

**The Violences of Men:
Men Doing, Talking and Responding to
Violence against Known Women**

Jeff Hearn

Professorial Research Fellow
in the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies,
Department of Social Policy and Social Work,
University of Manchester
Manchester

Stream: Gendering Men
Session: Men and Violence

Women's Worlds 99
GenDerations,
7th International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women,
Tromsø, Norway,
June 20-26, 1999

7th International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, GenDerations, June 20-26, 1999

The Violences of Men: Men Doing, Talking and Responding to Violence against Known Women

Jeff Hearn *

In this paper I outline three aspects of men's relations to violence to known women: doing it, talking about it, and responding to it. While these three aspects are conceptually distinct, in practice they closely interrelate and interconnect, so that it is a mistake to simply think of men being violent at one moment in time, then talking about it some other time later, and then responding at some further time later on still. Violence does not only occur in particular times and places, in specific 'incidents'; it is better thought of a social process taking place over time and places, that includes within it talking about violence and responding (or not responding) to violence. The separation of violence off from the rest of social life is one of the ways in which violence is reproduced.

I: Men Doing Violence to Known Women

The Problem

There is now a very large international literature, in the form of official records and statistics, social science and policy surveys, and victim/survivor report studies, that chronicles the extent and pervasiveness of men's violence against women (Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Mullender, 1996). Edwards (1989, p. 214) notes: 'The safest place for men is the home, the home is, by contrast, the least safe place for women.' Men still do a lot of violence to the women that they court, date, have sex with, live with, marry, 'love' and even 'care for'. It has been estimated from recent British research that between ten and twenty-five percent of British women have been a victim of violence from a male partner (Smith, 1989; Mirrlees-Black, 1994; Mooney, 1994, cited in Dobash et al., 1996, p.2). For example, Mooney's (1993, 1994) survey in Islington, London, found 27 percent of women reported physical abuse by a partner and 23 percent reported sexual abuse. Even such estimates should be treated with caution, as they may not take full account of rape, sexual harassment, coercive sex and pressurised sex, as well as emotional, psychological and other abuses. A recent British survey (Stanko et al., 1998) of women in Hackney, London, reports:

- More than one in two women had been in psychologically abusive relationships during their lives;
- One in four women had been in psychologically abusive relationships in the past year;
- One in three women had suffered physical and sexual abuse requiring medical attention in their lives; and
- One in nine women had suffered physical and sexual abuse requiring medical attention in the past year.

A very recently published national survey of 4,955 women in Finland (Heiskanen and Piispa, 1998) has reported the following results:

- '22 % of all married and cohabiting women have been victims of physical or sexual violence or threats of violence by their present partner, 9 % in the course of the past year.'
- 'violence or threats by their ex-partner had been experienced by 50 % of all women who had lived in a relationship which had already terminated.' (p. 3).

Broadly similar figures have been reported from elsewhere in the world. Recent US researches have generally found between 25 and 30 percent of women reporting physical abuse by a partner (Stark and Flitcraft, 1996), and about 20 percent reporting sexual abuse (Council on Scientific Affairs, American Medical Association, 1992), though individual surveys have found even higher figures of women reporting such forms of violence.

* University of Manchester, and Visiting Professor at Åbo Akademi University and Oslo University (From August 1999, Visiting Professor at Swedish School of Economics, Helsinki, and Tampere University).

Explaining the Problem: Roots, Causes or Excuses?

There are many ways to explain the problem of men's violence against women; they range across the whole of the social sciences – from psychology, psychoanalysis and social psychology to sociology, social anthropology, political science and economics. One simple but useful framework is to distinguish between those explanations that focus on the individual and their psychology; those that focus on socialisation and learning within the family (whether the family of origin or the family in the present); and those that focus on broader socio-cultural relations of power, for example, structural theories of patriarchy (Gondolf, 1985; Dankwort, 1992-93; Hearn, 1996a). In one sense, these different theories start from very different assumptions about the nature of violence. On the other hand, it is wrong to assume that there is one just explanation of men's violence, or that explanations are necessarily in competition with each other. It is not necessarily impossible to combine insights from two or more of these approaches, for example, structural processes operate through particular individuals with their own personal biographies.

While explanation is a very complex area of investigation and scholarship, there are a number of lessons that need to be borne in mind from previous research. First, and perhaps most radically, we need to be very cautious about thinking in terms of origins, roots and first or final causes. Whatever ancient first cause there might have been is certainly long lost in history; moreover, the operation of men's violence is different in different parts of the world, and it is inappropriate to assume that explanation in one place will work in all other places. The problem has to be reinvestigated and researched in each locality. Second, whatever approach is developed or prioritised, there is a need to gender it – to examine how gender and sexuality operate at the level of individuals, families, and broader social structures and cultural patterns. For example, Campbell has written that:

One of the strongest predictors of wife beating by men is whether they were exposed to violence in the house as children ... the boy who observes his father's violence is three times more likely to beat his own wife when he marries. The boy learns that aggression pays' (Campbell, 1993, p. 105).

Similarly, the recent Finnish national survey notes that 'Of those men whose fathers had perpetrated family violence (*sic.*), 41 % were also violent against their own partner.' (Heiskanen and Piispa, 1998, p. 3). However, such observations, though obviously of great interest, do not tell us about the gendered processes whereby boys observing violence by fathers may become men who are violent to women, while a similar process does not appear to operate for girls. Boys learn violence in the context of male domination more generally.

This leads onto a third point, namely, that explanations, any explanations, need to be treated with caution, as they can be re-used to take moral and political responsibility from individual men, and as 'excuses' for the violence. Explanations are not to be understood outside of their social context. Fourth, and linked to this, there is the importance of understanding men's violence in its specific social context – its concrete nature, its dynamic development and its wider social, indeed societal, context (see Dobash and Dobash, 1984). This entails attention to interpersonal, ideological and structural questions. It also highlights issues of difference and diversity, for example, by age, ethnicity, race, religion, sexuality, and other social divisions (Rice, 1990; Kirkwood, 1993; Tift, 1993; Pringle, 1995).

Fifth, there is the question of broad comparative and international approaches to explanation. In case there are any lurking suspicions that this is a biological rather than a social problem, I would ask you to think about how it can be claimed that the incredibly uneven and historically variable development of what is locally and nationally constructed at the time as 'legitimate' police and military violence can be explained biologically. Was Nazism just natural? Clearly, no. Such historically specific (at the time) 'legitimate' violence is a social and political phenomenon, as is men's violence against women. Broad comparative and historical studies are important here, as they point to the dramatically different levels of violence in times and places, especially when the threshold of violence is raised in or after war.

Sixth, men's violence against women is about men's power and control within the individualised feudal mode of reproduction within the patriarchal formation. It is the performance of violence along with what is considered intimacy, living together, sex, marriage, care, housework, and childcare.

Naming Men: The Problem of Men's Violence against Women and Its Consequences

Men's violence against women has to be understood in the context of social patterns of gendered power relations - what might be called 'the problem of men'. Men's violence against women is part of men's use of power, violence and control. Men remain the specialists in the doing of violence and violent crime. In the UK about 84 % of all recorded crime is by men; about 97 % of those in prison are men; a quarter of all men are convicted of an offence by the age of 25; and two-thirds of all male offenders are under 30 (Cordery and Whitehead, 1992). In contrast, about 12 times as many assaults are reported from men than from women. About 98 % of assaults reported on spouses are by men to women; and about 25 percent of all crimes recorded and telephone calls logged by the police are 'domestic' assaults by men on women. Men's violence against women is part of the problem of men.

Gender relations in the late 1990s in most countries can still be characterised by dominance and subordination, by men's relative dominance and women's relative subordination. Even in those countries where there appears to be greater relative equality between women and men, including the Nordic countries, there are still great inequalities in income, wages and wealth, and political, managerial and corporate power, as can be seen from the UN Human Development Reports. Seen in this context, the problem of men remains both very simple and rather complex (Hearn, 1999). While men and masculinities continue to be associated with power and control, men and masculinities are just as variable as women. Equally, while there are clearly all manner of changes in process, there is also a profound state of no change, in the sense that many arenas of power remain in the control of men, and men's violence persists.

The forms that gender dominance take are thus complex and changing. They include gendered economic exploitation, whereby the value of women's labour is not fully rewarded; gendered political and personal oppression, whereby people, along gender lines, are discriminated against, ignored, neglected, degraded, or harmed, to reduce them to less than human (Hearn, 1987, p.xiii); and gendered violence and violation. Importantly, exploitation, oppression and psychological abuse can continue without the direct use of physical violence and even without a direct awareness of experiences of violation. Particular associations of men and masculinities with power create specific political and personal problems in the form of pain, damage, distress, and violence for women and children. The negative consequences of men's violence are in all spheres of life for women: health and wellbeing, physical and mental; economic activity and loss of paid working time; human rights; political participation; family, friendship and cultural association.

