentors and to pay attention to the media, music, and other forms of popular culture that portray women in a negative fashion. The workshop was broken up into smaller groups and each group was given a particular scenario that depicts opportunities to engage as an active bystander, such as a victim-blaming statement after a news broadcast of a domestic abuse case, or sexist language, or witnessing a violent episode between family members. Participants are encouraged to brainstorm ways to effectively handle those scenarios as an active bystander. After conclusion of this group activity, the men are then asked to think of ways to become involved, and ways to stop violence against women, with a discussion of what the obstacles are and how to overcome them. Each participant is then asked to develop a personal goal to implement based on the training program.

At the closing of each workshop, for both New Brunswick and Rutgers University, men were invited to read and sign the pledge; an evaluation of the program was administered; T-shirts were distributed; and information was disseminated regarding an upcoming march/rally.

Sample

Sixteen men attended the Rutgers University 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training program in September 2008. Of these, eight men participated in the face-to-face interview nine- to eleven- months after. All interview participants were recruited directly from the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training program by requesting their contact information and consent to be contacted at a later date for an interview. Each of these men received an email in late spring of 2009 inviting them to

participate in a face-to-face interview; of which, eight men responded and participated in face-to-face interviews. One individual could only do an interview by telephone, and the transcript was unintelligible and thus ineligible to be used in data analysis. Therefore, seven participants' interviews were used for this study. The interviews lasted approximately one half-hour and were held at a place on Rutgers University. All the participants had affiliations with Rutgers University—students, faculty, or staff—which made Rutgers University a convenient place for the interviews to be conducted.

Face-to-face Interviews

Because of the exploratory nature of the program and evaluation, and due to the small sample size, structured interviews with open-ended questions were held with the participants that responded to an invitation to participate in a follow-up study. Interviews allowed for a closer examination into what information was retained from the training program, as well as closely examined participant feedback of the program. Other research methods, such as written questionnaires, would not have captured as much in-depth information. Having a live interviewer, that can ask further questions that have not been fully explained, or that holds particular interest to the research, offers a better researching tool for this type of evaluation. The interviewer can ask questions to further clarify points (Unrau, Gabor, & Grinnel, 2007).

The face-to-face interviews were only offered to the faculty, staff, and students who attended the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence training workshop at Rutgers University. The other three groups that attended the training did not receive a follow-up interview. The purpose of these interviews was to further evaluate how effective the

100+ Men program was; as well as to indicate how much long-term success the program would have. The goal was to research how much information was retained from the workshop; if any of the skills learned from the workshop had been employed since; if the training had had any impact on their life or the lives of others; and further suggestions and comments about the program. The interviews offered a more in-depth understanding of how much knowledge and sensitivity to the topic the participants had before the program, and how the program influenced their attitudes and behaviors afterwards. Future programs of 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence, or programs related, will benefit from these results.

Data Collection

Participants were given an informed consent sheet that outlined their rights as a research participant, including a confidentiality agreement, and consent to be audio-taped. Additionally, in case the interviews invoked emotional adversities, pamphlets for the Rutgers Department of Sexual Assault Services and Crime Victim Assistance were available, a department which provides free and confidential counseling to all Rutgers students, faculty, and staff.

Research participants were contacted by email about having the opportunity to take part in the interviews. The interviews were approximately thirty minutes to one hour in length and were audio recorded to be later transcribed by a Rutgers School of Social Work MSW student. Another MSW student at the Rutgers School of Social Work, and myself, a Master's student in the Rutgers Women's and Gender Studies Department, conducted the interviews. Many of the program participants were faculty, staff, or

students from the School of Social Work, so because the other interviewer was affiliated with the School of Social Work, those interviews were relegated to me to conduct. We performed most of the interviews at the Riverstede building on the College Avenue Campus of Rutgers University in one of the offices, with several others being conducted at the interviewee's place of employment on campus, or in an empty room at one of the campus' student centers.

I performed five interviews, and another Rutgers student from the MSW program performed three. Another MSW student transcribed the interviews, except for two that she recognized the participants' voices and ceased transcription immediately. I then transcribed these. The other interviewer and myself had read articles about how to conduct interviews, though neither of us received formal in-person training. We were both trained by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Rutgers University and received our Human Subject Research Certificate in order to conduct these interviews. The data collection was also approved by the IRB at Rutgers University.

Instruments

The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence evaluation is comprised of an open-ended set of interview questions. The research data is completely qualitative in nature; with no scales to measure outcomes (see Appendix 1 for the complete interview guide). The interview consisted of several different, but related, themes such as motivation to participate; utility of the program, opinions regarding men and domestic violence; how their life has been impacted by the program; if any skills from the program were used; how much information regarding active bystanders was retained; what some challenges

are to being an active bystander; how more men can become involved; and other general feedback regarding the program.

Analysis

For the analysis of the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence interviews, I looked for ways to enhance the program from the feedback provided from the interviews.

