

Challenging masculinities: A program analysis of male-based university sexual violence  
prevention programs

by

LORA K. MCGRAW

B.A., Kansas State University, 2013

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work  
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

2017

Approved by:

Major Professor  
Dr. Nadia Shapkina

# **Copyright**

LORA K. MCGRAW

2017

## **Abstract**

This study examines male-based sexual violence prevention programs on college campuses. In an effort to combat the widespread problem of sexual violence against college women, universities have implemented sexual assault prevention programs. While past programs have focused on risk-reduction strategies that target women, new programs are beginning to focus on approaching men to challenge hegemonic masculinity and gender social norms that are conducive to sexual violence. Thus far, the methods of these programs have not been studied in detail. This study uses interviews, observation, and document analysis to analyze the methods and messages of male-based sexual violence prevention programs at six universities in the United States. The research describes and analyzes the origins, goals, structures, strategies, success, and challenges of these programs. Their strengths and limitations are discussed, and suggestions and considerations for the programs are provided. As male-based violence prevention programs become more popular on college campuses, this research offers a deeper understanding of these programs that may inform and improve the effort to combat violence against college women.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	vi
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study and Research Objectives.....	3
Chapter 2 - Literature Review.....	4
Feminist Theory and “Doing” Gender.....	4
Hegemonic Masculinity and Sexual Violence Against Women.....	7
Male-focused Rape Prevention Programs.....	10
Chapter 3 - Data and Methods.....	14
Overview of Methods.....	14
Sampling.....	15
Data Collection.....	16
Data Analysis.....	18
Chapter 4 - Findings.....	19
Program Origins.....	19
Identifying the problem.....	20
Framing the problem.....	23
Program Goals.....	23
Challenging masculinity and gender inequality.....	24
Empowering men to lead and intervene.....	25
Program Structures.....	26
Peer education programs.....	26
Dialogue groups.....	31
Strategies and Messages.....	35
Deconstructing masculinity.....	36
Reconstructing masculinity.....	44
Success and Challenges.....	49
Success.....	50
Threat of decline.....	51

Backlash.....	53
Navigating challenges.....	56
Summary.....	56
Chapter 5 - Analysis.....	58
Undoing/Redoing Gender.....	58
Strengths and Limitations.....	60
Gender consciousness.....	60
Structural considerations.....	62
Accountability and intervention.....	63
Challenging the gender social structure.....	64
Men as allies.....	66
Summary.....	68
Chapter 6 - Conclusions.....	69
References.....	72
Appendix A – Interview Guide.....	78
Appendix B - Program and Respondent Information.....	79

## **Acknowledgements**

First, I would like to offer my gratitude to my Major Professor, Dr. Nadia Shapkina. I truly appreciate your willingness to be my mentor and your dedication to guiding me in finishing this project. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Spencer Wood and Dr. Chardie Baird, for their valuable input and guidance throughout my time in the master's program. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for all of their encouragement, support, and patience during my journey in graduate school and throughout the process of completing this thesis. I could not have completed this without your support and am eternally grateful for all of you.

## Chapter 1 - Introduction

In the United States today, sexual violence against women is a widespread and alarming problem. Nationally representative surveys have found that approximately one in five females will be sexually assaulted at some point during her lifetime (Saucier, Strain, Hockett & McManus, 2015; National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2015). The prevalence of sexual violence is astonishing, and while men are certainly victims of sexual violence with one in seventy-one being victims of rape, sexual violence is a crime that is largely perpetrated by males against females (National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2015). A study by Tjaden and Thoennes (2000), for example, found that 85.8% of rape victims are female, and 99.6% of those victims have a male perpetrator. Similarly, a more recent study by the U.S. Department of Justice (2013) found that 91% of all rape or sexual assault victims are women. The widespread perpetration and overall acceptance of sexual violence against women has resulted in the classification of the United States as a “rape culture” (Sanday, 1981; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002). Sexual violence is one of the most underreported crimes, and of those that are reported, only 2% result in a felony conviction (RAINN, 2009). This impunity condones sexual violence against women and, with its prevalence and acceptance, has created an environment that normalizes its perpetration (Saucier et al., 2015).

While sexual violence and rape culture affect the entire U.S. population, the problem is magnified on college campuses. Campus sexual assault has recently gained national attention as scandals and reports of universities mishandling sexual assault cases have surfaced across the country. Duke University, Baylor University, Kansas State University, and the University of Kansas are examples of universities that are currently being sued by sexual assault survivors for failing to take appropriate action in response to their rape allegations. These cases point to the

pervasive problem of the sexual assault of college women. Studies have shown that the rate of victimization is higher among college women than in the general population in that 23.1%, or nearly one in four, of female undergraduate students are victims of “sexual assault and sexual misconduct due to physical force, threats of physical force, or incapacitation” at some point during their college careers (Cantor, Fisher, Chibnall, Bruce, Townsend, Thomas & Hyunshik, 2015, p. 1). Others suggest that this statistic is even higher with estimates ranging from 25% to 33% of U.S. college women being victimized (Stephens & Eaton, 2014). Furthermore, these statistics are supported by studies showing that “20% to 69% of college men admit to using various forms of coercion to obtain sexual intercourse with an unwilling woman” (Stephens & Eaton, 2014, p. 387). This rate of victimization makes college women a high-risk population for sexual violence.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The prevalence of sexual violence against college women has led scholars, university administrators, and politicians to attempt to explain and address the issue. Scholars developed a large body of literature that establishes a link between hegemonic masculinity, or the traditional “male role” (e.g., toughness), and sexual violence against women (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Connell, 2002). This knowledge is beginning to inform the rape prevention programs that universities have implemented to reduce sexual assault. While previously focused on risk-reduction strategies that targeted women, university anti-rape programs are beginning to change their focus (Stewart, 2014). Because men are the primary perpetrators of sexual assault and “contributors to a culture of hegemonic masculinity that supports sexual violence,” it is argued that programs should shift their attention away from teaching women how to protect themselves to reaching out to men to stop rape (Stewart, 2014, p. 481). As a result, all-male anti-sexual

violence programs are being created, and their main goals are to address the gender social norms that are conducive to rape-supportive attitudes and rape perpetration. Furthermore, some programs attempt to create what they describe as a “new” form of masculinity to reduce sexual violence against women. The success of these programs, however, is limited, and it is unclear how they go about addressing the problem (Stewart, 2014; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Gidycz et al., 2011).

### **Purpose of the Study and Research Objectives**

The purpose of this study is to explore and analyze sexual violence prevention programs that target college men. These programs are currently still new, and the literature has not yet examined these programs in detail. Some studies have assessed their efficacy in terms of their effect on participants’ acceptance of rape myths (Stewart, 2014; Foubert & Marriott, 1997) and self-reported sexual aggression (Gidycz et al., 2011), but few have analyzed the actual methods and messages used in the programs. The goal of many of these programs is to challenge hegemonic masculinity and oppressive gender social norms that are thought to increase the likelihood of sexual violence against women. How and if these programs achieve this, however, is ambiguous. It is beyond the scope of this project to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs and to determine if the programs are achieving their goals. Instead, the purpose of this study is to answer the “how” question by exploring the programs and analyzing them by applying gender theory to better understand what they are doing, identify their strengths and limitations, and provide suggestions for how they can improve their methods. As such, the study seeks to answer the following questions: How do these programs go about challenging hegemonic masculinity and gender inequality, and how do they ask men to “do” gender differently?

## Chapter 2 - Literature Review

A feminist theoretical approach was utilized in this study. In this section, I outline the perspective of feminist theory on sexual violence against women and how gender is socially produced as we “do” gender in our everyday interactions. I then provide a definition of hegemonic masculinity and outline the literature that demonstrates a link between hegemonic masculinity and violence against women. Finally, this section concludes with a discussion of the previous literature on male-based violence prevention programs that sets the foundation for this study.

### Feminist Theory and “Doing” Gender

Feminist theorists posit that sexual violence against women is the result of the patriarchal gender social structure in which men are dominant, and women are subordinate. As Martha Burt (1980) suggests, “rape is the logical and psychological extension of a dominant-submissive, competitive, sex-role stereotyped culture” (p. 229). In contrast to theories promoted by some psychologists that suggest that sexual violence against women is the result of *individual* pathology, feminist sociologists argue that it is a systematic phenomenon that is the product of the social construction of gender and unequal gender power relations. The feminist perspective examines the *structural* aspects of sexual violence against women and is becoming the dominant perspective in explaining rape and sexual assault (Yodanis, 2004).

According to feminist theory, violence against women is a product of gender inequality at the structural level in that “the more unequal women are compared to men in a society, the more likely men are to be violent toward women” (Yodanis, 2004). In an ethnographic study of tribal societies, Peggy Reeves Sanday (1996) described the concept of “rape-free” versus “rape-prone” societies. She defined a “rape-prone” society as one in which “the incidence of rape is reported

by observers to be high, or rape is excused as a ceremonial expression of masculinity, or rape is an act by which men are allowed to punish or threaten women” (Sanday, 1996, p. 429). “Rape-free” societies were those in which rape was infrequent and was “socially disapproved and punished severely” (Sanday, 1996, p. 429). Because of the pervasiveness and acceptance of rape in the U.S. today, it is classified as a “rape-prone” society.

Rape-prone societies are characterized by gender inequality in which women are subordinate to men. According to Sanday’s study, in rape-prone societies “the genders were more segregated, and rates of interpersonal violence were higher” than they were in rape-free societies (cited in Murnen, Wright & Kaluzny, 2002, p. 360). Women had lower status, and there was a widely held belief in the inferiority of women (Murnen et al., 2002). Within these societies, women are treated as objects that are controlled by men while men struggle to maintain their dominance in the gender hierarchy and attempt to prove their manhood (Sanday, 1996). According to Sanday (1996), “sexual violence is one of the ways in which men remind themselves that they are superior...as such, rape is part of a broader struggle for control” (p. 430). Rape-free societies tend to be more egalitarian, thus eliminating the need for men to establish their dominance and control.

In patriarchy, then, men are dominant over women and oppress them on structural levels. A crucial component of feminist theory that is important to our understanding of patriarchy is how gender is socially constructed and how it maintains these power relations. How do we decide what a “man” is, what a “woman” is, and how they should behave? Feminists theorize that gender is a social construction in that it is not inherent or biological (Kimmel, 2000). Instead, it is how we are expected to behave based on our sex. This concept is reflected in what Candace West and Don Zimmerman (1987) describe as “doing” gender. “Doing” gender is a

widely accepted concept in feminist sociology that suggests that “gender is not what we are but something that we do” (Risman, 1998, p. 22). West and Zimmerman (1987) suggest that gender is a social product that is created and recreated through *social interactions* (p. 129). They argue that gender is “exhibited or portrayed through social interaction, and thus be seen as ‘natural,’ while it is being produced as a socially organized achievement” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 129). Once assigned to a sex category, one is held accountable for behaving as how people in that sex category are expected to behave (e.g., male-bodied individuals must act like men) (Risman, 1998). That person must perform gender to fulfill others’ expectations, and this is seen as “natural” rather than socially created and enforced (Risman, 1998).

Doing gender requires the construction of differences between men and women that are not essential or biological (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Instead, these differences are shaped by power and male domination (Kimmel, 2000). According to Kimmel (2000), the unequal power distribution between the sexes is not the consequence of gender difference. Instead, “power is what produces those gender differences in the first place” (p. 200). In the patriarchal gender structure, the male gender is constructed as being dominant while females are submissive. Masculinity is the “antifemininity” in that the construction of what it means to be a man is to be unlike a woman, who is considered to be the “other” (Kimmel, 2000). Once these differences are created “they are used to reinforce the ‘essentialness’ of gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 137). Doing gender and reinforcing the idea that men and women are essentially different serves to legitimize the social order as natural (West & Zimmerman, 1987). By doing gender in a way in which men perform dominance over women, the patriarchal social order is seen as a reflection of natural differences and justifies male dominance (West & Zimmerman, 1987; Risman, 1998).

In sum, performing gender is important in maintaining the gender hierarchy. Thus, men are expected to “do” masculinity, but what does masculinity look like, and how is it linked to sexual violence? To answer these questions, I now turn to a discussion of hegemonic masculinity and its relationship to sexual violence against women.

### **Hegemonic Masculinity and Sexual Violence Against Women**

According to Ridgeway and Correll (2004), gender is a widespread and “institutionalized system of social practices for constituting people as two significantly different categories, men and women, and organizing social relations of inequality on the basis of that difference” (p. 510). Gender is deeply embedded in society in that it is present at the macro, institutional level (e.g., resource distribution), the interactional level (e.g., patterns of behavior), and individual level (e.g., socialization and identities) (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Risman, 2004). Within this system, Ridgeway and Correll (2004) argue that there are hegemonic cultural beliefs about gender. The effects of these hegemonic beliefs in “social relational contexts,” or “any situation in which individuals define themselves in relation to others in order to act,” work to uphold the gender system (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004, p. 511). These beliefs about gender are widespread and institutionalized in that virtually everyone is aware of them, and they act as the implicit gender rules that are enforced in social interactions (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). The “rules” for how male-bodied individuals are expected to perform gender is referred to as hegemonic masculinity.

When examining hegemonic masculinity, it is important to first recognize that there are multiple forms of masculinity that exist simultaneously in society (Connell, 2002). According to Connell (2002), “historians and anthropologists have shown that there is no one pattern of masculinity that is found everywhere,” and masculinity is constructed differently in different

cultures and time periods (p. 11). These masculinities, however, do not “sit side-by-side” within society (Connell, 2002, p. 12). Most are socially marginalized and subordinated (e.g. racial minority masculinities), while hegemonic masculinity is the culturally dominant, normative form (Connell, 2002).

