introduction: men’s roles in violence prevention

Efforts to end violence against women must address men. This notion is increasingly accepted in violence prevention circles, and this shift is fuelled by three key insights. First and most importantly, violence prevention must address men because largely it is men who perpetrate this violence. Most men are not violent and most practise consent in their sexual relations with women. Yet when a girl or woman is subject to sexual violence, the perpetrator usually is male. This also means that men themselves must take responsibility for preventing sexual assault. As Berkowitz (2002:165) states, ‘Even though only a minority of men may commit sexual assault, all men can have an influence on the culture and environment that allows other men to be perpetrators’.

The impetus for engaging men is also informed by a second recognition, that constructions of masculinity play a crucial role in shaping sexual assault. At the individual level, men are more likely to sexually assault if they have hostile and negative sexual attitudes towards women and identify with traditional images of masculinity and male privilege (Heise, 1998; O’Neil & Harway, 1997). At the level of the immediate context in which violence takes place - typically families or other intimate or acquaintance relationships - male dominance is a strong predictor of the likelihood of sexual violence against women. At the interpersonal level, another predictor especially among young men is attachment to male peers who encourage and legitimate woman abuse (Heise, 1998). And at the macro-social level, rates of violence against women are higher in contexts in which manhood is defined in terms of dominance, toughness, entitlement to power or male honour, there are rigid gender roles, and violence is condoned as a means to settle interpersonal disputes (Heise, 1998).

These first two insights boil down to the point that we have no choice but to address men and masculinities if we want to stop violence against women. However, violence prevention work with men has also been fuelled by a third and more hopeful insight: that men have a positive role to play in helping to stop violence against women. There is growing recognition that violence is an issue of concern to men and men alike and that men have a stake in ending violence against women.

Feminist work on violence against women has always recognised and hoped for the positive and
non-violent roles that men can play. But this hope has only recently been translated into prevention programs and policy. Some feminist women are nervous about or opposed to men’s inclusion, for understandable reasons. Men’s participation in anti-violence work involves a delicate politics, as I have explored in detail elsewhere (Flood, 2003). Nevertheless, the inclusion of strategies aimed at men and masculinities is necessary if our prevention efforts are to be successful.

Violence prevention work among men aims to lessen the likelihood that they will use violence. Effective strategies confront the beliefs, values and discourses which support violence, challenge the patriarchal power relations which sustain and are sustained by violence, and promote alternative constructions of masculinity, gender and selfhood which foster non-violence and gender justice. To stop the sexual assault of women and girls, we must erode the cultural and collective supports for physical and sexual assault found among many men and boys and replace them with norms of consent, sexual respect and gender equality.

Violence prevention aimed at men and boys requires a range of strategies at multiple levels of the social order: programs in schools and among youth, media campaigns, interventions among particular groups of men such as athletes, and grassroots mobilisations such as the White Ribbon Campaign, an effort to invite men to wear a white ribbon to show their opposition to violence against women. These strategies can be described as ‘primary’ prevention, in that they aim to lessen the likelihood of boys and men using violence in the first place. ‘Secondary’ prevention refers to reducing opportunities for violence by supporting the men who are at risk of perpetrating violence. ‘Tertiary’ prevention aims to prevent the re-occurrence of violence, and refers to work with men who have already used violence. Tertiary prevention thus centres on perpetrator programs, and it may be more accurate to describe this as violence intervention.

What works in violence prevention education with men? This question is the focus of the remainder of this discussion. This review concentrates on educational strategies that are face-to-face such as workshops, small group work and peer education, and focuses on issues of process rather than content. This discussion is relevant for a variety of overlapping forms of violence against women, including physical and sexual violence, but it focuses in particular on sexual assault as this is where most education work, particularly in the US, has been done.