Because of the experimental nature of the training program and lack of comparative studies, an inductive analysis was used when interpreting the data from the seven male interview participants (Elo & Kyngas, 2007). This analysis was inductive because many of the ideas, concepts, and feedback in the interviews were not apparent before the analysis of the data was conducted. The data was also analyzed using conceptual and relational content analysis. Content analysis is a research tool that seeks concepts, thought-patterns or other distinguishable features that resonate throughout the material (Krippendorf, 2004). This analysis was used because it is useful when informing practical action, such as a training program like 100+ Men Against Violence, as well as providing insight to the researchers involved with the study (2004).

I used both preset and emergent categories when analyzing the narrative data. Preset categories refer to predetermined categories that are known in advance before reading the narrative texts; emergent are categories that are made present only when reading the text (Unrau, et al., 2007). For this analysis I utilized conceptual tools such as bystander intervention to look for patterns or other features, while also looking for other concepts that stood out. During the analysis I was particularly vigilant to notice if the participant had or had not remembered the term “active bystander”; used the term; and

accurately described the corresponding behaviors associated with the term. This information was especially important because the evaluation intended to capture how much information was retained over a long period of time. While not all the participant's responses could be included in this paper, I selected repeated themes that were apparent after reading the interview transcriptions, and also kept several themes in mind beforehand in order to take note of participant responses. These themes include if the participants used skills from the training, if the training had otherwise impacted their lives, how they viewed the utility of the training, and how they felt we could proceed in future trainings.

Themes

Specific themes that were measured by frequency include how many men were previously acquainted with the subject area of domestic violence; and if previously knowledgeable, if the participant felt that the information was useful for others; if the participant believed that men have a role in ending domestic violence; if they remembered what "bystander" was; if the training changed their views about violence against women; if the training reinforced previous thoughts about the subject; and if tools from the program were used. Contextual analysis was also used when surveying these themes in order to better evaluate the program.

Difficulties and Limitations

Because respondents may often provide answers that they expect the interviewer may desire (Unrau et al., 2007), I conducted the interviews with as little emotional affect as possible. As the questions were answered, I made no indication as to my agreement or

disapproval of their remarks through facial gestures or other physical clues. My intention for this was to have the most objective responses possible, unaffected by my response to their answers. My approach was that this interview was a gauge of the participant's retention of information, and to assess their opinions and values focusing on issues of violence against women and prevention, thus my opinion should not carry any weight during the interviews. If I had any opinions regarding the participant's responses, or if they had any questions regarding the training program but could not remember, I made it a point to voice these once the interview was officially over.

The other interviewer had a less strict interviewing style, with conversational pieces littered throughout the interviews that contained nuances of her opinion. Participant responses were frequently met with positive feedback. This limitation is important to consider because it adds a degree of difficulty when interpreting the results of the interviews in relation to the validity of the study. This highlights a great need to have interviewers that are similar in style when conducting interviews so that results do not differ in the same study.

Because my interviewing technique had less personal affect, the length of the interviews were shorter, and may have provided less information than the other interviewer's style had solicited. The conversational nature of the other interviewer increased the receptivity of the interview participant and allowed them to feel comfortable sharing more information, though the information may be biased and unreliable. Both of us would have benefited from receiving one-on-one instruction on interviewing styles and techniques in order to elicit more reliable and effective data results.

Another limitation was the proximity of the participants to the researchers. The other interviewer had a much more difficult time with this, and on one occasion could not complete an interview due to a professional relationship with the participant. Because I was from a different university department, I did not have this difficulty. However, one participant expressed his discomfort to me about anonymity for the interview. This participant felt that his voice would be recognized by the principal researcher of the project, because they were members of the same university department. In this case, I assured him that she would not be listening to the audiotapes and that it would be only be heard by myself, the other interviewer, or the transcriber.

Participation was difficult to obtain; no participants responded to my first email soliciting their involvement. An additional two or three rounds of emails finally resulted in some responses. Eight interviews were conducted; however, one participant's interview could not be used because it was conducted by phone and the responses were unintelligible on the audiotape. This was the only individual who performed the interview by phone, and with the added difficulty of obtaining signed consent forms, I would not want to rely on telephone interviews for the future. Additionally, face-to-face interviews provided for a much better rapport with the participant than that held with the telephone interview (Patton, 2002).

CHAPTER FIVE:

RESULTS

Overview

Research questions to be examined include how many men were knowledgeable about domestic violence before the program; how much information was new; how the participant viewed men's roles in the movement to end domestic violence; if the term "active bystander" was remembered; if and how the training had changed their views about women and violence; and if any tools were used in the nine months since the training program took place. These research questions will be considered under the following headings: (1) long-term efficacy to measure how much information and what type of information had been retained since the program took place; (2) bystander intervention in order to evaluate how the training had been used; and (3) attitudes about women and violence which will determine if the participant's views had changed because of the training.