Hegemonic masculinity is the form of masculinity that men should strive to accomplish, for it is considered to be the “most honored way of being a man” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832). It is what is considered to be the traditional “male role” that men are expected to perform (Connell, 2002, p. 12). In a patriarchal society like the U.S., hegemonic masculinity is understood as practices that perpetuate the subordination of women in the gender hierarchy (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). It is “the normative ideology that to be a man is to be dominant in society and that the subordination of women is required to maintain such power” (Smith, Parott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2015, p. 161). While the characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity in the U.S. are difficult to define, feminist theorists point to several aspects. These include homophobia, vigorous heterosexuality, toughness, aggression, power, emotional detachment, the objectification of women, fear of femininity, and masculine entitlement to women (Gerber, 2015; Murnen et al., 2002; Smith et al., 2015; Truman, Tokar, & Fischer, 1996; Harway & Steel, 2015; Carlson, 2015; Hill & Fischer, 2001). In general, men are expected to display these characteristics when performing masculinity.

The performance and internalization of hegemonic masculinity is strongly associated with sexual violence against women. For example, empirical studies show that rape-supportive attitudes and a man’s rape proclivity, or self-reported likelihood to commit rape, are correlated with beliefs in female inferiority, feelings of entitlement to women, fear of being subordinate to women, and antifemininity (Smith et al., 2015; Truman et al., 1996; Locke & Mahalik, 2005).

Men who believe that women are inferior, should be subordinate to men, and are objects that are intended to gratify men's needs are more likely to perpetrate rape and support sexual violence against women. In fact, sexual violence against women can be seen as an extreme performance of hegemonic masculinity in which men enact the aggression, vigorous heterosexuality and the objectification and devaluation of women that is a part of the gender construct. Studies have shown that rapists "see their actions in terms that express power differentials between women and men...they see what they do to women as their 'right,' a sense of entitlement to women's bodies" (Kimmel, 2000, p. 213). They perform the dominance and entitlement that is expected of men by hegemonic masculinity. The characteristics associated with U.S. hegemonic masculinity, then, create unequal gender power dynamics, and the internalization of this "traditional male role" is strongly related to the perpetration of sexual violence against women.

Furthermore, an examination of all-male social contexts provides important insight into how men doing hegemonic masculinity provides sociocultural conditions that are conducive to sexual violence against women. For example, studies show that, as with other all-male groups, fraternities may create an environment that stresses hegemonic masculine norms (e.g., the devaluation of women) (Boeringer, Shehan, and Akers, 1991). The fraternity context "is conducive to discussing sexual experiences with the tolerance, and to some extent approval, of assertive and aggressive sexual activity" and is a social setting in which women are "commodified" (Boeringer et al., 1991). Boeringer et al. (1991) suggest that the increase in sexually aggressive attitudes and behaviors present in fraternities may be a product of the social environment in which men learn these behaviors and imitate them while receiving positive feedback from other members. Fraternities are "vitaly concerned – more than anything else – with masculinity" (Martin & Hummer, 1989, p. 460). They work hard to display characteristics

that are in line with hegemonic masculinity like competition, dominance, and sexual prowess (Martin & Hummer, 1989). These group norms create a context in which sexual coercion and the domination of women is encouraged (Martin & Hummer, 1989). The social context of fraternities, therefore, demonstrates how the interactions among men encouraging one another to perform hegemonic masculinity creates conditions that normalize sexual violence against women.

### **Male-focused Rape Prevention Programs**

In response to the high incidence of sexual violence against college women, universities have implemented anti-rape programs that are designed to educate college students about rape and to reduce sexual violence (Gidycz, 2001). Informed by the knowledge of the link between hegemonic masculinity and sexual violence, these programs are beginning to focus on reaching out to men instead of women. While sexual assault has historically been constructed as a “women’s issue,” male-focused rape prevention programs have attempted to reframe the problem as a men’s issue and promote the idea that eliminating rape is a male responsibility (Piccigallo, 2008; Katz, 1995). In general, these programs attempt to address the gender social norms that are conducive to rape-supportive attitudes and rape proclivity by using male-led peer groups. These programs attempt to create an open environment in which men can discuss masculinity and sexual assault without feeling as if they are being vilified or blamed (Locke & Mahalik, 2005). In mixed gender programs, men report feeling defensive (Hong, 1998; Piccigallo, Lilley & Miller, 2012; Piccigallo, 2008). The formation of a social context in which it is “just guys” coming together and talking creates an environment in which men feel less defensive (Piccigallo et al., 2012, p.53). These programs approach men as leaders and helpers, rather than as potential

perpetrators, and this preempts defensiveness while rendering men “stakeholders in what has traditionally seemed to them a topic that only affects women” (Piccigallo et al., 2012, p.512).

A major goal of these programs is to create what they describe as a “new” and healthier form of masculinity to reduce sexual assault. Recognizing the link between hegemonic masculinity and sexual violence against women, all-male anti-rape programs position “the sociocultural construction of manhood as central to the problem of men’s violence against women, *as well as the basis of potential sources of prevention* [emphasis added]” (Katz, 1995, p. 163). For example, Men Against Violence is a national program that attempts to confront beliefs that support sexual violence, challenge patriarchy and construct new versions of masculinity that promote non-violence (Aguilar, 2012). The main tactics used by Men Against Violence are teaching male students bystander intervention techniques so that they can stop or prevent an assault in an active situation, hosting forums in which “men discuss issues related to masculinity and violence that they have not previously considered,” and “promoting a new concept of the ‘real man’ – one who walks away from a fight” (Hong, 1998, p.122). Men Against Violence promotes male leadership, the use of masculine strength to protect women, and the construction of a new “real man”. A “real man” protects women and does not promote violence.

Overall, these programs have had limited success, and their focus on constructing a new form of the “real man” is questionable. It is true that these programs typically have positive effects in that participants demonstrate decreased rape-supportive attitudes, lower sexist attitudes, a higher likelihood to confront sexism, and an increased willingness to end sexual violence after exposure to the programs (Stewart, 2014; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Gidycz et al., 2011). Unfortunately, however, their attitudes and beliefs tend to rebound months after the program, and the programs have not been shown to have lasting effects (Stewart, 2014; Gidycz

et al., 2011; Foubert & Marriott, 1997). Furthermore, it is argued that these programs do not challenge hegemonic masculinity (Murphy, 2009). Instead, they actually *reinforce* hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy by simply emphasizing other, more benevolent aspects of hegemonic masculinity (e.g., protectiveness).

An example of a program that inadvertently reinforces hegemonic masculinity is Men Can Stop Rape's "My Strength is Not for Hurting" poster campaign. In a media analysis of the posters, Murphy (2009) argued that the campaign actually works "to reinscribe heterosexual masculinity within a very familiar and limiting frame, at times reinforcing some of the most intractable myths supporting rape and sexual assault" (p.127). In this poster campaign, men are depicted alongside text that says, "my strength is not for hurting, so when she said NO, I said OK" (Murphy, 2009, p. 115). The campaign is meant to offer cultural "counter-stories" that "valorize the traditional masculine virtue of 'strength' but redirect it into channels that do not involve violence against women" (Murphy, 2009, p.114). While their efforts are well-intentioned, these posters reinforce beliefs about gender and sex (Murphy, 2009). They emphasize hegemonic masculine traits like strength and power. Even though they may create a *nicer* form of masculinity, they are not counterhegemonic and do not challenge the gender social structure that is at the core of sexual violence against women.

Thus far, the literature mostly defines the goals and aims of the all-male anti-rape programs and only briefly mentions what is actually addressed. While Murphy's study offers a glimpse into the approaches these programs use, it only examines one aspect (the poster campaign) of one group (Men Can Stop Rape). Thus, there is a major gap in the literature in that it discusses the aims of the programs but does not offer an in-depth examination of their methods. As Murphy states, "it is not enough for such programs to have laudable *goals*; they

must also be pursued through considered and informed *methods*” (p.127). Anti-rape programs must send unambiguous messages that challenge rape culture and hegemonic masculinity. At this point, however, the methods and messages about hegemonic masculinity in male-based sexual violence prevention programs are unclear. This study addresses this gap by examining the methods used in these programs.

## Chapter 3 - Data and Methods

### Overview of Methods

Because the aim of the study was to do an in-depth analysis of the methods and messages of the programs, the methodological approach that guided this study was a program theory evaluation using multiple case studies. Program theory is defined as “the set of assumptions about the manner in which a program relates to the social benefits it is expected to produce and the strategy and tactics the program has adopted to achieve its goals and objectives” (Rossi, Lipsey & Freeman, 2004, p. 432). Program theory evaluations examine the conceptualization of a program, specifically “its plan of operation, the logic that connects it to the intended outcomes, and the rationale for why it does what it does” (Rossi et al., 2004, p.44). After identifying a need for a social program, program designers must determine what the objectives are for the program and then conceptualize how those objectives will be achieved (Rossi et al., 2004). If there are deficiencies in the design of the program, it is unlikely that it will be effective in achieving its goals (Rossi et al., 2004). Program theory evaluations “may reveal that there are faults in a program’s delivery system, that the program’s target population is not well defined, or that the intervention itself needs to be reconceptualized” (Rossi et al., 2004, p. 136). In this case, the goal of male-based anti-rape programs is to reduce sexual assault by combating hegemonic masculinity and gender inequality. If the methods of the program are poorly conceived, they will be largely ineffective. By taking a program theory evaluation approach to my study, I was able to examine and analyze the overall design of a sample of male-based rape prevention programs.

In my analysis, I used multiple qualitative case studies of university-based programs. A qualitative case study “is an approach to research that facilitates exploration of a phenomenon within its context using a variety of data sources” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544). Case studies are

valuable in analyzing and informing program design because of their flexibility and rigor (Baxter & Jack, 2008). They allow for an in-depth examination of a phenomenon using several data sources like interviews, observation, and document analysis. This “ensures that the issue is not explored through one lens, but rather a variety of lenses that allows for multiple facets of the phenomenon to be revealed and understood” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544). Examining the conceptualization of these programs required an in-depth analysis of their methods and messages, and this made using case studies ideal. Furthermore, I used *multiple* case studies in my analysis. Using multiple cases allowed me to provide a more complete description of the various programs that are being used at universities and gave me the opportunity to compare them to identify their similarities and differences.

### **Sampling**

My sample consisted of six programs based at six universities across the United States. I chose to include six programs in order to have a diverse sample that would allow me to compare and contrast them. I also limited my sample to six programs due to the time constraints of this study. To collect my sample, I conducted internet searches using terms and phrases like “men against sexual assault,” “men against rape,” and “men against sexual violence.” I also contacted a faculty member at Fort Hays State University who has helped establish all-male anti-rape programs at universities across the nation. He gave me a list of universities that he worked with in the past, and I searched the university websites to find information on their programs. The inclusion criteria for my sample was that they must target college men and aim to explore and challenge masculinity in an effort to reduce violence against women.

Using this criteria, I selected six programs. This project was deemed exempt from further review by Kansas State University’s Institutional Review Board (proposal number = 8465). In

order to protect the confidentiality of the program coordinators, I used a random name generator to assign pseudonyms for each participant. Because the participants could be deductively identified by the name of the institution and the name of the program, I also assigned pseudonyms for the universities and the programs included in the study. The programs and universities are identified as the following: Men Against Sexual Violence (MASV) at Midwestern Private University (MPU), Men Ending Gender Violence (MEGV) at Southern State University (SSU), The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI) at Western State University (WSU), The Masculinities Project at Eastern College, Athletes Stopping Violence (ASV) at Eastern State University (ESU), and Men's Engagement Programming at Midwestern State University (MSU).

### **Data Collection**

In order to analyze these cases, I conducted interviews, reviewed program documents, and did personal observation. The goal of these methods was to identify the program's goals, strategies, and messages (Rossi et al., 2004). I began this process by gathering program documents. I used the program websites to collect mission statements, texts describing their programs, and posters. I also reached out to program coordinators using the contact information listed on their websites to request other information that was not readily available (e.g., PowerPoints presentations) and to request interviews. I then scheduled and conducted interviews with program coordinators and leaders.

Because most of the universities included in the sample were not in close proximity, all of the interviews were conducted via telephone. The interview process lasted from October 31, 2016 to January 20, 2017. I interviewed fifteen program leaders and coordinators, ensuring that I interviewed at least two individuals at each university in order to get multiple descriptions and

perspectives on each program. At their request, two of the participants were interviewed together at Midwestern State University, and two participants were also interviewed together at Eastern State University. In total, I interviewed fifteen participants in thirteen interview sessions. On average, the interview sessions were approximately forty-five minutes long and were audio-recorded.

In the interviews, I asked participants questions regarding the origins and goals of their programs, how their programs are conducted, what messages they focus on, and how they attempt to construct healthier or alternative masculinities (see Appendix A for interview guide). The interviews were semi-structured in that they consisted of structured questions that served as a guide yet allowed me to ask participants for further elaboration in their responses (Berg & Lune, 2012). This resulted in more in-depth responses that provided a more “textured set of accounts” from the respondents (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 114). At the end of each interview, I asked the respondents if there were other individuals who may have information that would be beneficial to my study. I followed up with these individuals and was able to interview almost all of the primary leaders at each program. When I finished conducting the interviews, I transcribed them for data analysis.

Because of its proximity, I was able to visit and conduct participant observation at one of the universities. The Men’s Engagement Programming at MSU organizes an annual symposium about masculinity that is open to all genders. The symposium is a five hour long event that includes presentations, speakers and panel discussions about masculinity, violence, and health. After obtaining permission from the coordinators of the symposium, I was able to attend the event. I took extensive field notes throughout the day and included them in my analysis as a supplement to my document and interview data.