In Australia, few face-to-face educational interventions aimed at males and addressing sexual violence have been developed or implemented, and almost none have been evaluated. Most are programs delivered to boys and young men in secondary schools, whether by community health and domestic violence agencies (Denborough, 1996; Friedman, 1999; Keel, 2005), anti-violence men’s groups such as Men Against Sexual Assault, or other bodies. Very few face-to-face interventions have been targeted at adult men, although education programs for professional athletes are being developed in response to alleged sexual assaults by players in Rugby League and Australian Rules football. In contrast, university-based programs focused on sexual assault are widespread in the United States (Urbs Keys Young, 2004), and various kinds of intervention have been evaluated, while anti-violence educational programs among young men are also being pioneered in Brazil (Barker, 2001) and elsewhere. In mapping best practice in sexual violence education with men and boys therefore, this paper draws particularly on this international experience.

make a difference: evaluation

Often we do not know what has worked or not worked in existing violence prevention education. Most interventions have not been evaluated. Many existing evaluations are poorly designed, and where education programs have been evaluated, they show mixed results.

There are a number of common weaknesses in the evaluations of educational programs, both those among men and in mixed-sex settings. Post-intervention assessments are often made only immediately after the program or only weeks later and there is no longer-term follow-up. Often there is poor evaluation of men’s potential to engage in sexually abusive behaviour. And typically, no outcome measures are used to assess whether the
program is effective in reducing actual rates of sexual assault (Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999).

At the same time, those evaluations which do exist show that a range of education programs have made positive changes to men's attitudes and understandings. Whether targeted at men or at mixed-sex audiences, prevention programs typically aim to dispel myths about rape, improve participants' understandings of violence against women, improve empathy towards rape victims, and enhance their awareness of services for victims and survivors. Various evaluations document at least short-term successes in such efforts. Male (and female) high school and university students who have attended rape education sessions show less adherence to rape myths, express less rape-supportive attitudes, and/or report greater victim empathy than those in control groups (Avery-Leaf, Cascardti, O'Leary & Cano, 1997; Foshee, 2000; Lanier, Elliot, Martin & Kapadia, 1998; Meyer & Stein, 2004; O'Donohue, Yeater & Fanetti, 2003; Pinzone-Glower, Gidycz & Jacobs, 1998; Rosenthal, Heesacker & Neimeyer, 1995; Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993, 1996; Shultz, Scherman & Marshall, 2000).

These positive results need to be treated with caution, however. One of the most common problems concerns the long-term effectiveness of intervention efforts. Evaluations commonly find that men's attitudes towards violence have undergone a significant improvement immediately after the program, but then return to pre-intervention levels one or two months afterwards (Anderson, Stoeb, Duggan, Hieger, Kling & Payne, 1998; Davis & Liddell, 2002; Flores & Hartkab, 1998; Frazier, Valtinsson & Candell, 1994). There is a 'rebound' effect in which initial positive changes are not sustained over time. In a finding that is even more troubling, in an early Canadian project among high school students, a minority of male participants reported worse attitudes after the intervention (Meyer & Stein, 2004).

On the other hand, more intensive and lengthy education programs have been shown to produce positive and lasting change in men's attitudes. For example, American undergraduate students undertook a semester-long university course designed to train peer facilitators to conduct rape education workshops. They were compared to students enrolled in a general human sexuality course. The rape education program resulted in positive attitude change, and two years later the participants were still less accepting of rape myths than those in the human sexuality course (Lonsway, Klaw, Berg, Waldo & Kothari, 1998). Similarly, persistent attitudinal effects have also been documented in a five-month follow-up of male university students (Foshee, Neville, Smith, Kivlighan & Gershuny, 1999) and a four-year follow-up of male and female adolescents (Foshee, Baumann, Ennett, Linder, Benefeld & Suchindran, 2004).