Attitudes about Women and Violence

This section will address the general question of how the participant's views about women and violence have changed because of the program. This includes consideration of participant's prior knowledge of the topic area of domestic violence and if their current opinions differ from their pre-program thoughts of women and violence towards women.

Five out of the seven participants indicated that they did not learn new information regarding domestic violence because of their academic background;

however, of these five, four stated that despite this, they felt that other men would greatly benefit from learning this information. As one participant stated, “In general, I thought that it wasn’t too far from what I’ve already heard in class ‘cause it kind of reinforced what I heard.” Another said, “There were a lot of men there that it was apparent they had not been through a training of that sort. I had been through and was more familiar with some of the subject matter . . . so I thought it was a good training because as I watched those men and the discussion ensue, I thought that it was engaging and working well.” Another man answered, “For me I felt like a lot of it was a rehash because I had done some work in that field before so I didn’t feel like I picked up a lot of new information. However, I thought it was a useful training and I could see how it would be useful for someone that had never been exposed to literature related to domestic violence.”

Four of the men felt that their views about violence against women had changed because of the program. All seven participants, when asked what role men had in ending domestic violence, felt that men had a primary role. One participant stated that, “[men have] a primary role. . . . It’s a tough issue for men to obviously talk about or admit or be willing to be a part of, but from all the research that we’ve confirmed, men are the likely perpetrators of sexual and domestic violence so they are the key demographic in ending it.” Another said, “It’s like their responsibility—more so it’s their obligation to try to end domestic violence . . . the role of men is to really be supportive and to be able to talk about it and to be actively involved in confronting situations where they overhear inappropriate comments . . .”

When asked if the training had impacted their view of what men can do related to the issue of domestic violence, four men stated that their view had not changed because of the program. In all four instances the participants had previous knowledge or exposure to the issues from the workshop. As one participant stated, it “reinforced” his previous thoughts on domestic violence, women, and men’s role to stop it. Three participants felt that their views on domestic violence and men’s role to change it had been altered because of the program. When asked if their attention to the women in the media, or violence and policy and/or politics had increased, only one participant answered positively. The other six participants felt that their attention to these areas were the same as before the program.

Long-Term Efficacy and Attitudes About Active Bystanders

One of the primary reasons the interviews were held nine to ten months after participation in the 100+ Men training program was to evaluate how much information was retained by participants, and if the program had a lasting effect. By measuring this, aspects of the training program can be altered in order to emphasize different concepts and create a more successful long-term approach to ending violence against women for future training programs.

Three of the seven participants remembered the concept of “active bystander”. However, even though three of the seven remembered the term, all seven had enough recollection of the general concept of bystander intervention to be able to answer questions such as what men can do to end domestic violence and how the program could

be improved upon for future sessions. The concept of the active bystander was described in their responses.

For example, when asked what role men have in the movement to end domestic violence, one participant stated, “. . . you have to be active and having a voice and disapproving of anybody that might be perpetuating violence.” Another participant, when prompted about what he thought of the idea of the active bystander, said,

I've forgotten it in seven-plus months. . . I suppose it plays a role in any kind of violence and I think if you're actually witnessing a scene where you could be harmed stepping in, you have to think about those consequences, but just in the sense that if you hear somebody make an offhand remark, I think the easiest way and most purposeful way somebody could behave as an active bystander would be if it's in a group of men and friends and comments are made or behaviors manifest that you would then say, 'you know that's really not appropriate', but that takes a whole other level of self-confidence and faith in yourself to be able to do that because it's—from a male standpoint—when locker room talk starts—it's very hard to step back and disengage from it.

In the above commentary, the participant very clearly describes the actions of an active bystander, as all the male participants in the study do, without being very familiar with the technical term “active bystander”.

When asked what another participant thought of the term active bystander, this participant did remember, and had this to say:

You need to take a stand publicly or when you hear something or see something, do something about it. And that's the harder battle. It's easy I think for men to say, well of course I'm not gonna be sexually violent, but for them to say, hey that's not cool when someone makes a joke about it or even when they're—I work with college-aged students so for a college-aged male to go up when he sees a woman in a dangerous situation—to do something about it is a completely different thing so I think that's the most important people we're trying target with the information.

The concept of the active bystander, even though the actual term may not have been immediately remembered, was both retained and supported by all seven

participants. All seven participants felt that men had a primary role in the movement to end domestic violence and supported the idea of being an active bystander in order to end violence against women.

Intervention Behaviors

In addition to finding out how men's attitudes about bystander intervention were impacted by the training, questions were asked about men's actual bystander behaviors and whether they had the opportunity to intervene since the time of the training program.

