

**WestminsterResearch**

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Men's efforts to tackle men's violence: negotiating gendered  
privileges and norms in movement and practice spaces**

**Wild, J.**

This is an author's accepted manuscript of an article published in the Journal of Gender-Based Violence, DOI: 10.1332/239868021x16757936936612.

The final definitive version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021x16757936936612>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

**Title:** Men's efforts to tackle men's violence: negotiating gendered privileges and norms in movement and practice spaces

**Author:** Jessica Wild

**Affiliation:** University of Westminster, UK

**Abstract:**

The participation of men in efforts to respond to men's violence is a crucial component for eradicating gender-based violence (GBV) and for disrupting the continued responsabilization of women and survivors for addressing it at various scales. But as men's participation in the field has evolved and become increasingly professionalised, so tensions have emerged regarding what happens when men enter women-majority professional and movement anti-violence spaces. Via a feminist, discourse analysis, this paper explores how men working in the violence against women and girls (VAWG) sector and movement conceptualise and negotiate the challenges associated with the reproduction of patriarchal privilege in the context of their practice and workplace settings. Analysis points to how gender inequalities and masculine norms are both instrumentalised as well as entrenched, even when participants seek to challenge them. Moreover, findings indicate men's often elevated status in anti-violence practice and movement spaces can be used to resource a type of entrepreneurial masculinity which obstructs structural change as regards to gendered norms and expectations. This paper offers an empirical and theoretical contribution to the expanding literature on men's role(s) in the prevention of men's violence against women and minoritised genders, and the ways in which gendered privilege operates therein.

**Key words:**

Violence against women (VAW) prevention ~ gender-based violence (GBV) ~ men's activism ~ masculinities ~ gender

**Key messages:**

- Men's often elevated status in anti-violence practice and movement spaces resources a type of entrepreneurial masculinity which obstructs structural change.
- Unequal gender hierarchies and norms are (re)produced in anti-VAW organisations, even when their overarching aims are to dismantle them.
- Men in the movement must robustly interrogate their own privilege and the ways they are implicated in the maintenance of gender inequalities in the context of their workplaces.

## Introduction

A number of femicides in England during 2020 and 2021 reportedly prompted an unprecedented rise in the numbers of men signing up to join men-led initiatives and campaigns focused on addressing men's violence against women (VAW) (Beyond Equality, 2021; Hill, 2021; Ng, 2021). This surge in the numbers of men catalysed into acting has been framed as a turning point by some commentators in England's trajectory towards tackling VAW and gender-based violence (GBV) more broadly. This is perhaps because the recognition that all men have some connection to men's VAW has been slow to emerge because as Peretz and Vidmar (2021, p. 2) observe, most men tend to view themselves as "uninvolved bystanders" or they are simply disinterested in the matter (Flood, 2019).

Notwithstanding this point, men's participation in global efforts to prevent or reduce men's violence has continued to expand incrementally over the last four decades (Barker et al., 2007; Messner et al., 2015) as men and boys are increasingly (re)framed as essential constituents in comprehensive efforts to eradicate GBV and to promote more equitable gender relations (Casey et al., 2018; Jewkes, Flood, et al., 2015; Peacock & Barker, 2014; Tolman et al., 2016; Westmarland et al., 2021). This reflects a key contention of this paper. But, as Macomber's (2014, 2015) work has strongly substantiated, as men's participation in the field has evolved so tensions and challenges have emerged regarding what happens when men enter women-majority professional and movement anti-violence spaces.

With this a set of dominant discourses underpinning key working assumptions and practice paradigms have become embedded (Flood, 2015; Jewkes, Flood, et al., 2015). If left unscrutinised these discourses can produce problematic outcomes in practice by (inadvertently) reproducing gender inequalities (Casey, 2010; Casey et al., 2018; Macomber, 2015; Stewart et al., 2021), thereby underscoring the still unresolved challenges of engaging men in efforts to prevent men's GBV (Casey et al., 2013; Glinski et al., 2018). Moreover, these discourses do not account for the material and political gains afforded to men, including those involved in violence prevention work, of retaining the normative gender order. A point complicated further when considering the range of intersecting structural factors (race, poverty, class, sexuality, religion and so on) that contribute to men and boys' resistance to gender equality (Ratele, 2015).

Against this backdrop, this paper explores how men in practices roles in the violence against women and girls (VAWG) sector conceptualise and negotiate the challenges associated with

gender inequality and the reproduction of privilege in the context of their practice and workplace settings. This paper will proceed by first providing a brief overview of men's historical participation in the prevention of men's violence and foundations for present-day tensions. This is followed by a discussion of masculinities and gender transformative approaches. The larger study informing this paper is then outlined. In the discourse analysis that follows, the participants' negotiation of a key set of gender discourses will be elaborated as they relate to the men's anti-violence practices at both individual and organisational levels.

Analysis reveals tensions in the approaches taken by some men-led campaigns from the vantage of men in professional roles responsible for VAWG provision. These connect with the routine 'pedestalling' (Macomber, 2015; Peretz, 2018a) of men following their entry into the anti-violence sector. The data suggest the 'pedestal effect' can resource a type of 'entrepreneurial masculinity' (Cornwall, 2016) which is at odds with the gender equitable aims of the movement (Gibbs et al., 2015), and oftentimes is in opposition to the men's own principles as 'allies'. This points to how the accomplishment of certain forms of masculine identities is made possible within a neoliberal capitalist framework (Connell, 2011, 2016; Garlick, 2020). Findings from this paper seek to offer an empirical and theoretical contribution to the expanding literature on men's role(s) in the prevention of men's violence against women and minoritised genders. This paper should be read alongside the views of the women practitioners and victim-survivors also involved in this study (see Wild, forthcoming).