Men's gendered dominance operates in different forms in local, regional and national contexts, with different versions of what might be called violent masculinities. It is important to identify such local forms and understand how they are reproduced and undermined. They are also complicated by resistance and social change in these patterns; by the cross-cutting of age, class, disability, ethnicity, race, religion and sexuality; and by the full range of contradictions, ambiguities and paradoxes that persist intrapersonally, interpersonally, collectively and structurally. Thus, for example, men's association with power also creates problems for men themselves (Thompson, 1995). Men who are in social, medical or psychological difficulty may live that experience through a relation, or attempted relation, with power. Indeed the very power and control of both some men and men generally create problems for other men, and for each other (Hearn, 1998a).

The need to critically focus on men and men's power and the problem of men's violence against women have been made apparent by feminist theory and practice; this work has made its main priority giving support to women, the hearing of women's voices, and the improvement of women's lives. Much remains to be done in naming men as the central problem in the analysis of and policy on men's violence against women. This includes changing men to reduce and stop violence against women; and educating men against violence against women.

Terminology: Naming the Problem

A question of special importance is the naming of the problem. I have already used the term 'men's violence to known women' several times. There have been a wide range of other terms used in English; these include: 'domestic violence', 'family violence', 'spouse (or spousal) violence', 'conjugal violence', all of which tend to de-gender the problem; and 'wife battering', 'wife abuse' and 'marital violence', which tend to gender it but in restricted ways. In Finland the term, 'perheväkivalta' (family violence), still seems to be the most widely used. Naming

the violence as predominantly men's violence is important analytically and theoretically; it is also important practically and in policy development.

II: Men Talking Violence to Known Women

Research on Men who have been Violent to Known Women

The research on men's violence to known women drawn on here has been conducted during 1991-1995 (Hearn, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1996b, 1998b, 1998c) and has been linked to, but separate from, the project on women's experiences of violence by known men directed by Jalna Hanmer (Hanmer, 1996, 1998; Hanmer et al., 1995). ('Violence, Abuse and the Stress-coping Process, Projects 1 and 2' on women and men respectively, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council [L 206 25 2003]). Both research projects used the same basic methods, although many of the issues raised have of course been different between the two projects. The project on men has been unusual in directly facing the question of interviewing men who have been violent to known women. 75 men were interviewed, sometimes more than once, from a number of sources: following arrest by the police; from men's programmes; via probation officers; from prisons; from various welfare agencies; as well as men who were not currently in contact with agencies. The first part of the interview consisted of an account of the man's story of the violence he had done, what had happened subsequently, how he understood why he had been violent, the reactions and responses of family, friends and agencies. The second part of the interview was a pre-coded questionnaire, which covered the man's and the relevant woman's biographical details, patterns of social support, responses from agencies, and measures of the man's well-being, his self-esteem and sense of control of his future (Mitchell and Hodson, 1983). At the end of the interview men were asked for their permission to do follow up interviews and consulting of their case records with the agencies that had had dealings with them or their 'case'. These were followed up in every case: 41 men gave 116 permissions which led to 130 agency follow-up contacts. Policy information was also collected from agencies. This research has provided a wealth of material on what men think and say about their violence against women, and what agencies do in response to it.

When Men Talk

When men talk about their own violence to known women they are doing several different things at the same time: they are usually trying to establish some form of credibility with the interviewer, sometimes by placing themselves in some kind of 'victim' position; they are giving descriptive accounts (no matter how 'accurate' or 'inaccurate'); they are providing (re)constructions of violence; they are also producing and reproducing silences and absences; they are operating within discourses of 'woman'; gender differentiation, 'man', sexuality and so on; they are providing accounts - repudiations, excuses, justifications and occasionally confessions - of their violence; and they may be recentering men. Men are quite able to talk about their violence and to give their reasons for their violence when they decide to do so. It is not so mysterious a process as is sometimes suggested. So what is happening when men talk about their violence to known women? What kind of talk do men use?

Interestingly, the great majority of men did not explain their violence with reference to their childhood. Most related it to what they saw as their legitimate rights over correction of women (justifications); their inability to control their anger and themselves more generally, particularly the use of their hand, arms and other parts of their physical bodies; the presence of violence 'inside' them (excuses); and occasionally to their illegitimate power over women (confessions). Some men did address the brutality of others to them in the past, usually fathers, teachers, peers, occasionally mothers. Thus some men 'explained' their violence by reference back to men in the past, and accordingly it can be argued that culture provides the context of violence or construct the norm of violence. In this sense, they received 'support', even legitimisation, from these men and their constructions and recollections of them.

One man described how his approved school headmaster 'kicked, punched, beat you with a big walking stick' - 'it was a violent regime ... things you learn in your early life or things that have happened in your early life do come back and haunt you in your later life ...' Another man who had spent six years in an approved school described how 'the headmaster used to stand you on a chair and say 'You're my size now aren't you.' And you used to say, 'Yes, sir'. And he used to punch you straight in the middle of the face and you'd go flying off the back of the chair.' This man also described being bullied by his peers until at 17 he decided to fight back then leading to fights with young men and conflicts with the police. He went on from there being violent to women. For such men violence from other men can act as part of a career and culture of violence that then moves onto violence to women, that was often acknowledged to be much 'easier' to do than the 'real violence' to men. It was in such contexts that

there was reference to a general norm of men's violence, as when one man said 'It was a violent place.' Furthermore, such violence from other men is seen by the men as an explanation, even an excuse, for their violence. While such references to 'violent places' in the past may be explained simply as *class cultures*, it would be a mistake to overstate this. Class is certainly relevant to the articulation of violence but this research did not demonstrate its causal power in any clear way.

It is difficult to argue, however, apart from a small number of cases, that there is a general culture of violence for both men and women. In this sense at least violence is *not a shared* aspect of culture, even though it is possible that men's violence to known women may be seen as legitimate by some women. Some men of course indicated that women accepted that his violence was legitimate or that the violence was '50/50' or, in one case, that the woman encouraged the violence, but all of these accounts have to be seen as what they are - accounts of men, not general, *agendered analyses of culture*. Seeing culture as the context for and norms of violence is to conceptualise violence in a relatively conventional way. However, if such an approach is to be used it is more accurate to speak of men's culture or some men's culture that may operate over time or at a given time across several social arenas. Without this qualification of 'culture' as *men's culture*, there are several dangers. These include the search for *sharing* in culture between men and women; the assumption of the *legitimacy* of men's violence and its acceptance by women; the assumption of *unconscious patterning* to violence rather than intention and clarity in men's actions; and the use of culture to not just explain but also excuse/justify men's violence. In such senses, culture can be a gloss of gendered social divisions and inequalities, that are taken-for-granted

Men's Cultures

It is more plausible to argue that there is for some men at least a *culture of men's violence* or *men's and boys' cultures of violence*. Men's culture could be said to operate *implicitly* in a number of respects. Perhaps the most important of these was the taken-for-granted nature of heterosexuality and male heterosexuality. It was rare for men to talk directly about their own heterosexuality or to talk about the relation of their violence to their sexual relationship in a direct way. The most common way this was articulated was by talking about the woman's actual or presumed infidelity to him - with reference to her 'messing about', 'going with other men', and so on. This was usually seen by the man as a clear justification for his violence. Thus talk between men, about women and women's sexuality could be said to be a form of men's culture or a means of men showing men's culture through possessive or hierarchic heterosexuality (Hearn, 1987).

Violence was also taken-for-granted in many of the accounts for what appeared to be different reasons: first, because that was the way man resolved his disputes; second, because some limited violence was accepted by the man as normal. Some men have a positive expectation that men will be violent. Violence is taken-for-granted and absence of violence is viewed with suspicion:

'But I mean I know men who couldn't be violent even when it's probably better for them and the woman. I think because they're not fully developed people. I'm a bit wary of men who are never violent.'

One can also examine the extent to which men's culture can be said to provide *explicit* support for men's violence in the present. There was considerable evidence for this particularly from men who were not in men's programmes. This support came primarily from family and friends. Men in the family did not usually intervene in other men's violence. For example, a man who reported about thirty examples of his violence was able to say: 'I think my father ... I don't think he actually knew that I used to be violent to her. I actually think that he knew that we didn't get on at times.' A more cautious decision appeared to have been taken by the family of a man who had been violent to women 'loads' of times: '... our family minds their own business. If he clouts his wife, he clouts his wife. If I clout mine, I clout mine.'

An apparently different response was described by another man:

'Q. Did any of your family or any of your friends know about the violence?

A. Two of my brothers knew. You know, they was blaming me for it, but they know different now. They've read everything what she's put down in statements and they know now that 99% she started it.'