Three of the seven participants stated that they had an opportunity to act as an active bystander since the training. While professions or university affiliations of the participants were not noted for the interviews, at times the participants made known their role at the university when discussing their use of the bystander intervention and workshop skills. The below participants, a person that works at Rutgers University with students, stated that they had opportunities to act as an active bystander "like on a regular basis". He states,

And those are the teachable moments that we have with our students who work for us every day. Whether you hear a man making an inappropriate comment—it's our obligation to step in, especially as a representative of Rutgers and a staff member to serve as role models to our staff. It's not personal—it's not that these students are ignorant—it's just that they don't know and they need to be educated about it and that's what I see my role as a student affairs professional, as an educator—to have a teachable moment with that student. So, yeah, those kind of things happen all the time.

Another participant stated of the active bystander tools, "I used the information they gave me and kind of like gave some people who were having at that point—living in violent relationships—and I told them about it, what I learned, and kind of used it to help out in that way."

Because part of being an engaged or active bystander is feeling equipped to act in a situation—by being able to identify and label the situation as a problem, and having the knowledge and practice to feel confident enough to act in the situation, or intervene—I also paid close attention to the participant’s confidence level to act in situations where bystander intervention tools from the training could be used. This information was provided throughout the interview, with many responses attributed to the question about the challenges men face to acting as an active bystander. Confidence to act in these situations was a primary challenge that participants acknowledged. The participants felt that the confidence was important, and some mentioned that the workshop could include more confidence-building tools such as role-playing and using more real-life scenarios.

One of the participants said, “I think that’s part of the anxiety that a lot of people have about confronting people is like if you do it in front of a group of people now you’ve not only almost embarrassed yourself but you’re also humiliating somebody else so there’s a lot of anxiety about that . . .”

In relation to anxiety and how to reduce this barrier to acting as an active bystander, another participant offered the following suggestion in reference to confidence-building that would empower more men to be active bystanders:

Maybe something that could be improved upon in the training as a suggestion is really to try to give strategies on how to be more positively confrontational in dealing with situations. So how do you kind of decrease your anxiety about confronting situations? Especially with people you’re close to—with your friends and family. I think maybe some more tips on doing that.

The concept of the active bystander, even though the actual term may not have been immediately remembered, was both retained and supported by all seven participants.

Five of the seven participants stated that they had used tools from the training program. Two participants had used the tools from the training in their professional lives, such as conversing with students; one participant discussed conversations he had with his daughter regarding violence and relationships; two other participants said that the training program had helped them know how to respond to a friend or family member in a violent relationship.

General Feedback

Four of the seven participants suggested that follow-up be conducted with the participants to keep the information of the training program fresh. One participant suggested this be done by sending an email with upcoming events that focus on violence prevention. One participant stated,

Every once in awhile, I find the certificate that I got that says I attended the training and I was like, oh yeah, I attended that training and then...what happened of it? What happened next? Is there follow-up? Is there more? It was just out of my head and I didn't know if there was anything additional going on, if there was a next step.

All seven participants felt that the program was worthwhile and should continue. One participant stated, "I really enjoyed it. It was a one-time experience for me. It was very well done. I liked the fact that there were people who know about domestic violence." Another said, "One aspect of it that I thought was very useful was the opportunity for men in the room to talk about their own experiences where they might have seen instances of conflict and gender-based conflict—conflict that might be shaped in some way by gender roles or expectations."

Yet another participant remarked that:

For me I felt like a lot of it was a rehash because I had done some work in that field before so I didn't feel like I picked up a lot of new information. However, I thought it was a useful training and I could see how it would be useful for someone that had never been experienced to literature related to domestic violence.

And another participant stated of the program, "It inspired me and I think that's what men need. They need to hear and see other men talking about these issues to really maybe start to make a connection that it's something they can actually assist with."

Overall, the training program was well-received. All seven participants felt that the program was useful and should be continued in the future.

Discussion

Part of this analysis will discuss how and if the training program met its original objectives. The objectives of the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence were to provide a basic overview of domestic violence and how to recognize abusive behavior; discuss sexist language and behavior and its relationship to promoting domestic violence; teach information about active bystanders and safe strategies to use when responding to abusive behavior; teach appropriate ways to assertively act against violence and behaviors that promote violence; and discuss ways for participants to become anti-violence mentors in their community (Final Grant Report, 2008).

Overall, I consider the program a great success. It was an experimental program and because of its participants it had mixed outcome results, with few men learning any new information. However, it is important to take into account the backgrounds of the audience; if this program had been administered to a different group—outside the walls of academia—a very different result may have occurred. This point is well-founded when considering participants who stated that the information from the workshop

reinforced their thoughts and views on violence against women—if the views were not preexisting, it would have been new knowledge to the men.

Though most participants did not remember the term “active bystander”, all seven participants did remember it enough to answer questions around the concept, such as inquiring about men’s role in ending domestic violence. In this case, the participant would describe how bystander intervention worked—just without using the term “bystander”. Because the point of this program was to empower men to intervene in situations that encourage or condone violence against women, the failure to remember this term is of little importance. It is more important that the men remember the actual tools and instances in which they should act, rather than what to refer to the intervention by a specific name. The intervention will still take place regardless of the knowledge retained of specific terms. The essential piece is remembering the concept behind it.

