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ABSTRACT

Ten Men is a primary prevention strategy, which involves a group of prominent men in the community who want to change the social norms around masculinity in Rhode Island and educate other men on the link between toxic masculinity and intimate partner violence (IPV). One way to accomplish this goal of social norms change is by having the Ten Men members, both current and alumni, communicate with men in their local communities about these topics. I evaluated the effectiveness of men’s communication utilizing a mixed methods approach, which incorporated both causal methods applied to network analysis (quantitative) and focus groups conducted with the Ten Men members (qualitative) to learn more about how they communicate with other men in their communities. I used a convergent mixed methods design, where the qualitative and quantitative data are collected at the same time, analyzed, and then the results are combined in a matrix to identify meta-themes. I found that Ten Men influence the attitudes of men in their communities. This is supported by the findings that Ten Men members and men in their communities are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, when compared to Control group men, and the themes of having positive interactions with community men, focusing on relationship-building and empathy in those interactions, and engaging with men in their communities in a multiplicity of ways derived from the focus group discussions, which are combined into the meta-theme of spheres of influence. I also identified the meta-themes of shared attitudes and Ten Men as leaders.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I agree wholeheartedly with the poet John Donne who said “no [wo]man is an island.” No one completes a dissertation alone: I have so many people to thank for their contributions to this work. I am throwing away the guidelines on how to write your acknowledgements section (e.g., it can’t be longer than one page and you should avoid being personal). This has resulted in a rather long section; I’ve bolded names so you can quickly locate yourself.

Kate Webster is an amazing person. After realizing I needed to make a change and work with someone new for my dissertation, I knew that person had to be Dr. Kate. She embodies mixed methods research, as one of only a few methodologists I know who cares just as much about theory as she does about methods. She always asks students to reflect about what we are ‘anchoring to’ in our work, bringing reflexivity into the forefront of our minds at all times. Her feminist mentorship and unending kindness has been incredible throughout this process and I am so grateful we had the opportunity to work together.

Working with Lisa Harlow has been a phenomenal experience. Lisa has been an informal mentor to me since I took her multivariate statistics class during my second semester of graduate school; I am so glad that I can now call her my co-major professor. Her structured approach to completing graduate school requirements and other tasks as well as checking in to make sure I’m doing okay has made this process so much less stressful than it would have been otherwise. I’m always especially grateful for her wordsmithing suggestions so I can write in a more professional, but not pretentious way.
I met with one of my committee members, **Natallia Katenka**, while I was still formulating ideas for my dissertation and trying to figure out how best to use network analysis in my work. She identified what I was describing as similar to the work she and **Ashley Buchanan** were doing and encouraged me to not only join their lab, but to take on a master’s degree in statistics too. Working with these co-major professors for my statistics degree (and their help with my dissertation) has been a wonderful experience. I’m so glad to have the opportunity to work with two of the most impressive statisticians I’ve ever met. Thanks also to **TingFang Lee** and **Benjamin Skov**, both members of Ashley and Natallia’s Networks and Causal Inference for Public Health and Education Research (NCIPHER) Group, for helping me with R code.

**Lyn Stein** has been an excellent committee member, contributing to my thesis, comps, and dissertation work. Her feedback is always incredibly thorough and helpful. Lyn is the person who can be counted on to ask why something matters; what is the impact of the work I’m doing? Thanks for keeping my work grounded, Lyn.

Without **Kat Quina** this dissertation would not have happened. Kat is a wonderful feminist mentor and friend. She took me to my first Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) conference in spring 2018 and proceeded to not only introduce me to many important women in the field, but also to brag to everyone about how I had just defended my master’s thesis. She has encouraged me to take leadership roles, while always volunteering her time to help out in any capacity. Kat is the person who, at an AWP planning meeting, introduced me and Cynthia Roberts, her former PhD
student, who is involved in the Ten Men project and with whom I’ve collaborated to do this work.

I am so blessed to be connected with Cynthia Roberts. She is the epitome of what it means to be a professional while also deeply caring about people. We started meeting to discuss working on a project together in the spring of 2018 and those meetings helped us frame my dissertation work. She also introduced me to what it looks like to work in anti-racist organizational development (AROD). Cynthia has been with me every step of the way for this dissertation and for that, I am immensely grateful.

I would also like to thank the others at the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence (RICADV) involved in Ten Men, who were a tremendous help in this work: Lee Clasper-Torch, Krista D’Amico, and Lucy Rios. Not only did they always make me feel welcome, they also took the time to provide valuable feedback on various aspects of this project. I am so grateful to have their input and insights, since they are the people doing this important work every day.

Also among those who do this work daily is the professor at the University of Rhode Island (URI) who helped us recruit “control” men for this study. They lent me books on men and masculinity early on in my work. Cynthia and I reached out to them when looking for “control” men for this study and they very generously agreed to email men who have been involved with their work around violence and masculinity at URI. This person will remain nameless and the description of the work they do is intentionally vague, as they participated in the current study.
Having **Jason Machan** as my externship supervisor at the Biostatistics Core at Rhode Island Hospital has been an unparalleled experience and one of my favorite parts of graduate school. He is my sounding board for any and all problems, whether they be professional, personal, or academic and has helped me grow so much as a person and a professional. I’ve received some of my best life advice from Jason, as well as some excellent, fun analogies for explaining statistical and methodological concepts to people outside of the field. Thank you also to my coworkers, **Grayson Baird** and **Ali Chambers**, who are always willing to listen to me vent and have provided helpful and humorous solutions to many of my problems.

I want to thank my undergraduate research assistants: **Aaliya Robinson**, **Ashley Fontana**, **Jessica Janus**, **Sabrina Rodrigues**, and **Stephanie Teran**. This team of incredible women worked with me during the 2018-2019 academic year doing literature reviews, learning about the research process, asking insightful questions, creating the surveys in Qualtrics, practicing thematic analysis, and putting up with my constant, overly-enthusiastic reminders to “engage in self-care.” I wish you all the best in your pursuit of jobs and/or graduate school!

I want to thank my partner, **Dan**, for always supporting me through this long, exhausting process. He makes sure I’m eating, sleeping, and not being too hard on myself. He also wrote the code to transcribe the focus group transcript, saving me countless hours of work. He is my go-to person for all things computer science/IT-related and has always been willing to help me (and everyone in my family) with any technological issues I might have.
I am grateful to my mom (a professional copy editor and fervent supporter of the Oxford comma), who was my very first editor and professional mentor. She would sit down with me from elementary school through high school to help me edit my papers, taking the time to explain what I was doing wrong, so I could learn and improve. She has always encouraged my love of reading and never put limits on what I was allowed to read (12-year-old Valerie probably should not have read *White Oleander*. Whoops.). I attribute this to fueling much of my passion for learning in general, without which I would not have been able to complete a graduate degree. And I would like to thank my MiMi who always has words of encouragement for me during our weekly Skype sessions. She is one of the wisest, most creative people I know. These two women have been shining examples of what it means to be a strong woman for my entire life and their unconditional support for the past five and a half years has made grad school infinitely more bearable.

Lastly, I would like to thank my participants. Without them there would be no dissertation.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................... ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ....................................................................................................... iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS ...................................................................................................... vii

LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................................... ix

LIST OF FIGURES ........................................................................................................... x

CHAPTER 1 ......................................................................................................................... 1

INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................. 1

CHAPTER 2 ......................................................................................................................... 14

METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................................... 14

CHAPTER 3 ......................................................................................................................... 28

FINDINGS ............................................................................................................................ 28

CHAPTER 4 ......................................................................................................................... 75

CONCLUSION ................................................................................................................... 75

APPENDICES .................................................................................................................... 80

BIBLIOGRAPHY ................................................................................................................ 115
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1. Focus Group Themes</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2. Demographics for full sample and each group</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3. Pairwise correlations between scale scores</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4. Associations between group membership and attitudes toward violence</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5. Associations between group membership and attitudes toward gender equity</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6. Associations between group membership and abusive relationship behaviors</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7. Mixed Methods results</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1. The Ten Men Social Ecological Model, from Roberts &amp; Rios (2017).</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2. Illustration of a simple undirected network graph with corresponding adjacency matrix.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3. A causal directed acyclic graph (DAG).</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4. Diagram of causal effects, based on work by Shimada et al. (2019).</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5. Connections between qualitative themes.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6. Distribution of scores on the Violence subscale by group.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7. Distribution of scores on the GEM scale by group.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8. Distribution of ABI-R scores by group.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9. Group membership and attitude toward violence (pro- or anti-violence). A square indicates a higher score on the Violence subscale (more pro-violence) while a circle indicates a lower score on the Violence subscale (more anti-violence).</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10. Group membership and attitude toward gender equity (more or less gender equitable). A square indicates less gender equity while a circle indicates more gender equity.</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11. Word cloud of data from focus groups.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Ten Men is a primary prevention strategy, which involves a group of prominent men in the community who want to change the social norms around masculinity in Rhode Island and educate other men on the link between toxic masculinity and intimate partner violence (IPV). One way to accomplish this goal of social norms change is by having the Ten Men members, both current and alumni, communicate with men in their local communities about these topics. While the program’s development has been systematically evaluated throughout its six years, it is now in a place where it can be evaluated at the state level. I will evaluate the effectiveness of men’s communication utilizing a mixed methods approach, which will incorporate both causal methods applied to network analysis (quantitative) and focus groups conducted with the Ten Men members (qualitative) to learn more about how they communicate with other men in their communities. I use a convergent mixed methods design, where the qualitative and quantitative data are collected at the same time, analyzed, and then the results are combined in a matrix to identify meta-themes.

Theoretical Framework

My theoretical framework involves two complementary theories: intersectional feminist theory and social network theory. Intersectional feminist theory includes some basic tenets: 1) everyone is part of a social hierarchy; 2) each person has multiple intersecting identities, some of which are advantaged and some of which are
disadvantaged; 3) our knowledge and our realities are shaped by social experiences and processes; 4) the personal is political; 5) Women of Color have been marginalized in traditional feminist scholarship; 6) and there is no ‘objective’ knowledge in social science research (Cole, 2009; Crawford & Marecek, 1989; Crenshaw, 1989; Davis, 2008). This follows feminist epistemology and philosophy of science, which holds that gender shapes our ways of knowing and our ways of doing science (Anderson, 2015).

Social network theory relies on “the premise that social life is created primarily and most importantly by relations and the patterns formed by these relations” (Marin & Wellman, 2014, p. 11). The most important concepts in social network theory are the interdependence between individuals and their actions, and that network structure (e.g., the patterns of relationships between members within a network) can inhibit or enhance individuals’ actions and resource distribution (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). These theories tie nicely into feminist psychological research, which as Naomi Weisstein (1968/1993) wrote, “requires, first and foremost, a study of the social contexts within which people move” (p. 203). We can use intersectional feminist theory to inform how men can use their privilege and power to educate themselves and other men about toxic masculinity and its ties with intimate partner violence (IPV), and we can study interactions between men around these issues with a grounding in social network theory.

These theories are also well-suited to be integrated into a mixed methods research design. Individually, both the qualitative and quantitative portions of the study include both feminist theory and social network theory. The focus group work is
grounded in feminist theory, where the researcher’s role is de-centered and the participants are the ones driving the conversation (Wilkinson, 1998). Focus groups are also highly interactional, with participants often speaking directly to one another, which fits well with social network theory. The quantitative surveys address feminist issues (e.g., attitudes toward gender equity, adherence to masculine violence norms, and perpetration of abusive behaviors in intimate relationships) along with directly asking the men with whom they are connected socially (i.e., friends, relatives, coworkers, neighbors). For this study, knowing whether or not Ten Men participants are influencing the men in their communities via communication about masculinity and IPV (quantitative) is not enough, we also want to know how they are communicating with community men (qualitative). Thus, we need to integrate both pieces for a more complete picture of the phenomenon. Together, looking at the interaction between the quantitative and qualitative work is a very relational process, connecting themes in a way that is similar to connecting people in social networks. The process is also focused on the intersections of the qualitative and quantitative work and is subjective, both of which fit with the tenets of intersectional feminist theory.

I examined the quantitative and qualitative results in this study as two parts of a whole that interact with one another, following social network theory, where emphasis is placed on connections and interactions (Marin & Wellman, 2014; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). In mixed methods research we seek to explore constructs on multiple levels, to address real-world problems with a grounding in theory. To do this, we combine the deep understanding and meaning-making that can be found in
qualitative research with the quantitative concepts of measuring the prevalence of effects and the magnitude of those effects (Creswell, Klassen, Piano Clark, & Smith, 2011).

**Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and Masculinity**

IPV is “violence or aggression that occurs in a close relationship” (CDC, 2017, p. 1), in many forms, including physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression. IPV is a pervasive problem in the United States: approximately 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men have been stalked, physically hurt, or have experienced unwanted sexual contact or assault perpetrated by an intimate partner. The impact of experiencing IPV is long-lasting: those who survive can experience a range of negative health outcomes and are more likely to engage in risky health behaviors, such as smoking and binge drinking, compared to those who have not experienced IPV (CDC, 2017).

Much of the rhetoric around IPV focuses on women as “victims” and places responsibility on women’s shoulders for IPV prevention, because IPV is seen as a “women’s issue” (Berns, 2001; Katz, 2006). Blaming women and de-emphasizing the role of men as perpetrators normalizes IPV and is a common theme in the media (Berns, 2001). Our society treats women who are victims of IPV and men who perpetrate it as “other” than “normal” people, which Shoos (2011) notes, “allows us to retain our conviction that, despite its apparent ubiquity, domestic violence is an aberration…it erects a mental wall around abuse, marking both batterers and victims as Other and reassuring us that we could never be them” (p. 227). These ways in which our society portrays IPV perpetuate toxic social norms in the United States.
Berns’ (2001) investigated these toxic social norms in the United States in her discourse analysis of political and men’s magazines, which revealed that 81% of the articles about domestic violence used a patriarchal resistance framework that blamed women and de-emphasized the role of male perpetrators. In terms of de-emphasizing men’s roles as perpetrators, some strategies included using terms like “human violence” rather than domestic violence, having women write the articles, and incorrectly interpreting the results of studies to claim women are perpetrators of violence just as often as men. The articles also used strategies such as saying women instigate domestic violence, pointing out specific instances of women perpetrators, and claiming that feminists are “male bashers” who exaggerate domestic violence statistics. These claims put the onus on women to prevent domestic violence, rather than teaching men not to perpetrate violence (Berns, 2001). They also flip the roles and promote the idea of women as aggressors “bashing” men who are victims (Katz, 2006). Toxic social norms are not just around IPV, but are enacted around all forms of wrong-doing in our society.

Freyd (1997) introduced DARVO, which means “Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender” (p. 29). This is what happens when a perpetrator is being called out for their abusive behavior – they deny the allegations, attack the person who is accusing them, and claim that they themselves are the victim in the situation. Empirically, Harsey, Zurbriggen, and Freyd (2017) have found that accused perpetrators are using these strategies, that they are most commonly used against women who are the accusers, and those who are the target of DARVO tend to exhibit higher self-blame, which contributes to silencing the accuser. We have seen this
strategy being used frequently in the United States over the past few years, with Freyd’s (1997) DARVO theory cited often in popular news articles (e.g., Dampier, 2019; Fitzgerald & Freyd, 2017; Wanjuki, 2018). This is an indication that although Berns’ (2001) research may be almost twenty years old, these toxic social norms are still being perpetuated today, particularly by high-profile men against women accusing of them of sexual violence.

The role of societal norms must also be acknowledged in the perpetuation of patriarchal masculine ideals (hooks, 2004; Katz, 2006). Masculinity in our culture cannot be understood without an understanding of the ways in which “imperialist white-supremacist capitalist patriarchy” (hooks, 2004), equates manhood with violence and domination of women. This dominant form of masculinity is called either patriarchal, toxic, or hegemonic masculinity and these terms will be used interchangeably. As hooks (2004) writes, “showing aggression is the simplest way to assert patriarchal manhood…all men living in a culture of violence must demonstrate at some point in their lives that they are capable of being violent” (p. 49).