Men's culture is not just about men ignoring other men's violence; it may also concern outright conflict between men:

'... she [his ex-wife] came back with her boyfriend in a van. I know he came to physically beat me senseless ... Luckily my brother was there ... Well he came to the door and my brother wouldn't let him in, I mean he were going to flatten him, which he would have done.'

Rarely, men family members do involve external agencies. One man referred to the intervention of the woman's father:

'He's caused a bit of aggro in the past, very much so ... He's had me locked up for violence ... and I took it out on [was violent to] her.'

This kind of intervention through agencies like the police by men in the family was unusual; more common was either direct intervention to the man himself or little or no action.

A rather similar pattern was generally reported in relation to men's men friends. A man who had stabbed his wife reported:

'... they [his friends] said "You've done nothing wrong against us or our families, you're still the same person as you were before." They said "What you've done, you've done something wrong, yes. And any man would have done something more or less similar, maybe not the same thing, or maybe not even anything related, but they would have fought for their children, sort of thing." They said and when children are involved in any sort of relationship or a man and a woman argument, it's a case of domestic and anything can happen.'

Some men did have a large circle of friends, but chose not to use their friends to talk about their or each other's violence. They might, for example, be friends met primarily for drinking or playing sport or watching sport. The agenda there was different; it was not generally something as 'intimate' or 'disclosing' or 'embarrassing' or 'ambiguous' as his violence to his wife. On the other hand, in some cases the existence of men's friendship networks was continued through an agreement, whether explicit or implicit, not to 'interfere' with other men's private business.

As a man who had been imprisoned for various acts of violence to women including indecent assault explained:

A. 'And like my mate were with me when all this [indecent assault] has gone off. He's even turned round to me and said, 'You've done nowt.'

Q. Right. But he was there.

A. Yes, he says he were there.

Q. So was he a witness?

A. Police wouldn't have him as a witness for me. They wouldn't have him as a witness.

Q. If you had have called him as a witness, what would he have said in court?

A. He'd have probably said what he said to me, that nowt happened.'

Not only do men friends not generally 'get involved' with their or each other's violence, but if they do attempt to intervene that may itself be resisted, sometimes with the threat of further violence. An important part of such a structuring of men's friendships is the assumption by most men that 'friends' and 'mates' themselves refer to men not women.

Men's Culture as Men's Talk and Representation

Constructing this culture as men's culture suggests that we need to also see men's talk about their violence to known women as social representation by men. In this sense, men's talk is primarily discursive rather than some corresponding report on what happened previously. It is after all men's talk. As such it is limited both by the *particular* relation of the men to the(ir) violence in question and by their more *structured* relation to power. A basic difficulty that the problem is being looked at through men's accounts, men's narratives, story-telling. The question clearly arises that while these give some indication of how *men* understand, construct, explain, account for their own violence, this should not be taken as any kind of definitive version of the 'truth' of the situation. Other research has shown how men tend to under-report their violence as compared with the women who experience the violence (Dobash et al., 1996). Women may themselves under-report violence to them for other reasons. There were many examples of minimisation in the reports of the men. On the other hand, when men's accounts were triangulated with reports from agency staff. In most cases men's and agency reports were quite compatible though both added further detail in crucial respects.

A particularly significant aspect of such talk is men's construction of what counts as violence in the first place. This typically involves the inclusion and exclusion of particular behaviours in talking of 'violence' men overwhelmingly refer to physical violence and even then physical violence of certain kinds. Some men do refer to emotional, verbal and psychological violence but this was very unusual even for those men in men's programmes. However, even these references are often related to the threat of physical violence or are constructed as if they are physical violence in their reduction to incidents. For men, violence to known women is generally constructed as one or more of the following:

1. Physical violence that is more than a push. Holding, restraint, use of weight/blocking, throwing (both things and people) are often excluded.
2. Convictions of physical violence.
3. Physical violence that causes or is likely to cause damage that is visible or considered by the man to be physically lasting.
4. Physical violence that is not seen as specifically sexual. Sexual violence, other than convicted or admitted rape, is seen as separate.

The convoluted nature of the men's definitions of violence are illustrated from the following quote:

'I wasn't violent, but she used to do my head in that much. I picked her up twice and threw her against the wall, and said 'just leave it'. That's the only violence I've put towards her. I've never struck a woman, never, and I never will. When I held her I did bruise her somewhere on the shoulder, and she tried making out that I'd punched her. But I never did. I never to this day touched a woman.'

In this account, 'throwing against a wall', 'holding', 'bruising' do not appear to be constructed as violence, while 'striking', 'punching' and 'touching' do.

Men's talk can also be understood in terms of different (sub-)discourses, with the man placing 'himself' in different subject positions. These include repudiations (in which violence and the man are disconnected); quasi-repudiations (in which violence is talked about by denying other kinds of violence); excuses where violence is seen as existing inside the man and is then 'brought out' by specific conditions ('I seem to explode'; 'It all boils up like a volcano, it's waiting'); justifications where violence is seen as chosen by the man and arises from decisions about the man's dissatisfaction with his relationship with the woman ('She let herself go'); and confessions where the man equates himself with the violence to some extent at least. These forms of talk occur in various combinations, sometimes ways that are quite contradictory and inconsistent.

Men's talk can also be understood as story-telling. The man may present himself as heroic, fallen, beaten, surviving, liable to explode, the product of his childhood, really loving of his wife, and so on. Interesting as these stories are they do not necessarily help to reduce violence. Talk about violence is for men also about all sorts of other things - the weather, drinking, money, parents, football, chatting and so on. Talk about violence is not necessarily about violence. Responses to questions on violence may not address violence. Violence may be avoided. Answers may not refer to violence as a significant topic of attention. They may be on completely different 'wavelengths'. Such talk can be analysed in its own terms - without necessary reference to violence. It is, after all, talk. Talk can be an avoidance.

The value of discursive and deconstructive approaches to violence is that they emphasise the fact that there is no such thing as unmediated social experience or representation. Violence does not pre-exist in some pure form prior to reference to it. Statements about men's violence to known women, like speech and text more generally, '... are not just supplements to a presence which exists in unmediated form 'elsewhere' but rather they are the constitutive form of any possible presence, which can only be already decentred.' (Frank, 1985, p. 111). There is no fixed, pre-centred meaning to a supposedly initial act of violence; violence builds on previous violences, themselves decentred, and events deemed to be subsequent to those recognised as violence may involve further violence.

On the other hand, seeing violence simply in this way leaves me feeling extremely uneasy. Violence is not just representation. Violence clearly exists. It exists in the immediacy of that moment of violence. We are not just talking of a constructed text - but of material happenings that involve violation, pain, damage, suffering and sometimes death, so removing the possibility of further action and talk from the absent person/woman. Another problem is the various transpositions that may take place in

construction and reconstruction of violence are not all of the same order; they are of uneven significance. There is a general problem with too narrow a focus on representation itself outside of a social context; that problem is partly political and policy-related. In short, how does a narrow focus on representation actually assist the reduction and elimination of men's violence to known women.

Men's Culture as Material Discursive Practices

Reducing men's violence to representation, text, talk is potentially dangerous, as it may obscure the material being and effects of violence. Men's violence to known women and men's talk about such violence need to be thought of as both separate from each other and intimately connected to each other. Each a form of the other. Men's violence to known women involves both violence and talk about violence that are simultaneously material and discursive. Accordingly, it can be understood not just in the context of culture or as cultural representation but as cultural practice that is simultaneously material and discursive. In this sense men's violence to known women can be understood as material, discursive culture that is continually being practised by men rather than shared between men and women. This perspective can be recognised and elucidated in a number of different ways.

First, men's talk about violence is not just representation (of norms); it is a creation of a reality in its own right. This applies both in the conduct of violence and in the talk about violence. For example, a man who reported about thirty assaults recounted how he would tell the woman 'You're not attractive and nobody will fancy you and I could get better than you and what did I need her for.' He explained 'of course this was so that she wouldn't think she was interesting to anybody else, so I had like a hold.' This was reinforced by his refusal to allow her to visit him in prison to avoid his supposed embarrassment at being seen with her. The performance of violence itself a form of representation/talk, while talk/representation can also be violence. There is the representation of violence and the violence of representation (Heathcote, 1994); the strict separation of violence and talk about violence needs to be problematised. Men's talk about violence is a way of reproducing violence. Talk is material in its being and in its effects. Men's definitions, explanations, excuses and justifications, and indeed more general discursive constructions all contribute to the construction or countering of men's violence.

The relationship of talking, not talking (silence) and violence is particularly complex. Talk can be opposed to violence; talk can be violent/violence, just as violence can be talk; silence can be opposed to violence; silence can be violent/violence; just as violence can be silence. Violence and the ability to talk (convincingly) about violence are personal resources for men in relation to women. Personal resources, including both violence and talking about violence, can be a means of both continuing even escalating violence and moving away from violence. Just as talk can both reproduce and cause violence, so too can silence. Not talking can be a way of denying violence or even threatening violence, or it can be a way of stopping violence, by being quiet, listening, not dominating. Talking about violence to women may be avoided by many men, but it can be a way of coping for some, perhaps increasingly for many, men. While many of the men appeared to make few if any responses to their own violence, the more violent the men were, the greater their range of coping responses. This included not only avoiding the problem, but also rethinking the problem and even taking more active steps.