## **Data Analysis**

Once I collected the textual and visual content from the programs and finished transcribing my data, I began my analysis. In order to analyze the programs, I explicated the conceptualization of each program by analyzing the major themes and logic of the program using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is “a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 6). It involves an in-depth reading of data to extract “patterns of meaning” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 15). While thematic analysis can be completely inductive in that the process of coding does not involve an already established coding frame, my analysis began with pre-existing categories that are important to understand the overall design of the programs (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These included the following categories: program origins, goals, structure, strategies and messages, and outcomes.

I organized my data into these pre-existing groups through careful reading (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Once my data was sorted into those groups, I then looked for themes that emerged within these larger categories by systematically reading through the data and extracting aspects that form patterns (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This involved exhaustively coding the data, grouping the codes into thematic clusters, and constantly refining and revising my themes to extract the themes that were key in understanding and analyzing the programs (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

## Chapter 4 - Findings

The exploration of these programs yielded a variety of themes and subthemes. This section includes an overview of the major components of the programs including their origins, goals, structures, strategies and messages, and successes and challenges. The themes and subthemes that emerged within these overarching categories are also discussed in detail.

### **Program Origins**

The origination dates of the programs range from 1997 to 2015 (see Appendix B). The Men Ending Gender Violence program at SSU was established in 1997 but became inactive until approximately five years ago, and The Men's Project group at Eastern College was just recently established and is still in the development process. Other than the program at Eastern College, all of them have been active for at least six years. A commonality among the programs is that they were initiated by male students rather than university organizations or faculty. Only one program, Athletes Stopping Violence, was formed by a professor at the university. In most of the cases, a small group of male students came together to start these male-based anti-violence groups that then became affiliated with a university organization. Most of them either became a part of the women's resources centers or the student health centers on their campuses. In the analysis of the data, the major themes as to why these groups were formed are consistent with the previous literature on programs like those included in this study (Piccigallo, 2008; Katz, 1995; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Piccigallo et al., 2012; Aguilar, 2012). According to the program leaders, the founders of the programs recognized that gender-based violence was a major issue and that the absence of men in the movement to combat the violence was problematic. They also perceived violence against women as a men's issue because men are the main perpetrators of violence, and they sought to frame the problem as a men's problem instead of solely as a

“women’s issue”. The program founders saw men as being fundamental to the movement against gender-based violence and created these programs as a result.

### **Identifying the problem.**

The student founders of these programs came to recognize sexual violence against women on campus as a problem due to the events that were happening on their campuses at the time and through their own personal experiences. Scandals about the mishandling of sexual assault cases were beginning to surface around the time of the founding of many of these programs. For example, when describing how The Masculinities Project began to form at Eastern College, one of the program leaders stated:

When I came here [in fall 2013], the campus was going through a reactionary time.

Basically what had happened was - as a lot of campuses nationally were going through similar negative experiences – there were basically some assault cases that happened that weren’t handled properly, so I think that it really drew attention to a lot of things.

The public outcry over the mishandled cases drew more attention to the problem of campus sexual assault. As students became more aware of the issue, some men wanted to be involved in addressing it. As such, many of the founders approached the Title IX offices or women’s resources offices on their campuses to discuss forming groups to help men become involved.

In addition to the awareness of the issue created by the time period, some men also had seen that sexual violence against women was a problem through their own personal experiences. Specifically, due to their experiences in fraternity houses, fraternity men saw sexual violence as a major issue. As Chad, the president of Men Against Sexual Violence (MASV) at Midwestern Private University, stated, “a group of men in fraternities – they knew that this was a problem. They were like, ‘yes, this is a problem.’” The advisor of MASV, Steve, also pointed to how

belonging to a fraternity had the “outcomes of realizing the need for conversations around sexual assault, particularly getting men involved.” Although they did not specify what experiences these students had that compelled them to form MASV, it was consistently pointed out throughout the interviews that sexual violence occurs at a high rate in fraternity houses due to the prevalence of parties and alcohol usage. It is likely, then, that the fraternity men who started these programs witnessed how fraternity culture creates an environment that is more conducive to sexual violence and decided to take steps against it.

As they became aware of the problem of sexual violence on campus, the founders of the programs also identified the absence of men in the movement against violence. They saw this as extremely concerning. As outlined in the literature on men’s anti-violence programming, all-male programs often argue that co-ed groups or female presenters are often ineffective because men either do not believe them or feel attacked and uncomfortable when discussing violence against women when women are around (Hong, 1998; Piccigallo, Lilley & Miller, 2012; Piccigallo, 2008). This sentiment was evident in the programs included in this study. For example, when describing how their program was started, Chad stated:

There’s just an apparent need on campus for men to be involved in this issue. And what I mean by that is there’s another group on campus called Sexual Health and Peer Educators, or SHAPE for short, and they’re a – it’s open to all genders, and essentially it is majority women. The women would come to the fraternity houses and educate the men. The men just wouldn’t listen to them or believe the things they were saying and like, you know, couldn’t believe that some of these things were happening. Then a group of men in fraternities – they knew that this was a problem...and they realized that men weren’t listening to the current educators on campus so they were like, “well, they can’t

get through to them, so we're going to have to do it." So six to eight guys got together and started [MASV] six years ago.

The men who started the group and current members see their role as crucial to combating gender-based violence because of the perceived failure of co-ed groups, and women specifically, to get through to men. This failure was frequently cited as an outcome of men feeling like they are being vilified in co-ed groups. Program leaders also identified men's discomfort with feminism as a reason why there needed to be male-only groups to discuss and challenge violence against women. When asked why the group was formed, Juan, the advisor to MEGV at SSU stated:

For a long time, violence prevention work was relegated to being a female issue, a women's issue...so because a lot of the work came from the feminist movement, then very few men felt comfortable identifying as feminists. Even to this day, there are very few men who...very few men are willing to identify that way. And so the organization was created specifically to raise awareness for the incidents of violence that happen, that are rampant on college campuses which has been the case for generations. So it was to get men involved in the conversation, to feel comfortable talking about violence and violence prevention in a male-centered, male-centric group where they felt comfortable.

They didn't feel they were being attacked.

The discomfort men felt with feminism and being in anti-violence programs that included all genders prompted men who had recognized this as a major issue to create their own groups in which they thought men may feel more comfortable in discussing and addressing the problem.

### **Framing the problem.**

The literature also points to how male-based violence prevention programs have begun to reframe gender based violence as a “men’s issue” because men are the primary perpetrators of gender-based violence (Piccigallo, 2008; Katz, 1995). This was also cited by all of the program leaders as a reason for the creation of the programs in this study. Program leaders stated that the focus on men stems from the fact that men perpetrate the vast majority of violent crimes. Even though men are the main perpetrators of all violent crimes, sexual violence has historically been seen as a women’s issue. When discussing why the program focuses on men, Craig, the program coordinator for MAVI at WSU, stated, “98% of violence is committed by men, and so it just needs to be done. I think like, just in general for a healthier society...it’s super important to get men involved in talking with other men.” His co-facilitator, Michael, argued that it is “ridiculous” that women have been tasked with solving the problem and that they have to do so primarily by teaching each other how to not be assaulted. Instead, he argued that the issue should be addressed by teaching people how to not be perpetrators, and because men are the primary perpetrators, it should be a men’s issue. The need to frame the problem as a men’s issue was expressed by all program leaders, and more specifically, the leaders pointed to hegemonic masculinity as the primary problem. The role of hegemonic masculinity will be discussed in detail in the following sections. The gendered nature of the crimes, then, signaled to the men that there is something about how men do gender that makes them more prone to committing violence, and these programs were created as a response.

### **Program Goals**

The explicit and overall goal expressed both in the interviews and in the documents about the programs is to reduce and prevent violence. Some programs indicate that their goal is to

address sexual violence specifically, while others state that they intend to reduce and prevent violence (e.g., domestic violence and stalking) in general. Every program, however, seeks to address violence that is based on gender in some way. In addition to this broad goal, the programs also have sub-goals that are aimed at helping to achieve the overall goal of violence prevention. The two main sub-goals that emerged from the data were challenging masculinity and gender inequality and empowering men to be leaders with skills in bystander intervention.

### **Challenging masculinity and gender inequality.**

One of the primary goals identified in the programs included in this study is to challenge hegemonic masculinity and gender inequality in order to prevent violence. Participants identified hegemonic masculinity and unequal gender relations as having a direct, causal link to violence. As one participant from WSU stated, “we feel that part of the structure of masculinity *is* violence.” The website for WSU’s program goes on to state that “since violence is one of the key tenants of hegemonic masculinity, it’s important for us to take a moment to unpack some of the complexities surrounding the topic.” Because hegemonic masculinity includes feelings of entitlement, a need to show aggression and toughness, being anti-feminine, and the inability to express emotions other than anger, program leaders see violence as a direct outcome of the performance of hegemonic masculinity. Furthermore, within the gender social structure, men are awarded more power and privilege in society, and according to the director at Eastern State University’s program, “violence is a way of asserting power, privilege, and control.” Change will only come when “we challenge the social norms and institutions that actively or implicitly condone and promote violence.” As such, these programs see addressing and challenging hegemonic masculinity and the way that men are given power and privilege in the gender social structure as integral to achieving their goal of violence reduction and prevention.

### **Empowering men to lead and intervene.**

Another goal of some of the programs is to “empower” men to become leaders in the movement against gender-based violence and to intervene in situations that could potentially result in violence. This is the primary goal of the programs with a peer education structure, although they do still strive to challenge gender norms and inequality. Interestingly, program leaders recognize that because men have more privilege in society, they argue that men should use their power and influence in combatting violence against women. This theme is particularly apparent in the case of Athletes Stopping Violence. Throughout the interview, the program developer, Ann, and student leader, Jason, frequently mentioned the importance of male athletes using their prestige on campus and in the community to become role models in the movement against violence. As Ann suggested, “when you have people that are as visible as a college president – student athletes – on campus, it’s great if you have them as role models for lots of things [like] sexual responsibility or anti-violence. It’s just really important.” Furthermore, she argued that because male athletes (e.g., football players) are seen as the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity, it is crucial for them to be role models and leaders in speaking out against the behaviors that lead to sexual violence. Using the power and privilege given to them both as a result of their status as athletes on campus and as fitting the model of what it is to be “ideally” masculine makes their voices and actions important in demonstrating how other men should behave.

In these programs the hope is that empowering men will allow them to go out into society to lead other men in how to not be assaultive and to be more proactive in standing up for social justice. The goals of challenging gender social norms and teaching men to be leaders are both aimed at achieving the overall goal of preventing sexual violence. Both goals, although to

varying degrees, are a part of the two main structures that were identified in these programs: peer education programs and student dialogue groups. With this, I now turn to an overview of the structures of these programs and their components.

## **Program Structures**

While the programs all have similar goals and strategies, they have different structures with slightly different emphases. The peer education programs, for example, emphasize educating others on sexual violence, while the dialogue groups are more focused on discussing violence and masculinity in a small group and doing little outreach to other students. Of the six programs, the programs at SSU, MPU, and ESU were categorized as peer education groups. Conversely, the programs at WSU, Eastern College, and MSU were categorized as dialogue groups. In this section, I describe the overall design of the programs, who the main participants are, how often they meet, and give a general description of what they do in the meetings. Their activities will be elaborated on further in the section discussing their strategies and methods. I also identify similarities and differences in their designs.

### **Peer education programs.**

*Men Against Sexual Violence (MASV), Midwestern Private University.* MASV is a student organization within the university's sexual violence advocacy, response, and education center that consists of mostly fraternity men. In comparison with the other programs, it is a large group with around thirty-five to forty active members. The advisor to the group, Steve, attributes this largely to the culture of MPU in which "student orgs are more where the status lies." He reports that membership in student organizations on campus gives students "a higher status than some of the athletes on campus" and that academics are "kind of the hallmark of a student on campus, as well as extreme over involvement." As such, Steve attributes the impressive size of

the program in relation to similar programs at other universities to MPU's emphasis on academics and participation in extracurricular activities. In addition to this, the majority of the members are from the Inter Fraternity Council (IFC). Because of their affiliation with the IFC, they have a connection to a large network of fraternities on campus and, therefore, more opportunities to bring in new members. Demographically, Steve stated that the majority of the members reflect the IFC community in that they are mostly cis-gender, straight, white men.

Like the other peer education groups in this study, MASV does not allow everyone to join and is selective when choosing new members. Every year, about thirty to forty students must go through an application process, after which only fifteen to twenty students are allowed in. This is due to the limited resources the group has to train the new members to be peer educators and because only students who are deemed to be committed and there "for the right reasons" are accepted. The group's president stated that they interview the potential members and conduct student checks in order to avoid problems that they have had in the past and that other universities have had with male members in sexual violence prevention programs. As he explained:

It has been a thing at other universities as well where men may join this group to use it as a place of standing. Maybe, you know, "Oh like I'm a part of [MASV]. I would never do anything like that," and kind of using that as a power dynamic. Or just past perpetrators who may want to join to clear their name, like show that they want to learn. Obviously, that's not an effective way to educate others – like if you're a perpetrator using it to be, like, a perpetrator.

This is similar to some of the other programs that have had issues with members using their membership in a rape prevention group as a form of status that they use to attract women. To

avoid this, MASV operates as a selective group of men who are trained to educate other men on violence prevention. The training process involves weekly meetings in which educators learn how to present while also reflecting on gender norms and hegemonic masculinity.