Most participants had prior knowledge of domestic violence before participating in the program; however, the program may have given the participants more empowerment, and thus, the impetus, to act in situations they may not have otherwise acted. I am critical of the quick responses men gave that indicated they did not have any changing relationships with friends, peers, family or personal relationships. I do not suspect the men have lied, however, participants may feel pressured to answer in a timely manner because of the more fast-paced nature of a face-to-face interview and this pressure may inhibit the reflection needed to truly recollect instances or changed relationships. Furthermore, these types of instances are most likely harder to remember, or to pay attention to so that it would be remembered later. These changes are most often subconscious and less overt.

Because bystander intervention highlights that people must feel empowered in order to respond in a crisis situation, more real-life skills, as suggested by participants, should be included in future programs. Role-playing various situations, such as responding to a friend who had experienced domestic violence, or confronting a friend who is committing domestic violence, should be conducted. Because many men voiced “anxiety” regarding social situations and bystander intervention, a greater emphasis could be placed on these situations where men may feel the social pressure to fit in with their peers and be less likely to speak up against sexist behaviors they witness.

The 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence had great success in teaching people how to be mentors for others; a few of the participants mentioned their profession as being involved with students and using the skills during their interactions with students. This highlights both the practicality and the success there can be when leaders in a community attend a workshop such as this. In future training programs, leaders of the community should be included so as to disperse the messages of the training program even further and have a more lasting effect on the community.

Because of the limitations discussed, most notably the self-selected participants that had prior knowledge of domestic violence, it was somewhat difficult to determine if the program was successful in meeting all of its objectives. If administered to a group with less knowledge of domestic violence, the information would surely have been new and thus a change in attitudes would hopefully occur after the program. However, there is also the consideration that the men involved in these interviews were already in tune with the message of the program, and others from different communities without the previous exposure may be less receptive to the program’s message. Because these

participants had previous knowledge, it is also difficult to determine the long-term efficacy. If the men were not already exposed to the messages of the program, and had received the messages of the program elsewhere—would the concepts of the program have been retained as readily? Perhaps participants with less knowledge would not remember the information as much as those who are exposed to information regarding domestic violence. However, contradicting this, one participant who did not have previous domestic violence experience of knowledge, explained to me about how he used some of the tools he learned from the workshop to assist a friend who was in a violent relationship.

This training program should be implemented in more communities. Because of the difficulty to obtain program participants, incentives should be offered in order to entice men. Ideally, all high school students and college freshmen should be required to attend training programs such as these. Unfortunately, the majority of men would not attend a training such as this unless provided incentive or otherwise required to attend. Those that do attend without incentive or requirement have previous interest in the training material, and these are the men that are less likely to change because of the program because their attitudes and cultural values were the factors that pushed them to attend in the first place.

Conclusion and Research Implications

So did the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence program work as a primary prevention program—changing cultural attitudes and beliefs? The results were mixed but can be easily explained. Many of the interview participants had prior knowledge of

domestic violence, so the pre- and post-knowledge base on the subject was not substantially different for many participants. However, the participants indicated that their current perspectives on the subject were reinforced. For a different sample population, the amount of information learned could be substantially larger. It is suggested that this training program be held in a non-academic community, and assessed with a similar interview guide in order to assess this information. It is important to note that populations without knowledge about domestic violence may also be more resistant to the central ideas and components of the training than participants who have been exposed to domestic violence information through their social circles, class, or by profession. This resistance may stem from differing cultural and educational backgrounds that may give more or less credence to issues of domestic violence. Racial and ethnic backgrounds, norms, and attitudes should be especially noted in future studies.

Even though many of the participants had already learned about domestic violence before coming to the program, the training was successful in empowering the men to act as active bystanders. To become engaged with a problem or crisis situation, it is important that an individual be able to identify the problem, and have a set of tools to use in the situation. The program did provide these tools, and many of the men felt able to use them in real-life situations. There were some suggestions about how to improve this feature, and these should be noted for future training sessions. This can be done by using role-playing, and more real-life scenarios—especially depicting male peers, friends, or colleagues talking or joking in a group setting—to enable men to thwart social pressures. It is often easier to deal with an instance of violence in the moment, or to help a friend after experiencing a violent event or relationship, but some men indicated that

the preliminary triggers to domestic violence—those that are found in our language, jokes, and culture—are often the most difficult to face. Men feel a social pressure to fit into the group and it is paramount that these skills be utilized for the program to be truly successful as a means of primary prevention. If the jokes and the language continue to be sexist, the cultural attitudes and beliefs surrounding violence against women have not changed very much, and incidents of violence against women will also, accordingly, not change.