Second, the current conduct of agency policy and practice emphasise the importance of talk. Incarceration, beyond one night, is extremely rare for men who have been violent to known women. Fines, community service and injunctions are also used. However, talk is the main medium of agency intervention with men. Talk can be used as a way of showing men have moved away from violence, as well as a means of excusing, continuing, reproducing violence, of confronting the problem; or avoiding the problem. Men talking about violence may easily become part of a therapeutic discourse, in which the talk is assumed to provide an explanation of the *individual's* violence, through the recollection of 'bits' of his past, his personality, inclinations, activities, drinking and so on. Talk-based approaches may detract from approaches based on or focusing on the removal of men, punishment, non-verbal interventions, the material conditions that promote men's violence, the immediate acts of violence themselves, explicit state and other publicity against men's violence to known women, and preventive education of boys and men.

Third, there is some degree of correspondence between men's accounts and the accounts of agency staff with whom they have had the closest connection. Interestingly, both are often insistent on seeing the particular men as exceptional to some supposed 'other men'. For example, men with their prime contact with the probation service tend to define themselves as criminals, and as such different from men who 'beat up women'; often the probation officers who work with them also do not focus

primarily on their violence to women but rather on other problems. Men in men's programmes that have been specifically set up to counter violence have a rather different relationship to their violence. Violence is no longer part of the cultural context, or a cultural norm or a representation, but is a cultural practice to be reproduced or change. Whether the programme is seen as 'scaring', 'brilliant', a 'waste of time' or 'something that has changed my life', the sense of active agency is undeniable. This matches the construction of men and men's violence that are promoted by the leaders of such programmes. For them is both the violence specifically and the whole man/person - violence is both endemic and liable to be changed if attended to seriously enough.

Fourth, the specific constructions that men use to talk of violence interconnect closely with the constructions of agencies that are themselves generally dominated by men. They are generally men's agencies. Definitions of what counts as violence and how violence is explained and understood, are equally important for agency policy and personnel and in thus these construct options for women and men, including in some cases their very livelihood and survival (i.e. avoidance of women being killed). Thus men's talk in agencies have definite material effects for both women and men.

Finally, the whole complex of violence, talk about violence, responses to violence by both individuals and agencies needs to be understood as a cultural phenomenon that is both material and discursive. Triangulation of such different kinds of accounts is useful in portraying violence, effects of violence, responses to violence and talk about violence as a cultural phenomenon. It also involves being centrally concerned with the interrelation of histories, biographies and the analysis of representations.

III: Men Responding to Violence to Known Women

Recent Policy Developments

Men's responses to men's violence, especially in the state but also more widely in communities, is part of the problem of men's violence to women. There is a long history of men ignoring or even implicitly condoning men's violence against women (Hearn, 1992, 1996a). The last thirty years have, however, seen major advances in bringing the issue of men's violence against women into the public domain, primarily through feminist theory and practice. There has been a substantial development of policies against such violence - internationally, nationally and locally - prompted by feminist politics and action research on women's experiences of violence and agency responses (for example, Dobash and Dobash, 1980, 1992; Hanmer and Saunders, 1984, 1990). Recent policy development and debate has focused on:

- the provision of refuges, shelters, and other (more) women-centred services in the state, community and voluntary sectors, and the material support of women victims/survivors;
- criminal justice system reforms, including injunction enforcement and free legal representation;
- provision of safer housing and greater income support for women and children;
- services for black and minority ethnic women;
- inter-agency policy development and co-ordination;
- the attempt to create safer public spaces;
- the devising of policies that deal with men.

Men need to support all these policies and practices. However, throughout all state and relevant community and voluntary sectors, there is a need to provide policies, practices and services that are as responsive as possible to women facing the problem of men's violence. This involves staff being suitably trained, being willing to ask difficult questions about violence, and being able to provide the necessary material and emotional support to women that will assist the change in their situation.

Men's Responses

This research has catalogued the uneven way that state agencies respond to the problem, and may even contribute to its continuation through inaction or supporting the man. Most of the organisations with which men who have been violent to women come in contact can be characterised as 'men's organisations'. They have their own gender structures and gender regimes; they are usually strongly dominated by men; and in many ways they raise similar issues as those raised in relation to the men themselves talking about men's violence to women, such as how violence is defined; what is included and excluded; how is violence explained, excused, 'justified', reproduced and stopped. It is vital to remember that state agencies themselves include many men who have their own definitions and understandings of violence. In this third section, I consider both men's responses in agencies to men's

violence to women, and some major arenas for policy and practical change, including those in which men, and boys, may respond to and change against men's violence against women:

- changing the male self;
- changing patriarchal family practices;
- men in groups;
- agency contact with women and men;
- criminal justice, social services and health;
- men's programmes;
- agency policy development;
- schools and educational institutions;
- campaigns and public politics.

Changing the Male Self

Men's violence against women, though a structural phenomenon, is enacted by individual men; the responsibility for violence lies with individual men. Whatever the social arena, changing men against violence against women involves changing of the male self. Most obviously, changing men against violence against women begins with men's relationship to women, and particularly the woman herself. This involves the man recognising the women's experience, listening to her, stopping the violence completely, and if necessary stopping the relationship and moving away from her. This is not to say that the individual man is naturally violent; however, dominant social constructions of the male psyche or male subjectivity are often intimately bound up with violence. It is at least a reference point for many dominant forms of male subjectivity.

Changing Patriarchal Family Practices

Similarly, the form and conduct of families and practices in families is a vital area needing attention. The assumptions that are made about who has the 'legitimate' right to control decision-making in families provide the not just the backcloth to but the very fabric of violence. Thus men's patriarchal control of women's money, time, movement, food, friends, family, clothes and so on both provide a facilitating context to more direct physical, sexual and emotional violences, and may be seen as constituting violences and abuses in themselves. A particularly interesting example is Yllö and Straus's study comparing violence against wives between the states of the United States. Broadly, they find two main relationships: first, a U-curve (curvilinear relationship) for 'the rate of severe violence against wives' against 'the structural status of women', with the highest violence in states with the lowest and highest status of women; second, a 'straight line' (linear) relationship of 'the rate of severe violence against wives' and 'acceptance of patriarchal family norms' (to what extent it is believed that husbands *should* dominate family decision making). Yllö and Straus (1995, p. 398) remark: '... wife beating is most common in a context where women's status in economic, educational, legal, and political institutions is relatively high, but where prevailing norms favor their subordination within marriage.' This highlights the need to understand violence against women as power, dominance and control; to change such violence necessitates change throughout all spheres of society and not only the only the formal status of (some) women.

Men in Groups: Men Learning More or Less Violence

Much of men's information about how to be a man comes from being with other men in groups. A number of previous studies of men who have been violent to known women have emphasised the importance of men's support for each other in perpetuating this violence. DeKeseredy (1990) has stressed the way 'male peer support' reproduces men's violence, through providing attachments and resources in the form of social integration, information support and esteem support. He also cites a number of studies that have found a strong relationship between the frequency of abusers' contacts with friends and female victimisation. In my research I have found that it is not so much the quantity but the quality of those social contacts that is important. Social support from friends that is anti-violence is likely to have a very different effect from that which is pro-violence. However, many men do seem remarkably unwilling to challenge other men's violence against women. Men's support for men needs to be viewed with great caution (Hearn, 1998b). Changing men can occur in any social situation, not just those labelled 'anti-sexist' or 'profeminist'.

Agency Contact with Women and Men

Men who have been violent to known women generally have far less contact with agencies than do women who experienced such violence. The women interviewed had been in contact with an average of about 11 *types* of agency in relation to their experience of violence. Many men have no or

negligible contact with agencies. For some men, it is quite difficult for them, short of murder, to have much sustained contact with agencies. Even so there is a large amount of agency contact that does take place with men who have been violent to known women, and women who have experienced violence from known men. However, this is usually not directly focused on stopping the violence. The problem may be mentioned in passing, other problems may be attended to instead or the violence may be dealt with periodically but not necessarily in a way that is likely to reduce or eliminate it. While there is much agency time and resources devoted to the problem both with women and with men, much of the time and resources is not directed in countering men's violence.