Once trained, educators present to all-male groups in residence halls and fraternities. They give two Power Point presentations: MASV 101 and MASV 201. The MASV 101 presentation is mandated for all new fraternity members by the IFC, while MASV 201 is provided on request. Both presentations are given to residence halls and are available to other groups of men who ask for them. In MASV 101, the focus is on facts about sexual violence like statistics and the definition of consent. MASV 201 goes more in-depth in terms of talking about “toxic masculinity” and how it relates to sexual violence. MASV utilizes Power Point presentations, documentary screenings related to masculinity (e.g., *The Mask You Live In*), and discussion-based approaches in their presentations and campus outreach.

***Athletes Stopping Violence (ASV), Eastern State University.*** Unlike the other programs, ASV is a peer education program that serves as an undergraduate class that can be taken for course credit. Peer education programs that can be taken for credit are common at universities and usually focus on topics related to health and wellness (e.g., mental health, substance abuse, and violence prevention). There are several courses similar to ASV at Eastern State University like a Greek peer education program. These programs and ASV were created by Ann, a professor of human sexuality and gender studies at the university. Like MASV, ASV is very selective and only consists of a group of eight students. Students go through an application and interview process to be allowed in the program. They write essays and supply references to attest to their character, and in order to have a representative group of athletes, only two are chosen from each varsity sport. The reason for their selectivity is similar to MASV’s reasons in that they want to

include only the men who are committed to the cause and also because they want to avoid having men in the group who may act inappropriately and reflect badly on the group. As Ann explained, “one of the biggest challenges – I don’t know if it’s a challenge – but for anybody doing this work whenever you have a group of people who are supposed to be role models, the concern is, what if one of them isn’t?” Because of this concern, Ann “screens” potential members through the interview and application process.

Structurally, the class meets once a week to discuss masculinity and gender norms, how those relate to violence, and how to present to other students about this topic. Some of the learning objectives stated in the course syllabus include: developing presentation skills to discuss violence with students to “help facilitate their adoption of anti-violent behavior,” empowering students to “express their thoughts and feelings about men, masculinity, and violence,” and critically “deconstructing cultural norms of masculinity and heterosexism and its connection to the use of violence.” Throughout the course, the members read articles about masculinity and violence and also watch video clips from films that focus on this topic (e.g., *Tough Guise*). These are used as ways to start discussions in the class about masculinity and how to challenge it.

Outside of the class, the peer educators are expected to do presentations and campus outreach events. Their main presentation, Reel Man vs. Real Man, is a Power Point presentation that concentrates on how the media portrays men and how that relates to how men are expected to act in their daily lives. It is given primarily to men in residence halls. Their main outreach event is called “Baking for a Change.” The peer educators make baked goods and give them out at a table in the middle of campus. Ann and Jason stated that the purpose of this event is to break gender stereotypes and show that men can do traditionally feminine activities like baking. This

outreach event and the presentations the students give are the main components of their educational activities outside of the classroom.

*Men Ending Gender Violence (MEGV), Southern State University.* Men Ending Gender Violence is a group of approximately seven active members. In contrast to the other programs, it is open to all genders. At the beginning of the program, it was solely for male individuals. During this time it was mostly a very small activist group that did outreach events on campus like participating in Take Back the Night, an international protest march aimed at ending violence against women. The group then became attached to the student health center and, in order to show more inclusivity, the program allowed female-identified, non-binary, and transgender students to join. Despite this, they retain the name with “men” in it for “the historical reference to it,” according to Juan, the program advisor. They mostly go by the moniker of MEGV on campus to offset the perception that the program is solely for men, however. The group of students is split almost evenly with half of the individuals being male-identified and half being female-identified.

The program is run by the student health center and is mostly made up of graduate and undergraduate students who have health-related majors. Unlike MASV and ASV, they are not selective in who they allow into the program. All students are welcome, although it is required that they are “able to work independently or on a team and have the ability to be open-minded and non-judgmental when discussing sensitive issues.” Unlike the other peer education programs, there is much less of a focus on masculinity in the program. While a major aspect of the program’s mission statement is to “break the link which exists between traditional norms of masculinity – the ways men are taught to behave – and violence,” there is only one presentation that is available to student groups that emphasizes masculinity. Furthermore, the peer educators

themselves are not asked to reflect on masculinity or gender inequality to the same extent as members of the other programs in this study. The program is much less introspective and places the emphasis on giving short presentations to classes, residence halls, Greek affairs, sports teams, and any other student group that requests a presentation. As Sean, the program's president, stated, "presentations are our number one thing – maybe 60% - 70% of our work, and the other is smaller outreach events." These presentations are approximately fifty minutes long and focus on a variety of topics including consent, bystander intervention training, domestic violence, and cyberbullying. Within these presentations, sexual assault, alcohol, gender socialization, and hyper-masculinity are discussed. As Sean stated, they do some outreach events like documentary screenings that touch on masculinity. The major focus of the group, however, is giving presentations to classes that emphasize health and wellness.

### **Dialogue groups.**

*The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI), Western State University.* MAVI is a student group that is based in the university's center for gender advocacy. The group is facilitated by the center's Men's Programming and Violence Prevention coordinator, Craig. Rather than being a group of students coming together with the intention of educating other students on campus, MAVI is an "anti-violence initiative that gathers [WSU] students who identify as men to engage with issues relating to gender, violence, and masculinity." The aim of the program is to have men come together to discuss hegemonic masculinity, reflect on how it affects their lives and how it ties into violence and gender oppression. The group does not do outside presentations and has few outreach events.

The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative group meets weekly for two hours every semester. There are twenty to twenty-five members, and it is made up of a diverse group of students. Most

of the students are affiliated with groups on campus like the Black African American Cultural Center, the Native American Cultural Center, the Pride Resource Center, and the Center for Disabled Students. The group also includes several resident assistants and fraternity men. Unlike the peer education programs, MAVI is not a selective group. In fact, the point of the group is to engage with as many men as possible. Many of its members are “nominated” by university staff or advisors. Essentially, academic advisors on campus suggest certain students who they think should be a part of the group, and Craig reaches out to them. When asked about what kind of men get nominated, Craig stated:

Honestly, I just want people. I just want dudes in the door. I don't care if they get nominated because they're total assholes and people are tired of dealing with them. Like, I will deal with them. It ranges from that to “you're a leader on this campus, and you would benefit from this particular type of education,” or yeah, so that's kind of the spectrum of “you're already in it, you're conscious but could probably be pushed to the next level” to “you just badly need to be in this group.” I ask for that, too. Just like, “give me your men.”

While the nominees are not required to join the group, Craig hopes to get as many of the nominees to attend as possible so that he can engage with them and spread the message of the group.

In terms of how the program operates, it is structured so that members who have completed one semester of the program can return the next semester and act as mentors for newer members. There are two separate groups in that one group is the returning men and the other group is the “mentees.” The mentees go through the program and then have the option to return the next semester as mentors. The first hour of the weekly meetings is for the mentees.

This hour is more structured, as Craig explained, and is aimed at creating “a base knowledge of gender socialization, basic sexual assault stuff, definitions of consent, power and privilege, intersectionality, and some homophobia stuff.” The second hour is when the mentors join and involves a more open discussion in which they talk about “deeper stuff” like hegemonic masculinity and its relationship to violence.

*The Men’s Project, Eastern College.* The Men’s Project is a new dialogue group that is still in its early stages. It is an independent group that is largely student-run but has ties with the student health and wellness center and the Title IX office. One of the main advisors, Jonathan, is a drug and alcohol counselor on campus and the other, Thomas, is the Assistant Director of the Office of Student Engagement at the university. The group is made up of approximately seven students and operates as Josh described it, “almost a bit of a confidential therapy session.” It is structured as an open group for male-identified students to come in and discuss issues related to masculinity that they have experienced or are struggling with in their lives. While Jonathan and Thomas do sometimes show documentaries (e.g., *Tough Guise*) or bring in discussion questions to start conversations, the group dialogue usually happens organically. The group meets bi-weekly and does not have a strong presence in terms of campus outreach, although Jonathan expressed an interest in doing activities for the White Ribbon Campaign or National Violence Prevention month which he states “is specific to male-identified commitment to prevent interpersonal violence.” They have attempted to do some documentary screenings for the student body in the past but lacked momentum in that very few people came to the events, and the members indicated that they are primarily interested in keeping the group private rather than doing any outside programming. Overall, the program has a loose structure that is still developing at this point.

*Men's Engagement Programming, Midwestern State University.* Finally, the Men's Engagement Programming is different from both the peer education and group dialogue structures. It is not a peer education program, but it does offer educational programming and group dialogue within their presentations. The programming is a part of the university's gender equity center and is run by the center's staff. A male graduate student intern and a male undergraduate assistant do most of the masculinities programming. They focus on giving presentations, running a poster campaign that features male role models, and organizing an annual symposium about masculinity.

The presentations surrounding masculinity are provided to classes, fraternities, residence halls, and student groups on request. The topics of the presentations include masculinity and popular culture, masculinity and sexual violence, and masculinity across cultures. They also do a screening of a film about masculinity, *The Mask You Live In*, followed by a discussion session. One of their most popular presentations is Masculinity 101 in which they talk about how the media portrays what it is to be a "real man" and how they can change that to establish a healthier masculinity. This involves a Power Point presentation that is followed by a discussion.

Other than the presentations, the programming involves a poster campaign and an annual symposium. According to their website, the poster campaign features "male-individuals who positively define masculinity through challenging norms, taking action, and leading by example." These men are nominated and selected to be featured on the poster annually. The purpose of this poster campaign is to show men who are "role models and resources for anyone who wants to better understand how masculinity affects everyday life." The symposium includes a panel discussion with some of the men featured on the posters in addition to the Masculinities 101 presentation, other presentations that examine the positive and negative aspects of

masculinity, and discussions about how men can be involved in the movement against sexual violence. All students, faculty and staff are welcome to attend the symposium, regardless of gender.

Overall, the Men's Engagement programming at MSU does not completely fit into one of the main structures identified in this study. It does not involve a core group of students and is not student-run. Furthermore, the programming is designed and carried out by the staff at the university's gender equity center. The goals of the programming, however, are similar in that it is focused primarily on educating and empowering men to critically reflect on masculinity and to create a more equitable society.

In sum, the two main types of programs identified in this study include programs that have a peer education structure and those with a dialogue group structure. The dialogue groups are more discussion-based and do not prioritize presentations or outreach. The peer education programs have the discussion element of the dialogue groups but emphasize giving presentations to students and doing outreach events. While their structures are different, they share common goals and have similar strategies and messages.

### **Strategies and Messages**

The intentions of the programs are to reduce gender based violence by focusing on masculinity and gender oppression. How they go about doing this and the messages that they send are important to understanding how the programs work and how they go about achieving their goals. As such, in this section I identify the main strategies that the programs use in their effort to challenge hegemonic masculinity. Program leaders suggested that the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and systematic violence against women is largely explained as a result of men's inability to express emotions and their general feelings of entitlement to women's

bodies due to the subordination of women in society. Because of this, the programs attempt to get men to feel and express emotions, understand how hegemonic masculinity is related to gender oppression, and identify how they can do masculinity differently to make themselves and society healthier. The two main strategies identified in the programs, then, are that they first deconstruct masculinity and then attempt to reconstruct it in some way.

### **Deconstructing masculinity.**

A common theme among the programs is that they first try to “deconstruct” or “break down” masculinity. In order to reconstruct or create a different form of masculinity, program leaders stress the importance of “unpacking” hegemonic masculinity with program participants so that they can recognize that it is a social construct and identify its damaging aspects. The main strategies used in these programs to deconstruct masculinity are to create “safe spaces” that allow men to become vulnerable and access their emotions, open up the “gender box” to educate men on gender and masculinity, challenge the men to do critical self-work in which they analyze their own masculinities, and then emphasize how hegemonic masculinity negatively affects men’s health and wellness.

*Creating safe spaces.* The importance of creating a space for men to come together to talk about masculinity and its relationship to violence was a subtheme identified in all of the programs. One of the program leaders suggested that there has never been a space for men to come together to talk about hegemonic masculinity and male privilege. He argued that it is important for men to have the opportunity to come together to discuss what it means to be a man and to have a space for discussion and personal development regarding their identities as men. He was careful to acknowledge, however, that since male-identified individuals benefit from

male privilege, it is important to make clear that they are not trying to give men more privilege by giving them their own space. As he stated:

It's a symbolic space of...most importantly recognizing that, oftentimes while being male, there is a dominant history and that things have to be thought about, potentially. The last thing we want is to make it seem like we're taking a privileged group and giving them more privilege by like having their own space to talk about things and that stuff. So the message that is intertwined into this group regularly is that [this is about] gender equality. This is about violence prevention...like just really sitting with these ideas and recognizing that the goal of this is not to gain more privilege by having this time and space. It's actually to drop that privilege and drop that mask and make a decision about who they're trying to be right now in their lives.

He believes that giving men a space to deconstruct masculinity is important in the individuals' development of their masculine identities but that it is crucial to reinforce the point that their meetings are about trying to further gender equality and to reduce violence against women within this space. Men, according to the program leaders, need a space to drop the "mask" of masculinity and a place where they do not feel like they have to perform hegemonic masculinity in order for them to deconstruct what it means to be a man and how that can be changed.

While giving men the space to deconstruct masculinity is seen as important in this work, it was also argued that the space must feel "safe" for the men. The program leaders argued that they must establish a space in which men feel comfortable in freely challenging masculinity because one aspect of hegemonic masculinity is the inability to be emotional or vulnerable. They believe challenging hegemonic masculinity requires the members to freely express their emotions, and going against gender norms that restrict men from being emotional is a major

obstacle in doing this. Because of this, they feel that participants must feel secure and like they will not be judged. As one of the leaders from MSU suggested:

Oftentimes I think...men are so defensive around this subject because we've been told to, you know, we've been told that we can't talk about our emotions, or we can't talk about things that matter. And so, you know, we want to discuss that, get into depth about that and, you know, be okay when people have disagreements and not shut them down either...but [we need to] just be able to provide a safe space where people can work through some issues and really get vulnerable about these things and talk about these things.