A second issue is that attitude change does not guarantee behaviour change. Statistically significant change in attitudes does not guarantee significant changes in behaviour. Few evaluations of prevention programs have documented actual reductions in violence (Berkowitz, 2004a). Many programs use standardised measures of participants' adherence to rape myths, adversarial sexual beliefs, acceptance of interpersonal violence and rape empathy, but these are only proxy measures of participants' actual perpetration of sexual violence (O'Donohue, Yeater & Fanetti, 2003). They should be complemented by the use of other standardised measures of sexually violent behaviour. In addition, positive program outcomes may be due to the use of low-risk samples of men (Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999), while such programs may be less effective among higher-risk populations.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that prevention programs can create behavioural change. For example, some adolescent violence prevention programs have been shown to reduce the levels of dating violence among school students. Eighth and ninth grade students participated in the Safe Dates program at 14 American public schools, involving a theatre production, a 10-session curriculum, and a poster contest. In a one-month follow-up, they reported less perpetration of psychological abuse, physical violence, and sexual violence against a current dating partner than students in the control group. They also reported more critical of norms supporting dating violence and used more constructive communication skills (Foshee, Baumann, Arriaga, Helms, Koch & Linder, 1998).
Do such behavioural changes persist over time? At least two educational programs show encouraging results here. A recent American multi-module program, one of the more sophisticated interventions among adult men, demonstrates the medium-term effectiveness of rape education programming at least for some men. Five months after the program, while some men had ‘rebounded’ to pre-intervention levels in terms of their attitudes and behaviours, others continued to show improvement (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlighan & Gershuny, 1999). Analysis of the Safe Dates program among American adolescents also shows that behavioural change can persist over long periods. Four years after the program had ended, adolescents who had received Safe Dates continued to report less physical and sexual dating violence perpetration (and victimisation) than those who had not (Foshee, Bauman, Ennett, Linder, Benefeld & Suchindran, 2004).

In order to assess and improve their effectiveness, violence prevention programs among men must use pre- and post-intervention evaluations, based on standardised measures of both attitudes and behaviour, with both short and long-term assessments. Education programs must use more sophisticated understandings of the intended, and actual, processes of change among participants. Rather than assuming that there will be one common pattern of change among participants or that individuals will vary quantitatively in terms of a common growth pattern (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlighan & Gershuny, 1999), evaluators should look for diversity and contradiction, investigate why some men rebound and others do not, and the extent to which different strategies are required for low-risk and high-risk men.

**effective prevention**

The central challenge of violence prevention education among men is to produce lasting change in the attitudes, values, and behaviors associated with violence against women. Effective prevention programs have five key features. First, effective prevention programs are comprehensive, in that they address and involve all relevant community members and systems. Second, effective programs are intensive, in that they offer learning opportunities that are interactive, involve active participation, are sustained over time and have multiple points of contact with reinforcing messages. Third, effective programs address cognitive, affective, and behavioural domains; what people know, how they feel, and how they behave. Fourth, effective programs are relevant to the audience. They are tailored to the characteristics of the participants and acknowledge the special needs and concerns of particular communities.

They focus on peer-related variables, use peers in leadership roles and emphasise the relationship of sexual assault to other issues. Finally, effective programs offer positive messages which build on men’s values and predisposition to act in a positive manner. They document and reinforce healthy behaviors and norms, encourage individuals to focus on what they can do, not on what they should not do, and avoid an exclusive emphasis on problem behaviours (O’erkwitz, 2001, 2004b).

To generate sufficient ‘intensity’ to produce change, effective educational programs require both length and depth. Interventions need to be short enough to be practical, but long and intensive enough to be effective. One-off and one-hour workshops may be attractive to over-burdened schools or organisations, but they are unlikely to produce substantial and persistent change (Carmody & Carrington, 2000). On the other hand, while there are practical and financial constraints on lengthy and intensive educational programs, they are more likely to produce lasting change (Lonsway, Klaw, Berg, Waldz & Kothari, 1998). For example, among five school-based interventions focused on dating violence prevention in the US, programs with greater amounts of contact with students and greater embeddedness in the classroom curriculum over time reported greater impacts on students’ attitudes and norms (Meyer & Stein, 2004).