We must note that masculinity is a social construction, made in opposition to femininity; and men have to earn the right to be men. They must constantly “prove” that they are masculine to other men, which includes asserting their dominance over women by enacting or encouraging violence (Kimmel, 2003). This concept is called precarious manhood (Vandello et al., 2008), which means that men, unlike women, must have frequent validation and social proof of their manhood. This results in men feeling very threatened and anxious when their manhood is challenged, which can result in increased aggressive behavior, a response which is seen as demonstrating
masculinity (Vandello et al., 2008; Bosson et al. 2009; Bosson & Vandello, 2011). Bosson and Vandello (2011) write about how these aggressive masculinity norms are particularly relevant situationally and culturally. Increased aggression as a response to threatened masculinity can be seen in men who live in cultures with strong norms tied to precarious masculinity, such as honor (e.g., men protecting their own and their family’s reputation, possibly with violence) and in situations where masculinity is threatened (e.g., braiding hair; Bosson & Vandello, 2011).

David and Brannon’s (1976) conception of traditional masculinity norms includes: “no sissy stuff” (p. 49), “the big wheel” (p. 89), “the sturdy oak” (p. 161), and “give ‘em hell” (p. 199). These indicate the opposition to femininity and emotions; an emphasis on being successful and having high status in society; being a resolute, tough, strong, and immovable person; and being aggressive and violent, respectively. We cannot ignore the fact that patriarchal masculinity is accessible differentially; men of color do not have the same access to power in our culture as white men and, thus, patriarchal masculinity is enacted in different ways across men by race, ethnicity, class, and other categories of social identity, such as sexual orientation (hooks, 2004).

Men’s adherence to toxic masculinity norms, including sexism, support of the patriarchy, male dominance within the family structure, and sexual dominance, has been found to be a strong predictor of violence against women across multiple meta-analyses of empirical studies of IPV; the more a man subscribes to toxic masculinity norms, the more likely he is to accept violence against women (Heise, 1998; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002; Schumacher, Feldbau-Kohn, Smith Slep, & Heyman, 2001;
Stith, Smith, Penn, Ward, & Tritt, 2004; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). The way men are socialized to adhere to traditional gender roles leads to men and boys being less likely to seek out help, particularly mental health treatment, which led to the American Psychological Association releasing their guidelines for working with men and boys in 2018. These guidelines (APA, 2018) call out traditional masculinity ideology (Levant & Richmond, 2008), also known as hegemonic masculinity, as being a barrier to men seeking treatment and also perpetuating unhealthy attitudes and behaviors, such as fear of vulnerability, perpetration of sexual assault, substance abuse, and suicide completion.

**Social Norms Change**

Social norms theory posits that people tend to overestimate how often others engage in negative behaviors and underestimate how often others engage in positive behaviors; this leads to an increase in risky behavior and a climate of permissiveness. To change social norms, we must educate people about the prevalence of negative behaviors and empower them to speak out against those behaviors (Berkowitz, 2005; WHO, 2010). For example, many men who have positive attitudes toward women and feminism (e.g., Eagley & Mladinic, 1989; Twenge, 1997) are uncomfortable with the ways other men talk about and treat women, but say nothing, believing they are in the minority (Katz, 2006). One study provides evidence for the effectiveness of a program conducted with boys and young men in Ethiopia to reduce IPV and change harmful gender norms by engaging men in their communities and conducting group education sessions about gender norms and IPV (Pulerwitz et al., 2015).

**How is Social Network Analysis Already Being Used in These Areas?**
One important question to ask is, how is social network analysis already being used to study these topics? There is a lack of social network analysis studies regarding IPV specifically. Some network studies related to these topic areas include: whether having violent high school peers is related to IPV perpetration later in life (Ramirez, Paik, Sanchagrin, & Heimer, 2012), how attitudes toward sexual violence against women play out in college men’s peer networks (Swartout, 2013), comparing differences between the networks of women who are in violent relationships with women who are not in violent relationships (Katerndahl, Burge, Ferrer, Becho, & Wood, 2013), the network structure for social hierarchies based on masculinities in all-boys schools (Lusher & Robins, 2010), and how community groups across a state developed a plan for primary prevention of sexual violence (Cook-Craig, 2010).

The social network study most closely related to the proposed study examined attitudes toward IPV among people living in rural Honduras. Shakya and colleagues (2016) found that attitudes toward IPV were shared within the household for women (i.e., women who lived together, such as mothers and daughters, shared attitudes toward IPV), but for men attitudes were both similar within the household, and were similar to people they talked to regularly outside of their household (i.e., men also shared attitudes toward IPV with men in their communities, not just the men they lived with). The researchers also found that IPV was more likely to be seen as acceptable among people with less social power/influence in the community (Shakya et al., 2016).

What Are Qualitative Studies Addressing in These Areas?
Most qualitative work about IPV is conducted almost entirely with women who have experienced IPV as participants and/or their healthcare providers (e.g., Bacchus, Mezey, & Bewley, 2006; Feder, Hutson, Ramsay, & Taket, 2006; Kaur & Garg, 2010; Minsky-Kelly, Hamberger, Pape, & Wolff, 2005; Rose et al. 2011; Rothman, Hathaway, Stidsen, & de Vries, 2007; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). There is some qualitative work on primary prevention strategies to address IPV, including a study that evaluated a community-based intervention focused on preventing violence against women in Uganda (Kyegombe et al., 2014), a study evaluating the activities and outcomes of 41 domestic violence coordinating councils in a Midwestern state in the United States (Allen, Watt, & Hess, 2008), and a study of community attitudes towards intimate partner violence against women in urban Tanzania using a grounded theory approach (Lassier, Nystrom, Lugina, & Emmelin, 2011). I was unable to find any mixed methods studies looking at prevention of IPV. The most relevant article I could find was a mixed methods study about IPV perpetration amongst Black, Hispanic, and White communities in Dallas, Texas with a focus on differences in police reports of IPV amongst the communities (Lipsky et al., 2012).

The Ten Men Program

One program dedicated to educating men and involving them in primary prevention work about IPV and its link with white American society’s social norms around masculinity, is the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence’s (RICADV) Ten Men project. One of their goals is to change “harmful gender-based social norms that perpetuate intimate partner violence” (Rios & Roberts, 2016, p. 3). There is emerging empirical evidence that working to change social norms around IPV
by directly partnering with men and boys can be a successful approach to primary prevention of IPV (WHO, 2010), with groups such as Men Can Stop Rape (2019) and A Call to Men (2019) being the most well-known primary prevention organizations that work with men to promote healthy masculinity and prevent violence and sexual assault. Every year, since 2013, RICADV recruits a new cohort of ten men who live and work in Rhode Island. They learn about IPV, participate in media campaigns to raise awareness, and lead events to create community dialogue about healthy masculinity and men’s responsibility in IPV prevention (Rios & Roberts, 2016).

It is important to study this group because it is the first program in Rhode Island to train men in primary prevention of IPV. We want to know how the men who have gone through Ten Men and are now alumni, and those who are currently in Ten Men, actually communicate with men in their local communities as this communication is crucial to social norms change (Flood, 2011; Katz, 2006). One of the long-term goals of the program is to “increase the number of men who actively work in their community to impact IPV prevention” (Rios & Roberts, 2016, p. 23; WHO, 2010). The Ten Men project may become a national example of one method of IPV primary prevention and we need to know how the men are disseminating the information they have learned to others in their communities and if that is effective.

The Ten Men project uses a modification of the Social-Ecological Model (based on Bronfenbrenner, 1979) in their work to show how various aspects of their program targets all levels of the ecological model (see Appendix 1, Figure 1). Heise’s (1998) theory that the causes of IPV are “grounded in an interplay among personal, situational, and sociocultural factors” (pp. 263-264), is important here because it leads
to the conclusion that primary prevention programs must address multiple levels of the ecological model, rather than just intervening on individual perpetrators. Work has already been done on the individual knowledge and community education levels of the model for the Ten Men project. The current work will focus on the mobilizing communities level of the model, which has not yet been extensively explored.

It is important for men to be involved in IPV prevention programs for many reasons. Men are most often the perpetrators of violence against women and hegemonic masculinity in our culture normalizes violence against women at all levels of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems model. Having men involved in this work allows them to partner with women in a positive way that lifts women up and, in turn, lifts men up by improving relations between women and men more generally (e.g., women are less likely to distrust men if the threat of violence is removed) and specifically (e.g., the relationships between individual men and women improve; Flood, 2011).

Also, men are more likely to listen to other men about men’s violence against women. As Katz (2006) points out, women are often demeaned when they talk about their experiences and thus it can be exhausting for women to do this work because they run the risk of not only not being heard but also being ridiculed for sharing personal stories. The effectiveness of having men communicate with other men can be especially impactful for men who are leaders in the community (Flood, 2011). They have power in their communities and can use their position to empower other men to stand up to toxic social norms about masculinity and they can educate other men on the link between those social norms and IPV. The men who are involved in Ten Men
are leaders in their communities and, thus, can use their positions of power and relationships with other men to bring about change. Engaging community leaders to effect change locally has been successful in many different areas and countries, such as in health care planning in Ghana (Nyonator et al., 2005), premarital counseling in the United States (Stanley et al., 2001), and health policy implementation regarding infants and mothers in Malawi (Walsh et al., 2018).

In this study, I surveyed community men and conducted focus groups with alumni of Ten Men. I examine the questions: how do the men in Ten Men communicate with other men about the topics of masculinity and IPV? And are the Ten Men members actually influencing the beliefs and attitudes about gender equity and behaviors related to IPV, amongst men in their communities?
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Case study.

I conducted a case study to learn more about the interactions that Ten Men alumni and current cohort members have with other men in their communities around the topics of masculinity and IPV. The boundaries of this study are not the program itself, but include the men with whom the Ten Men members interact (Creswell & Poth, 2018). As is recommended for triangulation, I used multiple types of information, including two focus groups, 18 digital stories from Ten Men, and other materials (Creswell & Poth, 2018). My main method of data collection was in-person focus groups, conducted with some of the Ten Men alumni and current members. I also reviewed program materials, including public-facing materials, such as videotaped testimonials (called “Digital Stories”) and billboards (RICADV, 2018) and materials that are not public-facing, such as the grant application/state-level evaluation plan used to start, and continue, the Ten Men program (C. Roberts, personal communication, June 5th, 2018; Rios & Roberts, 2016).

The focus groups were conducted with men who have already completed the Ten Men program so they hold the status of alumni. They were open to any of the men who would like to participate, including members of the current Ten Men cohort, though none of the current members chose to participate. See Appendix 2 for the focus
group protocol. Focus groups are a powerful tool for feminist research because they allow people to participate within a social context, which is crucial to both feminist theory and social network theory (Wilkinson, 1998). My data needed to be interactional and, as a feminist researcher, I agree with Wilkinson (1998) in rejecting the idea that an individual’s views expressed in a group are less authentic than those expressed in a one-on-one interview.

**Network analysis.**

Networks can be described using graphs, which are composed of nodes/vertices, representing the individuals in our network, and edges/links, which represent relational ties between nodes (Kolaczyk & Csárdi, 2014; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). The formal mathematical definition is as follows: a graph \( G = (V, E) \) is a mathematical structure made up of edges \( E \) and vertices \( V \), with edges represented as pairs \( \{u, v\} \) of vertices (Kolaczyk, 2009). Network data can be stored in an adjacency matrix. This is an \( n \times n \) square matrix where the rows represent nodes and the columns are those same nodes. In an undirected network, there are only two values that can be assigned: 0 representing no tie or connection, or 1 representing a tie, or connection between two nodes. The adjacency matrix for an undirected network is symmetric and the diagonal of the matrix is a node’s relationship to itself, which is usually interpreted as meaningless and is automatically given a value of 0 (Kolaczyk, 2009). See Figure 2 for a network illustration. Network analysts refer to data that is typically measured in a non-network research study, such as demographic variables, scores on surveys, and performance on tasks as attribute or covariate data. We can
have attribute data for nodes and/or edges, though nodal attribute data is more common (Kolaczyk & Csárdi, 2014).

There are two types of network studies: whole network studies and egocentric network studies. Whole network studies, also called sociometric studies, look at an entire network; all individuals within the bounds of the study are included and information on their shared connections is collected. Egocentric network studies focus on a specific group of people (egos) and measure their relationships to others (alters), without capturing an entire network (Kolaczyk, 2009; Neal & Neal, 2017). It would be prohibitively expensive, time-consuming, and likely impossible to conduct a whole network survey for this project; the current study was an egocentric network study with the men in the Ten Men program and control men, serving as the first nodes of interest (referred to hereafter as the “seed” nodes) and sampling men from their communities to create egocentric networks.

**Causal inference.**

In causal inference one estimates the causal effect of treatment, \( A = 1 \), and control, \( A = 0 \), using a potential outcomes framework. This means that researchers estimate the effects of the potential outcome of treatment, \( Y^{a=1} \), or control, \( Y^{a=0} \), as the outcome that would have been observed if, possibly counter to fact, an individual had been treated, or not treated (Hernan & Robins, 2019). One can say that treatment has an individual causal effect on an outcome if \( Y^{a=1} \neq Y^{a=0} \). That is, if a person was treated, their outcome is not the same as it would be if they were not treated. But individual effects cannot be computed because one cannot both treat and not treat someone, so causal effects must be estimated as an average causal effect for the
In this study, treatment represents being a seed person (i.e., Ten Men member or control man).

In a randomized experiment, causal effects can be determined using the assumption of exchangeability, which is when the potential outcomes, $Y^a$, are independent of treatment, $A$, for actual treatment $a = 1$ and control, $a = 0$ (Hernan & Robins, 2019). But in practice, it is not always ethical or feasible to conduct randomized experiments, so causal inference methods can be used in observational studies as well, using the principles gleaned from randomized experiments. First, the researcher must choose a set of covariates, similar to what one would use for matching in a matched case-control study, which define the groups (i.e., if the covariates were gender and sexuality the covariate groups could be bisexual men, bisexual women, homosexual men, homosexual women, heterosexual men, heterosexual women). The data are considered as if treatment had been randomly assigned within levels of the set of covariates, denoted as $L$, that are assumed to be important potential confounds to consider in the study. One has to select the set of covariates such that one can assume that there are no unmeasured confounding variables, which is a strong assumption.

The researcher conditions on the covariates, $L$, to determine the causal association between treatment, $A$, and outcome, $Y$ (see Figure 3) by having each participant weighted by the inverse of the conditional probability of being in a specific level of treatment. This process is called inverse probability weighting (IPW) and one can use a method of IPW in the presence of dissemination proposed by Tchetgen and VanderWeele (2012), which assumes that dissemination only happens within clusters, which are detected using community detection methods. The researcher must also
make sure that ‘treatment’ corresponds to a well-defined intervention, so there are not multiple versions of treatment. Causal inference methods rely on the assumption that one has not misspecified the model when effects are estimated. One thing to do to check for misspecification is to see if the means of the IPWs are close to 1. This is because IPW assigns each person a weight, based on the inverse of the probability that they would be selected. We know that the sum of probabilities of all events occurring is equal to 1 (Miller & Miller, 2014), therefore the mean of all of the IPW should be close to 1, as some individuals will be weighted more heavily than others (Hernan, Hernandez-Diaz, & Robins, 2005; Hernan & Robins, 2019). If the means are not near 1, this could indicate model misspecification or a violation of the positivity assumption (i.e., one or more of our levels, based on the set of covariates, do not have any participants; Hernan & Robins, 2019).

**Causal inference methods applied to network analysis.**

Causal inference methods applied to network analysis combines the principles of causal inference with those of network analysis. One can use observational data and replicate a randomized design by applying inverse probability weighting (IPW) and using the IPW to estimate potential outcomes (see explanation above). Instead of estimating potential outcomes by individual propensity scores, one can use a group-level propensity score based on the set of covariates, L, and their interactions within subgroups of the network (Shimada, Buchanan, Katenka, Friedman, & Kogut, 2019). A propensity score is created by converting a group’s set of covariates, and the interactions of the covariates, if any are present, into a score representing their estimated probability of being treated (Hernan & Robins, 2019). This is the network
component of the modeling, because traditional causal inference methods follow the assumption that observations are independent, (called the SUTVA, or stable unit treatment value assumption), whereas network analyses rely on the assumption that observations are not independent and spillover effects (i.e., effects that are dependent or “spilling over” from one participant to another; also called dissemination effects) are crucial (Hernan & Robins, 2019; Kolaczyk & Csárdi, 2014; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). That assumption can be relaxed by assuming that dissemination is occurring only within the network subgroups (i.e., partial interference; Shimada et al., 2019).