An important consideration for any type of prevention program is the issue of measurement. How do we know if the program is really working? We can assess the attitudes of the participants of these programs and perhaps the rates of violence with the participants and the participants' partners. However, because the program's objective is to reach many more people than solely the participant by way of influencing peers, colleagues and friends through the active bystander intervention, a true measurement of the program's success is very difficult to capture. There are several options available to attempt to circumvent this problem; however, most are equipped with their own set of limitations. A training program such as 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence could be offered in a community to a small number of members, including community leaders, and then rates of violence in the community could be measured quantitatively by looking at police reports and complaints, working with domestic violence agencies in the community, and conducting interviews and focus groups with community members that did not participate in the training workshop. However, domestic violence attitudes and rates can be influenced by a variety of factors such as police involvement and fluctuations

in income and education levels, so that implicating a single training program may be problematic.

Another possibility may be to offer the program to men and assess both their attitudes and their social and professional circles over time. This type of study would be very timely and costly, and would perhaps prove to be too difficult to trace back what information was learned from where, and what cultural attitudes caused others to change like a domino effect.

A tremendous amount of information could be captured if the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence were administered to a large contained population such as a university. If each incoming freshmen were mandated to attend the training that would ensure that everyone had received the same type of information. Rates of domestic violence could then be measured before and after the program, including several years after the program, and determine if the program had any effect on the population of students.

Because most people do not attend these types of programs unless they have a pre-existing interest or awareness of the subject, the participants may need to be required to attend the program, or be offered an incentive such as a gift card. Unfortunately, as seen in the interviews discussed in this paper, the results of the interviews are harder to assess because the participants only attended because they had an interest in the topic. Having an interest is great, not to say that it is not, but this pre-existing interest does bias the receptivity of the participant to be more susceptible to agreeing with the training program information.

Further research is sorely needed in this area concerning bystander intervention, its efficacy, and the barriers to performing bystander intervention by individuals. This research indicates that bystander intervention was well-received program by the participants but that some barriers exist that prevent the model from being employed. Many participants discussed anxiety as being a tremendous barrier to bystander intervention, and this area should be explored further in future studies in order to assess how to best alleviate anxiety in social circumstances.

Bystander intervention offers a unique way to use community efforts in order to inhibit incidents of violence against women. By using this primary mean of prevention, cultural attitudes and values can be shifted that will condemn violence against women and cause its prevalence to decline. Programs such as the 100+ Men Against Domestic Violence are essential in order to change these cultural norms. Even in its preliminary and experimental stages, the training program shows great promise in being able to make these changes.

APPENDIX I**100+ MEN AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVIEW GUIDE**

1. What motivated you to participate in the 100+ Men Training in September?

2. What did you think of the training- what was useful, what wasn't?

3. What role do you believe that men have in the movement to end domestic violence?
 - a. What do you think about the idea of "active bystanders?"
 - b. Did the training impact your view of what men can do related to the issue of domestic violence?

4. Since the training, have you had any opportunities to act as an active bystander?
 - If YES, please describe the situation(s)
 - a. How did you react? Why? What was challenging? What worked?
 - b. Did you use any skills from the training?

5. Since the training, has any of the following changed for you, and if so, please describe:

- a. Conversations with co-workers about violence against women? Friends?
Family members?
 - b. Your own personal relationships?
 - c. Your attention to the media and its portrayal of women, gender, violence?
 - d. Your attention or involvement on issues of violence against women within
any organizations you belong to?
 - e. Your attention or involvement with laws/policies related to violence against
women?
6. What do you believe are the challenges to acting as an active bystander?
 7. What support, if any, would be useful in encouraging men from the training to
continue to act as engaged bystanders? Are there future training sessions that
would be useful?
 8. How do you believe that can we involve more men in the movement?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, F., & Throsby, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Gender and interpersonal violence: Language, action, and representation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ball, B., Kerig, P. K., & Rosenbluth, B. (2009). "Like a family but better because you can actually trust each other": The "expect respect dating violence prevention program for at-risk youth". *Health Promotion Practice, 10*, 45.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1), 61.
- Banyard, V.L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Journal of Violence and Victims, 23* (1), 83.
- Barnett, O.W., Miller-Perrin, C. & Perrin, R. (2005). *Family violence across the lifespan*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Bergen, R. K., Edleson, J. L., & Renzetti, C. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Violence against women*. Boston: Pearson.
- Berkowitz, L. & Macauley, J. (1970). *Altruism and helping behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2005). Chapter 13: An overview of the social norms approach. In L. C. Lederman, & L. P. Stewart (Eds.), *Changing the culture of college drinking* (pp. 193). Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *International Encyclopedia of Education, 3*, 37.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Brush, L. D. (2004). Battering and the poverty trap. *Journal of Poverty, 8*(3), 23.
- Bryant, S.A. & Spencer, G.A. University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18* (6), 369.