Educational programs are also more effective if they address three domains: cognitions, affective or emotional responses, and behaviour (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlighan & Gershuny, 1999). Some programs engage participants only at the cognitive level, by offering information in a lecture format or by interactive exercises on ‘myths’ and ‘facts’. But programs that explore only what participants know are less effective than programs that also address how they feel and what they do.
A model example of such strategies is given by Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlghan & Gershuny (1999). They used three educational modules that addressed each of these three domains, in three 90-minute sessions held a week apart, in this case with American university students. A cognitive module focused on dispelling myths and providing facts about rape. The affective module relied on a panel of rape survivors speaking of the aftermath and long-term effects that rape has had on their lives. In addition, two male allies spoke of supporting friends who had been raped, their emotional reactions to this and so on. These exercises were designed to elicit empathy among the participants (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlghan & Gershuny, 1999).

The third, behavioural module involved role plays of a date rape and of male friends supporting a female rape victim. The first role play was an interactive drama. Actors portray a scene of sexual coercion, and the audience is then invited to rewrite the scene by making suggestions as to how the actors could have interacted differently so that sexual coercion did not occur. The actors then recreate the scene, incorporating these suggestions. Such an exercise facilitates behavioural change by modeling the specific behaviour that men can adopt to minimise their likelihood of coercing a partner into sex. The second role play extended this behavioural training by encouraging men's understanding of the needs of rape survivors and their skills at responding effectively (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlghan & Gershuny, 1999). This multi-method intervention was effective in producing persistent attitudinal and behavioural change, although a minority of participants did rebound to pre-intervention levels.

Men engaging men

To be effective, programs of violence prevention must be relevant to the audience, as I stated earlier. One aspect of relevance is program form, and in particular the characteristics of the educators and participants themselves.

There is an emergent consensus that sexual assault prevention is most effective when conducted in separate female and male groups. Women's and men's programs have different strategies and goals and there are difficulties in combining them.

Evaluations of US university-based programs demonstrate that separate-sex programs are more effective than mixed-sex programs, and female and male participants themselves prefer single-sex workshops (Berkowitz, 2001, 2002; Earle, 1996; Foubert & McEwen, 1998). In addition, women with prior histories of sexual assault may experience mixed-gender workshops as revictimising, while potential male perpetrators may misuse information on how women can reduce their risk of assault (Yeeat & O'Donohue, 1999).

The characteristics of the educator are also relevant. When conducting violence prevention work with all-male audiences, there are five good reasons to use men as facilitators and peer educators. First, men's attitudes and behaviour are shaped in powerful ways by their male peers (Kimmel, 1994), and male-male influence can be harnessed for positive ends in all-male groups (Berkowitz, 2004a). Second, all-male groups can provide the space and the safety for men to talk. This is vital given the evidence that programs with the greatest effectiveness are characterised by interactive participation in which men honestly share real feelings and concerns, discuss and reflect (Berkowitz, 2002).

Third, male educators and participants can act as role models for other men. Men can act as models of a non-violent masculinity, by practising listening, empathy and respect for women and other men and by taking responsibility for their own sexist behaviour. Male facilitators possess an insider's knowledge of the workings of masculinity and can use this to critical advantage.

Fourth, male educators tend to be perceived as more credible and more persuasive by male participants (Kilmartin, 2001). In the context of negative stereotypes of feminists and feminism and cultural constructions of male authority, men may be listened to more and taken more seriously than women speaking about the same issues. While this unfortunately reflects the cultural silencing of women's voices, it can be harnessed for antipatriarchal ends.

Fifth, working in single-sex groups minimises the harmful, gendered forms of interaction that are common in mixed-sex groups. Men may look to women for approval, forgiveness or support and women may adopt nurturing or caretaking roles for
men (Mohan & Schulz, 2001). Finally, having men work with men embodies the recognition that men must take responsibility for helping to end men's violence against women, rather than leaving it up to women.

All-male groups do involve greater risks of men's collusion with sexism and violence, and this must be minimised. And it should go without saying that work with men must acknowledge women's work and leadership, and never compete with nor undermine women's efforts (Berkowitz, 2004a).

Having emphasised the benefits of male educators, I should note that female facilitators can also work very effectively with men, and there are benefits to women and men working together. Having mixed-sex educators involves and demonstrates a model of working in partnership. This is a valuable demonstration to participants of egalitarian working relationships across gender, and it models women's and men's shared interest in non-violence and gender justice. In addition, mixed-sex workshops can be powerful opportunities for men to hear of women's experiences and concerns.