First, subgroups are determined; these involve each individual network surrounding an ego of interest, who is either a Ten Men man or a control man. Bernoulli individual random assignment is the framework for defining the potential outcomes. With Bernoulli random assignment, a participant can be moved to treatment from control, and vice versa, while holding all other participants constant (e.g., people assigned to treatment or control via a coin toss), whereas with a completely randomized design, changing one person from treatment to control, or vice versa, would affect all other participant’s probabilities of being assigned to treatment or control (Shimada et al., 2019; Tchetgen & VanderWeele, 2012). The causal estimands (i.e., our parameters) of interest for this study are: the average potential outcome of exposure for the individual, the marginal average potential outcome for the individual, the average potential outcome for the network subgroup, and the population potential outcome (Shimada et al., 2019).

The treatment group in this study is defined as being a seed member; either a Ten Men member or a control man. Community members are considered “untreated”
because they have not completed the training that either a Ten Men member (i.e.,
being part of a Ten Men cohort) or a control man (i.e., having taken a class, training,
or internship about the issues of masculinity and/or sexual violence prevention) has
completed. The primary outcomes were overall score on the attitudes/beliefs scales,
and overall score on the IPV behavior scale (see Appendix 3). I would expect that the
community men of the Ten Men members and Ten Men members are more likely to
have a score indicating that they never or rarely engage in IPV behavior, that they
subscribe to equitable gender norms, and do not condone violence, when compared to
men in the control group. Covariates which could be included in analyses are age,
ethnicity, educational attainment, income level, and childhood exposure to IPV, all of
which have been found to be risk or protective factors of perpetrating IPV (Capaldi,
Knoble, Shortt, & Kim, 2012).

Sampling

Recruitment.

Ten Men alumni and current members were asked if they were interested in
participating in a focus group and a survey via email. If they chose to participate in the
survey, they were also asked to email a survey link to men they connect with in their
communities, so the community men could complete an online survey to assess their
attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors in regards to masculinity and IPV. This is called star
sampling, a type of respondent-driven sampling (Heckathorn, 1997) where the Ten
Men members are the individuals (nodes) who provide the rest of the sample, via their
social connections (Wasserman & Faust, 1994).
Men who are similarly engaged in the topics of masculinity and sexual violence prevention to the Ten Men members, but who are not in the program were identified and asked to participate in the study. If they participated in the survey, they were also asked to send a survey link to men they are connected with in their communities; they were the controls. Informed consent was the first page of the survey and participants were only able to complete the survey if they agreed and typed the date and their email address to provide their consent. For the focus groups, men were asked to read and sign a consent form before the focus group began.

**Constructs and Measures**

I used subscales from the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory 46 (CMNI-46; Parent & Moradi, 2009) and items from the Gender Equitable Men (GEM) scale (Pulerwitz & Barker, 2008) to measure men’s attitudes and beliefs about masculinity. The CMNI-46 measures how much men align themselves with hegemonic masculinity using 11 subscales; it has been shown to have good internal consistency and validity for each subscale (with Cronbach’s α ranging from 0.72 to 0.91 for each subscale), and can be said to measure men’s conformity to the nature of individual subscales (Hammer, Heath, & Vogel, 2018; Mahalik et al., 2003; Parent & Moradi, 2009; Parent & Moradi, 2011). I used the Violence and Power over Women subscales, as these constructs are the most relevant to measuring attitudes and beliefs around IPV. Each question is worded as a statement that is answered on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” There are six questions for the Violence subscale and four questions for the Power over Women subscale.
The GEM scale has also been found to have good internal consistency 
(Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.81$ for total scale; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.85$ for the inequitable subscale 
and $0.77$ for the equitable subscale) and measures how much men align themselves 
with gender equitable or gender inequitable attitudes and beliefs (Pulerwitz & Barker, 
2008). I used 12 items from the gender inequitable subscale that are related to either 
vioence, male dominance over women, or adherence to traditional gender roles, as 
these are most relevant to the study. These questions are also worded as statements 
and answered on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly 
agree.”

I also used the first 13 questions of the Abusive Behavior Inventory Revised 
(ABI-R) to measure the frequency of psychological and physically abusive behaviors 
that occur in an intimate relationship; this has been found to have good internal 
consistency ($\alpha = 0.79$) and validity (Shepard & Campbell, 1992). Unlike 
other IPV scales (e.g., the Conflict Tactics Scale), the ABI was developed using 
feminist theory with the idea that IPV is used as a means to control women and is 
fueled by patriarchal masculinity. It was developed specifically to evaluate a domestic 
violence program (Postmus, Mathiesen Stylianou, & McMahon, 2016; Shepard & 
Campbell, 1992). This scale asks respondents to report the frequency of engaging in 
abusive relationship behaviors toward their partner during the past 6 months, with a 5- 
point Likert scale response. The response options are “never,” “rarely,” 
“occasionally,” “frequently,” and “very frequently.”

The demographic variables included in the survey were age, ethnicity, 
educational attainment, socioeconomic status (SES), what community the person lives
in, relationship status, and exposure to domestic violence in childhood. Many of these variables are risk or protective factors of perpetrating IPV (Capaldi, Knoble, Shortt, & Kim, 2012). See Appendix 3 for all survey questions. This survey was available online via Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) and was sent to participants as a link in an email or given to them by a Ten Men member or RICADV staff member as a Quick Response (QR) code, which is a particular type of bar code that can be scanned by a smartphone and used as a link to a survey or any other URL.

Reliability and validity.

No single study can establish the reliability or validity of a survey; one must evaluate a survey’s psychometric properties repeatedly over time and with different populations. I calculated the internal consistency for each of the subscales of my survey, as it is a mix of questions from different surveys. Internal consistency was calculated using McDonald’s omega coefficient, which is similar to Cronbach’s alpha in that it ranges from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1 indicating stronger internal consistency. McDonald’s omega was used because it performs better than Cronbach’s alpha under various conditions, such as when there are skewed data and tau-equivalence does not hold (Dunn, Baguley, & Brunsden, 2014; Green & Yang, 2015; Peters, 2014; Revelle & Zinbarg, 2009; Trizano-Hermosilla & Alvarado, 2016).

To investigate convergent validity, a type of construct validity (Embretson, 2007), I compared the scores on the measures (CMNI-46 subscales, GEM scale, and ABI-R) to see if there is a correlation between different measures of similar constructs. I compared the scores using the Pearson correlation coefficient (Benesty, Chen, Huang, & Cohen, 2009; Pearson, 1895), which calculates a value (r) ranging
from -1 to 1, which indicates the linear correlation between two variables. According to Cohen’s (1988) guidelines for the social sciences, a Pearson’s \( r \) correlation of 0.10 indicates a small correlation, 0.30 indicates a moderate correlation, and 0.50 indicates a strong correlation.

**Data Analysis**

**Thematic analysis.**

I used inductive thematic analysis to analyze the data from the focus groups and digital stories. The purpose of a case study is to gain an in-depth understanding of a specific case and to do so, case themes must be determined (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The purpose of inductive thematic analysis is to derive themes based on the data and using illustrative quotations to describe a phenomenon, making it a perfect fit for the case study methodology (Braun & Clarke, 2013). This entails using the various text (and other data sources) to discover themes, which are turned into a coding frame, where the themes are organized in some fashion and used to code all of the data (Silverman, 2006). I emphasize semantic themes in this work, meaning I am trying to find themes based on what the men actually said, rather than trying to identify what may be underlying what they are saying (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Braun and Clarke (2013) advocate for a reflexive approach to thematic analysis, which acknowledges the role of the researcher in generating themes based on the data and avoiding the use of phrases like “themes emerged” as that would imply that the themes are pre-existing, which fits within a positivist framework, and the researcher is not bringing their own lens and experiences into the analyses. These generated themes were then compared to survey results in a convergent mixed methods design to develop meta-themes.
Causal inference applied to social networks.

The causal effects I could estimate, proposed by Hudgens and Halloran (2008) are: the direct effect of treatment, the indirect effect of treatment, the total effect of treatment, and the overall effect of treatment (Shimada et al., 2019). Treatment is being a seed person (either Ten Men member or control seed). The outcome is the sum score for each scale (CMNI subscales, GEM scale, and ABI-R), modeled separately. Each covariate included in analyses (e.g., age, income, education, race/ethnicity) would be dichotomized.

The direct effect is the difference in potential outcomes between the Ten Men members (seeds) and their community men. The disseminated effect is the difference in potential outcomes among the Ten Men community members and the control community members. The total effect is the sum of the direct and disseminated effects, representing the total effect of treatment, i.e., the difference between the Ten Men members and the control community men. And the overall effect is the difference in outcomes between the Ten Men (seeds and community members) and control (seeds and community members) networks, meant to represent a population-level effect (see Appendix 4, Figure 4). These effects are estimated using propensity scores to create inverse-probability weighted (IPW) estimators for each effect based on work by Tchetgen and VanderWeele (2012). These causal effects can be expressed as the risk difference (RD), with their associated 95% confidence intervals, between the groups compared in each effect (Shimada et al., 2019).

Nonparametric tests.
Due to the small sample size, there were not enough clusters in the data to use causal inference methods. Effects were estimated, but the results were unstable. Instead, I used a nonparametric test to very roughly approximate the effects I would like to estimate in the causal inference analyses, using associational tests of differences between groups. I used the Mann Whitney U test (i.e., Wilcoxon Rank Sum test) to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between groups on outcomes. This is done by testing the null hypothesis that the two groups being compared have the same distribution, in other words, if we were to randomly select a value from one group it is equally likely that the value would be smaller or larger than a value randomly selected from the second group. The data are ranked, the ranks are summed, adjusted for sample size and compared. If the two groups come from the same distribution, one would expect the sum of their ranks to be similar (Mann & Whitney, 1947; Nachar, 2008; Wilcoxon, 1945).

Using notation from Mann and Whitney (1947), let \( x \) and \( y \) be two random variables and let \( x \) represent values obtained from the control group and \( y \) represent values obtained from the treatment group. We want to test that values from \( x \) are smaller than values from \( y \). First, values must be arranged in order from smallest to largest in each set: \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) and \( y_1, \ldots, y_m \). \( U \) is a count of the number of times a \( y \) comes before (is smaller than) an \( x \). We calculate \( U \) using the following equation:

\[
U = mn + \frac{m(m + 1)}{2} - T
\]

Where \( T \) is the sum of the ranks of the \( y \)'s, \( m \) is the number of \( y \)'s and \( n \) is the number of \( x \)'s.
The direct association was calculated by comparing the Ten Men seeds to the Ten Men community members. The disseminated (or indirect) association was calculated by comparing the Ten Men community members to the control community members. The total association was calculated by comparing the Ten Men seeds to the control community members. And the overall association was calculated by comparing the Ten Men (seeds and community members) to the control men (seeds and community members). One assumption of the Mann-Whitney U test is that the samples are independent, which may be a reasonable assumption for the disseminated, total, and overall associations, but does not hold for the direct association.

These models are not adjusted for other variables because the Mann-Whitney U test does not allow for the inclusion of covariates. There were three separate outcome variables: scores on the CMNI-46 Violence subscale, scores on the GEM scale, and scores on the ABI-R. Cliff’s delta effect size was calculated, along with its 95% confidence interval (Cliff, 1993; Vargha & Delaney, 2000). Values for Cliff’s delta range from -1 to 1, with 0 indicating no difference between the two groups. Absolute values of the small, medium, and large effect sizes for Cliff’s delta are 0.10 – 0.27, 0.28 – 0.42, and 0.43 or greater, respectively.

**Mixed methods.**

I used a convergent mixed methods design, collecting qualitative and quantitative data at the same time and combining the data after it was collected. I report and discuss the results of both qualitative and quantitative analyses together, with the quantitative aspects informing the qualitative aspects, and vice versa (Creswell et al., 2011). I did this by organizing the results into a matrix and noting
where the findings agree (are convergent), partially agree (are complimentary),
disagree (are dissonant), or where a finding is only evident in one part of the study
(silence). This allows for the identification of “meta-themes” found across methods
(O’Cathain et al., 2010).

Materials

The surveys were created in Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT). The second
focus group was held using Zoom (2019), a video conferencing platform. The focus
group transcript was recorded on my phone using a simple voice recording app called
Voice Recorder (2019). The transcription of the focus group data was accomplished
using Google Cloud Platform’s Speech-to-Text API (Google, 2019). All quantitative
data were analyzed using R and R Studio, version 3.4.3 (2017) and the psych (Revelle,
2018), igraph (Csardi & Nepusz, 2006), rcompanion (Mangiafico, 2015) and lattice
(Sarkar, 2008) packages.
CHAPTER 3

FINDINGS

Positionality Statement

In qualitative research positionality statements (also called reflexivity statements) are written as a way to acknowledge that research is not objective and to make others aware of where a person is coming from as a researcher and as a person (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006; Holmes, 2014; Hsiung, 2010; Malterud, 2001). There are several parts to include in a positionality statement: identity, insider-outsider status, access, and power (Merriam et al., 2001; Muhammad et al., 2015). A researcher’s identity includes various components, such as gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. Identity as part of positionality is not just these aspects that describe the researcher, but also how those identities impact the research, including how participants perceive the researcher and the implications of those perceptions (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006; Holmes, 2014; Hsiung, 2010; Malterud, 2001). Insider-outsider status is about how a researcher relates to participants and Banks (1998) proposed a typology of insider-outsider statuses, which include: the indigenous-insider, the indigenous-outsider, the external-insider, and the external-outsider. The indigenous-insider is someone who shares a community with the people they are researching and that community would endorse the person as an insider. The indigenous-outsider is someone who grew up in the culture they are studying but has assimilated to an outside culture and would be identified as an outsider to the
community they are researching. The external-insider grew up in an outside culture but rejects those values for that of the culture which they are studying and would be seen as an “adopted” insider by that community. The external-outsider grew up outside of the community they are studying and does not share the values of that community (Banks, 1998).

Access informs how the researcher recruits study participants; some populations are harder to access than others. The idea of “scientific colonialism,” that researchers have the right to access whomever they want to participate in their research, is an implicit assumption in much of the scientific literature (Allardt, 1990). By thinking about and writing about access, we can identify the more nuanced ways we may need to engage with our participants, even before starting the research process. Power is inherent in the research process and researchers must be aware of the power dynamic (and how they can minimize it, if possible) and how that can affect their study and their findings (Merriam et al., 2001). Feminist scholars prefer to have a collaborative environment with research participants (Reinharz, 1992; Wilkinson, 1998). I believe all researchers, quantitative and qualitative alike, should be required to do this, as we all have life experiences and biases that come into our work with us, that affect what we choose to study, how we choose to study it, and how we interpret our research findings.

**Identity.**

I am a young, white, cisgender, straight woman from the mid-Atlantic region of the United States currently living in New England. I grew up in suburban, urban, and (semi-)rural areas of the south-central Pennsylvania county in which I was born.
and left the area when I went to college in Boston, Massachusetts. Education was always considered crucial in my family (it was assumed that my brother and I would attend college): both of my parents were the first people in their families to earn bachelor’s degrees and my biological father was the first person in my family to complete a master’s degree. My parents divorced when I was five years old and my mother remarried when I was ten. I grew up relatively poor, but not destitute; my mom supported us on a church secretary’s salary and child support checks. When my mom married my stepdad, an electrician, now a project manager, we moved to a rural area and into the middle class.

I am an intersectional feminist. I am unmarried and do not have children, although I have been in a committed relationship with the same person for almost four years and we live together. I am not religious, although I grew up in the church (Protestant Christian) and my biological father was a Methodist pastor. I witnessed intimate partner violence as a child and teenager, though I did not recognize it as such at the time. I did not realize this until I started engaging in my dissertation work and learned that IPV is not just physical or sexual violence, but also emotional and psychological violence. My biological father would gaslight his live-in girlfriend (they are now married), as well as emotionally and economically manipulate her. I assume he still does (we are estranged).

**Insider-Outsider status.**

I am an outsider compared to the group I am studying: men. Regarding the Ten Men members specifically, they all live and work in Rhode Island (or the greater New England area) and I am not from the area, nor do I currently live in Rhode Island. This
made me an outsider in the focus groups and some of the men felt compelled to explain local issues a bit more in-depth to me, rather than assuming I was familiar with the geographic area and its associated cultures they were discussing, as I am not from Rhode Island.