- Burgess, A., & Crowell, N. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779.
- Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered A man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 16*(1), 3.
- Collins, P.H. (2000). *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.
- Cornelius, T. L., Sullivan, K. T., Alexander, F., Wyngarden, N., & Milliken, J. C. (2009). Participation in prevention programs for dating violence: Beliefs about relationship violence and intention to participate. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 1057.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (Eds.). (1998). *Rethinking violence against women*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Drisko, J. W. (2005). Writing up qualitative research. *The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 86*(4), 589.
- Dutton, M. A., & Goodman, L. A. (2005). Coercion in intimate partner violence: Toward a new conceptualization. *Sex Roles, 52*(11/12), 743.
- Eigenberg, H. M. (Ed.). (2001). *Women battering in the united states: Till death do us part*. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland.
- Ellis, L. (1989). *Theories of rape: Inquiries into the causes of sexual aggression*. New York: Hemisphere Publishing.
- Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (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.
- FBI Supplementary Homicide Report. (1999). Retrieved September 1, 2009, from Bureau of Justice Statistics. Website: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/homicide/teens.htm>
- Felson, R. B. (2008). The legal consequences of intimate partner violence for men and women. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*, 639.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Arriaga, X. B., Helms, R. W., Koch, G. G., & Linder, G. F. (1998). An evaluation of safe dates, an adolescent dating violence prevention program. *American Journal of Public Health, 88*(1), 45.

- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Ennett, S. T., Linder, F., Benefield, T., & Suchindran, C. (2004). Assessing the long-term effects of the safe dates program and a booster in preventing and reducing adolescent dating violence victimization and perpetration. *American Journal of Public Health, 4*, 84.
- Foubert, J.D., & Perry, B.C. (2007). Creating lasting attitude and behavior changes in fraternity members and male student athletes: The qualitative impact of an empathy-based rape prevention program. *Violence Against Women, 13* (1), 70.
- Fugate, M., Landis, L., riordan, K., Naureckas, S., & Engel, B. (2005). Barriers to domestic violence help seeking: Implications for intervention. *Violence Against Women, 11*, 290.
- Gage, E. A. (2008). Gender attitudes and sexual behaviors: Comparing center and marginal athletes and nonathletes in a collegiate Setting. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 1014.
- Germain, C. B., & Bloom, M. (1999). *Human behavior in the social environment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gill, C. (2006). *Understanding theories and their links to intervention strategies*. Toronto, Canada: Cormorant Books.
- Gillum, T.L. (2008). Community response and needs of African-American female survivors of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(1), 39.
- Giustina, J. D. (2008). Violence against women in intimate partner relationships: Community, responsibility, community justice. *Contemporary Justice Review, 11*(4), 351.
- Hague, G., & Malos, E. (1993). *Domestic violence: Action for change*. Cheltenham: New Clarion Press.
- Hampton, M. R., Gerrard, N., & Butala, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Intimate partner violence: Reflections on experience, theory, and policy*. Ontario, Canada: Comorant.
- Hancock, T. (2006). Addressing wife abuse in mexican immigrant couples: Challenges for family social workers. *Journal of Family Social Work, 10*(3), 31.
- Harvey, A., Garcia-Moreno, C., & Butchart, A. (2008). Primary prevention of intimate-partner violence and sexual violence: Background paper for WHO expert meeting May 2–3, 2007. World Health Organization.
- Hickman, L. J., Jaycox, L. H., & Aronoff, J. (2004). Dating violence among adolescents: Prevalence, gender distribution, and prevention program effectiveness. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 5*, 123.

- Hunnicut, G. (2009). Varieties of patriarchy and violence against women: Resurrecting "patriarchy" as a theoretical tool. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 553.
- Intimate partner violence: The need for primary prevention in the community.(2002). *Annals of Internal Medicine, 136*(8), 637.
- Jasinski, J. L. (2001). *Theoretical explanations for violence against women*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Jones, L., Hughes, M., & Unterstaller, U. (2001). Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in victims of domestic violence: A review of the research. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 2*, 99.
- Jordan, C. E., Wilcox, P., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). Stalking acknowledgement and reporting among college women experiencing intrusive behaviors: Implications for the emergence of a "classic stalking case". *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*, 556.
- Kass-Bartelmes, B. L., & Rutgerford, M. K. (2004). Women and domestic violence programs and tools that improve care for victims. *Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: Research in Action, 15*(Pub. No. 04-0055)
- Katz, J. (2006). *The macho paradox*. Naperville, Illinois: Sourcebooks.
- Kimmel, M. S., & Messner, M.A. (2004). Eds. *Men's Lives*. New York: MacMillan.
- Klaw, E. & Ampuero, M.C. (2007). From "No means No" to Community Change: The Impact of University Based Service-Learning Related to Intimate Violence Prevention. San Jose University Psychology Department.
- Kramer, V. L., Huss, M. T., Shlien-Dellinger, R. K., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2004). Attributions about perpetrators and victims of interpersonal abuse: Results from an analogue study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 484.
- Krippendorf, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Kurz, D. (1997). Violence against women or family violence? current debates and future directions. In L. O'Toole, & J. Schiffman (Eds.), *Gender violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 443). New York: New York University Press.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Shlien-Dellinger, R.K., Huss, M.T., & Kramer, V.T. (2004). Attributions about perpetrators and victims of interpersonal abuse: Results from an analogue study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 284.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*(4), 377.