Making the space “safe” for discussion requires that the men agree to be respectful of each other in their meetings and also maintain a certain level of privacy. Members of the dialogue groups mutually agree to not disclose the personal conversations and experiences that are shared within the group. This sense of confidentiality in the discussions allows the participants to be more open in expressing their feelings about hegemonic masculinity.

Another component to making the space safe is to, as previously discussed, establish it as an all-male space. As one of the leaders stated:

All-male spaces are the most effective spaces to do gender work and, in particular, interpersonal violence work. So I imagine like, even thinking for myself how much more hesitant I would be if I knew that there was a woman in the room because I would not say things that are on my mind. In this particular space, it doesn't seem like there is any hesitation to speak their minds.

While not all of the programs exclude women (e.g., MEGV), those that do see it as crucial to making the men feel comfortable enough to open up and to be receptive to the messages of the

programs. In line with what has been reported in previous literature, the leaders suggested that including women in the groups would alter the important dynamic of having “just guys” coming together in what they feel is a safe environment to talk about these sensitive issues (Piccigallo et al., 2012).

The final component to creating safe spaces is what Thomas at Eastern College called avoiding “bad dogging.” He argued that in conversations about masculinity, there is frequently a “bad dogging” effect. As he described it:

You can imagine someone yelling at their dog like wagging their finger, and so I really try to make my sessions not like “we all engage in this type of masculine process and here’s all the problems that result from it, and you should all feel bad about yourselves” because that doesn’t really cause them to think critically about it.

Thomas and the other program leaders argued that telling men that hegemonic masculinity and the way that they were taught to do gender is wrong can result in the men disengaging from the program. Furthermore, simply showing men statistics on sexual violence can alienate them and cause them to shut down because men do not identify with the idea of being a perpetrator.

According to Thomas, when they begin talking about the perpetration of sexual assault, “you lose 100% of them because they all say ‘that’s not me. I would never do something like that,’ and they just check out partially.” To avoid this and keep the men engaged, many of the program leaders preface their conversations by telling the men that *they* are not the “bad” men who are committing assault. Instead, they “other” the perpetrators of sexual violence and emphasize that masculinity is not inherently bad. This allows the men to then come to their own realizations throughout the program about the damaging aspects of hegemonic masculinity and its relationship to violence. Once they have established a space in which the men feel comfortable to

discuss the issue, they typically start trying to deconstruct masculinity by opening the “gender box.”

*Opening the gender box.* Within the safe space, program members are educated on the social construction of gender and sexual violence. This is an element of the dialogue groups, internally in the peer education groups, and in the presentations the peer educators give to other students. They define sexual violence and consent, give statistics on the perpetration of sexual violence, discuss how alcohol relates to sexual assault, and reiterate that not *all* men are perpetrators of violence to avoid defensiveness. They then move on to a conversation on gender socialization and open the gender box by defining masculinity and how individuals are socialized to adhere to gender constructs. The strategy most often used by the programs is an activity called the Man Box. The Man Box is a group exercise in which the participants identify all of the characteristics that “real men” are supposed to have. Participants usually include being tough, aggressive, stoic, strong, dominant, hypersexual, and powerful. They also discuss how men are frequently degraded by being called words that refer to being feminine (e.g., “bitch”) if they step outside of this box. The exercise is intended to get the men to question the concept of gender and to come to realize that gender is a social construct that constrains individuals in that they are policed by others to conform to the expectations of their gender. The ties between hegemonic masculinity and violence are brought up, but the overall discussion of gender and violence is fairly superficial in this activity when it is given to student groups by peer educators. This is largely due to the fact that the presentations are limited by time. In the dialogue groups and the peer educator meetings, however, these topics are discussed at length, and this is where the men are encouraged to be vulnerable, share their experiences, and express their emotions. This is what the programs refer to as doing critical “self-work” or introspective analysis.

*Doing critical self-work.* Intense, introspective self-work is emphasized in most of the programs. In order to gain a deeper understanding of hegemonic masculinity, how it is problematic, and how it can be restructured, both types of programs focus on engaging the men in conversation and reflection on their own masculinities. The point of doing this self-work is for the participants to contemplate how they were socialized to be masculine, how they perform masculinity, how they are expected to perform masculinity, and how their performance of masculinity affects themselves and perpetuates gender oppression and violence. In doing this reflection, it is hoped that the participants will be better able to understand how hegemonic masculinity and how their own masculinities can be harmful. With this understanding, they can do work to resist the oppressive and potentially violent tendencies of hegemonic masculinity, change how they perform masculinity, and be better educators. In the peer education group at MPU, doing self-work was seen as central to being an effective educator. As Chad stated:

The majority of the work that we do is, you know, internal work and self-reflection work because, you know, we really believe that if you're going to educate others, you first need to be like as educated on this yourself, and learning facts and figures is fine, but to really understand how your actions play into rape culture, you really need to self-reflect on that and understand how your masculinity plays into that.

Deconstructing masculinity, then, is seen as a largely introspective exercise in which the men gain a deep understanding and awareness of the gender social structure and its relationship to oppression and systematic violence against women.

While the program leaders consistently said that they focus on doing what they described as intense, in-depth, and critical self-reflection work, it is useful to understand what that actually looks like. Many of the leaders reported that they have open dialogues in their meetings that are

usually centered on the participants sharing and analyzing their own experiences. For example, members often share their personal stories regarding how they were raised to be a man, how their fathers shaped their perceptions of masculinity, and how this has affected their lives. Program leaders also stated that the members frequently bring up recent experiences that they had that made them question masculinity and gender. They also talk about situations they have been in in which they intervened when someone was using misogynistic language, for example, or when men were disrespecting women. The program leaders facilitate these discussions and question how their experiences reflect the gender social structure and its connections to oppression and gender violence. Leaders also bring in scholarly literature on masculinity and gender for participants to read, deliberate, and apply to their lives. The men at MPU, for example, read excerpts from R.W. Connell's *Masculinities* (1993) to learn that there are multiple masculinities. In the programs, then, participants deconstruct masculinity by analyzing society's construction of what a "real man" is, reflect on their experiences and beliefs about masculinity, and then tie it back to concepts in scholarly literature to help members gain a better understanding of gender and oppression.

Another strategy used by some of the programs is doing activities that invoke empathy. These activities are aimed at both helping the men to understand women's position in society and to help them, as one leader described it, "access their emotions". One example of an activity that the programs use is called In Her Shoes. In this activity, the men are given cards that have stories about women who have survived domestic violence. Imagining that they are the women in the narrative, they are faced with the obstacles that come with being in this situation in that they have to navigate the system and make choices about what they should do (e.g., go to the

hospital). In doing this, they gain insight into the challenges that survivors of domestic violence face, and it is hoped that they gain more empathy for women in these situations.

Another activity used at MPU is asking the men to describe all of the concerns that they have or things that they think about before they go to a party. The men are then asked to consider the concerns that women may have before a night of going out. The men usually cite very few concerns but realize that women have to be mindful about ensuring their safety throughout the night. This is intended to help them recognize male privilege and realize that they do not face the same level of danger of being sexually assaulted as a result of that privilege. In doing activities to increase the men's empathy for women, it is hoped that they create more of an awareness of gender oppression, the consequences of systematic violence against women, and cause the men to be less likely to commit gender-based violence.

***Focusing on health.*** Finally, a strategy that the programs use to deconstruct masculinity is asking the men to contemplate how hegemonic masculinity is related to internal violence against *themselves*. In doing this, they appeal to the men's own interests by explaining how hegemonic masculinity harms men's mental health and overall wellbeing. The programs go over how men are affected by depression and suicide and relate this to how masculine norms inhibit emotional expression. This makes it difficult for men to have intimate personal connections with others and harms their emotional wellbeing. As the president of SSU's program stated, "bottled up emotions tend to bring men unhappiness and can lead to feelings of anxiety around their friends or long-term depression." Changing masculinity and allowing men to express emotions other than anger, it is argued, would allow them to lead happier and healthier lives. This, in turn, is connected to having a healthier society. It is argued in the programs that by allowing men to share their emotions, society in general would be healthier and would have less violence.

Essentially, the main argument is that if men are able to express emotions other than anger, they will be healthier and less likely to commit violence against women. Therefore, the programs point to the aspects of hegemonic masculinity that are harmful to men as a way of getting the men to see how problematic it is for their own interests.

The process of deconstructing or breaking down masculinity involves in-depth learning about gender, oppression, and violence. In the safe spaces created by the programs, the men learn about and critically analyze hegemonic masculinity. They share their experiences and emotions with the group as they examine hegemonic masculinity, how it affects them personally, and how it affects others in the gender social structure. It is hoped that by giving the men the education and opportunity to “drop the mask” of masculinity that they will come to realize that it is important to change the way that men are expected to behave. Throughout the process of breaking down masculinity, the program leaders simultaneously attempt to help the participants find other ways to do or define masculinity. As such, the following section explains how the programs try to reconstruct or redefine masculinity.

### **Reconstructing masculinity.**

When breaking down hegemonic masculinity and how it can be problematic, the programs also try to find a way to change hegemonic masculinity with the intention of making it “healthier” or less harmful and less oppressive in some way. Overall, what that different form of masculinity looks like is somewhat ambiguous. There are, however, some patterns in how the programs reconstruct masculinity. The reconstruction of masculinity ranges from simply modifying hegemonic masculinity into something that they see as being healthier, allowing participants to define masculinities for themselves, and seeing the ideal as totally getting rid of masculinity and gender altogether.

*Defining healthy masculinity.* All of the programs operate under the assumption that hegemonic masculinity must somehow be changed to become healthier for the benefit of both individual men and, in turn, for society as a whole. The question is, however, what exactly is healthy masculinity? This turned out to be a difficult question for the program leaders to answer. All references to healthy masculinity in this section came from the respondents. One answer to this question was that hegemonic masculinity needs to be modified or its definition needs to be expanded in a way that would allow men to express emotions and to take on roles that are stereotypically feminine. This idea is particularly apparent in the group at ESU. When talking about how they were challenging masculinity, the student coordinator for the group stated:

We're just adding on to it and showing that there's more to being a man than just what the media has been showing us. There's more than just, I guess, being the one that's always expected to be the tough guy, you know, show no emotions, no fear. We're trying to show that men are allowed to care for their children and treat their wives and girlfriends with respect and kind of just level the playing field almost, I would say, where there's not a double standard in what men can do and what women can or shouldn't do. It should be an equal playing field, and that's really one of the things that we do.

The group states that they are attempting to take men out of the gender box so that they are not as constrained in their gender roles. One of the ways the group tries to make an "equal playing field" is having the men break stereotypes by taking on a traditionally feminine role in their "Baking for a Change" event. They believe that showing that men can be feminine is important to expanding gender norms and giving men more opportunities to express themselves.

In addition to this event, the group also has a set of posters that they place around campus. Because the group is made up solely of athletes, the posters usually portray them in their

athletic gear and in poses that make them appear to embody hegemonic masculinity. For example, one poster shows the men in their football uniforms looking at the camera with their arms crossed and confrontational expressions on their faces with the words “Stand Tough Against Violence” in the center of the poster. Additionally, they have another poster promoting the event Walk a Mile in Her Shoes, a common event on college campuses in which men walk in high heel shoes to raise awareness about sexual violence against women. In the group’s poster advertising their participation in the event, the image is of the men’s feet in red high heels with the words “Man Enough to Walk a Mile in Her Shoes.” While the mission of the program is to change gender norms, these posters show that their methods may be somewhat misguided. Instead of challenging hegemonic masculinity, it is reinforced in that men are shown as tough and even aggressive in these images. They may try to modify hegemonic masculinity by making it acceptable for men to take on traditionally feminine roles, but the issue of the patriarchal gender structure is mostly avoided in this program, and they uphold the binary view of gender.

The other programs go beyond modifying the definition of masculinity to allow men to take on stereotypically feminine roles and instead focus on the need for individuals to define masculinity for themselves. They stress that there are multiple masculinities (e.g., black masculinity, white masculinity, queer masculinity) and argue that there should not be one set ideal of what masculinity looks like. Instead, they suggest that masculinity should be self-defined. As Steve from MPU stated:

So I think for me, in terms of creating a healthier masculinity, I think part of it has to be some sort of self-definition of what makes up your own masculinity and not necessarily always defining it in terms of some, you know, imaginary standard or bar.

The leaders at Eastern College took this further and argued that creating a healthy masculinity means developing an idea of what masculinity means to each individual and allowing them to choose to be the person that they want to be through personal reflection. When talking about the main message of the group, Jonathan explained:

I think the main message is that being a man doesn't mean you have to be anything specific, and just identifying with the phrase masculinity doesn't have to be inherently wrong...like there's this idea that there's a bracket of allowable behaviors, and anything that's not in there means that you're de-masculinized. It's kind of a decision to like find peace within yourself to dissolve those barriers between like this is what it means to be masculine, this is what it means to not be and really just allow yourself the space to be in the driver's seat to developing a healthy identity if you identify as male or masculine.

The program leaders hoped to give the men the opportunity to develop their own identity and own masculinity. While many of the program leaders argued that masculinity should be self-defined, the one requirement was that it had to be *healthy*.