Yet I am an insider in terms of being a feminist and caring about the work Ten Men does, and so the men assumed I agreed with their sentiments when they would make jabs at Donald Trump or discuss the Me Too movement. However, not being a man may have made some of the men more hesitant to fully explain some examples they brought up in the focus group. For instance, the men alluded to the topics of masculinity and IPV “coming up naturally” in conversation and when I asked them to provide specific examples, they would generally say that sometimes the interactions were negative and not elaborate. One of the participants, Dade, did provide an example where he quoted a coworker as making comments like “she’s got a great ass,” but most of the men just mentioned misogyny in general or false accusations of rape in general and did not go into specifics, possibly because I am a woman and going into specifics in front of me would have made them feel uncomfortable. However, the men were not hesitant to describe negative interactions they experienced with women around these topics so my gender may not have been much of a barrier to their sharing. The combination of being an outsider (e.g., being a woman, not being a Rhode Islander) and an insider (sharing feminist attitudes and beliefs) makes me an external-insider, though possibly leaning toward the external-outsider part of the spectrum.

Access.
I am new to community work and IPV and have been lucky enough to have an excellent mentor in these areas: Cynthia Roberts. She has been my contact person and the insider who has allowed me access to work with the RICADV and the men in Ten Men. She has been my go-between for sending emails to the men and has attended the focus groups to help put the men at ease. I started planning my dissertation project with Cynthia well before I proposed my research project, recognizing that I would need to support of someone who helped create the Ten Men project if my dissertation would be about Ten Men. I also attended a few Ten Men events before beginning my study to become more familiar with what Ten Men is, what the events are like, and who the people are who are involved in this work (both the people who work at the RICADV and the men themselves). Without Cynthia and the folks at RICADV I would not have been able to do this research.

I also needed access to men for the control group and a professor at the University of Rhode Island, was my insider for those men. They helped me recruit men who have taken their classes, attended their trainings, and/or worked with them as an intern. These men have been exposed to the issues of masculinity and/or intimate partner violence in their work with this professor, but they have not been a part of the Ten Men project. This professor’s work focuses heavily on masculinity and the prevention of sexual violence, particularly on college campuses, as that is the population with which they work most frequently.

In both cases, with the Ten Men members and the control group men, it was difficult to recruit their community members. In terms of access, we asked the Ten Men members and the control group men to send the survey link to their community
members because they are the ones who have access to those men and they are indigenous-insiders with those men. I wrote a blurb for the men to send to their community members along with the survey link, if they chose to do so, and made myself available to answer any questions the community men might have, but recruiting the community men fell on the Ten Men members and control men themselves. They had to take the initiative to reach out to their contacts and provide them with the study information and links. In the follow-up emails I thanked them for their participation in the study, but also let them know that participation was very low and that I would not be able to complete my analyses without increased participation.

**Power.**

During the focus groups I wanted to form a collaborative relationship with the participants, letting them talk amongst themselves and asking them open-ended questions without trying to steer them to any specific answers or types of answers. Having a focus group allows the researcher to step back and not be the center of attention (Wilkinson, 1998). While I was in a position of power as the researcher, I also believe that being young, a woman, and a current graduate student made me seem more approachable. Most, if not all of the men were older than me. Cynthia was also present at the focus groups, which made the men feel more comfortable than they likely would have if it had just been me (an outsider) and them. I reiterated that I worked with Cynthia on all of this work and that she came through the same PhD program in which I am currently enrolled.

Power also plays a role when administering surveys, even if there is no face-to-face interaction. Whoever completes the survey must first read the consent form,
which includes the names, degrees, and contact information of the researchers (i.e., me, Lisa Harlow, and Kate Webster). We are the researchers and as such, we are the ones in the position of power. Knowing that we will be analyzing their data may have made the men more likely to answer in a way that makes them appear more likeable, also known as social desirability bias (Paulhus, 1991; Paulhus & Reid, 1991).

Focus Groups

The men in the first focus group were diverse in terms of age and work experience. The men ranged in age from mid-twenties to retirement age. Three of the men worked in white collar jobs, while one worked in a blue collar job. The men were given pseudonyms, the men in this focus group are called Abe, Barnaby, Campbell, and Dade. Two of the men, Campbell and Dade, were in the same Ten Men cohort and thus already were familiar with each other.

There were only two men in the second focus group, but they had different backgrounds and were at different stages of their lives, one was in his mid-twenties, the other was middle-aged. These men were not in the same Ten Men cohort and had never met before the focus group. The pseudonyms of the men in this focus group are Edmond and Ferdinand. The first focus group was conducted in person and the second focus group was conducted using Zoom (2019), a video conferencing platform.

I asked the men questions about how they interact with other men about the topics of intimate partner violence (IPV) and masculinity. I asked them about how the topics come up, how they address them in interactions, and if there are any particular strategies they use to address or bring up the topics. I also asked them to tell us about a time they had a positive interaction about these topics and a time they had had a
negative interaction. Lastly, I asked them if anything had changed in regards to communicating about these topics after becoming a part of Ten Men.

Using inductive thematic analysis to analyze the focus group discussion, I have generated the themes of multiplicity of interaction types, topics coming up naturally due to popular culture/the news, men speaking from positions of power, the tension between taking an indirect versus a direct approach when addressing these topics, and using a plethora of specific strategies to bring up these issues. We also talked about negative interactions the men have had when discussing these topics and how their communication about these issues has changed since before they started Ten Men. Some of these themes were spoken of only in the context of formal settings (e.g., when teaching) or informal settings (e.g., with friends and family), though many of the themes applied across both settings. See Appendix 5, Table 1 for a list of the dominant themes, sub-themes, types of conversational settings (formal versus informal) in which they occur, the frequency with which each theme occurred in the focus groups (e.g., how many specific examples were given by the men for each theme), and how many of the men provided examples for each theme.

Comments have been lightly edited for clarity (e.g., removing “umms”, “likes”, “you knows”, and similar fillers), though I tried to stay true to the way the men talked, including the use of words like “gonna”, “ain’t”, and expletives. Anything in italics within quotes indicates a word the man who was speaking emphasized. Any brackets within quotes are my explanations. Any errors in transcription are my own.

“It runs the gambit of how the issue comes up and what I do about how I engage in it”
The men in both focus groups listed a wide variety of ways that the topics of masculinity and IPV came up in communicating with people in their communities. They also had many different strategies for addressing these topics. The men listed a myriad of places they discuss these topics and people with whom they discuss them. A few of the men mentioned they talk about these issues with family and friends in more casual settings (e.g., informal gatherings at home), while others talk about these topics at work and at school. Many listed various community places where they engage in these conversations, such as places of worship, groups in which they are members and/or leaders, and town council meetings.

Three men mentioned bringing up IPV and/or toxic masculinity specifically with strangers, though they took different approaches. Campbell said, “there have been times when I’ve intervened when I've seen things with strangers and voiced my opinion, but I try to do it in a diplomatic and gentle fashion.” He says that most people will respond positively and “take it down a notch”, but that some people will never listen. But he intervenes anyway because “I think that it’s a duty to do that [intervene].” Edmond also mentioned bystander intervention, saying “if I'm on the bus, if I see something, I'm the person who is gonna step in and just diffuse the situation.” Dade said that he would bring Ten Men flyers (and other materials about domestic violence) with him to street fairs in case “people want to talk about it or take something.” Campbell’s and Edmond’s approach was to engage in bystander intervention strategies, while Dade brought conversation-provoking materials with him to a place in which he knew he would be engaging with strangers.
Most of the men focused on interactions that happen in person, but Abe also mentioned that many interactions he had did not: they would occur over text or he would share something on social media “that's educational and positive in regards to the subject [masculinity or IPV], so that I can reach a large number of people. That’s just a different way to communicate.” Abe was also one of the younger participants, so using social media was probably a more normal way for him to share his thoughts, compared to the other men in the first focus group, who were middle-aged or older.

“A number of things have been in the news, popular culture these days”

All of the men spoke of instances when the topics “came up naturally” and many of those instances were tied to popular culture and the news. Barnaby mentioned someone bringing up false accusations of rape during a discussion about scapegoating immigrant communities because “it was Monday morning after the Patriots game, so Antonio Brown was on his mind.” Barnaby dismissed the person’s comment in the moment, as it wasn’t related to the conversation at hand. But what’s most salient to someone in the moment may prompt these conversations.

At first, Dade disagreed with others, saying he did not think that the topics came up “spontaneously,” but, after reflecting, he said “a number of things have been in the news, popular culture these days, that it [masculinity and IPV] has come up. The Kavanaugh hearings…Harvey Weinstein thing, Me Too…popular topics in the news. There seem like there have been a lot of them about this topic, lately, so, that [topics coming up naturally] has happened.” He provided a few different examples of toxic masculinity and violence towards women coming up naturally in conversations he had with men in his community.
Dade described an experience where he used a topic that was in the news to educate a man on what sexual assault actually is. He describes it as follows:

One time I got together with this guy, we were having lunch and he said ‘you’re in the Ten Men thing, what kind of things are you doing?’ I was talking to him about it and then this topic came up, sexual assault, and I had to educate the man; sexual assault, it’s more than rape. That’s all he thought it was and I said ‘no, there’s this and there’s this and this’ and he was like ‘really? I just never thought of that.’ He heard sexual assault in the news and that’s all he thought about. I mean, I think he heard it, you know? It was an educational moment that went well and we were just talking as friends. Instead of saying ‘you're doing something wrong, you idiot!’ I was like ‘there's a lot more to this than you knew about’ and he was like, ‘oh yeah there are all these other things that also count.’ And I thought that went well.”

He was able to have a positive interaction with someone while also educating him and not being accusatory or reactionary, but just having a simple conversation about what sexual assault is, prompted by an event that was being covered in the news at the time.

Abe brought up that he has experienced two distinct scenarios where talking about IPV or masculinity would come up naturally. In one scenario, “somebody approaches you on the subject and says, maybe like ‘oh what's Ten Men?’ Or ‘have you seen this news story, what are your thoughts on it?’ Or ‘this person is treating this person this way, what are your thoughts, what can we do?’” He identified those as “the positive scenarios where you’re probably both on the same page, or maybe you're not, but it's going to be a productive conversation.” Conversely, he mentioned another
scenario where “something happens or somebody says something and you feel that it's appropriate at that time to have a moment that might be educational for them or just to voice that you don't stand for what's occurring in that situation.” The men in the first focus group generally agreed that the topics can come up naturally, particularly now because these topics are in the news frequently. They also agreed that when the topics come up naturally, they tend to be brought up in one of two ways: a friendly way or a combative way, as Abe described.

The men in the second focus group would disagree – they saw these topics as almost always coming up naturally and being more conversational. Ferdinand said “I tend to approach my conversations with men in my life and boys in my life as natural as possible, so it's not necessarily something that I bring up or set up.” He goes on to say “I don’t necessarily approach conversations automatically saying ‘I’m going to get this point across.’ It doesn't happen to me like that. It's a conversation I'm having with someone. And then based on how we're relating with each other, that conversation explores certain subjects much deeper or not. It's not a full-out task of every interaction I have with men or boys.” Edmond agreed and added, “just really coming off as authentic too” is important in these conversations “because if people feel like you're trying to force something on them, you know, if it doesn't feel fluid, they pick up on that. But if you’re honest, you’re talking with enthusiasm,” so it’s more about having an honest conversation than starting a conversation with someone with the intent to discuss masculinity and/or IPV.

“The Voice of Authority”
Many of the men in the first focus group spoke of times when they brought up the topics of masculinity and IPV intentionally, and many of those times were when the men themselves were in positions of power. Barnaby frequently provided examples of how he addressed the issues of IPV and toxic masculinity when he was in a position of power at work, and Dade was quick to point out that at work, Barnaby is “the voice of authority,” and Barnaby agreed. Many of the men talked about times when they used their positions of power to talk about masculinity and/or IPV.

As the youngest in the group, Abe did not share many examples of speaking from a position of power. However, Abe spoke about how he was an RA [resident assistant] in college, which gave him a lot of opportunities to speak to people and “when you have that credibility, if you have some kind of credibility, I think it makes it a lot easier to have a positive interaction each time.” Credibility comes with being in a powerful position and Abe recognized that his position as an RA gave him that power to talk to others about these issues.

Campbell spoke about how, instead of arguing with people, he would simply say that he didn’t like a certain negative behavior or a certain type of misogynistic talking, and often, that would make the person engaging in that behavior or talk reconsider. He used this strategy with young men in a community group in which he is a leader. He provided the following example:

When I talk to the young men about how they behave around women and if they're doing something that I don't agree with, that I don’t think is right, instead of lecturing them I may just say ‘hmm.’ I'll grunt. Usually, I’ll just say ‘hmm.’ And then they’ll say ‘oh, Mr. _____, what is it?’ So I’m like ‘ehh I don't
like that kind of talk.’ And then we'll have a discussion, maybe, or most of the time there is no more discussion and they never say it again.

The young men look up to him, he is in a position of power over them, and his disapproval of their behavior or what they say means a lot to them. So, if he shows that he disapproves, they will generally listen to him and he knows that. He uses this (partially non-verbal) strategy to communicate his disapproval when they’re saying or doing something that is negative towards women.

Ferdinand emphasized that he talks about these topics daily as part of his work and provided an example of a time where he had a positive interaction with some boys with whom he was working. The boys played sports and they were talking about their interactions with other boys while playing sports and Ferdinand pointed out that “in nothing that they explained did they see anything wrong.” He said that he had a trusting relationship with these boys and felt that he could call them out about the different things he could see as problematic in their interaction. He said:

Moving through those steps about how they would undermine one another, how they would put one another in situations that were incredibly vulnerable, all for the sake of laughter, versus the sake of sharing and being one with each other. How they would physically pick on someone that had lesser physique, but all of this was under this guise of ‘fun.’ But what they weren't doing was exploring the individual perspective and feeling under all those actions how someone felt, how somebody could have felt with some of those actions, how they internalized it, how they went home and thought about it, how they reacted to it next time. All those processes were nowhere in their reference.
And so the discussion was really about that. What happens to the person that quote-unquote ‘you were making fun of and was laughing with you?’ He walked the boys through how the person who was the butt of the joke would feel and how the cycle is vicious and self-perpetuating in that the person who was made fun of would not acknowledge that they were hurt, but would instead do what was done to him to someone else. He ended by saying, “so we went through that exploration, which I thought was very important for them and they were the first to admit, ‘no we don't think about things that deeply even though we feel it, if it happens to us specifically.’” He used the trust he had with the boys but also his position of power to lead them through an exercise in empathy. Edmond pointed at that the interaction was also about respect, saying “I assume these kids [respected you], then they would actually be open enough to even hear you, and maybe they would dismiss it on some parts, but that doesn't matter, that door is open.” It’s not just about power, it’s about the relationships these men have with the boys and young men in which respect and trust play a vital role.

**Direct vs. Indirect Approaches**

One aspect of communication the men in the first focus group disagreed on was whether to approach these topics directly or indirectly. There was a tension between when can you let something go, versus when you should dig your heels in and say something. They did not want to not address something and be complicit in perpetuating negative behavior and/or negative talk with their silence, but they also did not want to bring up the topics and call people out so often that people starting ignoring them or became hostile. The men who brought up picking their battles, rather
than addressing everything directly gave examples of situations where they were not in positions of power. These examples were contrary to those times where they were in positions of power as the “voice of authority” and were more direct in their approaches to addressing these issues, mentioned earlier.

“Anything and everything does not help.”

Dade sometimes took a more cautious approach when bringing up these topics, especially at work where he’s “surrounded by Trump supporters” and isn’t in a position of power. He described himself as “outnumbered” at his job and said, “if I jump on everything all the time they turn on me.” He explained that the way men at his job talk about women is not great (e.g., objectifying women) and he would have to point out that behavior daily. Once, when he did say something to someone “they said ‘hey, you don’t even know, can I kiss a woman, can I not?’ And I said ‘how about asking her??’” It’s not that he doesn’t bring up the issues at all, because he does, and he provided numerous examples of talking to people about these issues. He even said “some people are kind of sick of me talking about it, I think. There’s a thing where bringing it up and calling everyone on everything is counterproductive and sometimes you just have to say, ‘well, this time no. Maybe the next time I could say something.’”