### **Men's in the movement to end men's violence**

The foundational roots of men's participation in the prevention of men's violence against women are in voluntary, grassroots activism, after men's consciousness-raising groups were established in the 1970s alongside women's rape crisis and anti-violence movements (Katz, 1995; Messner, 1997; Messner et al., 2015; Pease, 2000). Albeit the numbers of men were small, members of this early men's movement began to carve out a role for men in anti-sexist and anti-violence activism as 'profeminist' actors (Burrell & Flood, 2019; Carlson et al., 2020; Flood, 2019; Messner et al., 2015; Pease, 2000). Later, the mid-1990s saw the growth of dedicated men-led anti-violence organisations (Messner et al., 2015; Peretz, 2020), which paved the way for the more recent growth in the professionalisation of the gender-based violence sector involving both women and men in paid roles (Messner et al., 2015; Westmarland et al., 2021). In practice, this has meant more men occupying non-voluntary

and practice-based roles as part of violence prevention and response programming (Glinski et al., 2018) .

However, men's involvement in the movement to address men's VAW has historically been a site of political contestation (Hester, 1984; Hester et al., 1996; Ramazanoglu, 1992), and was connected with preoccupations regarding the security and maintenance of certain gendered political and epistemological territories. Implicit were questions regarding how men negotiate their privileged status as advantaged group members within women-only or women-majority (movement) spaces (Case, 2012; Wildman & Davis, 1995). Enmeshed with these were fears that the movement could be diluted or depoliticized (Burrell & Flood, 2019; Messner et al., 2015). Also present were uncertainties regarding where men 'fit in' within feminist-led movements, coupled with anxieties regarding the potential for men's co-optation of the women's movement (Digby, 1998; Schacht & Ewing, 1997).

These concerns closely imbricate with the challenges of allyship across differently privileged groups (Russell & Bohan, 2016) and of coalition building as theorised by Black feminists (Collins, 1986; Johnson Reagon, 1983; Lorde, 1984; Smith, 1983). As these scholars note, the work of including more privileged actors has the potential to threaten the epistemological, ontological and or physical security of disadvantaged groups spaces and the people therein (Droogendyk et al., 2016) . As such, parallels can be drawn here with other examples of cross-group mobilisation including within the anti-racism movement (Hopkins & Kahani-Hopkins, 2006; Saguy et al., 2009) and the LGBTQ+ movement (Case et al., 2014; Russell, 2011). The maintenance of systems of privilege within these types of activism is indicative of what Russell (2011) terms "hierarchical drift". It functions to reinstate a dominant/subordinate status binary based on gender identity or sexuality in this case, and can decentralize the disadvantaged groups' interests in the context of collective activism (Wright & Lubensky, 2013).

Connected to the workings of unearned privilege is the 'pedestal effect' (Macomber, 2015; Peretz, 2018a) within movement spaces. It is a conceptualization which draws upon Williams' "glass escalator" (1992) first coined in relation to men's recruitment into typically women dominated professions. As analysis later indicates, this can facilitate men's speedy upward mobility within organisational or movement structures (Messner et al., 2015; Peretz, 2018a). A similar phenomenon is seen in the positive media portrayals of men-led groups (Macomber, 2014) such as those referred to at the beginning of this paper and in the

generally favourable perception of men whose actions are regarded as deviating from (hetero)normative gender-role expectations (Hochschild & Machung, 1990).

### **Masculinities and men as gendered beings**

This paper engages with an ethnomethodological (West & Zimmerman, 1987), (feminist) poststructuralist (Butler, 1990) reading of gender as performative, interactional and which must be continuously accomplished. Heteronormativity is understood here as the suite of cultural, legal, institutional, and discursive practices that sustain the assumption of binary gender (Kitzinger, 2005). In this gender (identity) aligns with biological sex (Schilt & Westbrook, 2009) and heterosexuality is (re)produced as 'natural' and taken for granted (Kitzinger, 2005). A framing of men as gendered beings and the notion that socially constructed norms of masculinity critically shape men's behaviours has been a key part of research examining men's relationship to GBV. The concept of 'hegemonic' masculinities as socially legitimised and aspirational versions of 'ideal' manhood (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) has provided a framework for men's violence prevention premised on the notion that certain masculinities are achieved through the use of violence (Morris & Ratajczak, 2019; Peretz & Vidmar, 2021). This discourse establishes some gender stereotypes as incubators for damaging constructions of what it is to be a 'real' man (Flood, 2015). Often implicit in these is the demotion and subordination of that which is deemed feminine.

Strategies for men's engagement in violence prevention has typically incorporated an interrogation of gender norms and masculinities (Flood, 2011; Jewkes, Morrell, et al., 2015; McCook, 2022; Peacock & Barker, 2014; Tolman et al., 2016), especially those espousing a lack of emotionality and displays of aggression and domination (Macomber, 2015) (and men who fall short of these masculine expectations) (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Segal, 1990). This is coupled with the mobilisation of a discourse of men's accountability and responsibility (Flood, 2011; Messner et al., 2015; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2008). With this, is an attempt to sever the links between certain masculinities, violence perpetration and patterns of coercive control (Flood, 2016; Peretz, 2020; Ratele, 2015), and to rework gender stereotype discourses in order to produce societal and culture change (Stewart et al., 2021). Increasingly this is operationalised by engaging men and boys via gender transformative programming, of which there are numerous examples globally and that are understood as seeking to rework gender roles, norms and expectations, especially those pertaining to masculinities (Casey et al., 2018; Dworkin & Barker, 2019).