The condition that a self-defined masculinity must be healthy returns us to the question of what does it mean to the program leaders to have a healthy gender identity? The answers to this question were vague, but it came down to two major requirements: allowing each other to express emotions and removing male privilege. When deconstructing masculinity, the leaders pointed out how the aspects of hegemonic masculinity that dictate that men must be tough and stoic negatively affect men's emotional health. When reconstructing masculinity, then, they saw the ability to be emotional and to have intimacy with other men as being key to having a healthy identity and a healthy society. For example, when asked what health masculinity looks like, Sean at SSU said:

I would say it looks like the acceptance and expression of men openly - comfortable acceptance and expression. Ideally, what we would like in terms of healthy masculinity is that males feel comfortable expressing a wide range of expressions, thoughts and ideas and that other males in particular are accepting and nurturing of those thoughts and ideas. The key to solving the problems related to hegemonic masculinity like mental health issues, aggression, stoicism, and a lack of empathy was, to the group leaders, teaching the men to be more emotionally intelligent. As Craig from WSU put it, “dudes [who] are more emotionally intelligent tend to be less jerky.” Adopting a “less jerky” form of masculinity, it seems, would lead to less violence.

The other component of healthy masculinity that the group leaders identified is that it would remove male privilege in some way. This meant to them that people with healthy masculinities would show respect to all gender identities and give people of different identities an equal voice and space in society. Specifically, this includes not speaking over individuals who are not male-identified, removing the notions of ownership and entitlement to women’s bodies, and permitting other individuals to step outside of the gender box. Importantly, the program leaders suggested that to remove male privilege, the men must be willing to openly question the gender box with their peers, hold each other accountable to their commitment to challenging hegemonic masculinity and reducing gender-based violence, and call out men who are perpetuating harmful gender norms (e.g., using misogynistic language). Removing male privilege means being allies with individuals with other gender identities, striving for gender equality, and challenging themselves and their peers to not perpetuate oppression. As such, having a healthy masculinity, according to the program leaders, means defining one’s own identity while also striving to give others the equal opportunity to be who they want to be.

*Eliminating masculinity.* While all of the programs hoped to somehow make masculinity healthier, Craig at WSU suggested that the ideal would be to totally eliminate the gender social structure, but he did not think that society and his program participants were ready for that discussion. As he stated, “I think right now we’re in a state to say ‘healthy masculinities,’ but I don’t think the words ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’ would exist in a perfectly gender neutral world.” The problem with a healthy masculinity, he argued, is that “when we describe healthy masculinities, we start naming what are traditionally considered feminine characteristics” like expressing emotions or having more open and intimate conversations. This was problematic to Craig because it maintains a gender binary that has simply been modified and does not truly challenge the patriarchal structure that maintains oppression and systematic violence against women. Eliminating gender would be ideal, but it would take time and be a slow change.

Overall, the two main strategies that the programs utilize are deconstructing and reconstructing masculinity. This involves creating safe spaces for their participants in which they have in-depth conversations about gender and hegemonic masculinity to help the participants become more aware of the social construction of gender and how it is harmful to both them and society. While unpacking masculinity, they also try to rebuild masculinity into something different. This includes expanding its definition or encouraging the participants to define their own gender identity that is healthy and attempts to dismantle gender inequality by removing male privilege. Although completely eliminating the construction of gender was considered, it was not seen as a feasible goal at this point in time.

### **Success and Challenges**

When exploring how these programs work to achieve their goals, it is useful to consider how they perceive the overall success of their programs thus far and identify the challenges they

encounter. Being aware of the challenges they face may offer insight into how to help the programs to improve. This section outlines the program leaders' assessment of the success of their programs, the major challenges that they identified, and how they navigate these challenges by building alliances with other programs at their universities.

### **Success.**

Even though the program leaders acknowledged that changing masculinity and combating gender inequality would be a slow process, all of them thought that their programs had had some level of success in achieving their goals. Two of the leaders expressed an interest in doing formal assessments of their programs in the future, but none of them had done any type of evaluation at the time of the interviews. Therefore, their evidence of success was purely anecdotal. For example, Sean at SSU reported that he felt that the program is successful because students frequently come speak with him after he gives a presentation and tell him how helpful or enlightening it was. During his two years of being a peer educator, Sean reported:

There's been at least like 20 or 25 students that had a long - hour long - conversation with me after a presentation about, you know, some huge thing and how this made a big impact on their lives. And 25 students out of 40,000 isn't really significant, but it's progress nonetheless, and that's satisfying to me.

Although small, Sean claimed that the program is successful in its goals based on the individual impacts he saw as an educator. Similarly, Craig at WSU expressed that he needed to do learning assessments but that he thought they were having success because "anecdotally, the men that come to the program, I get to watch them grow, and I constantly get feedback from my contacts saying, 'this particular student has been great.'" Furthermore, Ann at ESU stated that the men in the program had been practicing bystander intervention while they were at parties. The programs

measured their success by hearing from individual students about the impact the program had made on them or by witnessing changes in their behavior. Even though the changes they observed were on a small scale and supported by anecdotal evidence, the programs reported that they feel that they are making progress in achieving their goals.

Although not related to these specific programs, it is encouraging that these types of programs have been endorsed by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. The Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault was established by the Obama Administration in 2014 to “focus on the seriousness and urgency of addressing sexual misconduct at colleges and universities” (White House Task Force, 2017, p. 2). The task force produced a guide for universities outlining how they should respond to sexual violence and how they can engage with students to address sexual misconduct (White House Task Force, 2017). The task force has “concentrated on identifying promising practices used by schools around the country” and recommends that universities engage with men to reduce violence against women by challenging gender norms (White House Task Force, 2017, p. 2). This suggests that these programs do have the potential to be successful in achieving their goals. Although these specific programs do not have solid evidence showing their success, the task force’s backing of these types of programs is a positive indicator for their potential to make an impact on the problem. Unfortunately, however, the program leaders did admit that they face several challenges in their work. These included the threat of their programs declining and some occasional backlash from students.

**Threat of decline.**

The most significant challenge mentioned by the programs is the persistent threat of decline they face due to their small size and the difficulty of recruiting and retaining members.

Most of the programs are fairly small and struggle to bring more men into the group. While the peer education programs at MPU and ESU do not have the same difficulty in recruiting members, there is still some concern over what would happen to the programs if the key leaders left. Ann at ESU, for example, worried that the program would cease to exist if she were to leave the university, as she is both the founder and faculty coordinator of the program. In a similar vein, Chad at MSU suggested that the group had been in disarray before he became the president. He argued that he contributes more structure and better leadership in the group, and it is unclear what will happen after he graduates and leaves the program. In general, the programs have a group of critical members who keep the program on track, and because of this, there is concern over who would maintain the program if those members left. In fact, the program coordinators at Eastern College cited the lack of student leadership as the main problem in developing and establishing the group. The main leaders of the groups do most of the recruitment and ensure that members are committed to the programs. Without them, the program leaders fear that the programs will decline.

Even with strong leaders and coordinators in the programs, they still reported struggling with recruitment and member retention. While some of the programs utilize outreach events in recruiting, the program leaders suggested that the most effective recruiting method is using a base group of current members to go out and recruit their peers. This gives the members a chance to share their experiences in the programs that, hopefully, make others want to join. As Craig at WSU described, “I do lean on the men who are currently in the program to do the recruiting, and they do a really good job of...like I tell them, ‘if you bring at least one, we’ll never go down in numbers.’” While this has been somewhat effective, he admitted that the members struggle to “sell” the program. According to Craig, “it does take a village to get men into this stuff and keep

them here.” Unfortunately, this was a common problem among the programs at WSU, SSU, MSU, and Eastern College. In general, it can be difficult to get students to do extracurricular activities that take time away from their busy lives, and this is a problem that all of the programs are confronted with. However, getting students to participate in these particular programs seems to be even more difficult because of the problem they seek to address. Several program leaders suggested that a lot of men do not see sexual violence and masculinity as an issue that they should be concerned with, they simply do not care about it, or they are outright hostile toward the idea of challenging masculinity. Overcoming this and convincing men that the aims of the program are important and legitimate is a significant obstacle. As Steve at MPU stated when discussing the difficulties of getting men involved:

There’s the general defensiveness and resistance to the, you know, “I don’t commit violence, so I don’t have to care or do something about it,” or even the more problematic end of the spectrum, “well survivors lie, and this is the worst problem - with false reporting,” and these kind of things – just general disbelief of survivors. So I think it kind of mimics pretty much what we would see everywhere – just getting members from a dominant group to engage in social justice work.

Asking men to join a group that deals with something that is often seen as a women’s issue and challenges their gender’s dominant position in society is an impediment to program growth. This and the uncertainty of the future of the programs if key members were to leave make the threat of decline a major issue in the programs.

### **Backlash.**

As alluded to in Steve’s comment in the previous section and mentioned by all of the program leaders, another challenge that they occasionally face is a backlash against their goal to

change masculinity and their efforts to make gender-based violence more visible. Although the programs all stated that they never receive blatant backlash from the institution itself, they did express that there is mixed support from students. All of the programs felt like they were totally supported by the university except for SSU and MPU. Steve stated that he did not feel any real support but also did not have any “roadblocks” put in the way of the program by the university. Similarly, Juan at SSU, said that while he had not received any outright backlash from the university, he also did not feel that they were totally supportive. He attributed this to the fact that the group was pointing out that sexual violence is a considerable problem on college campuses. He stated:

I wouldn't say there's full support from the university just because I don't think that that is always something that is fully supportive of the university's mission or the business aspect of a university. Colleges are businesses, and they're here to make money. So if we're constantly highlighting the negative features of academic life...that isn't as supportive of the positive view of the university.

While Juan felt that the university did not support the program because its mission went against the interests of the university, the other programs felt that they had backing from the university. They felt particularly supported by the Title IX offices on campuses and some reported that they often work with the staff in the Title IX offices. Despite this university support, however, many of them claimed that they occasionally receive negative pushback from students.

Every program leader asserted that they feel that the overall student body is supportive of their programs, but there is pushback from students against their messages at times. This pushback comes mostly from male-identified students who feel defensive when hearing that men commit the majority of violent crime and when they become aware of the programs' intentions

to change masculinity. Some male students refuse to believe statistics about sexual violence, refute the idea that there is something about masculinity that should change, and seek to belittle the men in the programs. At WSU, for example, the group was disparaged in the comments section of the college newspaper. According to Craig, a student at the university wrote that one of the group's workshops on masculinity "looks like a 'mangina' conference for beta males." In response to the idea of challenging masculinity, some students become hostile and attempt to denigrate the men in the programs by suggesting that they are feminine and weak. Similarly, the program leaders at SSU, MPU, Eastern College, ESU, and MSU stated that they receive pushback when engaging with men and can sometimes get into heated discussions because, as Juan stated, "a lot of it is masculinity or challenging masculinity...guys just don't like feeling challenged...guys don't like being told that they're wrong." In short, the programs encounter backlash from primarily male students who feel as if they need to defend hegemonic masculinity and who fear that men are becoming "feminized" in some way.

Although the program leaders feel supported by the campus overall, the backlash from a part of the student body poses a challenge to the legitimacy of the programs and their hopes for future growth. The perception that they are trying to "feminize" men and disrupt the gender social structure elicits a strong, negative response at times. This can lead to some students ridiculing the program and denigrating its members. When this happens, the opposing students are belittling and delegitimizing the program and possibly making other students more hesitant to join for fear of being subjected to the same scrutiny. This, of course, is harmful to the programs' effort to obtain more members and may make other students take the groups less seriously. Fortunately, the program leaders stated that the amount of backlash they receive is much less than the support and enthusiasm they see for the programs.

### **Navigating challenges.**

To gain more support and to overcome their challenges, many of them described building alliances with other groups on campuses that have similar goals. These groups include student health centers, feminist student groups, counseling centers, the Title IX offices, and offices dedicated to gender equity, diversity, and inclusion. Their alliances help the programs gain more visibility on campus in that they invite and promote each other at events. This allows them to engage with more students, make students aware of their presence on campus, get their message out, and have more recruitment opportunities. Ann and Jason at ESU also mentioned that they have a strong relationship with the university's athletics department, and MPU has a partnership with the Inter Fraternity Council. These relationships give the programs a pool of students to recruit from, and MPU's partnership with the IFC guarantees that they get their message out to the fraternities because the IFC requires all fraternities to attend the group's presentations. As such, joining forces with other organizations on campuses helps legitimize the programs by obtaining the support of multiple groups and offices on campus. Most of the program leaders hoped that their programs would grow and have more of a presence on their campuses, and building alliances with other organizations that advocate for them is a method that may help them accomplish this.

### **Summary**

This section has described the various components of the programs including their origins, goals, structures, strategies, and success and challenges. These programs began with male students coming together out of concern for the lack of men involved in the movement against sexual violence. They felt that the problem should be reframed as a men's issue that men should work on in groups that exclude women to help them avoid feeling hesitant or defensive.

They have grown and built alliances with other groups on campus over the years and have developed into two distinct types of programs with different structures. The peer educators concentrate more on giving presentations, and the dialogue groups prioritize weekly discussion-based meetings. Despite these differences, they have similar goals and strategies. They strive to reduce violence by challenging oppressive and harmful gender norms and seek to empower men to lead others, hold each other accountable, and intervene in situations where rape culture is perpetuated or when someone is at risk for being harmed. The program leaders try to accomplish these goals by deconstructing hegemonic masculinity and then reconstructing masculinity into something healthier. Although they face many challenges, the leaders feel like they have had success in their effort to challenge men to do gender differently.