In any case, most violence prevention education is likely to continue to be done by women. Women already shoulder this work, and the pool of men with both feminist sympathies and educational skills is small indeed.

making interventions relevant

A second aspect of the 'relevance' of effective violence prevention programs among men is their content. It is now taken as given in the field of violence prevention that interventions must be 'culturally appropriate' and sensitive to cultural diversities. This goes far beyond such measures as the use of culturally inclusive language, to the exploration of the ways in which women's and men's experiences of and involvements in sexual violence are organised by class, race and ethnicity, age and other forms of social division.

In violence prevention work with racially diverse groups of men, culturally relevant interventions are more effective than 'colourblind' ones, at least according to American evidence. In a recent US study, Black men found the culturally relevant workshop (that used facilitators who shared the ethnic background of participants and included culturally specific information and reflection) to be more relevant and engaging than the colourblind intervention (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivljian & Gershuny, 1999).

'Cultural appropriateness' conventionally is understood to refer to a sensitivity to ethnic diversity, but it should also refer to a sensitivity to gender cultures. Among men, there is enormous diversity in the constructions of masculinity and sexuality which are dominant in particular social contexts and communities. This diversity certainly is shaped by ethnic differences, but also by many other forms of social differentiation. There are social groups, workplaces and social networks of men in which violence against women is frequent and viewed as legitimate and other contexts in which this violence is rare and seen as unacceptable. And in any one context, particular constructions of masculinity will be dominant while others are marginalised or subordinated (Connell, 1995). One of the first steps in working with a particular group or community of men should be to map their gendered and sexual culture, in order to see what aspects of this culture contribute to violence against women and what aspects can be mobilised in support of non-violence.

Making one's intervention relevant also means matching it to men's level of awareness about and willingness to take responsibility for the problem of violence against women. Men are at different places along the continuum from passive indifference to active intervention, and different educational approaches should be adopted for men at earlier and later stages of change (Berkowitz, 2002). The different methods described below are arranged to match men's developmental stages. Strategies such as empathy induction are suited to men with little recognition of the problem. Skills training begins to teach men to change their personal behaviour, and requires deeper changes in assumptions about consent and sexuality. Bystander intervention and social norms approaches go further still, in fostering change in peer relations and masculine culture (Berkowitz, 2002).
enabling and inspiring men

The fifth feature of effective programs of violence prevention among men is that they are centred on positive messages which build on men's non-violent attitudes and relations. Boys' and men's relations to and involvements in dominant constructions of masculinity are diverse and fluid. With this in mind, an important strategy is to find examples of men's resistance to violent masculinities and evidence of their gender-equitable practice, and foster communities of support with which to sustain and spread these (Denborough, 1996).

Educators can encourage men to find examples of times in their own lives when they have chosen non-violent ways of relating and being, build on these exceptions to dominant masculinity, find support for these in the men's personal histories, and find support for alternative identities and ways of relating from significant others such as peers, family and partners.

Non-violent men can be recruited as educators themselves. For example, in an action-research project in low-income settings in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, young men who questioned prevailing violence-supportive views were trained as peer educators to foster gender-equitable relations in their communities (Barker, 2001).

One of the most significant challenges in work with men is to minimise their reactions of defensiveness and hostility. Many men already feel blamed and defensive about the issue of men's violence (Berkwitz, 2004a), and defensive reactions are relatively common among men attending rape prevention interventions. Men have responded negatively to workshops in the US by saying that 'This is male bashing' (Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, DeBord, 1995), and to media campaigns in Australia by emphasising that men are the invisible victims of violence (Huber, 2003).

The potential for defensiveness can be lessened by approaching men as partners in solving the problem rather than as perpetrators of the problem (Berkowitz, 2004a). Some programs emphasise that we need leadership from men on the subjects of sexism and men's violence against women (Katz, 1994). They address men as leaders on their campuses or in their communities, inviting them to use their leadership role to promote a healthy sexual environment' (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlghan & Gershuny, 1999:18). Another effective way to address men is as bystanders to other men's violence.