## **Method**

### *Participants, recruitment and ethics*

This paper reports on a sub-section of participant data from a larger triangulated sample (n=57) made up of domestic abuse women victim-survivors and practitioners, and men engaged in anti-violence activities. Focus here is on the accounts offered by the men's participant group only (n=14); analysis of the other groups' data is discussed elsewhere (Wild, 2022; Wild, forthcoming). Including the three groups created a unique space in which to explore the challenges and opportunities of men's anti-violence participation from three key perspectives.

A broad definition of 'men's engagement' was employed to better capture the range of men involved in anti-VAW efforts and their correspondingly diverse role(s). 'Men's engagement' in this context is understood as participation by a (cis or trans) man over the age of 18 of any sexual orientation, in an in/formal activity aimed at preventing or challenging men's GBV. There was no limit as regards to the type of role participants occupied, however, prospective participants were excluded if their practice did not incorporate some form of prevention work with men and or boys.

This framing resulted in a sample of men in roles that spanned a broad-spectrum including practitioners in survivor-facing supporter positions, activists and educators including in schools. Also comprising the sample were programme managers and commissioners responsible for VAWG strategy and provision, and domestic abuse consultants. These groups are not mutually exclusive, and several participants occupied more than one role. Approximately half of the men participants also provided direct support to men victim-survivors of DVA and or men who perpetrate domestic abuse. A small minority of the participants identified that they employed a feminist analysis. The term 'engaged men' (Burrell & Flood, 2019; Tolman et al., 2016) is used to collectively refer to this heterogeneous group.

Participants were recruited via three main routes; direct communication with men-led organisations who acted as gatekeepers to reach their members or employees, Twitter, and a dedicated project website which enabled prospective participants to learn about the study and to register their interest. Following recruitment, interviews were conducted in person (n=9) and via Skype (n=8). There was greater uptake of online engagement for this cohort of participants in comparison to the other two owing to the more disparate geographical

dispersal of the participants which spanned 12 different English towns and cities.

The participants were mostly white, heterosexual men, and all cisgender. A minority identified as Black (n=3) or gay (n=2). Two disclosed personal experience of domestic abuse – one as a child and another as an adult in a heterosexual relationship. It is a significant limitation of this study that it did not engage trans men. The small sample size and the limited degree of racial diversity constitutes another substantial limitation. So that the study was ethically sound and capable of supporting the wellbeing of all participants safety measures were implemented from the outset. Measures comprised strict participant confidentiality and privacy procedures coupled with informed, dynamic consent. Detailed study information was provided in advance of interview and participant debriefing conducted immediately after interview. Post-interview 'check-in' was conducted within 2 days which led to a follow-up interview with three participants. Locally specific support information and signposting were provided if required.

An advisory group made up of a small group of women survivors of domestic abuse acted as 'guides' (Liddiard, 2013) during the research in order to ensure it remained survivor-led. The group were consulted on suitability and accessibility of the research design, relevance and framing of research questions, broad interview themes and terminology used. The study underwent thorough risk assessment and received full ethical approval prior to commencing. Pseudonyms are used here to refer to all participants. Role specifics are purposefully vague and limited demographic information (where provided) is included to protect participant anonymity. This is owing to the small sample size and the public profile and/or visibility of some participants in the English VAW sector.

#### *Data production, coding, and analysis*

Data were produced using one-to-one, in-depth, unstructured narrative interviews (n=17) during which participants were invited to discuss their experience on their own terms – there were no predefined questions. This method was chosen due to its coherence with a feminist theoretical and discourse analytic framework and is grounded in the understanding that the interview encounter is a dialogical process co-constructed by participant and researcher (England, 1994) and led by the participant (S. Hesse-Biber, 2007). Experience in this context is understood as discourse (Gavey, 2011) allowing for an examination of how participants



narrate their own lives (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000; Riessman, 1993) and to surface the discourses used to account for their practice.

Coding of the data was done via repeated reading and sifting followed by categorisation using NVIVO, and guided by Potter and Wetherell's (1987) suggestion that it is done as "inclusively as possible". Structured by the study's primary research questions, coding functioned as a practical means to synthesise and compare often quite disparate pieces of discourse across the three data sets from which a detailed coding framework was devised. Discourse constituted the primary unit of analysis and was understood in its broadest sense, referring to all forms of talk and text (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Data were analysed using discourse analysis (Gill, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell, 1998). Discourse analysis offers an epistemological framework in which talk and text are centred as social practices that are interactional, action-orientated and constructive of the social worlds we inhabit (Wood & Kroger, 2000). In this sense discourse is used by people to *do* things (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Analysis entailed close examination of the fine grain detail of the accounts (Antaki et al., 2003) and the discursive resources utilised by participants; personal narrative constituted just one of the many deployed in participants' process of meaning-making (Tamboukou, 2016). It also involved the identification of patterns present in the data mainly in the form of account variability and consistency. Variability refers to differences in the form and content of the accounts, while consistency denotes the variety of discursive features shared in and across the accounts, as well as across the three data sets enabling comparative analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

A key part of the analysis involved the demarcation of 'interpretative repertoires' (IRs) (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984) based upon the initial coding framework. IRs are rooted in the dominant discourses pertaining to a particular issue such as GBV. Historically contingent, they refer to sets of normatively used, systematically associated terms to describe and evaluate events (Potter, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Culturally and socially embedded (Wetherell, 1998) and often in circulation within workplace settings (Wetherell, 2012), IRs function to make intelligible the participants' social worlds (Taylor & Littleton, 2006). An example is the IR of 'men talk to men' utilised when constructing strategies for men's engagement and rooted in the dominant discourse of men as 'allies' in GBV violence prevention. IRs are malleable discursive patterns which can be selectively deployed and reworked dependent upon the setting in which they are deployed. In the sections that follow, analysis of the participants' accounts will be discussed.