Criminal Justice, Social Services and Health Intervention

Criminal justice, and especially *Police* intervention, against men's violence is more consistent than previously. The police have relatively responsive to reform over the last 10 years in some parts of the UK. Since 1987-88, force orders have been in operation which advise officers to use their existing powers of arrest in relation to assaults in the home; similar national guidelines were issued in 1990. Consistent arrest is now more likely, but prosecution, conviction and indeed imprisonment have changed little; however, even some court-based intervention appears to have some beneficial on at least some men (Dobash et al. 1996). There has also been a growth of Domestic Violence, Child Protection and Rape Special Units in various police forces. Another development has been the production of greater publicity to women by the police about these services, including their printing in various languages for women whose first language is not English. Emergency quick telephone services are also available for some women who are in specific danger from particular men. There are still many difficulties in the improvement of Police work:

1. Greater attention to the interconnections between men's violence against women and child protection work.
2. Higher profile to policy and publicity that opposes men's violence against women.
3. Greater awareness of the continuity of many men's violence against women, and the interconnections between different kinds of violence. Need for greater understanding of how some men use excuse and justify violence, for example, 'drink', use of 'calmness'.
4. Strict enforcement of force policy.
5. Greater liaison with other agencies.

Some parallel but rather slower responses have been made by the Probation Service and the Crown Prosecution Service, in developing specialist workers and producing clear guidelines for all staff on the problem. The *Crown Prosecution Service* (CPS) has attempted to improve policy and practice in recent years; however, cases are still routinely delayed, dropped, and reduced in the offence during the prosecution process. It is vital to process cases swiftly, and to maintain support for the women throughout the proceedings. Additional areas for concern and policy action are research:

1. The reasons for not proceeding to prosecution with a case are clearly varied. The reasons given by individual CPS solicitors elaborate on the formal reasons for not proceeding, recorded in the Code for Crown Prosecutors. Even though the CPS is working within a given legal framework, there is room for discretion in particular cases, particularly in respect to the public interest criterion. Not proceeding may involve dropping the case or prosecuting a lesser charge. This is especially important in cases where the parties are known to each other. The questions that arise include: how can different CPS solicitors develop a greater knowledge and awareness of the need to prosecute? How can greater consistency be guaranteed between CPS solicitors and indeed between offices in this regard? This may involve a combining the development of specialist expertise in cases of men's violence to known women and across the board training for all CPS solicitors.
2. CPS work is defined in terms of the prosecution of particular cases. While much information is collected on each case, this may not include the full context of the situation, such as continuity of violence over time. Can this mass of information collected be put to further use? Can the context of violence be more fully included? Can the woman's perspective be more fully acknowledged beyond just being a witness to the alleged offence, for example, in terms of information on the continuity of violence over time, or the possibility of options for her to change the situation? Interconnections between men's violence to known women and child protection work are rarely considered in CPS work. These are important in understanding the full damage of men's violence, and the need to prosecute cases with maximum urgency.
3. The liaison of CPS with other agencies is extensive, but primarily for the compilation of evidence to inform prosecution. It is not liaison designed to assist the women or alleviate the situation. Can liaison between criminal justice and civil law be extended in such ways?.

4. The work of the CPS would be eased by being able to obtain statements and other evidential information more speedily. This relies on police with their own work demands and priorities. Could there be specific police doing CPS-identified follow-up work? Would this assist? Speed of obtaining evidence is especially important in cases involving people known to each other.
5. The non-availability and destruction of files is crucial. In a few cases there were problems of obtaining files. Destruction of files is a particular concern, especially when men re-offend. Equally important policy and practice issues concern the court system, and the development of trained and knowledgeable magistrates, judges and lawyers.

The *Probation Service* became involved with men who have been violent to known women in a number of ways, including Pre-Sentence Reports to Court, Community Supervision, the management and staffing of Hostels, the work of the Probation teams in Prisons, supervision of men of life sentence, through care, the management and staffing of sex offenders programmes, family court welfare work, liaison with other agencies and so on. Having said this, the amount of ongoing direct work by probation officers on the problem of men's violence to known women was found to be disappointingly low. There are a number of areas of concern that have become apparent in Probation work with men:

1. Some cases showed probation officers' lack of involvement in confirming the problem of the man's violence to known women. Some probation officers were concerned to get the man to recognise the problem but were unsuccessful. Rarely did probation intervention work specifically on the problem.
2. The difficulties found in Probation Service work are of three main kinds:
 - a) avoidance of the problem by the probation officer;
 - b) avoidance of the problem by the man;
 - c) lack of success in intervention, through men's denial, the use of inappropriate approaches etc.
3. There is a need for understanding the complexity of men's violence to known women. It is necessary to go beyond explanations that rely solely on 'drink'. There are also dangers of explaining the man's violence in terms of 'the relationship'.
4. There is a need for more attention to links between men's violence to women and child protection.
5. There is a need to ensure that developing focused work on men's violence to known women is done in away that maintains and develops support for women and women's projects. This may include court-mandated men's programmes specifically designed to counter men's violence.

While *Social Services Departments* in the UK have a statutory duty in relation to children in danger of violence, abuse and neglect, this does not apply to women who are in similar danger from violence by men. Both Social Services Departments and Probation have not, at least until recently, made this problem, and especially men's violence to known women, a high priority, even though many of the other problems that they may deal with, most obviously child abuse (Bowker et al., 1988; Mullender and Morley, 1994), may be connected. Initial research on this issue was based on investigations of the work and files of social workers and probation officers (Leonard and McLeod, 1980; Maynard, 1985; Swain, 1986). This demonstrated the relative lack of attention to the problem of violence in the interventions and indeed the recording of many social workers. There are increasing indications of growing interest in the development of policy and practice in both Social Services Departments and Probation that works directly on this problem (for example, Burnham et al., 1990; McColl, 1991a, 1991b; ACOP, 1992/1996; Gillespie and Lupton, 1995; Potts, 1996; Mullender, 1997; Hearn, 1999b).

The most important general conclusion from this research on men was the relatively low level of contact with Social Services Departments in relation to their violence against women. Only 8 of the 60 men reported contact with Social Services Departments or Voluntary Social Work Agencies. This low level of contact did not increase with greater violence. This very limited amount of contact contrasted with the much greater level of contacts reported with, for example, doctors and GPs. Of 55 men who had had agency contact in relation to violence, 29 reported contact with their GP, and 8 with hospitals in relation to their violence. In the light of this research, there is a specific need to:

1. relate child protection work and work on men's violence to known women;
2. consider men's violence to known women in other sectors of Social Services work other than child protection work;
3. to consider men's violence to known women as a priority for social work intervention in its own right;
4. to develop focused work with men who have been violent to known women while maintaining and developing support for women;
5. to maintain accurate recording on men's violence to known women;
6. to develop interagency work.

Violence is bad for your health. *Health* agencies were a major point of contact for both women and men. There is a very urgent need for policy and practice reform in the everyday work of health workers and professionals, so that men's violence is asked about, recognised, recorded, and acted against in a consistent way. Health agencies could become a major force in action against men's violence.

Men's Programmes: Specific Intervention Against Violence

During the 1980s there has been a growth of group-based men's programmes specifically designed for men who have been violent to women (Adams, 1988; Caesar and Hamberger, 1989; Edleson and Tolman, 1992). In North America, the initial forms included shelter adjunct programmes, mental health programmes and self-help programmes (Gondolf, 1985). In addition, there have also been initiatives from anti-sexist men and feminist women, and from within the criminal justice system, in particular the Probation Service. Perhaps most importantly, there are major variations in the philosophy, theoretical orientations, and practical methods of different men's programmes, including psychoanalytic, cognitive-behavioural, systemic, and profeminist (Dankwort, 1992-93). In profeminist models, the task is to educate men, sometimes didactically, on the inaccuracy and oppressiveness of their beliefs and actions — what has been called 'profeminist resocialization' (Gondolf, 1993). Typical methods involve the men describing and analysing their actual violence, abuse and controlling behaviour, and moving away from that power and control and towards more equal relationships. More specific techniques include cost-benefit analysis (of the gains and consequences of violent and abusive behaviour), safety plans (strategies for avoiding violence and abuse), and control logs (diary records of attempts to control partners) (Gondolf, 1993). Some programmes are fixed length, say 25 weeks, others more open-ended.

In the Duluth 'Power and Control' model (Pence and Paymar, 1990) all aspects of men's power and control over women - physical, sexual, economic, emotional and so on - are confronted and, if possible, changed. The programme's task is to educate, challenge and change the full range of men's behaviours, not only physical violence. In the UK, most programmes have developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s on a voluntary or part-funded basis. There is increasing interest in court-mandated programmes, in which the man completes attendance at the programme as part of his court sentence following conviction.