Dade emphasized that it was about picking your battles. He said, “I have to be careful, and I think other places [not just work] too, you have to choose them [when to engage about these topics] well. Anything and everything does not help.” Abe agreed with Dade “one hundred percent, you can't pick every single battle and it’s probably a majority that you can't go ahead and say something, because it will be detrimental in the end to the whole situation.” They endorsed taking a measured approach of not
engaging every time with every comment a person makes, especially when they weren’t in a position of power.

Barnaby disagreed with Dade’s idea of letting something go because addressing it might end up being counterproductive. He said “there’s an axiom in management, you praise publicly and criticize privately, however, that goes by the boards when you're confronting discriminatory behavior. Because if you wait to do it privately and you let it go publicly that's like you're condoning it.” He goes on to say that it’s a delicate balance when it comes to addressing these issues, but he would take a more direct approach.

“I'm getting too old to let shit pass”

Unlike the other men in the first focus group, every example of communication about IPV and toxic masculinity Barnaby shared with the group was about him using a direct approach, regardless of who he was talking to or where he was. For him, talking about these topics “is an agenda item going in and every opportunity I have to raise it, I raise it and I engage people.” He added, “We need more people to be courageous, I think. We just need more courage and call BS when you see it.” Did his positions of power at work play a role? Was it because he was a bit older than the other men? We can’t know for sure, but at one point he made the pronouncement “I'm getting too old to let shit pass” and later remarked, “I'm an old man, I ain't got a lot of years left and I'm going to go down fighting.” And his examples of talking to people in the community about these issues certainly show a fighting spirit.

Barnaby told us about attending a town council meeting in his community to voice his concern about a proposed change to the community ethos regarding guns. He
talked to the council members and meeting attendees about “white male suicide and white nationalism” to support his argument. He attempted to establish his credibility when speaking about this topic by introducing himself as a veteran and a current gun owner. He said that the meeting was hostile, describing it as follows:

The room was packed at the meeting and it was a fait accompli; they were going to do it anyway. And there were maybe a half dozen of us that spoke out—spoke against it—and they did everything they could to cow us, you know, to cow us and almost jeer us, as we were speaking against it…I am not cowed by the crowd.

Even though the response was not positive, he added “if I get an opportunity [to talk about these issues], publicly, I don't let it slide.” He went into the meeting with the intent to bring up these topics and that’s what he did.

Barnaby also talked about addressing these issues when he was in a middling position at work in a hierarchical work environment. He said:

It was a lot harder—cuz I was in a hierarchical organization—it was a lot harder to criticize up, to call it up. Like at a staff meeting if the [boss] said something…it was really hard to say something back. But at the lateral level or with subordinates it was mandatory to say it. I was a little more careful criticizing up, but I still spoke up. To the detriment of my career, a lot. But I did speak up. But it takes a hell of a lot of courage to do that.

This is in contrast to the men who talked about taking a more indirect approach to addressing these topics when they weren’t in positions of power. Barnaby
acknowledged that when he was in a position of power “it was mandatory” to say something, but he also said something when he wasn’t in a position of power.

Barnaby goes into many situations the same way he would at work, saying “I take seriously my role...as a father, as a grandfather, as a neighbor.” Though he does point out when he is speaking with friends “in those one-on-ones I'm a lot gentler. You know what I mean? It's not like I'm, you know, the political correctness police for everybody, but when I'm [at work]? No, they need to be confronted with a lot of this stuff.” Because he thinks it is crucial to confront people directly about these topics, he says, “You need to be uncomfortable. You need to be uncomfortable, you need to get off your comfort zone.” He argues that he’s “trying to develop people's ability to develop their mind and to think,” particularly at work. And if he has to “hit ‘em in the head with a two-by-four” to get people’s attention, that is what he is going to do.

Barnaby also thought it was important to add, “I have compassion for people. I know it doesn't sound like it. I do have compassion for people, but damn it, I care so much that I don't want them to go blindly into the night. I feel like I have a responsibility.” He added, “if I make people uncomfortable, I give hugs, you know, free hugs if you need ‘em. I'm there to pick you up. If I knock you on your ass, I ain't runnin’ away and leavin’ you there, I'll pick you up. You'll stand up a little taller, I think, after I pick you up.” He’s direct with people because he cares and because he feels that it is his responsibility to address these issues.

“I try to use an array of different strategies; apply a strategy for that particular situation.”
The men use a variety of different strategies for bringing up these topics and engaging community men. As Campbell said, “I try to use an array of different strategies; apply a strategy for that particular situation.” Some of the more common strategies were showing a video with a discussion of the video afterward, using non-video materials created by people who work in the fields of IPV prevention and masculinity, leading by example, relationship-building, and employing empathy.

**Videos**

Many men use videos to bring up these topics and prompt discussions. Campbell talked about using the *Dear Daddy* video (2015), a PSA about rape culture, with many different groups and estimated that he has shown it to at least 1,000 people. He describes the group discussions after watching the video:

There were some men in some of the groups, they were emotional, they started to cry. And some of the groups we had they talked about their personal experiences with that kind of thing and their guilt of how they felt about the video and thinking about ‘well, wait a minute, I am guilty. I did that. But I didn't realize how guilty I was until I looked at it.’ It really emphasizes what if that was your sister, your daughter, your mother. And they felt a lot of guilt around that and questioned their own behavior. And that was really powerful for me to witness that. More than once at different venues. It was good.

He also mentioned that his men’s groups and youth groups would get together to watch popular movies and then they would discuss the movies after watching them. He said that he likes to bring up inappropriate behavior toward women in movies during these discussions so “it's not me really hammering them with some message.
I'll just initiate the conversation and start to talk about the movie that they already like and then I might be able to point out this or that.” The videos made to address toxic masculinity or violence against women specifically naturally lead to group discussion about those topics, but when watching popular movies, Campbell brought up those topics in particular so he could get a conversation going.

Barnaby shared a similar story about showing *The Mask You Live In* (2015), a documentary about masculinity in America, to his men’s group. He said:

> When they watch the video, it’s just like this ‘ah ha’ moment for a lot of the individuals and then the magic happened after we stopped and they had this discussion. I could just back out and this discussion was so deep and so rich and so, yeah, using videos are a good way, but the dialogue and discussion and the processing afterward was just so so valuable and men don't often do that.

Barnaby really emphasized that watching a video is not the most important part of bringing up these topics; it’s the discussion that happens amongst the men after they’ve watched the video together that really matters. Campbell’s experiences showing the *Dear Daddy* video and watching popular movies with his men’s groups follows the same lines; he agreed that it’s the discussion afterwards that is so important.

**Engaging with similar movements**

Barnaby and Dade both mentioned using materials and quotes from groups and individuals who work in the areas of IPV prevention and/or masculinity. Barnaby said that he really likes to use the Tony Porter quote “most men are not violent, but most men are silent.” He uses that quote to address people who say “‘oh, I don’t do this’”
when he brings up violence against women or other similar negative behaviors. He adds “if you’re silent, that's the voice of complicity and so you got to speak up, get up there and be active.” It’s not enough to not engage in the behaviors yourself, you have to “speak up” when others are doing or saying those things. And he likes to quote one of the Parkland activists who said “‘I call BS’…to the senator and God bless her cuz I'm with her. A hundred percent.” He “calls BS” on justifying violence as defensive.

Dade said that he led a workshop for one of his men’s groups based on Jackson Katz’ *Domestic Violence is a Man’s Issue* talk, which he said “went well and I brought it up there a number of times.” Dade also mentioned wearing his *No More* pin. *No More* is an international campaign working to end domestic violence and sexual assault. The men in Ten Men are given a pin as part of the program and pins are available at Ten Men events. Dade said, “wearing the little pin, I've had a few conversations, and then tell people I'm in Ten Men and they want to know what it's about and why I got interested in it.” As mentioned earlier, Dade also likes to bring domestic violence awareness materials along with him to street fairs so people could take the information with them or he can engage them in conversation about it.

“Leading by example”

Abe brought up the idea of leading by example in the first focus group, saying “another form of communication is how you carry yourself and leading by example, so maybe you don't pick that battle verbally, but you also don't engage with it and you don't show that you condone that kind of behavior.” He adds “by leading by example, by being a good human being, people are going to want to follow what you are saying and have positive interactions.” Barnaby agreed, bringing the topic up again later in
the first focus group discussion. He said, “It's also walking your talk. When you can do that, I think you’re the most effective.” The men in the first focus group agreed that leading by example is a good way to engage with others around this topic, even when they can’t directly engage with someone.

Edmond emphasized “I’m a big believer in setting and acting by example.” He mentioned leading by example multiple times, particularly around masculinity. He mentioned “It's doing masculine things…I like to be active, I like to be confident. It's taking some of those good things we may associate with masculinity, but also tying it in new things and showing the value to myself about how better off I am because I can learn from my mistakes, hell, even ask for directions. It's about being a good role model.”

Part of leading by example is identity and using who you are as a person to model healthy masculinity. Ferdinand said he has “a lighter stance and walk that I take in my life because I don’t hold so many of those stereotypical kind of positions of manhood.” He mentioned that as a kid he was always the one who was singled-out as being “sensitive” and wanting to talk about his emotions. He’s “never really been one to repress my emotions. I’ve always been generally fairly open, fairly straightforward in having conversations about one’s position.” And later he stated “I am who I am.” He added “I think a lot of my conversations lean towards the sense of expression and emotional repression, so I tend to open conversation through an honest kind of entry into who I am and how I like to do things.” He embraces his identity and uses it to show that men can be vulnerable, emotional, and sensitive and that that does not have to be in opposition to masculinity.
Edmond said he was the opposite of Ferdinand; Edmond repressed his emotions. He said “especially in middle school, in high school and in elementary I was not like that [emotionally open]. I was aggressive, oppositional, defiant, then there was a mix of things, but I guess I would have to admit I was toxic.” He admits “I'm still on my process. It's a journey.” He uses his journey to embrace healthy masculinity and being more emotional as a way to lead by example and show others that you can be masculine and still be emotional. He said “just talking about my own journey of realizing that ‘wow I’m really good at burying my feelings.’ I don’t even realize I’m doing it, but making a point to externalize that. To talk about those experiences. Because, again, if people see that in the environment, I think it goes a long way.” Both Ferdinand and Edmond used their emotions as a way to be an example to other men of what healthy masculinity can look like.

**Relationship-building.**

The men in the second focus group emphasized that their conversations with other men about these topics were about relationship-building. Their conversations were not about having a particular point they wanted to talk about, but instead they focused on having a relationship with someone and meeting them on their level. Ferdinand mentioned that when he has these conversations, “I speak a lot about love, I speak a lot about care, I speak a lot about community and unity. I speak about a sense of belonging. And through those lenses is where I tend to explore a bit and throw some commentary about how men are kind of practiced in creating distance from one another. How they practice coding their conversations. How they practice camouflaging some of their emotions.” He talks to people about these specific topics,
but he said he tries to “through example and through initial contact, and through first instances, just to share a sense of passion and comradery and a sense of care and that's exemplifying how a man can be all of those emotions and all of those characteristics.” His conversations are about connecting with people and weaving these topics into conversation, rather than going into the conversation with an agenda to talk about masculinity or IPV.

Edmond agreed with Ferdinand, saying “I think you [Ferdinand] made a really important point when you talked about projecting honestly, love, and caring. I tell anyone, any form of a relationship is based on trust and honesty, period. If I can trust you then I’m going to be honest with you and vice versa.” He later went on to add “And I guess also again, I can't hit enough on that honesty. Because it's about that human connection, it's about the human condition…it makes a difference.” Ferdinand focused on relationships with people because when you have a good relationship with someone they will listen to you. As he says, “what I find is that those that are invested in friendships or those that are investing in having some kind of relationship with you, they'll give you an ear. And I think through that process of listening to one another, you tend to either come close or you stand apart. But we do it amicably. There's no ill will in my approach to anyone.” Even if he does not agree with someone, if that relationship is there, they can still be amicable in their disagreement.

“It made a point in an empathetic way.”

A few of the men brought up the idea of asking men to think of a woman as their daughter, mother, or sister, as a way to induce empathy in the men; this topic is
also brought up in the *Dear Daddy* video Campbell frequently uses. Dade provided an example of a conversation he had with a man about a woman in the news:

Saying, ‘well you don't believe this woman, you think she’s lying, but this could have been your mother, this could be your sister, this could be your daughter; how would you think about it then?’ Bringing it home to empathize; ‘this is not some abstract person in the news, this is someone’s mother or sister and it could have been yours. So think about that.’ I don't know that I’ve changed anybody's mind, but it made a point in an empathetic way.

Asking men to think about specific women, rather than “women” as a concept can help promote empathy and avoid thinking of women as “some abstract person in the news.”

Edmond used his experiences with struggling to identify his own emotions as a way to empathize with others. He said “If you’re like ‘hey, listen I’ve been there’ and you can emphasize, because it's still a journey. I’m not saying I'm perfect. I always am consciously aware of how I can improve myself. And that’s talking, that's listening to people. If you say ‘I've been there. I know what it is. I know where that road goes and let me tell you about it, but let me show you how you can lead a better life.’” He places a lot of weight on self-improvement and realizing that not everyone is at the same level, but that it is a process to learn about and engage in these topics. He said “I don't want to say there's some end finite point where you’re like okay, ‘I'm the best man I can be.’ No. I think that we can be better, but we can also recognize that other people may be on different parts or stages…that's important to just show different
stages of the journey.’’ He can empathize with someone because he has been there, he knows what it is like.

**Negative Interactions**

Engaging people about the topics of IPV and masculinity doesn’t always go well, so I asked the men about a time they had a negative experience or bad interaction when communicating with someone about these issues. While two of the men in the first focus group pointed out that they wouldn’t characterize their experiences as “bad,” they would rather see them as opportunities, all of the men in the first focus group described times when they had had negative interactions when discussing these topics. Only one man in the second focus group described a negative interaction he had and it was about avoiding talking about these topics with someone, rather than someone reacting negatively to these topics. The negative reactions the men in the first focus group described were around false accusations, men’s defensiveness and disliking specific terminology, and talking to women.

**False accusations.**

While Abe is an optimist and didn’t like to label interactions as bad, but instead “a moment for opportunity or an educational point,” he recalled two interactions he had that “were around the same issue of false accusations. That seems to be something that everybody has an opinion one way or another on, and that they're willing to voice a lot of the time. I definitely think that's an area where if you're going to get into a scenario that might be a little less positive it's usually around something like false accusations or what really is sexual assault.” Many of the men in the first focus group brought up interactions about false accusations and sexual assault, such as
the person who brought up Antonio Brown in conversation with Barnaby and the man Dade talked to about how sexual assault encompasses more than rape.

“‘Where’s my privilege?’”

People can get hung up on academic phrases like ‘white privilege’ and ‘toxic masculinity,’ because they have a strong negative reaction to the words. And that can make them defensive. Dade describes how using these words can shut down a conversation before it starts. He was talking with a man who he described as “very educated” and “very progressive” but:

He was really resistant to the whole APA [American Psychological Association] thing with toxic masculinity and I’ve had some discussion about that…’they’re not saying all men are toxic or masculinity is toxic, they said these violent behaviors are the toxic thing. And then there are these good ones too.’ But that’s been a really sticking point and that terminology I think, toxic masculinity, things don't go well for a lot of people when you use that, you know? I know what it means, I agree with it, but it’s like people put up a wall about that and then you can’t go any further. Cuz like I said, they don't look at what it really means, they say ‘you're telling me men are toxic and masculinity that has conquered the West and saved the world is bad.’ ‘No! I’m not saying that!’ But that’s what they’re hearing. That doesn't go well when you bring that up. It doesn't go well with some of the guys I know.

The Ten Men alumni and others who engage in this work are used to hearing and using these phrases, but many people aren’t familiar with the phrases and when they’re confronted with them they may shut down and stop engaging in the
conversation because, like Dade says, they think they’re being told that all masculinity is toxic.

Dade provides another example where his coworkers’ have negative reactions to the phrase ‘white male privilege.’ He said:

I work with a lot of blue-collar…kind of guys and you start bringing up stuff like ‘white male privilege’ that does not go well in the conversation. Is it a real thing? Yes, I believe it is. Do they believe it? No. It’s like suddenly you’ve stopped any communication because they’re thinking ‘I'm makin’ less than I did 20 years ago, I'm makin’ less than my father did, I can't afford a house, I get laid off every 3 months, where's my privilege?’ You know?