## Findings

### *Pledges, paternalism and protectionism*

To begin with, analysis will focus on an extended data extract, in which there is the interrogation of several enmeshed dominant discourses typically present in men-led violence prevention campaigns:

“[W]hat I think is problematic about [some men's anti-VAW campaigns] is they reward the good bits of being a man standing out against violence against women and girls, too quickly and too easily. So, you know, all you need to do is rock up and hold your badge and you've got it [...] but I don't think [these] campaign[s] necessarily [...] on an individual level or an institutional level really say to people, [...] ‘what is your actual understanding of these issues and what are you personally going to do about them?’ [...] It's a fairly superficial level which means it's then just a performance which probably means it's just reinforcing privilege. ‘Gosh, I am the great...normally, white heterosexual, middle aged male coming to rescue those poor damsels.’”

(Lloyd, age 37, white, gay)

Lloyd occupies a senior managerial role responsible for VAWG programming. He offers an account which is critical of an individualised ‘pledge’ type activism which rewards men “too quickly and too easily” for taking a public stand. There are continuities here with DVA consultant Gary's account, who states, “all we're asking guys to do is put a signature on [...] and then they can relax in this smugness about how [they've done something]. [T]hat's not going to do anything.” (age 55, white, heterosexual). The participants allude to the problematic of a gesture politics without interrogation of individual behaviours, despite perhaps functioning to alleviate men of the burden of guilt for their previous inaction.

Also notable is the reference to prevention initiatives which routinely fail to acknowledge difference among men, instead treating men (and violence) as homogenous (white, heterosexual, cisgender) (Flood, 2015), as Lloyd critiques the endurance of a ‘salvation’ model of prevention which turns on a logic of masculinist paternalism. Implicit in this discourse is the construction of women as subjects in need of protection and men as women's defenders, a binarized framing implicit in the campaign discourse of organisations such as the White Ribbon Campaign. It has the effect of aligning men with both protection and risk, while women's safety is contingent upon men's willingness to take action (Seymour, 2017).

This formulation shores up another widely circulating discourse of the 'good/bad' men dichotomy such that men's violence becomes the purview of "othered", 'bad' men:

"I think you could reinforce negative stereotypes [...] guys who think that their behaviour is great, they just think 'oh yeah, we're talking about other guys, 'out there', in the world. Hiding in bushes and alleyways'. [...] [L]ike we're just talking about this abstract, 'other person, out there'. And that links back to this idea of gender-based violence being an 'everybody issue' and not just an issue for women or for a small number of perpetrators." (Cameron, age 31, white, heterosexual)

Cameron is employed in a men-led international organisation and here he reflects on the narrative present in the work he does. He rejects the construction of men's violence against women as an issue perpetrated by aberrant men in exceptional circumstances thereby allowing some men to distance themselves from the issue. This has the effect of challenging the assertion that VAW is an isolated, individualised problem perpetrated by a minority of 'othered' men (read: minoritised by race, class), thereby obscuring the structural relations of power and privilege within which the violence occurs.

#### *'Men talk to men'*

The leveraging of the social relationships between and among men as a mechanism to engage other men is in evidence across the sample, as Gary states; "the only time [men] get it is when other men spell it out". This discourse is reproduced by Nigel speaking in the context of his work with men domestic abuse perpetrators:

"[I]f a woman says [it], because of their misogyny [...] they'll just think, 'oh she's just being a woman, it's rubbish'. And dismiss it. Whereas a man doing it (.) it makes them think a bit." (Nigel, age 61, white, heterosexual)

Discernible here is common working assumption that men will listen more readily to other men, mobilised at the level of program implementation and at the organisational level as regards to how men practitioners themselves are 'heard'. It is a discourse that sustains an epistemic hierarchy in which the voice of men is given primacy, as Lloyd attests; "I definitely

got heard in a different way to my [women] predecessors [...] [s]ome of that was definitely about a man speaking around these things. And that was real a dilemma.”

Other accounts point to the ways in which ‘traditional’ masculinities are understood to be productive of social credibility and patriarchal capital such that the promotion of gender equality and violence prevention are made more audible, and the audience more receptive:

“[W]e had three members who nearly completed [the programme] [...] One was a 10 year stretch prisoner, another one was a big hard man that had been in and out of prison all his life, and another was one an ex-boxer. So, I would say something about emotions and [...] these three men would agree with me and support me. [...] [T]hen it makes [the other men] think. If it was just me then they would just think, ‘oh he's just a gay so and so’, or something like that. And dismiss it. Because again one of the things I'll get challenged constantly is my masculinity.” (Nigel, age 61, white, heterosexual)

Notable in his account are the competing discourses of masculinities, which coincide with the identity Nigel constructs for himself in opposition to the men he works with. Talk of men's emotions, including as a mechanism to promote gender equitable behaviours is constructed as a cogent threat to hetero masculinity, whereby homophobia comes to function as a key gender policing tool. Here the threat of homosexuality is disrupted via the approbation offered by the three group members. The men's visible backing of Nigel not only corroborates his talk by virtue of their identity construction as ‘real men’, but crucially makes it more palatable to the rest of the group. Moreover, their endorsement of Nigel's message creates windows for the potential engagement of otherwise unengaged men and provides a discursive framework for conversations regarding GBV.