## Chapter 5 - Analysis

The underlying theory of male-based sexual violence prevention programs is that sexual violence is a problem of oppressive gender social norms and hegemonic masculinity. In order to reduce sexual violence, they aim to address these problems by encouraging men to challenge themselves and their peers and to be leaders in a movement to end gender-based violence. Using the in-depth description of the programs in the previous sections, it is important to analyze them from a theoretical standpoint to ask if what they are doing is conducive to achieving their goals. As such, the following section includes an analysis of how the programs are asking the men to undo or redo gender, identifies their strengths and limitations, and provides some considerations for the programs.

### Undoing/Redoing Gender

In answering the question about how the programs ask the men do gender differently, it is useful to analyze them from a theoretical standpoint. The theory of doing gender (West & Zimmerman, 1987) has become a subject of debate within the past decade. Specifically, Deutsch (2007) and Risman (2009) have criticized the theory for its lack of attention to social change. The main question they pose is, can gender be *undone*? This is a question that must be considered when analyzing programs that seek to challenge hegemonic gender beliefs. While West and Zimmerman (2009) argue that gender can only be *redone*, Deutsch (2007) and Risman (2009) assert that society can undo gender. According to West and Zimmerman (2009), undoing gender “implies abandonment – that sex category (or race category or class category) is no longer something to which we are accountable” (p. 117). Individuals will always be held accountable to gender structures but, as summarized by Connell (2010), “the accountability structures that maintain gender may shift to accommodate less oppressive ways of doing gender,

but are never entirely eradicated” (p. 32). This is in contrast to Risman’s (2009) argument that gender is being undone “when the essentialism of binary distinctions between people based on sex category is challenged” (p. 83). In short, Risman (2009) argues that gender is undone when people challenge the gender binary, while West and Zimmerman (2009) maintain that gender is not undone but redone when individuals attempt to alter gender norms.

This debate is highly theoretical and has not been resolved, but it raises the question: are these programs undoing or simply redoing masculinity? In their descriptions of challenging masculinity, it can be argued that some of the programs are attempting to both redo and undo masculinity. The program leaders at Eastern College, MPU, MSU, and WSU, for example, suggested that there should not be an ideal or set of characteristics that define what it means to be masculine. They seek a broader perspective on gender and believe that an individual’s gender identity should be self-defined. Furthermore, the goal to remove male privilege and to create gender equality is another aspect of a healthy gender identity that the program leaders described. While their challenges to hegemonic masculinity do not question whether or not society should have gender (excluding Craig at WSU), their messages could be interpreted as undoing gender based on Risman’s (2009) criteria that undoing gender means undermining the gender binary and attempting to dismantle gender inequality.

At the same time, some of the programs also seem to be seeking to redo rather than undo gender using the perspective of West and Zimmerman (2009). This is especially apparent in ESU’s program when they indicated that they desire to make it acceptable for men to do traditionally feminine tasks. They seek to expand the definition of masculinity instead of dismantling it. In addition to this, many program leaders conveyed the importance of altering the masculine norm of being tough and stoic by allowing men to express their emotions and to be

vulnerable with each other. They attempt to shift the norms that define being masculine to allow men to express more stereotypically feminine qualities, but they do not necessarily depart from the construction of men and women as two separate categories. In doing this, they perpetuate the perspective of gender as a binary but hope to make that binary less restrictive. This could be interpreted as simply redoing masculinity in a different and less oppressive form.

Regardless of whether the programs are redoing or undoing masculinity, they are making a strong effort to create less oppressive gender norms and, thereby, reduce gender-based sexual violence. They attempt to raise gender consciousness by asking men to reflect on hegemonic masculinity, male privilege, and rape culture. They ask men to defy many of the aspects of hegemonic masculinity like being more expressive, respecting other gender identities, and checking their privilege by giving others an equal space and voice in society. They encourage the men to inform their peers about gender oppression and to call each other out when they are somehow perpetuating gender inequality and rape culture. Whether they are successful in achieving these goals is unknown and should be evaluated in the future, but the messages they are sending are, for the most part, productive. The programs do, however, have some limitations that should be discussed along with their strengths.

### **Strengths and Limitations**

#### **Gender consciousness.**

The content of the programs is primarily to bring about an awareness of gender and how some of its aspects are linked to sexual violence. In a study examining a program that seeks to undo gender in secondary education, Murphy-Graham (2009) argues that educational settings are “strategic sites of influence” for undoing gender because they are “where an open debate about gender relations is most likely to happen” (p.506). Undoing gender in educational settings like

the programs at universities can be done, according to Murphy-Graham (2009), by creating an awareness of gender through education, demonstrating how gender is related to oppression, “engaging students...in critical reflection and dialogue, and emphasizing the need for change among both individuals and social structures” (p. 506). In her study, Murphy-Graham (2009) found that using “small groups of students to promote open discussion and critical reflection about gender” (p. 505) leads to greater gender consciousness that allows students to reorganize “gender relations in their everyday lives in a way that reflects their increased consciousness of gender equality” (p. 516). Most of the programs in the present study, particularly the dialogue groups, focus on critical reflection and discussing gender and how it is related to oppression and violence. As evidenced by Murphy-Graham’s (2009) study, these methods have the potential to be effective in the programs as they may increase gender consciousness that, in turn, could result in men undoing or redoing gender in a less destructive way and reduce sexual violence against women. Creating gender awareness and critically reflecting on hegemonic masculinity, therefore, could mean that these programs will be effective in achieving their goals.

A weakness related to creating gender awareness in many of the programs, however, is that they have a self-selection bias in that it is likely that their participants already have a great amount of gender awareness. Students who join these groups, as admitted by several of the program leaders, have already reflected on masculinity and how it ties to violence. They come in to the programs with a desire to do social justice work to end gender oppression and sexual violence. While this is not to say that the programs will not be effective in helping to change how their participants perform gender, it does highlight an issue with how the programs can reach men who have no awareness of the problem and may be in the most need of these types of interventions. Furthermore, men benefit from male privilege, and the programs face challenges

in getting men to get involved in social justice work that seeks to undermine their dominant position in the gender hierarchy. The major question is, then, how can these programs go about recruiting men who may need the programs the most?

A possible answer to this question is given by Connell (1996). In analyzing why boys participate in activities that challenge male privilege, Connell (1996) argued that their motives are driven by several interests. One of the main interests is “the emotional and physical costs of patriarchy for boys and men” (Connell, 1996, p. 228). In the programs, the leaders appeal to men’s interests by discussing how hegemonic masculinity is harmful to men’s mental health. They discuss the costs of hegemonic masculinity related to suicide, depression, and relationships. Appealing to the men’s interests in the presentations that are given to large groups of students by the peer educators, for example, may be an effective way in reaching men and getting them to participate in more work that combats patriarchy. Informing the men on how an unequal gender social structure and hegemonic masculinity harm everyone in some way seems to be a useful method that the programs could continue to use in the future to reach more men and to bring about more gender awareness.

### **Structural considerations.**

The overall structural designs of the programs each have their own strengths and weaknesses. The peer education model has been shown to be effective in terms of educating men on facts about sexual violence. Choate (2003), for example, found that male students who received an all-male peer education presentation about sexual violence prevention “learned factual information from the program and gained awareness of their rape-supportive attitudes and of the importance of obtaining positive consent for sexual activity” (p. 173). Having knowledge about consent and rape myths is important, of course, but challenging attitudes about sexism and

sexual violence is difficult to do in one intervention and has not been shown to have lasting effects (Stewart, 2014; Gidycz et al., 2011; Foubert & Marriott, 1997). This is a significant weakness in the peer education programs in the study. The programs only give their presentations to a group of men either once or twice. It is not likely that this will be effective in changing hegemonic masculinity or reducing sexual violence, and they should consider increasing the frequency of interventions for the groups of men that receive their presentations. In contrast, the dialogue groups in this study meet regularly over several weeks and experience in-depth learning about these topics. It is likely that dialogue groups have more of an impact on participants because they meet frequently over a long period of time.

#### **Accountability and intervention.**

The emphasis the programs place on having the men hold each other accountable and call out their peers is important in challenging hegemonic masculinity and sexual violence against women. In his book, *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men*, Michael Kimmel (2008) argues that young men have retreated into a territory called “Guyland” in which they struggle to navigate their way from being boys to men. Guyland is a social world marked by binge drinking, hazing, and abusive behavior toward women (Kimmel, 2008). In his analysis, Kimmel (2008) argues that “the only way to transform Guyland is to break the culture of silence” (p. 280). Young men, Kimmel (2008) argues, behave in destructive ways because they believe that other men will remain silent and complicit. As Kimmel (2008) states:

Remember, the majority of guys are bystanders. And so it is the bystanders, the ones who know, and yet do nothing, whom we have to engage. Yet bystanders help create the culture of protection in which the most egregious and extreme behaviors occur...as a culture, we need to drive a wedge in between the perpetrators and the bystanders,

severing the few from the many, and isolating their behavior. This wedge requires that some young men need to challenge their peers. (p. 280-281)

To interrupt the misogyny and violence associated with hegemonic masculinity, there need to be men who call each other out and hold each other accountable for their actions. Helping men break the culture of silence is precisely what these programs are attempting to do. Through bystander intervention training and teaching men that they must challenge each other to do gender differently, the programs' messages about accountability and intervention are in line with Kimmel's (2008) view of how young men can make social change regarding these issues. It should be noted, however, that Kimmel (2008) argues that changing the culture of Guyland will require more than creating change in individual men. Instead, it will require a collective and institutional effort (Kimmel, 2008). With this, I now turn to a discussion of the limitations of the programs regarding their efforts to create social change by primarily emphasizing the individual and interactional dimensions of the gender social structure.

### **Challenging the gender social structure.**

Because of their focus, these programs are limited in the impact they can have on creating change in the gender social structure. Returning to the concept that gender is embedded in society on three dimensions (individual, interactional, institutional), these programs are limited in that they primarily work on the individual and interactional dimensions (Risman, 2004; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Most of the programs emphasize critical self-work so that the men can reflect on how they were socialized to be men in an effort to break down stereotypes and create psychological and behavioral changes. They focus on having the men work at the individual level to work on their gender identities in an effort for personal development. In addition to this, the programs attempt to undo or redo masculinity in a way that is less oppressive

at the interactional level. Changing how these men perform gender emphasizes how they interact with other individuals and is an attempt to create cultural change. Doing work on these dimensions is crucial, but change on the institutional dimension is also imperative. Systematic violence against women is a product of deeply embedded gender inequality on economic, political, and social dimensions (Yodanis, 2004). Women's lack of power on these dimensions contributes to the perpetuation of violence against them. Because of the gender wage gap, for example, women may be economically dependent upon male partners. As a result, women may be forced to stay in situations in which they are subjected to intimate partner violence due to their economic dependence. Changes that address women's lack of power at the institutional level in the gender social structure will be necessary to reduce systematic violence against women. Doing work on the individual and interactional dimensions is necessary and should not be undervalued, but the programs' limitation to create widespread institutional change must be recognized.

If these programs desire to push further and work on a larger-scale, they could consider becoming more political by connecting with local and national activist campaigns that are working against sexual violence. Activists against sexual assault have already made tremendous progress in bringing the issue to the forefront in the national conversation. Their efforts have resulted in federal investigations of the mishandling of assault cases and the creation of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. These are institutional level changes in that the government is taking legal action and giving its attention and resources to address the problem. As the rate of sexual violence on campus remains high and more reports of universities mishandling assault cases surface, however, it is clear that more needs to be done. Reducing sexual violence against women will require a widespread collective effort, and in

building alliances with other groups and campaigns, these programs could help to make a larger impact on the problem at the national level while also gaining support from larger organizations. This could also help further their message and increase their resources and membership.

### **Men as allies.**

A final matter that should be taken into consideration in these programs is the possible pitfalls of being men as allies in doing gender work. Women have been working for decades to reduce sexual violence, and while it is laudable and necessary for men to be a part of the movement, having male-only groups does raise some concerns. As discussed by Baily (2012), three major concerns associated with men creating their own groups to do feminist work include the following: men's groups competing with and taking resources from women's groups, men's groups taking attention and legitimacy away from women's groups, and the possibility of men using their groups to advance male privilege.

First, the problem of men competing with predominantly female groups was evident with the program at MPU. MASV was created because the men thought that the women's group, SHAPE, was failing to get through to men in their presentations about sexual violence. Since then, the leaders stated that there has been tension between the groups and that the men in the program have shown hostility towards SHAPE at times. For example, Steve stated that the men in MASV had the "we're guys, and we can do it better, and we're the only ones that can do it right" mentality. The men in the group would state that they were better than SHAPE, and Steve saw this as an outcome of sexism. The groups are reportedly trying to improve their relationship and be more collaborative, but this dynamic shows the potential for men to enact sexism even when attempting to do work that benefits the feminist cause.

The second pitfall is men's groups taking attention and legitimacy away from women's groups. This issue was also seen in some of the programs in the study. At WSU, for example, Craig stated that the men would often get praise from others for being men doing anti-violence work. He had to constantly keep the men in the program in check by reminding them that women had been combatting sexual violence for decades and did not receive the same amount of praise. Similarly, this concern was also expressed by James, a prevention educator at MSU. In a presentation he gave at the symposium I was able to attend, he stated that he often gets more praise from the public than his female colleagues. This was seen as a significant issue by the program leaders, as some of them were vigilant about being careful to not speak over women or to co-opt the movement.