There has been a good deal of interest in the evaluation of the effectiveness of men's programmes (for example, Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealey, 1985; Edleson, 1990, Edleson and Syers, 1990). An evaluation study of two men's programmes in Scotland working with a combination of cognitive-behavioural methods and a profeminist 'Power and Control' framework has produced relatively impressive results (Dobash et al., 1996). This evaluation used women partners' assessment of men's behaviour following intervention. Three months after the imposition of the criminal justice sanction (i.e. men's programme or other sanctions, for example, fines), 20 percent of the men in the programmes had committed another violent act, while 62 percent of the men with other criminal justice sanction had done so. After a year, the comparable figures were 33 and 75 percent respectively. An even clearer differentiation appears when the frequency of violence is considered. After three months, none of the women, whose partner was in the programme reported five or more incidents of violence, while 16 percent of the women whose partner had other criminal justice sanctions did so. After a year, the comparable figures were 7 and 37 percent. This evaluative study fits closely with some US evaluations. Tolman and Bennett (1990) found that 60 percent of men who complete programmes were not physically assaultive of women after 6 months.

One of the most difficult questions is the evaluation of different curricula and approaches amongst men's programmes. In my research, men from three programmes with quite different philosophies were interviewed. Virtually all the men had some positive remarks about the programme; only one of the 19 men from this source (41 were from other sources) dismissed the experience as a 'complete waste of time' (Hearn, 1998b). However, such responses cannot in themselves be taken as evidence of 'success' in stopping violence. As one of the women leaders of a men's programme noted: 'What I find with men in the group is that physical violence stops probably within the first week. They over-compensate then by increasing the verbal, emotional and psychological [violence], because they've nowhere to off-load the tension you see. That takes a long time.'

Programme groups often involve complex dynamics whereby men recognise their similarity with and difference from others' stories and behaviours, including intentions to change or not in the future (Hearn, 1998b). Peer support between men in men's programmes may assist some men to change

through mutual re-education (Gondolf, 1984; Saunders, 1989). While Gondolf (1989, p.xi) argued that 'Those batterers in deep denial and resistance may be more likely to respond to the didactic confrontation of the feminist approach.' Finally, it is very important not to generalise about programmes (they vary a lot; it all depends what they do), and not to divert resources from women's projects into men's programmes.

General Agency Policy Development: Changing Men In and Outside Agencies

Following the research on both women's and men's experiences of men's violence to known women, a series of policy and implementation seminars were organised to feedback the results of the research and assist policy development (Hanmer, 1995; Hearn, 1995b, 1995c; Hanmer et al., 1995). In these policy seminars it became clear that there were important issues needing attention across particular agency responses to the problem of men's violence to known women (Hearn, 1996b). These include:

1. *Educating men on what violence is:* a basic educational task is for men to understand more fully what men's violence to known women is. In the research many men had a very limited definition of violence. Violence is not only physical violence alone, nor is it only physical violence that is visibly damaging or leads to police intervention. It includes pushing, shoving, blocking, pinning, holding and throwing the woman - all forms of physical violence excluded by some men. It is also sexual violence and abuse; violence and abuse of children and young people; emotional, verbal and psychological violence; threat, control of money, time, friends, potentially the whole social life of the woman. It is that which the woman experiences as violence from the man - a sense of the situation being out of control. Men do not have to use physical violence in order to be experienced as violent. Boys, young men and men, including those in agencies, have to understand this broader definition of violence in order to work against violence. This is important in schools, youth work and other agencies.
2. *Dealing with the problem as the responsibility of the statutory sector:* there has been considerable interest in recent years in voluntary sector responses against men's violence through men's programmes. While this has developed some innovative work, the responsibility for intervention should not remain here. The statutory sector of local and central government, the health service and the criminal justice system has to have the responsibility of dealing with the problem of men's violence to known women, just as it does for child protection. Leaving the problem to the voluntary sector would be leaving the responsibility for law enforcement to it rather than the statutory sector.
3. *Producing clear, general policy statements:* agencies and interagency groups need to have clear general policy statements against men's violence to known women. Violence is not to be tolerated.
4. *Developing public campaigns:* these statements need to be supplemented by public campaigns using the power of advertising and the media.
5. *Changing the conditions that produce and sustain men's violence:* the conditions that produce and sustain men's violence to known women need to be challenged and changed at all levels. Agencies and interagency groups are engaged in maintaining and/or changing power and inequalities between men and women. This applies both in the internal operation of agencies and the delivery of services to people, such as equal opportunities and other policies.
6. *Addressing other oppressions:* connections between men's violence to known women and racism, sexism, ageism, disablism, and heterosexism need to be addressed, in both understanding that violence and in the development of agency and interagency responses.
7. *Developing appropriate and detailed policy and practice:* each agency or interagency group needs to develop its own appropriate, detailed policies and practices in working against men's violence to known women. The question needs to be asked what is good policy here?
8. *Monitoring, maintaining and improving policy and practice:* agency and interagency policies and practices need to be monitored. Commitment needs to be reasserted and developed; successes celebrated; areas for improvement acknowledged and addressed.
9. *Working against violence with men in contact in a focused way:* contact that agencies have with men who have been or who are likely to be violent to known women needs to be much more focused. It should directly address the problem of violence and work to stop it.
10. *Placing issues of power, control and responsibility as central in focussed work with men:* focused work with men must avoid providing further excuses/justifications for violence.
11. *Developing interagency work with women and with men:* interagency work with women who have experienced violence from known men may also lead to the recognition of the problem of what is appropriate work with men. This has been a major focus of activity, especially in urban areas; inter-agency policy forums have brought together women's projects, community, social services, health, probation, police, prosecution and other agencies. Interagency work with men is at an early stage of development. It involves identifying key responsibilities, for both agencies and workers, for this work.

12. *Making men, men's power and men's violence explicit in agency and interagency work:* agencies and interagency groups that work with men are generally 'men's agencies', predominately controlled, managed and staffed by men. Agencies that deal with men have to meet to explicitly address the question of men and men's power and violence. This involves managers and staff meeting, both within and between agencies, to consider these issues. There is a need to change agency cultures so men's violence against women is not acceptable. It is not possible, on the one hand, to work with men against *their* violence and, on the other, to be violent and abusive ways as men. Developing ways of managing that are non-oppressive, non-violent and non-abusive is a high priority (Hearn, 1996b; Collinson and Hearn, 1996).

13. *Addressing the need to change men in agencies:* this kind of work means that men in agencies have to be able to work against men's violence to known women. This involves considering the position and power of men in agencies such men being able to do this kind of work as well as reducing or stopping their own violence against women.

14. *Dealing with ambiguous issues of men's support for men:* changing men's practice in agencies in working with men who have been violent to known women raises some complex and ambiguous questions about men giving support to men. On the one hand male workers may need to work closely with male users; on the other hand it is essential to avoid collusion between men. The issue needs to be addressed rather than avoided.

15. *Reaching out to men not in contact with agencies:* many men are not in contact with agencies in relation to the problem of their violence against women. There is a need for outreach work, bringing us full circle to educational and campaign work with men and boys.

Schools and Educational Institutions: Potential for Change

Schools and other educational institutions are an obvious arena in which education of boys and thus men against violence to girls and women may be developed (Hearn, 1999a). Edleson and Tolman (1992, p.109) observe: 'One of the most logical avenues to influencing future behaviour is through contact with children and adolescents in the educational system.' There are a number of interrelated ways in which such educational intervention can be framed. First, there are those attempts to produce non-violent educational environments. Second, there have been increasing concerns with the operation of gender and sexual dynamics in schools, and how these may include violence, abuse and harassment. This perspective also often emphasises the ways in which the social production and reproduction of boys and young men in and around schools is a major part of the production and reproduction of adult men and masculinities, including men's violence against women. Thus in order to reduce that violence it is necessary to challenge and change the ways that boys are brought up and educated in schools and elsewhere (Mahoney, 1985; Askew and Ross, 1988; Whyld, 1990). An excellent recent review of theory and practice for working with adolescent boys around these issues is provided by Salisbury and Jackson (1996). In such broad approaches to the challenging of boys sexist behaviour there is a huge range of possible interventions, exercises and practices that may be relevant to reducing boys' violence in the present and men's violence in the future.

Third, there is the problem of bullying in schools (for example, Tattum and Lane, 1993). Bullying between boys can be understood as versions of boyhood by other boys (Salisbury and Jackson, 1996, p.90); and in turn these different forms of boyhood go on to encourage or discourage violence in adulthood. Anti-bullying policies can be part of an educational environment in which men's violence against women is not tolerated, and the whole educational ethos of the school is re-examined.