By way of contrast, other participants such as Dale provides an account in which there is an active reworking of dominant gender role presentations within the context of a survivor intervention:

“We set the program up so we've got a man and a woman as facilitators. So that the [participants] in the group [can see] that a woman can be in control. And can be in control around men. And can make decisions. And that a man can accept those decisions [...] there's a kind of narrative there which needs to be played out.” (Dale, age 57, white, heterosexual)

Dale is a group facilitator on a women's domestic abuse recovery programme and a practitioner supporting young fathers. The "narrative that needs to be played out" is a counter-discourse to the dominant discourse that patterns the lives of the women attending Dale's group, several of whom were still living with abusive partners. The importance of ensuring that the attendees were able to witness as well as envisage for themselves an alternative gender power dynamic is made central in Dale's formulation and in turn is reflected in the programme design. This is arguably achieved because Dale reworks his own relationship to patriarchy and masculinities within the confines of the group space (see Wild, forthcoming, for further discussion of this group from the perspective of the women participants).

### *Entrepreneurialism and men's 'pedestalling'*

The participants' accounts of their professional experience evidence the ways in which dominant masculinities and epistemic hierarchies can become embedded at the level of the organization:

"Men in this field – and certainly this has been my personal experience – receive as much in the way of praise [...] which I think largely is unearned compared to the efforts of women, for speaking out on these kinds of topics [...]. So, I think it's a lot easier for men in many ways to speak about these topics in the first place". (Max, age 26, white)

"If I and a female colleague were doing something together at the most basic level often stuff would be directed towards me. Even if that female colleague was the most appropriate person to answer it." (Lloyd)

Max imports a clear discourse of 'pedestalling' here to construct how men tend to encounter anti-VAW spaces as generally accepting of their presence, and of the messages they communicate. Lloyd corroborates this point and brings to bear concerns regarding the curtailment of women's decision-making capacities when men enter typically women majority spaces.

Cameron, who describes his work in the field as a "joy" and "another privilege" echoes both Max and Lloyd saying, "I think guys who tell you that it's difficult being a guy and being a

feminist are wrong. In my opinion [...] you get additional praise for saying the exact same thing that women have been saying for a hundred years". Together, these participants foreground the routinised, systemic undervaluing of women and their labour in a neoliberalised economy of patriarchal privilege, including within movement spaces.

Jacob, who describes himself in our interview as the "the 'go to guy'" for domestic abuse reflects this as he charts his pathway through the VAW sector from a starting position of ignorance:

"I didn't even know what DV was [...] I just didn't have any interest. And maybe that's part of, you know, the [...], the...the gender issues we have in society because [...] I was 21. But [the organisation] pushed, and said, you know...give it a shot. And, ever since then, I haven't done anything other than, domestic violence actually." (Jacob, age 34, black, heterosexual)

According to Jacob his rapid promotion to a senior managerial role responsible for VAWG programming was linked to the fact there "there [were] no men before [him], there were always women in [his] post", as he notes elsewhere in the interview. This same professional upward mobility is in evidence in Patrick's professional path as a VAWG educator:

"Because I've got a certain amount of profile within my professional network I'm asked to do things. And also on behalf of [organisation] I went to quite a few universities; did five national conferences... [...]; t]he county have just asked me to write a program for teaching and youth staff across the county [...]" (Patrick, age 50, white, heterosexual).

Together, these accounts signal the material and social outcomes associated with men's entry into the field buoyed by a progressive accumulation of "patriarchal dividends" (Connell, 1995). The participants comparative status as a minority (in numerical terms) in a largely women-dominated workforce enables an individualised entrepreneurialism in the sector, as they are located as subject matter 'experts'. A finding that is reflected in other studies (Macomber, 2015).

## Discussion

Analysis indicates a consistent investment in the gender binary as a meaningful framework for 'engaged men's' understanding of methods for engagement, men's role, as well as for strategizing VAWG prevention approaches. In critiquing 'pledge-activism' the participants import a discourse of performativity and individualised action. This functions to sever men's participation from concepts of embodied gender as grounds for an alliance, in favour of one based upon privileged actors' behaviours. However, as analysis of the men's experiences in workplace settings later indicates, individual actions do not successfully alter the structural conditions of ubiquitous sexism in which the men operate. The participants' criticism of a discourse of white masculinist protectionism discernible in some prevention approaches surfaces the problematic notion that men use their position of relative superiority to 'rescue' women from harm. At the same time, as Lloyd and Cameron allude to, there is a sustained lack of intersectional analysis in violence prevention efforts involving men in the global north (Boonzaier et al., 2020; Peretz, 2018b). This produces an excessively narrow conceptualisation of men as homogenously white, heterosexual and cisgender, thereby complicating the challenges of engaging more (diverse) men and boys in gender justice work both on a professionalised basis and as recipients of programmes (Flood, 2016; Ratele, 2015). This underscores the importance of engaging with epistemologies from the global south which better respond to the convergences of racism, capitalism, neoliberalism and colonialism in the lives of men (Boonzaier et al., 2020)

The 'men talk to men' discourse circulates widely across various movement and practice settings. The participants' unanimous acknowledgement of the elevated credibility and authority assigned to men's voices within this field represents what Flood (2015) describes as a sustained 'homosocial investment' in men's peer to peer evaluation. Crucially, it exemplifies the regimes of knowledge production put into motion via a discourse which asserts men listen to and hear other men more readily. In evidence are the ways the participants not only benefit from this construction but also how it provides an interpretative resource for the engagement work they undertake, rationalised on the grounds that it acts as an antidote to dismissal by otherwise unengaged men. But while there is some anecdotal evidence supporting this strategy (Casey & Smith, 2010; Messner et al., 2015) it undoubtedly secures an epistemological hierarchy in which women's voices and those of minoritised genders continue to be deprioritised, including in organisational settings. Men are instead located as 'elite knowers' (Janes, 2016) while women's epistemic credibility is discounted. They are instead established as "unreliable epistemic agents" (Kelland, 2016),

reflecting a broader cultural discourse of disbelief in victim-survivors and of their political silencing (Epstein & Goodman, 2019).