After Dade said this, Barnaby pointed out that his response to white people who think they aren’t privileged is to say “‘would you be better if you weren't white? Would you be better off?’ That’s always my question to them. ‘So, if you weren’t white, you'd be better off, is that what you think?’” Dade responded to Barnaby saying, “I admire your passion, I'm just saying if you want to change someone, if you put something up to them, you shut them down, you're not going to get any further.” He’s pointing out that directly confronting a person like that may just serve to shut them down, especially if they’ve already reacted negatively to a phrase like ‘white male privilege.’ As he points out, “you can say the same thing in other language, but I just think it's real problematic for a lot of men when they hear ‘toxic masculinity’ and ‘male privilege’ and they don’t see it, that they are privileged.”
Abe added to the discussion, talking about how people are resistant to talking about these topics because it makes them vulnerable, which makes them uncomfortable. He commented that:

I think the word denial is huge too because when you shine light on something like that [privilege], you're threatening their way of life and nobody wants to be in a position where they are uncomfortable or unfamiliar or have to actually look introspectively at themselves and their behavior and what they're doing to their communities and the people around them. The denial, the vulnerability and just kind of taking an actual look at who you are is not easy for men.

Dade responded to Abe, elaborating on his point by saying “and what happens when you feel threatened? You get even more defensive.” The men they were talking to in these instances were getting defensive because they felt threatened and that was shutting down any further possibility of communication about privilege or masculinity.

Barnaby, who practices non-violence, pointed out that people also get defensive when talking about violence. He said, “all of us justify our own violence as defensive…Everyone's defending something.” He added:

There’s another quote, it’s from William James and I use it all the time. ‘I have learned something; it feels as if I have lost something.’ And what you've lost, when you start learning about this, is you’ve lost your privilege. You've lost your right to assert that privilege. And you've lost your excuse for your violence. ‘Cuz you're smarter than that now. Now you know. So, there’s no excuse. You lost your excuse.
This is why people can get defensive when you confront them with tough topics, such as IPV or toxic masculinity. Once they have learned about privilege, they can no longer ignore it, which is a huge part of privilege: those who have it can just ignore these issues.

“**I was attacked several times by women.**”

Campbell talked about his experiences with women not trusting him, as a man, to talk about violence against women. He stated, “I was attacked several times by women, being in Ten Men. I think they didn't understand what it was about. I got several comments about ‘why do you think that you can talk about these issues?’” Some women would want him to talk about these issues with their significant others, but first they would want to “vet” him to see what he was going to say, “they wanted to see if I really understood from their perspective, what it was like.” His strategies to deal with these situations were to ask the women about their opinions, particularly on the *Dear Daddy* video he liked to show to groups of men. He would also share his awareness of privilege, saying “men are privileged, just like there are other privileged groups in our society. I’m trying to recognize my privilege and I think I still have a long way to go in fully realizing how it impacts other people around me, but I’m trying and looking for your [women’s] insights into helping me understand it better.” He used these strategies of seeking opinions from women and acknowledging his privilege as a man; he said “the group [Ten Men] helped me to have those tools to be able to talk to the women about the issue.”

Barnaby also spoke of a negative experience he had when discussing these issues with a woman. He was at his bank speaking with a woman who worked there
and Brett Kavanaugh was brought up, so he said, “‘yeah, that was horrible, he’s despicable, there’s no way that man should be anywhere near the Supreme Court.’ And she was totally just from the opposite direction. Couldn’t believe that I would besmirch the man just because of the credible testimony of Elizabeth [Christine] Blasey Ford and she was just adamant that his reputation was being ruined by this woman and I was just as adamant.” He explained the interaction as stemming from the fact that she was a “white woman, lives in a totally white community, totally Republican, banker, you know?” It could be argued that this interaction wasn’t negative because it was with a woman, but because it was with a privileged person living in an insular community. But the fact that she was a woman arguing for Kavanaugh is what struck Barnaby the most. He said to her “‘how can you, as a woman, say what you just said?’ … Kind of a bad reaction, but it was like, I don’t suffer fools gladly and I don’t suffer foolishness. What she was saying was not based on anything that I understood anyway. Just ‘when women accuse men of sexual assault, they are ruining the men.’ Yikes.” The issue wasn’t resolved and the next time he went to the bank they had scheduled him to meet with a different banker.

**Change in interactions after Ten Men**

Once the men have completed one year with their cohort in Ten Men they become an alumni of the program and are invited to all of the events and are encouraged to stay engaged with the Ten Men community. I asked the men if they think their interactions around IPV and masculinity have changed, compared to the way they interacted about these topics before being in Ten Men. Responses were mixed. Abe said that he “changed *significantly* through the program, through going
through Ten Men,” while the others said they didn’t change much in communicating about these topics, though Ten Men was a great space to be around other men who cared about the same things.

Abe’s experience with Ten Men was different than the other men’s experiences because he:

Hit it at a critical point in my life…I knew what I believed. I knew who I was as a person and didn't stand for interpersonal violence or anything that Ten Men would oppose, however, I didn't really have the tools or the confidence to display that in the world, or to actually have an intellectual conversation about it or actually make an impact. So, going through Ten Men…started to plant that seed and gave me those tools…Just gaining that confidence and those strategies like we’ve talked about. Or having effective conversations I think is huge. And it changed me significantly and made me more effective to do this work and have a positive impact on the community.

Abe was younger than the other Ten Men alumni in the first focus group who were well-established in their lives and careers and who were already part of men’s groups, prior to becoming a Ten Men man. Barnaby asked Abe “was there a particular tool that you gained? Can you identify something that you call a tool?” Abe responded, “just having meaningful conversations. Prior, maybe they would have been more confrontation or just spewing of ideas, but using personal examples or using, like we talked about, ‘what if it was your mother?’ Just trying to hit home and make it as effective as possible without having a negative interaction.” Ten Men had given Abe
specific conversational tools and strategies to use so he could be more effective when talking with others about violence toward women and masculinity.

Dade said that his communication was “no different” from before Ten Men. He continued by saying, “I was a pain in the ass a long time ago…Ten Men has given me some ideas about it and some focus on what to do about it and how to look at it differently.” He was already communicating frequently about these topics before coming into the program, but Ten Men helped him find different ways to look at the topics and what else he could do to be effective when communicating about IPV or masculinity. Barnaby agreed with Dade, saying:

I would say the same thing. I didn't change drastically going through the Ten Men program, I was kind of already there, in a sense. But meeting other people that are doing the same thing and thinking and going in the same direction is very refreshing ‘cuz doing this kind of work can be very wearing, wearying…If anything I'm more hopeful after Ten Men than I was before, just knowing that there is such a thing. That there are these cohorts and they keep going on. The collegiality and the colleagues of going through that has been very very positive and apparent.

Having other people to engage with in this work at Ten Men was a crucial part of the men feeling supported. Campbell agreed with Dade and Barnaby, saying “I enjoyed the camaraderie and the forms that we had. But I feel like I was doing a lot of that already with men that I interacted with.” However, Campbell also said “the big thing that I got out of this was talking with women,” indicating that Ten Men had given him
some tools for conversations, but conversations with women, rather than conversations with men.

Abe also enjoyed spending time with other men as part of Ten Men. He said “it’s a group that you can confide in and know that there are other men out there with similar beliefs. And maybe that’s what men need, just to know that we’re kind of all on the same page, with the exception of a few men that act violently, and that it’s okay to empower women or to act appropriately towards women. That’s acceptable and other men would agree with that.”

Ferdinand pointed out that he has these conversations (e.g., about masculinity, gender equity, IPV) regularly because these are integral to the work he does every day, which is different from many of the other Ten Men members, who may only engage in these conversations periodically, especially when it is not part of their workplace. What he found “powerful” about Ten Men was “my ability to be able to speak about Ten Men. That such a thing does exist. That there is this concentration, there is this group that come together and have these discussions. And they’re not made out of professionals they’re made out of everyday men. Wanting to engage in this conversation and then go back to their communities and everything else.” Despite being a professional in these areas and already bringing expert knowledge to the table, he still got something out of Ten Men—being part of a group of people who care about these issues and being able to tell others about this group.

Other Qualitative Materials

The RICADV has created videos of the Ten Men members each year, starting with the 2015-16 cohort. These videos are available on their website and also their
YouTube channel. In these videos the men talk about what brought them to Ten Men and why they value their involvement in the project. While these videos are not specific to their communication with men in their communities, much of what the Ten Men members speak about fits with a few of the themes from the focus groups. Some themes from these videos are the culture of silence, the “man box,” and supporting each other as Ten Men members, which fit with the focus group themes of direct vs. indirect approaches, leading by example, and changes in communication style after Ten Men, respectively.

Frequently, the men in these videos talked about how men are silent when other men do things such as make jokes or lewd remarks about women because they think they will be punished by other men for speaking up about these issues. However, many of them gave examples of times they spoke up against misogynistic views and often, other men supported them and told them they appreciated that they had said something. Many of the men talked about how it takes courage to stand up to others directly, but that staying silent perpetuates a culture where IPV is seen as permissible and “a woman’s issue.” Men in the videos were quick to point out that IPV is not a woman’s issue—it is a man’s issue—and said that men need to step up and use their power and privilege as men to engage in this work. They also pointed out that IPV is a public health issue and educating men is part of the necessary prevention of IPV. This theme connects with the direct versus indirect approaches to addressing issues when they come up, that the men in the focus group discussed.

One of the most popular topics in the videos was the “man box,” which relates the way that men are expected to act in our culture, i.e., social norms, to being put in a
The men remarked that men are not allowed to be vulnerable, they are not allowed to show emotions, and they have to do things that men and boys are expected to do, such as play sports and be tough. They mentioned that part of the problem with the man box is that men are seen as the opposite of women. They said that men are scared of other men; if they do not do what a man is “supposed” to do, they are punished by other men and aren’t considered strong. But they mention that there is strength in healthy masculinity, it’s just a different type of strength, compared to that touted by toxic masculinity in our culture. They discussed how the man box is restrictive and ways they can challenge toxic masculinity by breaking these stereotypes of what it means to be a man by not doing what society tells them they have to do as men and not punishing other men when they step outside of the man box. This breaking out of the man box relates to the topic of leading by example that many of the men spoke about in the focus groups.

The last theme was the support the men feel from being a part of Ten Men, from meeting with their cohort every month for a year as they progress through the program. One man mentioned that he has said things during Ten Men meetings that he has not said to close family and friends, because he is so comfortable with the other men; they can be open with one another. Many of the men said that they liked being a part of Ten Men because it can be lonely to do this work on their own and knowing they had a community of men who were also doing the work made them feel supported and gave them strength to do the work. They valued their connections with other men in the group and those connections help them continue to do the work. The men want to lead by example, to be positive role models for the next generation of
men and the support they have from Ten Men helps them do so. This fits with the theme of changes the men in the focus group felt after completing their time in a Ten Men cohort; even if they felt that they were pretty much the same person they were before they began Ten Men, all of the focus group members mentioned the comradery they had with their fellow Ten Men members and being encouraged in the work they were doing because they knew others were doing it too.

The themes constructed from these qualitative analyses are interconnected. The overarching theme is the multiplicity of ways in which these topics come up when communicating and with whom the Ten Men members communicate. This theme is directly connected to the following themes: the tension between direct versus indirect approaches, speaking from a position of power, using specific strategies to address these topics, the topics coming up because they are frequently in the news, and negative interactions that the men have had about these topics. Each of the sub-themes is connected to each of those larger themes and some of the sub-themes are connected with each other. The topic of the “man box” and the culture of silence are both connected to topics coming up in the news/popular culture. Changes after Ten Men is connected to speaking from a position of power because many of the men mentioned that being part of Ten Men allows them to speak about the program and what they have done as part of the program, as well as having the support of other Ten Men members, which is a powerful position to be in. The topic of having Ten Men as a space of community, belonging, and a support system is connected to using specific strategies to communicate about masculinity and IPV, as some of the men mentioned that being part of Ten Men helped them hone their communication skills around these
topics. See Appendix 5, Figure 5 for a conceptual map of the themes and Appendix 5, Figure 11 for a word cloud made with data from the focus groups.

Survey

One control seed man completed the survey twice; only the first response was kept. One of the Ten Men members skipped one question on the Violence subscale of the CMNI-46; the missing value was imputed based on his other answers to questions in the same section.

Demographic information.

A total of 42 men have completed the survey; 13 control seed men, 13 Ten Men community members, 11 Ten Men members, and 5 control community members. All participants self-identified as cisgender men. All men who completed the survey had been in an intimate relationship at some point in their lives. Of these, 37 had been in an intimate relationship in the past 6 months, 32 were currently in an intimate relationship, and 26 of those were living with their current partner. None of the men in a current relationship was in a relationship with multiple partners.

More than one-third of the participants \(n = 16; 38\%\) had witnessed domestic violence when they were a child or teenager. Seven men witnessed IPV between their parents/guardians, three witnessed it between friends of the family, and one witnessed it between other family members. Four men witnessed IPV from multiple areas: one of them witnessed it between other family members and their grandparents, one witnessed it between other family members and their parents/guardians, one witnessed it between their parents and family friends, and one witnessed it between their parents,
family friends, and other family members. One person wrote in that the domestic violence occurred between “my stepfather and me.”

Most of the men were white \((n = 30)\), with 7 men who were Black, one man who was Latinx, one man who was Asian and Black, one man who was Asian, one man who self-identified as Jewish, and one man who preferred not to say. Most of the men were heterosexual \((n = 34)\), three were gay, one was bisexual, one was asexual, one self-identified as “attracted to the opposite sex”, and one preferred not to say. Thirteen men were in the 18 – 24 age group; eight were in the 45 – 54 age group; six in the 25 – 34 group; five each in the 35 – 44 and 55 – 64 age groups; four were in the 65 – 74 age group; and one was in the 75 – 84 age group.

Eleven men had a master’s degree or equivalent and ten men had completed some college. Eight men had a doctoral or equivalent degree; six had a bachelor’s degree; five had completed some graduate work; one had an associate’s degree; and one had a high school diploma or equivalent. Eight men had an annual household income between $100,000 and $149,999, while seven men had an annual income less than $20,000. Five of the men were students, two were teachers, three were retired, and two were psychologists. See Table 2 for demographic information for the full sample and demographic information for each group.

More community men witnessed IPV as a teenager or child for both the Ten Men community members \((n = 7; 54\%)\) and the control community members \((n = 3; 60\%)\), compared to the Ten Men members \((n = 3; 27\%)\) and the control seed men \((n = 3; 23\%)\). While the majority of each group of men was white (60% or higher), the Ten Men community members were the least racially/ethnically diverse as they were
almost all white (n = 12; 92%). Most of the men in each group were heterosexual (between 69% and 91%). Most of the control seed men were in the youngest age group, 18 – 24 (69%) and many of the control seed men had completed some college as their highest level of education attained (46%).

**Reliability and validity.**

Coefficient omega was calculated for each subscale to determine the internal consistency of each measure. Coefficient omega was very high for the Violence subscale of the CMNI-46 (ω = 0.91), but it was quite low for the Power over Women subscale: ω = 0.53. Two items were removed from the GEM scale and three items were removed from the ABI-R for analyses because all participants had answered “0” for those questions, indicating that they all strongly disagreed (GEM) or had never engaged in a certain negative behavior directed at their intimate partner (ABI-R). Coefficient omega was high for the ABI-R (ω = 0.92) and acceptable for the GEM scale (ω = 0.75).

Convergent validity was moderate, based on pairwise correlations of the scales. The strongest correlation was between the GEM scale and the Power over Women subscale, r = 0.50. The next strongest correlation was between the ABI-R and the GEM scale, r = 0.39. The Violence subscale was moderately correlated with the GEM scale, r = 0.30 and was only very slightly correlated with the ABI-R, r = 0.16. See Table 3 for all pairwise correlations.

The Power over Women subscale was not used in analyses, as it had low internal consistency and displayed a distinct floor effect, with over 90% of men answering “strongly disagree” to three of the four questions on the scale and at least
97% of men answering “strongly disagree” or “disagree” to all questions on the subscale. Two items were removed from the total GEM scale score because all participants answered “strongly disagree” to those questions (“there are times when a woman deserves to be beaten” and “it is okay for a man to hit his wife if she won’t have sex with him”). Three items were removed from the total ABI-R scale score because all of the participants answered “never” to those questions (“prevented your partner from having money for their own use,” “become very upset with your partner because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when you wanted it done or was not the way you thought it should be,” and “made your partner do something humiliating or degrading”).