Other measures that can lessen men's defensiveness include the creation of safe and non-judgmental environments for open discussion and dialogue (Berkowitz, 2004a), the use of male facilitators, and a language of inclusive personal pronouns (he' and 'us') (Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlghan & Gershuny, 1999). Perhaps the most fraught measure is to offer an acknowledgement of men's own victimisation (Flood, 2002-2003). This may involve hearing and deconstructing men's perceptions of blame or denigration, acknowledging that men too are victims of violence, and emphasising that men are most at risk of violence from other men.

Strategies of blame and attack are ineffective and even damaging in violence prevention work with men. As Berkowitz (2004a:3) notes,

Most men are not coercive or opportunist, do not want to victimize others, and are willing to be 'part of the solution'. (In contrast ... more intensive treatment is required for men who are predatory or who have a history of perpetration to change previous patterns of perpetration.)

While this work does not require a style of personal confrontation (Lonsway, 1996), certainly it must challenge the constructions of masculinity and gendered power relations that sustain sexual violence.

questions of pedagogy

Violence prevention programs among men have relied on a variety of pedagogies, each associated with different frameworks regarding how to help men change and with different constructions of why men commit sexual violence. What are they, and what issues are associated with them?

Encourage victim empathy. Prevention programs often appeal to or encourage men's empathy with the victims and survivors of rape, based on the belief that lack of empathy for the victims is a necessary condition for men to rape. Programs have men hear survivors speak of the impact and trauma of rape, ask how men would feel if a woman close to them were raped, or invite
reflection on the likely impact of being raped themselves (by other men).

Various studies have shown that education programs intentionally can increase men's sense of empathy for the victims of sexual violence (Foubert, 2000), including among 'high risk' males who show a higher self-reported likelihood of committing sexual abuse (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993; Schewe & O'Donohue, 1996; O'Donohue, Yeater & Fanetti, 2003). However, there are some serious cautions to note. In at least one study, male undergraduates who listened to an audiotape of a woman describing her experience of being raped reported an increased likelihood to engage in rape-supportive behaviors, and neither their empathy nor their rape-supportive attitudes improved (Berg, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999).

Such experience leads Berkowitz (2002) to argue that education programs that invite male participants to empathise with a female victim have been unsuccessful in changing men's attitudes, while the use of male survivors has been more effective. He speculates that it may be necessary to address men's own questions and concerns first, and that it is prudent to incorporate the voices of both male and female survivors in efforts to encourage victim empathy. A recent intervention, using this method of combining several appeals, did prove effective in increasing males' victim empathy. In a video-based program for male college students, the relevant segment featured testimonials from women who had been raped, invited participants to imagine a loved one being raped, and asked how it would feel if another man raped them (O'Donohue, Yeater & Fanetti, 2003).

Change outcome expectancies: Some education programs among men emphasise that participating in sexual assault will have severe and negative consequences for themselves. They attempt to change participants' expectations regarding the outcomes of rape. For example, showing participants interviews with imprisoned rapists and another man on the negative consequences of their aggressive behaviour did produce positive changes in outcome expectancies among participants (O'Donohue, Yeater & Fanetti, 2003). This approach is based on the recognition that some men's perceptions of rape as involving 'rewards, low costs and a low probability of punishment' contribute to their sexually aggressive behaviour (O'Donohue, Yeater & Fanetti, 2003:517).

However, providing accurate information to men about the likely consequences of sexually coercive behaviour, particularly the legal consequences, can be dangerous. In Australia, only 15 per cent of female victims of sexual assault report the incident to police (Jievore, 2005) and perhaps only two or three per cent of reported sexual assaults result in a conviction (Stubbis, 2003). While most men will share women's despair at this, giving such facts to men already oriented towards sexual assault may lessen the perceived social inhibitions to violent behaviour. Education programs with men should emphasise both the legal and extra-legal harms associated with perpetrating sexual assault and the unethical or immoral nature of this behaviour regardless of its criminal significance.