Despite attempts to challenge the dominant order of things on an individual level, the men's accounts illustrate the gendered nature of bureaucracies and workplace settings (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), especially when men occupy professionalised roles in the VAWG sector. Here the men's participation in the field comes to be read as exceptional and consequently 'worth' more. Analysis illustrates how this formulation resources professional credibility, prestige, and (self)assuredness – often for doing the same (or less) work (more experienced) women have been doing for decades, as others have also noted (Burrell & Flood, 2019; Kolb, 2014; Macomber, 2015; Messner et al., 2015; Peretz, 2018b). It is from this that a discourse of entrepreneurial masculinity (Cornwall, 2016) is made possible, as men acquire a unique form of gendered resource capital based upon their positionality as 'one of the few men in the organisation/service/programme/sector'. Made coherent via a neoliberal individualised logic (O'Neill, 2018), it is brought into alignment with the aspirational, individualised norms of hegemonic masculinities. A cursory glance at the positions held by the men in this study as well as their pathways into the work supports this assertion with several in strategic or senior managerial positions with decision-making and agenda setting responsibilities for regional or national VAWG provision and or public awareness campaigns.

## **Conclusion**

This paper exposes some of the more intractable epistemological and political challenges associated with men's engagement in anti-VAW activities. As such, findings illustrate the sometimes-contradictory nature of men's participation in this field, despite a clear personalised commitment to gender change and violence prevention on the part of all the participants. In the context of professional practice, men's gender transformative efforts must therefore include an analysis of how they are personally implicated in the (re)production of gender norms in their workplace settings, especially those pertaining to an entrepreneurial masculinity, as part of their wider efforts to instigate change. In practice, this means actively working to resist individual 'pedestalling', particularly when it is not accompanied by the equivalent (material and epistemic) promotion of women and minoritised genders.

The accounts substantiate the fine line 'engaged men' must tread when it comes to the production and dissemination of knowledge bound up with men's anti-violence practices and



the role they occupy within them. Especially when the dominant discourses governing GBV prevention can produce both the instrumentalization as well as a reification of reductive masculine tropes and gender norms which are limiting for all persons – not just men. This arguably exposes the limitations of an approach to GBV prevention which uncritically invests in a discourse of strict gender binarism in the absence of a robust feminist, intersectional analysis. An approach to gender change which instead strives to move beyond the binary may offer a more inclusive discourse for GBV prevention that is better equipped to challenge reductive, harmful gender norms.

But despite these challenges, this paper does not seek to make an argument against men's participation in prevention efforts -- their involvement is crucial to disrupting the multifaceted responsabilization of women and survivors for the social problem of GBV. Instead, this paper emphasises the need to remain steadfastly attuned to the various ways gendered and racialised power and privileges are continually reproduced – including in organisational environments in which the overarching aims are to dismantle them.

**Funding details:** This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) under grant number: ES/J500215/1.

**Conflict of interest statement:** The Author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

**Acknowledgements:** The author is grateful firstly to the participants who made this work possible. Thanks also go to Karen Throsby for early conversations regarding the themes in this paper, as well as to the anonymous reviewers for their feedback which helped strengthen this article.

## References

- Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2003). Discourse Analysis Means Doing Analysis: A Critique Of Six Analytic Shortcomings. *Discourse Analysis Online*.
- Barker, G., Ricardo, C., & Nascimento, M. (2007). Engaging men and boys in changing gender-based inequity in health: Evidence from programme interventions. *World Health Organization*, 76.
- Beyond Equality. (2021). *Beyond Equality statement on the need for men to end violence against women*. <https://www.beyondequality.org/blog-posts/boys-wont-be-boys-theyll-be-what-we-teach-them-to-be>
- Boonzaier, F., Huysamen, M., & Van Niekerk, T. (2020). Men from the South: Feminist, decolonial and intersectional perspectives on men, masculinities and intimate partner violence. *Men, Masculinities and Intimate Partner Violence*, November, 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280054-4>
- Burrell, S., & Flood, M. (2019). Which Feminism? Dilemmas in Profeminist Men's Praxis to End Violence Against Women. *Global Social Welfare*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40609-018-00136-x>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Carlson, J., Leek, C., Casey, E. A., Tolman, R., & Allen, C. (2020). What's in a Name? A Synthesis of "Allyship" Elements from Academic and Activist Literature. *Journal of Family Violence*, 35(8), 889–898. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10896-019-00073-Z>
- Case, K. A. (2012). Discovering the Privilege of Whiteness: White Women's Reflections on Anti-racist Identity and Ally Behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68, 78–96.
- Case, K. A., Hensley, R., & Anderson, A. (2014). Reflecting on Heterosexual and Male Privilege: Interventions to Raise Awareness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70, 722–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12088>
- Casey, E. A. (2010). Strategies for Engaging Men as Anti-Violence Allies: Implications for Ally Movements. *Advances in Social Work*, 11, 267–282.
- Casey, E. A., Carlson, J., Fraguera-Rios, C., Kimball, E., Neugut, T. B., Tolman, R. M., & Edleson, J. L. (2013). Context, Challenges, and Tensions in Global Efforts to Engage Men in the Prevention of Violence against Women: An Ecological Analysis. *Men and Masculinities*, 16(2), 228–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X12472336>
- Casey, E. A., Carlson, J., Two Bulls, S., Yager, A., Sierra, T. B., & Yager, A. (2018). Gender Transformative Approaches to Engaging Men in Gender-Based Violence Prevention: A Review and Conceptual Model. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 19(2), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016650191>
- Casey, E. A., & Smith, T. (2010). "How can I not?": Men's pathways to involvement in anti-