Fourth, there are some specific attempts to introduce education on men's violence against violence into the curriculum. This may be done as part of general education on peace and conflict resolution, personal and social development classes, or specific teaching on violence, gender equality or equal opportunities. Edleson and Tolman (1992, pp.109-110) have reported on several such initiatives. For example, the curriculum, *Skills for Violence-Free Relationships* (cited in Levy, 1984) was developed for 13-18 year olds jointly with the Southern California Coalition on Battered Women and the Junior League of Los Angeles. Four major areas are covered: defining abuse; understanding the myths and facts of domestic violence; comprehending the social and psychological contributors to abuse; and developing skills that provide alternatives to abuse, such as stress management, conflict resolution, and assertion skills. However, 'evaluation comparing students in classes where the curriculum was delivered with those in classes where it was not delivered reveals that knowledge about woman abuse and community resources increased significantly. Student attitudes about male and female roles in intimate relationships did not, however, change significantly' (Edleson and Tolman, 1992, p.110). Special attention needs to be given in curricular and related development to the interconnections of

sexuality and violence in sex education and elsewhere. This is partly because of the generally sexualised nature of men's violence against women. It is also because of the increasing understanding that much sexual abuse of children and young people is enacted by young male adults and male youth. In this work, teachers and other educational personnel need their own education, training and support. Finally, there is the question of response to violence to staff within education (see, for example, Education Service Advisory Committee, 1990). This perspective can be placed within the framework of increasing personal safety at work.

Campaigns and Public Politics: Broad Education Against Violence

A final arena for changing men against violence against women is the world of campaign and public politics. They can be prompted by state, third sector, and even occasionally private sector organisations; Edinburgh City Council's 'Zero Tolerance' campaign against men's violence uses posters, stickers, T-shirts, exhibition and other materials, and circulates widely in the UK and elsewhere. In Canada two national campaigns have been promoted by men as part of anti-sexist politics. First, the White Ribbon Campaign organised in 1991 urging men to wear or display a white ribbon on the anniversary of the 1989 Montreal massacre. 'Their idea was to create a symbol which any man...could easily display and thereby begin to foster a climate in which violence against women would become increasingly unacceptable' (Luxton, 1993, p.362). Second, following two deeply shocking murders of women in Toronto, a small group of men walked from Windsor to Toronto in Spring 1992, and then to Ottawa in Autumn 1992, as a way of speaking out against men's violence and making contacts and meeting with communities on the way.

Large-scale state-funded advertising and postal campaigns (of the car safety-belt type) are needed that say simply and directly 'don't do it, don't think it. Such campaigns can be created and can be effective when governments and other powerful lobbies want them to be. It would do no harm for all agencies to begin by making it part of their policy statements that they oppose men's violence against women, in all its forms. Men's violence against women is a clear challenge to the development of agency policy and practice by men and in relation to men. There is a need for national commitments against violence. As the Gulbenkian Commission Report (1995) stressed as its priority recommendation:

'Individuals, communities and government all levels should adopt a 'Commitment to non-violence', of similar standing to existing commitments to 'equal opportunities'.'

It continued: 'The aims of the commitment are to work towards a society in which individuals, communities and government share non-violent values and resolve conflict by non-violent means. Building such a society involves ... consistent disavowal of all forms of inter-personal violence - in particular by opinion-leaders.'

Governmental and other policies and strategies should tell boys and men not to be violent, advocate policies that encourage men to behave in ways that facilitate women's equality, and make it clear that the realisation of such changes depends partly on men in politics and policy-making, and their own understanding of their gendered actions. Mullender (1997, p. 28) summarises recent initiatives: 'Wife abuse only became a formal international priority in the 1980's during the United Nations' Decade for Women. In 1992, a UN Declaration recognised violence against women and children as a human rights issue, and the UN Platform of Action from the Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995 ... built upon this by including violence against women as one of its critical areas of concern.'

IV: Conclusion

Men's doing violence, men's talking (of their own) violence, and men's responding to violence are in some ways discrete activities within their own social locales. However, as shown, there are in practice a variety of ways in which the of doing violence is reproduced through the talking about violence; and in turn the responses to violence can either reproduce or counter violence. Importantly, much of the state's responses are enacted by organisations managed and staffed predominantly by men, and with strongly masculine cultures. Moreover men in agencies are still men. Their definitions, understandings, and excuses and justifications for violence may mirror or sometimes contradict those of men who are have been violent; they may of course themselves be violent. These connections make up part of what may be called 'patriarchy'.

More positively, initiatives against men's violence are interconnected with each other in what may be thought of as spirals. Changing the self connects with changing men in relationships and in groups; that

in turn connects with policy and practice in agencies, men's programmes and educational institutions; and this connects with broader campaigns and public politics, themselves requiring change of the male self. Just as spirals of action can become vicious circles of more and more violence, so too can they become virtuous circles against violence. Men's violence to known women exists in the context of men's broader position in society. Changing men hinges on similar principles and politics to changing men more generally. Changing men to act against violence does not just involve the simple adoption of principles by men but recognising ambivalences, dilemmas and contradictions and working from that reality. Parallel issues around the problem of men persist *within* agencies dealing with men. To address these issues needs focused attention on violence and action against violence by men, the development of an analysis of men in the agencies, and the formulation of new policies and practices.

References

- Adams, David (1988) 'Treatment models of men who batter: a profeminist analysis' in Kersti Yllö and Michele Bograd (eds.) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.
- Askew, Carol and Ross, Sue (1988) *Boys Don't Cry: Boys and Sexism in Education*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Association of Chief Probation Officers (1992/1996) *Position Statement on Domestic Violence*, London: ACOP.
- Bowker, Lee, Arbitell, Michelle and McFerron, J. Richard (1988) 'On the relationship of wife beating and child abuse' in Kersti Yllö and Michele Bograd (eds) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.
- Burnham, Dave, Boyle, J., Copsey, M., Cordery, J., Dominelli, L., Lambert, J., Smallridge, M., Whitehead, V. and Willis, S. (1990) 'Offending and masculinity: working with males', *Probation Journal*, 37(3), 106-11.
- Caesar, P.L. and Hamberger, L.K. (eds.) (1989) *Treating Men Who Batter*, New York: Springer.
- Campbell, Anne (1993) *Out of Control: Men, Women and Aggression*, London: Pandora.
- Collinson, David L. and Hearn, Jeff (eds.) (1996) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, London: Sage.
- Cordery, Jack and Whitehead, Antony (1992) "'Boys Don't Cry'", in P. Senior and D. Woodhill (eds.), *Gender, Crime and Probation Practice*, Sheffield: Sheffield City Polytechnic PAVIC Publication.
- Council on Scientific Affairs, American Medical Association (1992) 'Violence against women: relevance for medical practitioners', *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 267, 3184-9.
- Dankwort, Jürgen (1992-93) 'Violence against women: varying perceptions and intervention practices with woman abusers', *Intervention (Quebec)*, 92, 34-49.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. (1990) 'Male peer support and woman abuse: the current state of knowledge', *Sociological Focus*, 23 (6), 129-139.
- Dobash, Rebecca Emerson and Dobash, Russell (1979) *Violence Against Wives*, London: Open Books.
- Dobash, Rebecca Emerson and Dobash, Russell (1984) 'The nature and antecedents of violent events', *British Journal of Criminology*, 24(3), 269-88.
- Dobash, Rebecca Emerson and Dobash, Russell (1992) *Women, Violence and Social Change*, London: Routledge.
- Dobash, Russell, Dobash, Rebecca, Cavanagh, Kate and Lewis, Ruth (1996) *Research Evaluation of Programmes for Violent Men*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Edleson, J.L. (1990) 'Judging the success of interventions with men who batter' in Douglas Besharov (ed.) *Family Violence: Research and Public Policy Issues*, Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Edleson, J.L. and Syers, M. (1990) 'The relative effectiveness of group treatment with men who batter', *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 26, 10-17.
- Edleson, J.L. and Tolman, R. (1992) *Intervention for Men Who Batter: An Ecological Approach*, Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.
- Edwards, Susan (1989) *Policing 'Domestic' Violence*, London: Sage.
- Frank, A W (1985) 'Out of ethnomethodology' in H. J. Helle and S. N. Eisenstadt (eds.) *Micro-Sociological Theory. Perspectives on Sociological Theory Volume 2*, Beverly Hills Ca.: Sage.
- Gillespie, Terri and Lupton, Carol (eds.) (1995) *Working with Violence*, London: Macmillan.
- Gondolf, Edward (1984) *Batters Anonymous: Self-help Counselling for Men Who Batter Women*, San Bernardino, Ca: BA Press.
- Gondolf, Edward (1985) *Men Who Batter: An Integrated Approach for Stopping Wife Abuse*, Holmes Beach, Fl: Learning Publications.
- Gondolf, Edward (1989) 'Foreword' in P.L. Caesar and L.K. Hamberger (eds.) *Treating Men Who Batter: Theory, Practice and Programs*, New York: Springer.