**Mann Whitney U Test.**

When using the score on the Violence subscale of the CMNI-46 as the outcome variable, we find that the direct, total, and overall effects are statistically significant, indicating that the distribution of the groups being compared is different. The direct effect compares Ten Men members to men in their communities; in this case, the groups have the same median score, 7, but the range of scores is different, with Ten Men members having lower scores (Range: 0 – 10), compared to their community members (Range: 2 – 12). This indicates that the Ten Men members endorse higher levels of non-violent attitudes, compared to men in their communities. The total effect compares Ten Men members to control community men. The median for the control community men (Median = 11) was higher than that of the Ten Men members (Median = 7) and the range was also higher (Range: 9 – 12), indicating that Ten Men members are less accepting of violence, when compared to men in the...
control communities. The overall effect compares Ten Men (seeds and community members) to Control men (seeds and community members). Though the range of both groups was very similar (Control Range: 0 – 13; Ten Men Range: 0 – 12), the median for the Control group was higher (Median = 11), compared to the median of the Ten Men group (Median = 7). This indicates that Ten Men members and men in their communities are less accepting of violence, when compared to Control group men. See Table 4 and Figure 6 for full results.

When using the score on the GEM scale as the outcome variable, we find that the total and overall effects are statistically significant, indicating that the distribution of the groups being compared is different. The total effect compares Ten Men members to control community men. The median for the control community men (Median = 6) was higher than that of the Ten Men members (Median = 0) and the range was narrower in the control community (Range: 1 – 8), compared to the Ten Men (Range: 0 – 9) indicating that Ten Men members reported less tolerance for gender inequity, compared to men in the control community. The overall effect compares Ten Men (seeds and community members) to Control men (seeds and community members). The median for the Ten Men group was 0, whereas the median for the Control group was 2. They also had similar ranges (Control Range: 0 – 10; Ten Men Range: 0 – 9). This indicates that Ten Men members and men in their communities are less tolerant of gender inequity, compared to Control group men. See Table 5 and Figure 7 for full results. I did not find any statistically significant differences between groups on frequency of abusive behaviors perpetrated in intimate relationships (See Table 6 and Figure 8).
Network visualizations.

As we can see in Figure 9, more of the control men were accepting of violence, compared to Ten Men members and their community men. Only a few control group men had non-violent attitudes, while most of the Ten Men members and men in their communities had more non-violent attitudes. As we can see in Figure 10, attitudes were more gender equitable overall and most of the men who have less gender equitable attitudes are men in the communities, rather than seed men.

Mixed methods.

Results are varied, though mostly convergent or complimentary, when comparing the focus groups and the quantitative analyses. There was convergence between the qualitative and quantitative findings that Ten Men members influence the attitudes of men in their communities, which is the first meta-theme: spheres of influence. This theme was displayed in the focus groups when the men talked about relationship-building and employing empathy, when they described positive interactions they had had with community men, and spoke of the multiplicity of ways in which they engage other men in these topics and the many men whom they engage. The quantitative findings that Ten Men members and men in their communities are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, when compared to Control group men support this theme.

The quantitative finding that Ten Men members endorse higher levels of non-violent attitudes, compared to men in their communities agrees with focus group findings that Ten Men members are speaking from positions of power and leading by example – these men have been educated on these issues specifically, and thus it is not
surprising that, although their community members have higher levels of non-violent attitudes, compared to control men, the Ten Men members themselves have even stronger non-violent attitudes than the men in their own communities. The convergence between these findings results in the meta-theme that Ten Men are leaders. They have more training on these issues, compared to men in their communities, so they use their position as leaders to help educate community men.

The meta-theme of shared attitudes amongst Ten Men members can be found in the complimentary findings that being a part of Ten Men provides a sense of community and belonging amongst the men, who support one another in the work that they do as Ten Men members and the quantitative finding that Ten Men members are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, when compared to men in the control communities. These findings are complimentary. In the focus groups men clearly endorsed Ten Men’s role as a gathering place for men of shared beliefs. However, the quantitative finding is that the Ten Men members, as a group, are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, compared to men in the control communities. The quantitative findings do not necessarily emphasize what makes Ten Men special and unique, unlike the focus group discussions.

There was silence from the quantitative side when looking at the findings from the focus groups that the men use specific strategies when bringing up these topics, such as videos and other materials related specifically to masculinity and/or IPV. There was also silence from the quantitative side when considering the focus group findings that these topics are in the news/popular culture, that they have had negative interactions with people about these topics, and that there is a tension between taking
an indirect versus a direct approach when talking about these topics. These focus group themes relate specifically to communication between Ten Men members and community men and nothing in the surveys asked community men or Ten Men members about how they communicated about these topics. There was also silence from the qualitative side on the lack of significant differences between groups on the frequency of perpetrating abusive behaviors in intimate relationships. Perpetrating or not perpetrating IPV was not a topic that was discussed in the focus groups. See Table 7 for a matrix of the mixed methods results.
As I hypothesized, the men in Ten Men influence the attitudes of men in their communities. This is supported by the finding that Ten Men members and men in their communities are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, when compared to Control group men and the focus group discussions about having positive interactions with community men, focusing on relationship-building and empathy in those interactions, and engaging with men in their communities in a multiplicity of ways.

I also found that the men in Ten Men have higher levels of non-violence attitudes, compared to their community men, which is likely due to the fact that part of the Ten Men training includes educating the men on the links between toxic masculinity and IPV, which may not be something that their community men are exposed to as frequently or as rigorously. One would hope that the community men also have higher non-violence attitudes and we see that, in part, in the overall effects, which indicates that men in the Ten Men group (both seeds and community men) indicate less acceptance of violence when compared to the control men (both seeds and community men).

It was surprising, and contrary to my hypothesis, that I did not find any significant differences between the Ten Men and the control men on perpetration of abusive behaviors in relationships. This could be because reports of the frequency of
abusive behaviors was relatively low across all groups. It could also be that men chose not to report engaging in abusive behaviors, and might have been particularly uncomfortable disclosing this information to researchers who are women, as was the case in this study. These conclusions were made by a researcher who is an outsider from the population she is studying (men) and, as such, should be taken with the positionality of the researcher in consideration.

**Limitations**

One limitation of this work is the small sample size. It was difficult to recruit people to participate and even more difficult to get those who participated to recruit their contacts. As a result, I was unable to conduct the causal inference analyses I had originally planned to use and instead had to use simpler analyses, which did not include important covariates, such as age and having witnessed IPV as a child or teenager.

Another limitation is that some of the scales used were likely not sensitive enough. The GEM scale had a distinct floor effect, with most of the men strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with most, if not all of the questions. However, there was some variability in scores on the GEM item stating, “men need sex more than women do,” five men agreed with the statement. Two men also agreed with the statement “you don’t talk about sex, you just do it.” These items may have had more men agreeing with them if we had been able to recruit more community men or if our sample had included control men who did not have any exposure to topics such as sexual assault, bystander intervention, and/or masculinity. Many men scored very low
on the ABI-R, which could be a result of them not wanting to endorse engaging in what are rather clearly described as negative behaviors.

Another limitation was the lack of convergent validity between the scales used, though this could have been due to the fact that each of the scale measured different constructs. The Violence subscale of the CMNI-46 measured attitudes toward violence in the lens of masculinity, whereas violence in the items used from the ABI-R was specific to intimate partner violence and did not include questions about physical violence. The GEM items included a mix of questions: some were about sex, some were about gender roles, and some were about violence.

Another limitation is that surveys were administered via sending the participants a link over email or having them scan a QR code. This could have prohibited men who do not have smartphones, computers, or access to the internet from participating. Because we used respondent-driven sampling we cannot know for sure whether or not the seed men actually sent the surveys to men in their communities for completion. And selection bias could also be influencing these results. Men who engage in abusive relationship behaviors and/or who have inequitable gender attitudes may have been less likely to take this survey, resulting in a sample of men who are predisposed to take the survey because they are not abusive in their intimate relationships and they value gender equity. Another limitation is that this study is cross-sectional, with measurements taken at only one time point. I made comparisons between men, but did not collect data to assess change within men over time.

Additionally, I was the only person who created the themes for the qualitative analyses and it is typically recommended that at least two people code the data and
then meet to discuss the themes and come to a consensus on which themes should be kept or discarded. Another limitation is that only two focus groups were conducted. While many similar themes were derived from both groups, I cannot know whether we reached saturation (i.e., no new themes being created when new data are collected and analyzed) without conducting at least one additional focus group.

**Future Directions**

Creating a new survey in the future to measure gender equity attitudes, attitudes toward violence, and knowledge about IPV and masculinity for men who engage this type of work would be a great next step. The scales used in this study were not developed with feminist men in mind, so it would be helpful to create new scales for men who are already sensitive to these issues. Future work could also involve creating a knowledge scale specifically based on knowledge that men learn as part of Ten Men to assess men’s knowledge of masculinity and IPV. It would also enhance the reach of the project to include people of all genders in these surveys, not just men. Men in the first focus group mentioned that they talked to women about IPV and masculinity too, and thus, it would be interesting to also include women when conducting these network surveys, as women are important people in these men’s networks, although they are not the target population in this work.

In the future, it would be worthwhile to conduct focus groups asking the same questions we asked in this study to men who have recently completed their cohort year (within a few months of completion) with Ten Men to see if their answers are similar to Ten Men members who participated in these focus groups, who were alumni of Ten Men. It would also be helpful to conduct interviews and/or focus groups with the men
in the control groups to see what strategies they use when communicating with men in their communities about masculinity or IPV. Future research may also want to further explore the finding from this study that men use different strategies when talking to other men about these topics and how those differing approaches might be mediating the relationship between communication about these issues and changes in attitudes and behaviors.

Conducting future longitudinal work would be a great opportunity to assess change in men’s communities and communication with other men over time. This work could involve administering surveys to men and their community members when they first begin their Ten Men cohort year, at the end of their cohort year, and at follow-up times (e.g., 6 months, 1 year, 2 years) to see changes in attitudes over time. Future work could also involve conducting multiple focus groups, similar to what I described above, with a focus group about communication with other men at the beginning of a Ten Men member’s cohort year, at the end, and a few years later to see if men are changing their communication strategies over time.
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Figure 1. The Ten Men Social Ecological Model, from Roberts & Rios (2017).

Ten Men Theory of Change-in-Action

Education and Experiences
- Ten Men experience and co-create education & support
- Educational sessions
- Mutual support within cohort
- Annual summit
- Annual retreat
- Digital storytelling
- Public awareness campaign

Grounded in multiple theories including Theory of Planned Behavior, Social Norms Theory, Diffusion of Social Innovation, Bystander theory

Action
- Ten Men act in their spheres of influence at different layers of the SEM

Increase in healthy, non-violent masculinity within individuals, relationships, community and society
Decrease in Intimate Partner Violence
Figure 2. Illustration of a simple undirected network graph with corresponding adjacency matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person A</th>
<th>Person B</th>
<th>Person C</th>
<th>Person D</th>
<th>Person E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. A causal directed acyclic graph (DAG), showing how conditioning on covariates, L, blocks the backdoor path \( Y \leftarrow L \rightarrow A \), which allows one to conclude that treatment, A, causes the outcome, Y (as shown in A. L. Buchanan’s 2017 Causal Inference course slides, based on work by Hernan and Robins, 2019).
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Focus group protocol

Welcome: Hi everyone, we’re going to get started now. I want to thank you all for being here. My name is Valerie Ryan and I am a graduate student at the University of Rhode Island. We’re going to be talking about how you communicate with other men about masculinity and intimate partner violence and in what ways, if any, that has changed since you completed the Ten Men program.

Ground rules: Disagreeing with another person is not a problem, however, we want to treat everyone with respect; no name-calling or talking over anyone. There are no “right” or “wrong” answers here. We’re going to use each other’s first names – we will not be using anyone’s name in our work; we will keep any information you provide confidential. I also hope that everyone here can agree that anything said here stays here.

Directions: I would like us to go around the table and introduce ourselves, briefly. I’m sure some of you know each other, but I don’t know any of you, so this will really help me get to know a little bit about you all. Please be sure to state your name, what you do for work, and where you’re from.

[introductions]
[pass out notecards]
I’d like you all to take a minute or two to think about ways you approach the topics of masculinity or intimate partner violence with men in your community. Do you talk to men one-on-one or in a group? Do you bring up these topics or do you wait until someone else brings them up? Feel free to jot down anything you think of on the notecard.

Research question: in what ways do the Ten Men alumni communicate with men in their spheres of influence around topics of masculinity and intimate partner violence (IPV)?

Questions:
How do these topics come up when you are talking to other men in the community? How do you address these topics when they come up, if at all? Are there any particular strategies you use? Can you tell me about a time when you had a really good (or successful) interaction with someone about masculinity or intimate partner violence? Can you tell me about a time when you had a bad (or unsuccessful) interaction with someone about masculinity or intimate partner violence? Can you tell me about how your interactions with other men around these topics is different than they were before you were in the Ten Men program, if the interactions are, in fact, different?

Ending:
After everything we’ve discussed today, what is one thing you’ll be taking away from the discussion? Something new you’ve learned?
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IPV and Masculinity Survey

**CMNI-46 Scales** (found in Hammer, Heath, & Vogel, 2018)

Rate your level of agreement with the following statements, using the following responses: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

*Violence subscale*

- I believe that violence is never justified.
- I am disgusted by any kind of violence.
- Sometimes violent action is necessary.
- I am willing to get into a physical fight if necessary.
- Violence is almost never justified.
- No matter what the situation, I would never act violently.

*Power over women subscale*

- In general, I control the women in my life.
- Women should be subservient to men.
- Things tend to be better when men are in charge.
- I love it when men are in charge of women.

**Items from the GEM Inequitable Subscale** (found in Pulerwitz & Barker, 2008)

Please respond to the statements with the following responses: do not agree, partially agree, agree, or do not know.

- It is the man who decides what type of sex to have.
- A woman’s most important role is to take care of her home and cook for her family.
- Men need sex more than women do.
- You don’t talk about sex, you just do it.
- Women who carry condoms on them are “easy.”
- There are times when a woman deserves to be beaten.
- Changing diapers, giving the kids a bath, and feeding the kids are the mother’s responsibility.
- A man should have the final word about decisions in his home.
- A woman should tolerate violence in order to keep her family together.
- If a woman cheats on a man, it is okay for him to hit her.
- If someone insults me, I will defend my reputation, with force if I have to.
- It is okay for a man to hit his wife if she won’t have sex with him.

**Items from the ABI-R** (found in Postmus, Mathiesen Stylianou, & McMahon, 2016)
Please respond to the following statements with the frequency of how often these behaviors occur in your current or most recent relationship: never, rarely, occasionally, frequently, or very frequently.