- violence against women work. *Violence Against Women*, 16(8), 953–973.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210376749>
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the Outsider Within : The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. *Social Problems*, 33(3), S14–S32.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Polity.
- Connell, R. W. (2011). Organized Powers: Masculinities, Managers and Violence. In *Men and development: politicizing masculinities* (pp. 85–96). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Connell, R. W. (2016). Masculinities in global perspective: hegemony, contestation, and changing structures of power. *Theory and Society*, 45(4), 303–318.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829–859.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Cornwall, A. (2016). Introduction: masculinities under neoliberalism [Book]. In A. Cornwall, F. G. Karioris, & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Masculinities under neoliberalism* (pp. 1–28). Zed Books.
- Digby, T. (1998). *Men doing feminism*. Routledge.
- Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M., & Louis, W. R. (2016). Acting in Solidarity: Cross-Group Contact between Disadvantaged Group Members and Advantaged Group Allies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 72(2), 315–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12168>
- Dworkin, S. L., & Barker, G. (2019). Gender-Transformative Approaches to Engaging Men in Reducing Gender-Based Violence: A Response to Brush & Miller's "Trouble in Paradigm." *Violence Against Women*, 25(14), 1657–1671.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219872555/FORMAT/EPUB>
- England, K. V. L. (1994). Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research. *The Professional Geographer*, 46, 241–256.
- Epstein, D., & Goodman, L. A. (2019). Discounting women: Doubting domestic violence survivors' credibility and dismissing their experiences. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 167(2), 399–461.
- Flood, M. (2011). Involving men in efforts to end violence against women. *Men and Masculinities*, 14(3), 358–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X10363995>
- Flood, M. (2015). Work with men to end violence against women: a critical stocktake. *Cult Health Sex*, 17 Suppl 2, S159-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1070435>
- Flood, M. (2016). An Intersectional Approach to Engaging Men. In *Prevalent & Preventable: Practice & Policy in the Prevention of Violence against Women and Children*. AVAWA and WESNET.
- Flood, M. (2019). Engaging Men and Boys in Violence Prevention. In *Men and Masculinities*.

- Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184x19878740>
- Garlick, S. (2020). The nature of markets: on the affinity between masculinity and (neo)liberalism. *Journal of Cultural Economy*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2020.1741017>
- Gavey, N. (2011). Feminist Poststructuralism and Discourse Analysis Revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(1), 183–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684310395916>
- Gibbs, A., Vaughan, C., & Aggleton, P. (2015). Beyond 'working with men and boys': (re)defining, challenging and transforming masculinities in sexuality and health programmes and policy. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17, 85–95.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1092260>
- Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening Pandora's box: a sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gill, R. (1996). Discourse Analysis: Practical Implementation. In J. T. E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 141–158). British Psychological Society.
- Gliniski, A., Schwenke, C., O'Brien-Milne, L., & Farley, K. (2018). *Gender Equity and Male Engagement: It only works when everyone plays*.
- Hesse-Biber, S. (2007). The Practice of Feminist In-Depth Interviewing. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. L. Leavy (Eds.), *Feminist Research Practice* (pp. 110–147). SAGE.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984270>
- Hester, M. (1984). Anti-sexist men: A case of cloak and dagger chauvinism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 7, 33–37.
- Hester, M., Kelly, L., & Radford, J. (1996). *Women, violence, and male power: feminist activism, research, and practice*. Open University Press.
- Hill, A. (2021). *Sarah Everard's death prompts men to join groups trying to halt male violence*. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/oct/12/sarah-everard-sabina-nessa--prompts-men-join-groups-trying-halt-male-violence>
- Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (1990). *The second shift*. Avon Books.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: free association, narrative and the interview method*. SAGE.
- Hopkins, N., & Kahani-Hopkins, V. (2006). Minority group members' theories of intergroup contact: A case study of British Muslims' conceptualizations of "Islamophobia" and social change. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(2), 245–264.  
<https://doi.org/10.1348/014466605X48583>
- Janes, J. E. (2016). Democratic encounters? Epistemic privilege, power, and community-based participatory action research. *Action Research*, 14(1), 72–87.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750315579129>

- Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations. *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1580–1589. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61683-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61683-4)
- Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., Quayle, M., Sikweyiya, Y., & Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: combining theory and practice in gender interventions. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 17(September 2016), 112–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1085094>
- Johnson Reagon, B. (1983). Coalition politics: Turning the century. In B. Smith (Ed.), *Home Girls: A black feminist anthology* (pp. 356–368). Kitchen Table: Women of Colour Press. internal-pdf://133.255.250.172/Johnson Reagon\_Coalition politics-Turning the.pdf
- Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing Masculinity in the Locker Room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(2), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.2.55533188520136u1>
- Kelland, L. (2016). A Call to Arms: The Centrality of Feminist Consciousness-Raising Speak-Outs to the Recovery of Rape Survivors. *Hypatia*, 31(4), 730–745. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12295>
- Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems*, 52(4), 477–498. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2005.52.4.477>
- Kolb, K. H. (2014). *Moral wages: The emotional dilemmas of victim advocacy and counseling*. University of California Press.
- Liddiard, K. (2013). Reflections on the process of researching disabled people's sexual lives. *Sociological Research Online*, 18, 1–13. internal-pdf://0962490172/Liddiard\_Reflections on the process of researc.pdf
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: essays and speeches*. Crossing Press.
- Macomber, K. (2014). Integrating men as allies in anti-violence work: Accountability and Beyond. *XY: Men, Masculinities, and Gender Politics*, 1–12.
- Macomber, K. (2015). "I'm Sure as Hell Not Putting Any Man on a Pedestal": Male Privilege and Accountability in Domestic and Sexual Violence Work. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1491–1518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515618944>
- McCook, S. (2022). 'So, What is a Good Masculinity?': Navigating Normativity in Violence Prevention with Men and Boys. *Australian Feminist Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.2022.2095612>
- Messner, M. A. (1997). *Politics of masculinities: men in movements*. Sage Publications.