Teach skills in non-violence and consent: Another strategy is to teach men skills in negotiating consent in sexual relations and other skills such as communication, conflict resolution and anger management. Such efforts can help to reduce men's violence, in encouraging men to take responsibility for their own actions and intentions in relation to others (Berkowitz, 2004). However, sexual assault should not be understood in general to be the result of 'miscommunication', as this obscures the power relations and deliberate, planned choices that typically organise sexual violence. The notion of sexual 'miscommunication' is popular because it serves useful functions in trying to sustain heterosexual relationships: it avoids blaming men, it gives women an illusory sense of control, and it obscures institutionalised power relations (Frith & Kitzinger, 1997).

Men do not sexually assault because they lack skills, but because they feel they can, doing so offers certain benefits, and their behaviour is socially sanctioned. Skills training can underestimate the ways in which dominant forms of masculinity may 'feel right' or 'make imaginative sense' to the men who inhabit them. Nevertheless, we do need to teach men strategies to minimise their likelihood of coerceing someone into sex and more widely to become active citizens for gender justice (Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998).

Enable men as bystanders: Some programs teach men how to intervene in violent or sexist
behaviour by other men. For example, the Mentors in Violence Prevention Project, run among American athletes and others, 'highlights the role that non-abusive men can play in preventing or interrupting sexist or abusive behavior by [their] peers' (Katz, 2003:3).

This approach provides the majority of men who are uncomfortable with a minority's violent behaviour with the permission and skills to confront them (Berkowitz, 2004b). Bystander interventions have the advantage that they move beyond individual empathy and attitudes, to make men responsible for helping to create a male peer culture in which the abuse of women will be seen as entirely unacceptable (Katz, 2003).

Undermine men's conformity to sexist peer norms: Men overestimate each others' comfort with sexist, coercive and derogatory comments about and behaviour towards women and the extent to which other men believe in societal myths about masculinity and violence (Fabiano, Wesley Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach & Stark, 2004). The 'social norms approach' begins with a recognition of this disparity between actual and perceived norms regarding behaviour and attitudes. It aims to correct this distortion, to shift men's perception of the norm by revealing the extent to which other men also disagree with violence or are uncomfortable with common norms of masculinity, and thus to undermine men's conformity to sexist peer norms (Kilmartin, 2001). This has been done on some university campuses by surveying men regarding their comfort or discomfort with other men's sexism and publicising the results. By shifting men's perceptions of other men's attitudes and behaviour, men's own emphasis on sexual consent, their approval of sexist behaviour and their willingness to intervene in violent behaviour increase (Fabiano, Wesley Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach & Stark, 2004; Kilmartin, 2001).

Conclusion

Education programs among men can significantly reduce their support for and participation in sexual violence. Violence prevention programs can lessen men's adherence to the attitudes and values associated with sexual violence, increase men's emotional and moral compassion, encourage men to intervene in the behavior of other men, and reduce men's future violence. Far more work must be done to assess such efforts, and it is troubling to note that some interventions do little to create lasting change or even make men's attitudes worse. Nevertheless, existing evaluations do show that many programs produce short-term positive change and some produce long-term changes in attitudes and behaviours.

If such programs are to do more than 'deliver and hope' (Yenter & O'Donohue, 1999:750), however, they must be well organised, well evaluated and well supported. Effective violence prevention programs will draw on, and indeed extend, the strategies and processes outlined in this review. But even the most effective men's programs will make little overall difference to sexual assault if their numbers and presence continue to be so slight. In other words, not only do we need existing educational efforts among men to develop 'best practice,' but we also need such efforts to be adopted far more widely.

Beyond educating men face-to-face, violence prevention requires that we also foster collective action and community development. Men must take public and collective action, organising grassroots men's groups and networks committed to advocacy for non-violence and gender equality (Flood, 2003). And, working in partnership with women and women's groups, men must develop forms of community development and social marketing to change the power relations and ideologies that underpin violence against women.

Men have a vital role to play in helping to end violence against women. But if we are to create cultures among men of non-violence and sexual consent, we must make far more systematic efforts to engage and change men.
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