Finally, the creation of all-male spaces and the idea of using male privilege to combat sexual violence is potentially risky in that it could go against the goals of the programs and result in men advancing their privilege instead of reducing it. As Baily (2012) describes, "feminists and (pro)feminists have also highlighted the danger that men's groups may serve to reinforce male privilege, providing a space for male-bonding and criticism of women or focusing on mutual support rather than challenging sexism" (p. 27). Indeed, the creation of all-male sexual violence prevention programs that exclude women from the conversation does raise some questions about if and how they are going about reducing male privilege. Many of these programs, for example, exclude women so that the men will be less hesitant to express their thoughts and feelings. The question is, then, how are they speaking about women in their meetings? If they become defensive and cannot talk about sexual violence with women, how can men and women work together to solve the issue? The concern that giving men their own space to talk about masculinity may serve to simply give them more privilege was mentioned by Jonathan at Eastern

College, and Chad at MPU stated that they receive criticism for not allowing women's voices to be heard in their program. This concern, however, was not brought up by the other programs. In order to prevent these spaces from perpetuating male dominance, this is a potential problem that program leaders should take into serious consideration.

## **Summary**

In sum, these programs are doing laudable work and have many strengths. Regardless of whether they are undoing or redoing gender, all of them are working to challenge harmful gender norms and sexual violence by raising participants' gender consciousness, teaching the men to be leaders in combating gender-based violence, and encouraging the men to hold each other accountable for performing gender in what they perceive to be a less destructive way. They have limitations in that they are focused on only individual and interactional change. Nevertheless, change on these dimensions is important in creating change at the structural level. Some of their methods could be improved upon, such as the one-time interventions used by the peer education groups, and they should be diligent in the role they play as allies in the movement to end sexual violence against women. Overall, however, these programs do have the potential to play an important role in challenging sexual violence on college campuses.

## Chapter 6 - Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore and analyze male-based sexual violence prevention programs on college campuses. Little research has been done examining the methods of these programs and how they ask men to do gender differently. This study fills that gap in the literature by providing an in-depth description of six different programs that outlines their origins, goals, strategies, messages, and some of the challenges that they face. Furthermore, this study provides an analysis of the programs that discusses their strengths and limitations and offers some suggestions. This is significant in that it adds to the body of knowledge about sexual violence prevention that may help shape future programs and has some implications for U.S. universities and colleges.

According *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, there are currently 315 open investigations of the mishandling of sexual assault cases at universities across the country (“Title IX: Tracking sexual assault cases,” 2016). Furthermore, a survey of college and university presidents found that “about one-third (32%) of respondents agree or strongly agree that sexual assault is prevalent at American colleges and universities,” but only 6% “agree or strongly agree that sexual assault is prevalent at their institution” (“The 2015 *Inside Higher Ed* survey,” 2015, p. 18). Campus sexual violence is a significant issue, but the large majority of top university administrators deny that it is a problem at their institutions, and many respond to it inadequately. This is concerning, and it is apparent that the actions (or inaction) being taken to address sexual violence have not been sufficient. To stop sexual violence, it is imperative that institutions take sexual assault cases seriously and send a clear message that sexual violence is a crime that will not be tolerated. Universities must make sexual assault prevention a top priority. Because these programs have the potential to reduce its occurrence, more universities should consider adopting

similar programs and make a full commitment to supporting them as much as possible. While many of the program leaders mentioned that they generally feel supported by the institution, they seemed to primarily rely on support from student groups and other similar organizations on campus. These alliances are helpful, but having outright, vocal support from the university as a whole is important in demonstrating the university's commitment to addressing this problem and their dedication to helping these programs achieve their goals. To show their support, universities should promote the programs and offer some financial backing for their activities and events. Having the institutions promote them would help them get their messages out, gain more visibility and legitimacy, and may give them more momentum in terms of recruiting members and garnering the interest of the student body. Reducing sexual violence on college campuses is a major undertaking that will require a concerted effort from these programs and the university as a whole. As evidenced by this study, the programs are working on a small-scale and face many challenges. As such, a major implication of this study is that the university needs to commit to helping these programs and dedicate themselves to sexual violence prevention.

Despite its benefits, this study has limitations and implications for future research that should be acknowledged. One limitation is that it is based upon a small sample that was collected using purposive sampling. It does not provide a large random sample that is generalizable to all male-based sexual violence prevention programs. Furthermore, while the study included Midwestern, Southern, and Eastern universities, the sample did not include any universities from the West Coast. This is important to consider because there may be regional variations in the performance of masculinity that could affect how they go about challenging masculinity and how they perceive a healthier masculinity. Future studies should examine a larger sample that includes programs from all regions in the country. Doing this would provide a more complete

description of male-based violence prevention programs, allow for more comparisons among them, and possibly highlight other strategies that may be effective in addressing the problem. Finally, this study did not include an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the programs. While it was not the intention of the study to conduct a formal evaluation of their effectiveness, this would be a useful topic to research in the future. This study explored these programs and gave a description of what they aim to do and how they go about doing it. This information is essential to gaining a better understanding of the new methods that are emerging in college violence prevention and education. With this understanding, the next important step is to conduct formal evaluations to determine if these programs are having a lasting impact on their participants. This information could have major implications for university violence prevention programs and would be extremely valuable as we move forward in combating sexual violence against women.

## References

- Aguilar, D. (2012). *Men's entrance into rape and sexual assault prevention work: Motivations and hesitations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1517443).
- Baily, J. (2012). *What happens when men get involved in feminism? Contemporary mixed-gender feminist activism in England* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (U603516).
- Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*, 544-559.
- Berg, B.L. & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*, 8<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Boeringer, S.B. Shehan, C.L., & Akers, R.L. (1991). Social contexts and social learning in sexual coercion and aggression: Assessing the contribution of fraternity membership. *Family Relations, 40*, 58-64.
- Braun, V. & Clark, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101.
- Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217-230.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Bruce, C., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., & Hyunshik, L. (2015). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. *The Association of American Universities*, 1-109.
- Carlson, J. (2015). Mourning Mayberry: Guns, masculinity, and socioeconomic decline. *Gender and Society, 29*, 386-406.

- Choate, L.H. (2003). Sexual assault prevention programs for college men: An exploratory evaluation of the Men Against Violence model. *Journal of College Counseling, 6*, 166-176.
- Connell, R.W. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools. *Teacher Colleges Record, 98*, 206-235.
- Connell, R.W. (2002). Studying men and masculinity. *Resources for Feminist Research, 29*, 43-55.
- Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J.W., (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society, 19*, 829-859.
- Connell, C. (2010). Doing, undoing, or redoing gender? Learning from the workplace experiences of transpeople. *Gender and Society, 24*, 31-55.
- Deutsch, F.M. (2007). Undoing gender. *Gender and Society, 21*, 106-127.
- Foubert, J.D., & Marriott, K.A., (1997). Effects of a sexual assault peer education program on men's belief in rape myths. *Sex Roles, 36*, 259-268.
- Gerber, L. (2015). Grit, guts and vanilla beans: Godly masculinity in the ex-gay movement. *Gender and Society, 29*, 26-50.
- Gidycz, C.A. (2001). An evaluation of an acquaintance rape prevention program: Impact on attitudes, sexual aggression and sexual victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 1120-1138.
- Gidycz, C.A., Orchowski, L.M., & Berkowitz, A.D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women, 17*, 720-742.

- Harway, M., & Steel, J.H. (2015). Studying masculinity and sexual assault across organizational culture groups: Understanding perpetrators. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 16*, 374-378.
- Hill, M.S., & Fischer, A.R. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*, 39-50.
- Hong, L. (1998). *Redefining babes, booze and brawls: Men Against Violence – Towards a new masculinity*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.
- Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention project. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*, 163-174.
- Kimmel, M.S. The social construction of gender relations. In L. Heldke & P. O'Connor (Eds.), *Oppression, privilege, and resistance: Theoretical perspectives on racism, sexism and heterosexism* (pp. 193-216). Boston: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 2000).
- Kimmel, M. (2009). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Locke, B.D., & Mahalik, J.R., (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 279-283.
- Martin, P.Y., & Hummer, R.A., (1989). Fraternities and rape on campus. *Gender and Society, 3*, 457-473.
- Murnen, S.K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*, 359-375.

- Murphy, M.J. (2009). Can “men” stop rape? Visualizing gender in the “My Strength is Not for Hurting” rape prevention campaign. *Men and Masculinities, 12*, 113-130.
- Murphy-Graham, E. (2009) Constructing a new vision: Undoing gender through secondary education in Honduras. *International Review of Education, 55*, 503-521.
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center. (2015). *Statistics about sexual violence*. Retrieved from [http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications\\_nsvrc\\_factsheet\\_media-packet\\_statistics-about-sexual-violence\\_0.pdf](http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications_nsvrc_factsheet_media-packet_statistics-about-sexual-violence_0.pdf)
- Piccigallo, J.R., Lilley, T.G., & Miller, S.L. (2012). “It’s cool to care about sexual violence”: Men’s experiences with sexual assault prevention. *Men and Masculinities, 15*, 507-525.
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN). (2009). Retrieved from [www.rainn.org/statistics](http://www.rainn.org/statistics)
- Rich, M.D., Utley, E.A., Janke, K., & Moldoveanu, M. (2010). “I’d rather be doing something else:” Male resistance to rape prevention programs. *The Journal of Men’s Studies, 18*, 268-288.
- Ridgeway, C.L., & Correll, S.J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender and Society, 18*, 510-531.
- Risman, B.J. (1998). *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Risman, B.J. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society, 18*, 429-450.
- Risman, B.J. (2009). From doing to undoing: Gender as we know it. *Gender and Society, 23*, 81-84.

- Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*, 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sanday, P. R. (1981). The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37, 5–27.
- Saucier, D.A., Strain, M.L., Hockett, J.M., & McManus, J.L. (2015). Stereotypic beliefs about masculine honor are associated with perceptions of rape and women who have been raped. *Social Psychology*, 46, 228-241.
- Smith, R.M., Parott, D.J., Swartout, K.M., & Tharp, A.T. (2015). Deconstructing hegemonic masculinity: The roles of antifemininity, subordination to women, and sexual dominance in men’s perpetration of sexual aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 16, 160-169.
- Stephens, D.P., & Eaton, A.A. (2014). The influence of masculinity scripts on heterosexual Hispanic college men’s perceptions of female-initiated sexual coercion. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15, 387-396.
- Stewart, A.L. (2014). The Men’s Project: A sexual assault prevention program targeting college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15, 481-485.
- The 2015 *Inside Higher Ed* survey of college and university presidents: A study by Gallup and *Inside Higher Ed*. (2015). *Inside Higher Ed*, Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com>
- Title IX: Tracking sexual assault investigations. (2016). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Retrieved from <http://projects.chronicle.com/titleix/>
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Full report of prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women. *National Institute of Justice*, 1-61.

- Truman, D.M., Tokar, D.M., & Fischer, A.R. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 555-562.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2013). *Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov>
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1*, 125-151.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender and Society, 23*, 112-122.
- White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2017). *Preventing and addressing campus sexual misconduct: A guide for university and college presidents, chancellors, and senior administrators*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov>
- Yodanis, C.L. (2004). Gender, inequality, violence against women, and fear: A cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 655-675.

## Appendix A – Interview Guide

### 1. Background/Reasons for the Program

- Why was the program initiated?
- Who decided to initiate it?
- How did that process work? Did you encounter any barriers (e.g., institutional resistance)? Were you offered any support (e.g., funding)?
- What were past programs like?
- How did you get involved?

### 2. Program Theory

- Who are your main participants? How do you get participants, and who do you target?
- What are the main goals of your program? Why are these your goals?
  - How does your program visualize a “new” masculinity or alternatives to masculinity?
  - How do you go about building this?
  - How would you define the gender social structure you are trying to change? How do you think this is challenged by your program?
- How do you try to achieve these goals? What are your methods/strategies?
  - Messages?
  - Activities/Components?
  - Meetings? When and how many?
  - What educational tools do you use (e.g., videos)?

### 3. Impact

- Have you faced any challenges in the implementation of your program (e.g., institutional, participants, members of the university or community)?
- What have been some reactions to your program? Have you received any feedback from the participants? What did that look like?
- What do you visualize for the future of your program? Would you like to make any changes or expand?

### 4. Is there anyone else you think I should talk to? How should I contact them?

### 5. If I have more questions, can I call you back?

## Appendix B - Program and Respondent Information

University	Program/Foundation Year	Interviewee & Position	Interview Date
Eastern State University (ESU)	Athletes Stopping Violence (ASV) 2004	Ann, Founder and Director	10/31/16
Eastern State University	Athletes Stopping Violence (ASV) 2004	Jason, Student Coordinator	10/31/16
Midwestern State University (MSU)	Men's Engagement Programming 2008	Amy, Assistant Director	11/4/16
Midwestern State University	Men's Engagement Programming 2008	Brian, Graduate Intern & Men's Engagement Programming Coordinator	11/4/16
Midwestern State University	Sexual Violence Prevention Center 2015	James, Prevention Educator – Men's Engagement	11/8/16
Southern State University (SSU)	Men Ending Gender Violence (MEGV) 1997	Juan, Interim Advisor	11/10/16
Southern State University (SSU)	Men Ending Gender Violence (MEGV) 1997	Sean, MEGV President	12/8/16
Western State University (WSU)	The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI) 2011	Craig, Program Coordinator for Men's Programming & Violence Prevention	11/11/16
Western State University	The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI)	Michael, Co-Facilitator	11/21/16

Western State University	The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI) 2011	Brandon, Student Leader	11/18/16
Western State University	The Men's Anti-Violence Initiative (MAVI) 2011	Mark, Student Leader	11/18/16
Midwestern Private University (MPU)	Men Against Sexual Violence (MASV) 2010	Chad, MASV President	11/11/16
Midwestern Private University	Men Against Sexual Violence (MASV) 2010	Steve, Coordinator of Men's Engagement	12/5/16
Eastern College	The Masculinities Project 2015	Jonathan, Group Advisor	11/16/16
Eastern College	The Masculinities Project 2015	Thomas, Group Advisor	1/20/17