Wild, J. (2023). Men's efforts to tackle men's violence: negotiating gendered privileges and norms in movement and practice spaces, *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021X16757936936612>

---

- Messner, M. A., Greenberg, M. A., & Peretz, T. (2015). *Some men: feminist allies in the movement to end violence against women*. Oxford University Press.
- Morris, E. W., & Ratajczak, K. (2019). Critical Masculinity Studies and Research on Violence Against Women: An Assessment of Past Scholarship and Future Directions. *Violence Against Women*, 25(16), 1980–2006. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219875827>
- Ng, K. (2021). *Meet the men joining the fight to end violence against women*. The Independent. <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/women/violence-against-women-sarah-everard-b1939262.html>
- O'Neill, R. (2018). *Seduction: Men, masculinity and mediated intimacy*. Polity Press.
- Peacock, D., & Barker, G. (2014). Working with men and boys to prevent gender-based violence: Principles, lessons learned, and ways forward. *Men and Masculinities*, 17(5), 578–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X14558240>
- Pease, B. (2000). *Recreating men: Postmodern masculinity politics*. SAGE Publications.
- Peretz, T. (2018a). Seeing the Invisible Knapsack: Feminist Men's Strategic Responses to the Continuation of Male Privilege in Feminist Spaces. *Men and Masculinities*, 23(3–4), 447–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X18784990>
- Peretz, T. (2018b). "We're Not Equipped": The Paradox of Intersectional Failures in the Formation of Men's Gender Justice Groups. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 26, 284–304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1060826518773489>
- Peretz, T. (2020). Trends and trajectories in engaging men for gender justice. In *Routledge International Handbook of Masculinity Studies* (pp. 498–507). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315165165-49>
- Peretz, T., & Vidmar, C. M. (2021). Men, masculinities, and gender-based violence: The broadening scope of recent research. *Sociology Compass*, 15(3), e12861. <https://doi.org/10.1111/SOC4.12861>
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviours*. SAGE Publications.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (1992). What can you do with a man?. Feminism and the critical appraisal of masculinity. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 15(3), 339–350. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(92\)90002-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(92)90002-D)
- Ratele, K. (2015). Working through resistance in engaging boys and men towards gender equality and progressive masculinities. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17 Suppl 2, 144–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1048527>
- Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis* (Vol. 30). Sage Publications.
- Russell, G. M. (2011). Motives of Heterosexual Allies in Collective Action for Equality.

- Journal of Social Issues*, 67, 376–393.
- Russell, G. M., & Bohan, J. S. (2016). Institutional Allyship for LGBT Equality: Underlying Processes and Potentials for Change. *Journal of Social Issues*, 72, 335–354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12169>
- Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The Irony of Harmony. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 114–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x>
- Schacht, S. P., & Ewing, D. (1997). The Many Paths of Feminism: Can men travel any of them? [1]. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 6(2), 159–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.1997.9960679>
- Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing gender, doing heteronormativity: “gender normals,” transgender people, and the social maintenance of heterosexuality. *Gender and Society*, 23(4), 440–464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243209340034>
- Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (2008). Interpersonal Violence Against Women. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 24(2), 178–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986208315483>
- Segal, L. (1990). *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (Updated and). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seymour, K. (2017). “Stand up, speak out and act”: A critical reading of Australia’s White Ribbon campaign. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 51(2), 293–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865817722187>
- Smith, B. (1983). Home Girls: A black feminist anthology. In *ACLS Humanities E-Book*. Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Stewart, R., Wright, B., Smith, L., Roberts, S., & Russell, N. (2021). Gendered stereotypes and norms: A systematic review of interventions designed to shift attitudes and behaviour. *Heliyon*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06660>
- Tamboukou, M. (2016). A Foucauldian Approach to Narratives. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing Narrative Research* (pp. 88–107). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402271.n5>
- Taylor, S., & Littleton, K. (2006). Biographies in talk: a narrative-discursive research approach. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 2, 22–38.
- Tolman, R. M., Casey, E. A., Allen, C. T., Carlson, J., Leek, C., & Storer, H. L. (2016). A Global Exploratory Analysis of Men Participating in Gender-Based Violence Prevention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(16), 3438–3465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516670181>
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Source: Gender and Society*, 1(2),

Wild, J. (2023). Men's efforts to tackle men's violence: negotiating gendered privileges and norms in movement and practice spaces, *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021X16757936936612>

---

125–151. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/189945>

Westmarland, N., Almqvist, A.-L., Egeberg, L., Sandy, H., Stephen, R., Burrell, R., & Delgado Valbuena, C. (2021). *Men's activism to end violence against women: Voices from Spain, Sweden and the UK*. Policy Press.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387–412.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005>

Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and emotion: a new social science understanding*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203889114-15>

Wild, J. (2022). Gendered Discourses of Responsibility and Domestic Abuse Victim-Blame in the English Children's Social Care System. *Journal of Family Violence* 2022, 1–13.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/S10896-022-00431-4>

Wildman, S. M., & Davis, A. D. (1995). Language and silence: Making systems of privilege visible. *Santa Clara Law Review*, 35(3), 881–906.

Williams, C. L. (1992). The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the "Female" Professions. *Social Problems*, 39(3), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3096961>

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: methods for studying action in talk and text*. Sage Publications.

Wright, S. C., & Lubensky, M. E. (2013). *The struggle for social equality: Collective action versus prejudice reduction*. November, 291–310.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203848814>