- Leidig, M. W. (1992). The continuum of violence against women: Psychological and physical consequences. *College Health, 40*, 149.
- Lenore, L. E. (Ed.). (2009). *Battered woman syndrome* (3rd ed.). New York: Springer Publishing.
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of Gender*. Binghamton, New York: Vail-Ballou Press.
- Loue, S. (2001). *Intimate partner violence: Societal, medical, legal, and individual responses*. New York: Plenum Publishers.
- Macaulay, J., & Berkowitz, L. (Eds.). (1970). *Altruism and helping behavior*. New York and London: Academic Press.
- Macy, R. J., Nurius, P. S., Kernic, M. A., & Holt, V. L. (2005). Battered women's profiles associated with service help-seeking efforts: Illuminating opportunities for intervention. *Social Work Research, 29*(3), 137.
- Martin, S. L., Coyne-Beasley, T., Hoehn, M., Matthew, M., Runyan, C. W., Orton, S., & Royster, L. (2009). Primary prevention of violence against women: Training needs of violence practitioners. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 44.
- McPhail, B. A., Busch, N. B., Kulkarni, S., & Rice, G. (2007). An integrative feminist model: The evolving feminist perspective on intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 13*(8), 817.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Miller, C. E., & Mullins, B. K. (2002). Lifelong learning to reduce domestic violence. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 21*(5), 474.
- Nabi, R. L., & Horner, J. R. (2001). Victims with voices: How abused women conceptualize the problem of spousal abuse and implications for intervention and prevention. *Journal of Family Violence, 16*(3), 237.
- New Brunswick Domestic Violence Awareness Coalition, Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital Community Health Promotion Program, The Rutgers Community Health Foundation. (2008). *100+ men against domestic violence brochure*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Oak, E. (2009). *Social work and social perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Keefe, M. (2005). *Teen dating violence: A review of risk factors and prevention efforts*. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.

- Pagelow, M. D. (1984). *Family violence*. New York: Praeger.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Payne, B. K. (2008). Challenges responding to sexual violence: Differences between college campuses and communities. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 224.
- Payne, M. (2005). *Modern social work theory* (3rd ed.). Chicago, Illinois: Lyceum Books.
- Perkins, H. W. (Ed.). (2003). *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
- Pleck, E. (1987). *Domestic tyranny: The making of social policy against family violence from colonial times to the present*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Public Law. Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.nnedv.org/policy/issues/vawa.html> on September 1, 2009.
- Raj, A. & Silverman, J. (2002). Violence against immigrant women. *Violence Against Women*, 8 (3), 367.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (1993). *Research methods for social work*. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (2008). Interpersonal violence against women: The role of men. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 24(2), 178.
- Schwartz, R. (2008). *Final evaluation report for the domestic violence has no place in our community: New Brunswick domestic violence awareness project grant*. New Jersey.
- Shaw, S. M., & Lee, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Women's voices, feminist visions* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Shepard, M. F., & Campbell, J. A. (1992). The abusive behavior inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(3), 291.
- Shotland, R. L., & Straw, M. K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(5), 990.
- Skinner, B.F. (1953). *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.

- Simons, R. L., Kuei, -, L., & Gordon, L. C. (1998). Socialization in the family of origin and male dating violence: A prospective study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60(2), 467.
- Smith, S. W., Atkin, C. K., Martell, D., Allen, R., & Hembroff, L. (2006). A social judgment theory approach to conducting formative research in a social norms campaign. *Communication Theory*, 16, 141.
- Stahly, G. B. (Ed.). (2007). *Gender, identity, equity, and violence*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1988). *Intimate violence*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1990). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the american family*. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Sugarman, A. (Ed.). (1994). *Victims of abuse: The emotional impact of child and adult trauma*. Madison, Connecticut: International University Press.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (November 2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women* No. NCJ 183781) National Violence Against Women Survey; National Institute of Justice; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Tolman, R. M., & Raphael, J. (2000). A review of research on welfare and domestic violence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(4), 655.
- Unrau, Y. A., Gabor, P. A., & Grinnell, R. M. (2007). *Evaluation in social work* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, H. M., & Shinn, M. R. (2002). Structuring school-based intervention to achieve integrated primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention goals for safe and effective schools. *Interventions for academic and behavior problems* (pp. 1)
- Walker, L.E. (2009). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Wantland, R. A. (2008). Our brotherhood and your sister: Building anti-rape community in the fraternity. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*, 36, 57.
- Wilt, S., & Olson, S. (1996). Prevalence of domestic violence in the united states. *JAMWA*, 51(3), 77.
- Yoshioka, M. R., Gilbert, L., El-Bassel, N., & Baig-Amin, M. (2003). Social support and disclosure of abuse: Comparing south asian, african-american, and hispanic battered women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(3), 171.