- Gondolf, Edward (1993) 'Male batterers' in R.L. Weisberg (eds.) *Family Violence: Prevention and Treatment*, Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.
- Gulbenkian Foundation Commission Report (1995) *Children and Violence*, London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Hanmer, Jalna (1995) *Patterns of Agency Contacts with Women who Have Experienced Violence from Known Men*, Bradford: University of Bradford.
- Hanmer, Jalna (1996) 'Women and violence: commonalities and diversities' in Barbara Fawcett, Brid Featherstone, Jeff Hearn and Christine Toft (eds.) *Violence and Gender Relations: Theories and Interventions*, London: Sage, 7-21.
- Hanmer, Jalna (1998) 'Out of control: men, violence and family life' in Jennie Popay, Jeff Hearn and Jeanette Edwards (eds.) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge.
- Hanmer, Jalna, Hearn, Jeff, Dillon, Cath, Kayani, Taira and Todd, Pam (1995) *Violence to Women from Known Women: Policy Development, Interagency Approaches and Good Practice*, Bradford: University of Bradford.
- Hanmer, Jalna and Saunders, Sheila (1984) *Well-Founded Fear*, London: Hutchinson.
- Hanmer, Jalna and Saunders, Sheila (1990) *Women, Violence and Crime Prevention*, Bradford: Research Unit on Violence, Abuse and Gender Relations, University of Bradford.
- Hearn, Jeff (1987) *The Gender of Oppression*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- Hearn, Jeff (1990) 'Child abuse' and men's violence' in Violence Against Children Study Group (ed.) *Taking Child Abuse Seriously*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Hearn, Jeff (1992) *Men in the Public Eye: the Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*, London: Routledge.
- Hearn, Jeff (1995a) 'It Just Happened' A Research and Policy Report on Men's Violence to Known Women, Bradford: Violence, Abuse and Gender Relations Research Unit, University of Bradford.
- Hearn, Jeff (1995b) *Patterns of Agency Contacts with Men who have been Violent to Known Women*, London: University of Bradford.
- Hearn, Jeff (1995c) 'Policy implications for agency and interagency working with men' in Jalna Hanmer, Jeff Hearn, Cath Dillon, Taira Kayani and Pam Todd (eds.) *Violence to Women from Known Men: Policy Development, Interagency Approaches and Good Practice*, Bradford: University of Bradford.
- Hearn, Jeff (1996a) 'Men's violence to known women: historical, everyday and theoretical constructions' in Barbara Fawcett, Brid Featherstone, Jeff Hearn and Christine Toft (eds.) *Violence and Gender Relations: Theories and Interventions*, London: Sage.
- Hearn, Jeff (1996b) 'Men's violence to known women: men's accounts and men's policy developments' in Barbara Fawcett, Brid Featherstone, Jeff Hearn and Christine Toft (eds.) *Violence and Gender Relations: Theories and Interventions*, London: Sage.
- Hearn, Jeff (1998a) 'It's time for men to change' in Jim Wild (ed.) *Working with Men for Change*, London: Taylor & Francis.
- Hearn, Jeff (1998b) 'Men will be men: the ambiguity of men's support for men who have been violent to known women' in Jennie Popay, Jeff Hearn and Jeanette Edwards (eds.) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge.
- Hearn, Jeff (1998c) *The Violences of Men*, London: Sage.
- Hearn, Jeff (1999a) 'Educating men about violence against women', *Women's Studies Quarterly*, Special Issue: Teaching about Violence against Women, Vol. 27 (1 & 2), 140-151.
- Hearn, Jeff (1999b) 'Men, social work and men's violence to known women' in Alistair Christie (ed.) *Men and Social Work*, London: Macmillan.
- Heathcote, Owen (1994) 'Is there abuse in the text? Legitimate and illegitimate violence in *La Question, Les Chiens, Le Boucher* and *Mémoires d'une fouetteuse*', in Renate Günther and Jon Windebaeck (eds.) *Violence and Conflict in Modern French Culture*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 153-177.
- Heiskanen, Markku and Piispa, Miina (1998) *Faith, Hope, Battering: A Survey of Men's Violence against Women in Finland*, Helsinki: Statistics Finland/Council for Equality.
- Kirkwood, C. (1993) *Leaving Abusive Partners: From Scars of Survival to the Wisdom for Change*, London: Sage.
- Leonard, Peter and McLeod, Eileen (1980) *Marital Violence: Social Construction and Social Service Response* Coventry: University of Warwick.
- Levy, B. (1984) *Skills for Violence Free Relationships*, Santa Monica, Ca: Southern California Coalition for Battered Women.
- Luxton, Meg (1993) 'Dreams and dilemmas: feminist musings on 'the man question'' in Tony Haddad (ed.) *Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology*, Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

- McCull, Anne (1991a) 'Violent men on probation', *Working with Men*, February, 10-11.
- McCull, Anne (1991b) 'Working with violent male offenders', *Working with Men*, September, 4--5.
- McWilliams, Monica and McKiernan, Joyce (1993) *Bringing It Out in the Open: Domestic Violence in Northern Ireland*, Belfast: HMSO.
- Mahoney, Pat (1985) *Schooling for the Boys?*, London: Hutchinson.
- Mama, Amina (1989) *The Hidden Struggle: Statutory and Voluntary Sector Responses to Violence against Black Women in the Home*, London: The London Race and Housing Research Unit.
- Maynard, Mary (1985) 'The response of social workers to domestic violence' in Jan Pahl (ed) *Private Violence and Public Policy*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mirrlees-Black, Catriona (1994) *Estimating the Extent of Domestic Violence: Findings from the 1992 BCS*, Home Office Research Bulletin No. 37, London: Home Office Research and Statistics Dept.
- Mitchell, R. and Hodson, C. (1983) 'Coping with domestic violence: social support and psychological health among women', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 11(6), 629-54.
- Mooney, Jayne (1993) *The Hidden Figure: Domestic Violence in North London*, Islington, London: Islington Borough Council.
- Mooney, Jayne (1994) *The Prevalence and Social Distribution of Domestic Violence: An Analysis of Theory and Method*, Unpublished PhD, Middlesex University.
- Mullender, Audrey (1997) *Rethinking Domestic Violence: the Social Work and Probation Response*, London: Routledge.
- Mullender, Audrey and Morley, Rebecca (eds.) (1994) *Children Living with Domestic Violence*, London: Whiting & Birch.
- Pence, Ellen and Paymar, M. (1990) *Power and Control: Tactics of Men Who Batter: An Educational Curriculum*, Duluth, Mn: Minnesota Program Development. 1st pub. 1986.
- Pirog-Good, M.A. and Stets-Kealey, J. (1985) 'Male batterers and battering prevention programs: a national survey', *Response*, 8, pp. 8-12.
- Potts, David (1996) *Why Do Men Commit Most Crime? Focusing on Masculinity in a Prison Group*, Wakefield: West Yorkshire Probation Services/HM Prison Service.
- Pringle, Keith (1995) *Men, Masculinities and Social Welfare*, London: UCL Press.
- Rice, M. (1990) 'Challenging orthodoxies in feminist theory: a black feminist critique', in L. Gelsthorpe and A. Morris (eds.) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Salisbury, Jonathan and Jackson, David (1996) *Challenging Macho Values: Practical Ways of Working with Adolescent Boys*, London: Falmer.
- Saunders, Daniel.G. (1989) 'Cognitive and behavioural interventions with men who batter: application and outcome' in P.L. Caesar and L.K. Hamberger (eds.) *Treating Men Who Batter: Theory, Practice and Programs*, New York: Springer.
- Schrumpf, Fred (1994) 'The role of students in resolving conflicts in schools' in Jacqueline S. Thousand, Richard A. Villa and Ann I. Nevin (eds.) *Creativity and Collaborative Learning: A Practice Guide to Empowering Students and Teachers*, Baltimore, Md.: Paul H. Brookes.
- Smith, Lorna (1989) *Domestic Violence: An Overview of the Literature*, Home Office Research Study 107, London: HMSO.
- Stanko, Betsy, Crisp, Debbie, Hale, Chris and Lucraft, Hebe (1998) *Counting the Costs: Estimating the Impact of Domestic Violence in the London Borough of Hackney*, London: Crime Concern.
- Stark, E. and Flitcraft, A. (1996) *Women at Risk: Domestic Violence and Women's Health*, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.
- Swain, K. (1986) 'Probation attitudes to battered women: apathy, error and avoidance?', *Probation Journal*, 33(4), 132-4.
- Tattum, D. Lane, D. A. (ed.) (1993) *Understanding and Managing Bullying*, London: Heinemann
- Thompson, Neil (1995) 'Men and anti-sexism', *British Journal of Social Work*, 25, pp. 459-75.
- Tift, L. *Battering of Women: the Failure of Intervention and the Case for Prevention*, Boulder, Co.: Westview.
- Tolman, Richard M. and Bennett, L.W. (1990) 'A review of quantitative research on men who batter', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 87-118.
- Whyld, Janie, Pickersgill, Dave and Jackson, David (eds.) (1990) *Update on Anti-Sexist Work with Boys and Young Men*, Caistor: Whyld Publishing Co-op.
- Yllö, Kersti A. and Straus, Murray A. (1995) 'Patriarchy and violence against wives: the impact of structural and normative factors' in Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles (eds.) *Physical Violence in American Families*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.