Over the past 6 months, how often have you:
- Called your partner a name and/or criticized them
- Gave your partner angry stares or looks
- Put down your partner’s family and friends
- Tried to keep your partner from doing something they wanted to do
- Ended a discussion with your partner and then made the decision yourself
- Accused your partner of paying too much attention to someone or something else
- Checked up on your partner
- Told your partner that they are a bad person
- Said things to scare your partner
- Prevented your partner from having money for their own use
- Refused to do housework or childcare
- Become very upset with your partner because dinner, housework, or laundry was not ready when you wanted it done or was not the way you thought it should be
- Made your partner do something humiliating or degrading

Other Survey Questions

Questions about exposure to treatment, relationship status, past IPV exposure

Questions for Community Men Only

Have you ever talked to the man who nominated you [name of man] about masculinity?
  What did you talk about? ________________________ (open response)
Have you ever talked to the man who nominated you [name of man] about intimate partner violence?
  What did you talk about? ________________________ (open response)
Have you heard about the Ten Men program? Yes/No
  What have you heard about the Ten Men program?
  ______________________________ (open response)

Questions for Control Seed Men Only

Do you engage in work about masculinity? (yes/no)
  If so, please describe: ______________________________ (open response)
Do you engage in work regarding IPV? (yes/no)
  If so, please describe: ______________________________ (open response)
Have you heard about the Ten Men program? Yes/No
Questions for everyone

Have you ever been in an intimate relationship? (Yes or No)
   If yes, continue to next question. If no, skip this set of questions, do not take ABI.
Have you been in an intimate relationship in the past six months? (Yes or No)
   If yes, they take ABI. If no, they do not take ABI.
Are you currently in an intimate relationship? (Yes or No)
   Are you in a relationship with more than one partner?
   Are you living with your current partner? (Yes or No)

Did you ever witness domestic violence when you were a child? (Yes or No)
   If yes, was the domestic violence between: (Parents, Grandparents, Other family members, friends of the family, if not listed, please specify)

Demographic items

What is your race/ethnicity? [select all that apply] (Asian, Black/African American, Latinx, Native American, Pacific Islander, White/Caucasian, prefer not to say, if not listed, please specify)
How would you describe your gender identity? [select one] (Man, Woman, Transmale/Trans Man/Female-to-Male (FTM), Transfemale/Trans Woman/Male-to-Female (MTF), Genderqueer/Gender Non-conforming, Different Identity, please state: ________________)
What sex were you assigned at birth? (Male, Female, Intersex)
What is your sexual orientation? [select all that apply] (Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Pansexual, Heterosexual, prefer not to say, if not listed, please specify)
What is your age? (Less than 18, 18 – 24, 25 – 34, 35 – 44, 45 – 54, 55 – 64, 65 – 74, 75 – 84, 85 or older)
What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? (Some high school, High school or equivalent [GED], Some college, Associate’s degree, Bachelor’s degree, Some graduate work, Master’s or equivalent degree, Doctoral or equivalent degree, prefer not to say)
What is your occupation? ________________ (open response)
What is your annual household income? (less than $20,000; $20,000 to $34,999; $35,000 to $49,999; $50,000 to $74,999; $75,000 to $99,999; $100,000 to $149,999; $150,000 to $199,999; $200,000 or more)
   How many people contribute to your household income? 1 2 3 4 5+
What is the zip code where you live?
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Figure 4. Diagram of causal effects, based on work by Shimada et al. (2019).
Table 1. Focus Group Themes. Frequency is the number of times a theme was brought up and number of men is the number of participants who spoke about each theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
<th>Conversational Settings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicity of ways topics brought up and with who</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in the news and popular culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking from a position of power</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct vs. Indirect approaches</td>
<td>Direct approaches</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect approaches</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific strategies</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other materials</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading by example</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship-building</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative interactions</td>
<td>False accusations</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s defensiveness/aversion to terminology</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking to women</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Themes</td>
<td>Changes after Ten Men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ten Men is a space of community and belonging</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. Connections between qualitative themes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample (N = 42)</th>
<th>Ten Men Members (n = 11)</th>
<th>Control Seed Men (n = 13)</th>
<th>Ten Men Community Members (n = 13)</th>
<th>Control Community Members (n = 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 (38)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>7 (54)</td>
<td>3 (60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30 (71)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
<td>8 (62)</td>
<td>12 (92)</td>
<td>3 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>34 (81)</td>
<td>10 (91)</td>
<td>9 (69)</td>
<td>11 (85)</td>
<td>4 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identify</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>13 (31)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>9 (69)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (23)</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 84</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (46)</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>Some graduate work</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Pairwise correlations between scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABI-R</th>
<th>GEM</th>
<th>Violence Subscale</th>
<th>PoW Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABI-R</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Subscale</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoW Subscale</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Associations between group membership and attitudes toward violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>delta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>[0.44, 1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminated</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>[-0.33, 0.56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>[0.71, 1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>353.5</td>
<td>0.0004**</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>[0.33, 0.91]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at p < 0.05
** indicates significance at p < 0.001

Note: Values for Cliff’s delta range from -1 to 1, with 0 indicating no difference between the two groups. Absolute values of the small, medium, and large effect sizes for Cliff’s delta are 0.10 – 0.27, 0.28 – 0.42, and 0.43 or greater, respectively.
Table 5. Associations between group membership and attitudes toward gender equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>delta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminated</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.93]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>[0.23, 1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>296.0</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.69]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at p < 0.05
** indicates significance at p < 0.001

Note: Values for Cliff’s delta range from -1 to 1, with 0 indicating no difference between the two groups. Absolute values of the small, medium, and large effect sizes for Cliff’s delta are 0.10 – 0.27, 0.28 – 0.42, and 0.43 or greater, respectively.
Table 6. Associations between group membership and abusive relationship behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>delta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[-0.38, 0.59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminated</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>[0.00, 1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>246.5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>[-0.21, 0.45]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at p < 0.05  
** indicates significance at p < 0.001

Note: Values for Cliff’s delta range from -1 to 1, with 0 indicating no difference between the two groups. Absolute values of the small, medium, and large effect sizes for Cliff’s delta are 0.10 – 0.27, 0.28 – 0.42, and 0.43 or greater, respectively.
### Table 7. Mixed Methods results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-Theme</th>
<th>Results from Focus Groups</th>
<th>Results from Quantitative Analyses</th>
<th>Convergence Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spheres of influence</td>
<td>Relationship-building.</td>
<td>Ten Men members and men in their communities are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, when compared to Control group men.</td>
<td>Convergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive interactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiplicity of ways topics brought up and with whom men engage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Speaking from a position of power.</td>
<td>Ten Men members endorse higher levels of non-violent attitudes, compared to men in their communities.</td>
<td>Convergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading by example.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared attitudes</td>
<td>Ten Men provides a sense of community/belonging.</td>
<td>Ten Men members are less accepting of violence and less tolerant of gender inequity, when compared to men in the control communities.</td>
<td>Complimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in the news/popular culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct vs. Indirect approaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videos and other materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative interactions</td>
<td>Did not find any statistically significant differences between groups on frequency of abusive behaviors perpetrated in intimate relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Distribution of scores on the Violence subscale by group
Figure 7. Distribution of scores on the GEM scale by group
Figure 8. Distribution of ABI-R scores by group
Figure 9. Group membership and attitude toward violence (pro- or anti-violence). A square indicates a higher score on the Violence subscale (more pro-violence) while a circle indicates a lower score on the Violence subscale (more anti-violence).
Figure 10. Group membership and attitude toward gender equity (more or less gender equitable). A square indicates less gender equity while a circle indicates more gender equity.
Figure 11. Word cloud of data from focus groups

![Word Cloud Image]
Appendix 6

R Code for Statistical Analyses

# Appendix 6 R Code for Statistical Analyses

rm(list=ls()) #clear workspace

setwd("C:/Users/Valerie/Documents/URI/FALL 2019/DISSERTATION/Quant Survey")

### Demographic Statistics ###

att = read.csv("attribute data/Attributes.csv", header = TRUE, sep = ",", stringsAsFactors = TRUE)

## Single demographic variable tables

# Important variables

table(att$Q23) # in intimate relationship ever

## Relationships

table(att$Q24) # in intimate relationship in past month

table(att$Q25) # in intimate relationship currently

table(att$Q26) # if in a relationship currently, were they in a relationship with more than 1 partner?

table(att$Q27) # if in a relationship currently, living w/current partner?

table(att$Q28) # ever witness DV as a child or teen

table(att$Q29) # DV between who

## Additional demographic variables

table(att$Q3) # race/ethnicity

table(att$Q4) # gender

table(att$Q5) # sex

table(att$Q6) # sexuality

table(att$Q7) # age

table(att$Q8) # education

table(att$Q9) # occupation

table(att$Q10) # household income

table(att$Q11) # number of people contributing to income

table(att$Q12) # zip code

## Tables by type (community, seed, etc.)

table(att$Q23, att$Type)

table(att$Q24, att$Type)

table(att$Q25, att$Type)

table(att$Q26, att$Type)

table(att$Q27, att$Type)

table(att$Q28, att$Type_all)

table(att$Q29, att$Type)

## Additional tables

table(att$Q3, att$Type_all)

table(att$Q4, att$Type_all)

table(att$Q5, att$Type_all)

table(att$Q6, att$Type_all)

table(att$Q7, att$Type_all)
table(att$Q8, att$Type_all)
table(att$Q9, att$Type_all)
table(att$Q10, att$Type_all)
table(att$Q11, att$Type_all)
table(att$Q12, att$Type_all)

#################
## Scales ##
#################

## CMNI Violence Subscale
table(att$Q13_1)
table(att$Q13_2)
table(att$Q13_3r)
table(att$Q13_4r)
table(att$Q13_5)
table(att$Q13_6)

## CMNI Power over Women Subscale
table(att$Q13_7)
table(att$Q13_8)
table(att$Q13_9)
table(att$Q13_10)

## GEM
table(att$Q22_1)
table(att$Q22_2)
table(att$Q22_3)
table(att$Q22_4)
table(att$Q22_5)
table(att$Q22_6)
table(att$Q22_7)
table(att$Q22_8)
table(att$Q22_9)
table(att$Q22_10)
table(att$Q22_11)
table(att$Q22_12)

## ABI-R
table(att$Q21_1)
table(att$Q21_2)
table(att$Q21_3)
table(att$Q21_4)
table(att$Q21_5)
table(att$Q21_6)
table(att$Q21_7)
table(att$Q21_8)
table(att$Q21_9)
table(att$Q21_10)
table(att$Q21_11)
table(att$Q21_12)
table(att$Q21_13)

## Select items for scales
Violence.Items <- c("Q13_1", "Q13_2", "Q13_3r", "Q13_4r", "Q13_5", "Q13_6")
POW.Items <- c("Q13_7", "Q13_8", "Q13_9", "Q13_10")

#22_6 and 22_12 removed b/c all participants answered 0
GEM.Items <- c("Q22_1", "Q22_2", "Q22_3", "Q22_4", "Q22_5", "Q22_7", "Q22_8", "Q22_9", "Q22_10", "Q22_11")

#Q21_10, Q21_12, and Q21_13 all removed b/c all participants answered 0
ABI.Items <- c("Q21_1", "Q21_2", "Q21_3", "Q21_4", "Q21_5", "Q21_6", "Q21_7", "Q21_8", "Q21_9", "Q21_11")

# Use this package for calculating coefficient omega
library(psych)

# Calculate Omega for each scale
# Violence subscale
All.Violence <- att[Violence.Items]
omega(All.Violence, plot = F)

# Power over Women subscale
All.PoW <- att[PoW.Items]
omega(All.PoW, plot = F)

# Gender Equitable Men Scale
All.GEM <- att[GEM.Items]
omega(All.GEM, plot = F)

# Abusive Behavior Inventory
All.ABI <- att[ABI.Items]
omega(All.ABI, plot = F)

# Correlations for convergent validity
att$Violence <- att$Q13_1 + att$Q13_2 + att$Q13_3r + att$Q13_4r +
att$Q13_5
att$PoW <- att$Q13_7 + att$Q13_8 + att$Q13_9 + att$Q13_10
att$GEM <- att$Q22_1 + att$Q22_2 + att$Q22_3 + att$Q22_4 + att$Q22_5
+ att$Q22_7 + att$Q22_8 + att$Q22_9 + att$Q22_10 +
att$Q22_11
att$ABI <- att$Q21_1 + att$Q21_2 + att$Q21_3 + att$Q21_4 + att$Q21_5
+ att$Q21_6 + att$Q21_7 + att$Q21_8 + att$Q21_9 + att$Q21_11

cor(att$ABI, att$Violence)
cor(att$ABI, att$GEM)
cor(att$ABI, att$PoW)
cor(att$GEM, att$PoW)
cor(att$Violence, att$PoW)

# Manipulating Attribute Data
attach(att)

# Witnessed IPV as child
att$Witness[att$Q28 == "No"] <- "No"
att$Witness[att$Q28 == "Yes"] <- "Yes"

# Talked about/trained in masculinity
att$Masculinity[att$Q30 == "No"] <- "No"
att$Masculinity[att$Q30 == "Yes"] <- "Yes"

# Talked about/trained in IPV
# 0 = no, 1 = yes
att$IPV[att$Q32 == "No"] <- 0
att$IPV[att$Q32 == "Yes"] <- 1
# Create sum score for Violence subscale
att$Violence <- att$Q13_1 + att$Q13_2 + att$Q13_3r + att$Q13_4r + 
att$Q13_5 + att$Q13_6

# Flip valence of Violence subscale
# Now a higher score means more accepting of violence
att$Violence_r <- 18 - att$Violence

# Make subscale score into a factor
att$Violence.f <- factor(att$Violence_r, ordered=TRUE)

# Create sum score for GEM
# Higher score indicates less gender equity
att$GEM <- att$Q22_1 + att$Q22_2 + att$Q22_3 + att$Q22_4 + att$Q22_5 + 
att$Q22_7 + att$Q22_8 + att$Q22_9 + att$Q22_10 + att$Q22_11

# Make GEM score into a factor
att$GEM.f <- factor(att$GEM, ordered = TRUE)

# Create sum score for ABI
# Higher score indicates engaging in more abusive behavior
att$ABI <- att$Q21_1 + att$Q21_2 + att$Q21_3 + att$Q21_4 + att$Q21_5 + 
att$Q21_6 + att$Q21_7 + att$Q21_8 + att$Q21_9 + att$Q21_11

# Make ABI score into a factor
att$ABI.f <- factor(att$ABI, ordered = TRUE)

# Create variable identifying if person is TM or control
att$Type_TM[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Seed"] <- "Ten Men"
att$Type_TM[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Community"] <- "Ten Men"
att$Type_TM[att$Type_all == "Control Seed"] <- "Control"
att$Type_TM[att$Type_all == "Control Community"] <- "Control"

# Create variable identifying type of person
att$Type_total[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Seed"] <- 1
att$Type_total[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Community"] <- 0
att$Type_total[att$Type_all == "Control Seed"] <- 0
att$Type_total[att$Type_all == "Control Community"] <- 1
detach(att)

library(lattice)

## Violence subscale
XT.violence = xtabs(~ Type_all + Violence.f, data = att)
xT.violence
prop.violence = prop.table(XT.violence, margin = 1)
prop.violence
hist.violence = histogram(~ Violence.f | Type_all, data=att, 
layout=c(1,4))
hist.violence

## GEM
XT.gem = xtabs(~Type_all + GEM.f, data = att)

XT.gem

prop.gem = prop.table(XT.gem, margin = 1)

prop.gem

hist.gem = histogram(~ GEM.f | Type_all, data=att, layout=c(1,4))

hist.gem

## ABI

XT.abi = xtabs(~Type_all + ABI.f, data = att)

XT.abi

prop.abi = prop.table(XT.abi, margin = 1)

prop.abi

hist.abi = histogram(~ ABI.f | Type_all, data=att, layout=c(1,4))

hist.abi

## Calculate medians

library(psych)

describeBy(att$Violence_r, att$Type_all)

describeBy(att$Violence_r, att$Type_TM)

describeBy(att$GEM, att$Type_all)

describeBy(att$GEM, att$Type_TM)

describeBy(att$ABI, att$Type_all)

describeBy(att$ABI, att$Type_TM)

#########################################################################
### Create Analysis Datasets for each association ###
#########################################################################

disseminated <- att[att$Type == "Community", ]
str(disseminated)

direct <- att[att$Type_TM == "Ten Men",]
str(direct)

total <- att[att$Type_total == 1,]
str(total)

#########################################################################
#### Mann Whitney U Test/Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test ####
#########################################################################

library(rcompanion)

# Violence

# Mann Whitney U Test
# Vargha and Delaney's A
# Cliff's delta
## Disseminated association
if (is.na(Disseminated)) {
  wilcox.test(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=disseminated)
  vda(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=disseminated, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=disseminated, ci=TRUE)
}

## Direct association
if (is.na(Direct)) {
  wilcox.test(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=direct)
  vda(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=direct, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=direct, ci=TRUE)
}

## Total association
if (is.na(Total)) {
  wilcox.test(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=total)
  vda(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=total, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(Violence_r ~ Type_all, data=total, ci=TRUE)
}

## Overall association
if (is.na(Overall)) {
  wilcox.test(Violence_r ~ Type_TM, data=att)
  vda(Violence_r ~ Type_TM, data=att, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(Violence_r ~ Type_TM, data=att, ci=TRUE)
}

#############
## GEM ##
#############
# Mann Whitney U Test
# Vargha and Delaney's A
# Cliff's delta
## Disseminated association
if (is.na(Disseminated)) {
  wilcox.test(GEM ~ Type_all, data=disseminated)
  vda(GEM ~ Type_all, data=disseminated, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(GEM ~ Type_all, data=disseminated, ci=TRUE)
}

## Direct association
if (is.na(Direct)) {
  wilcox.test(GEM ~ Type_all, data=direct)
  vda(GEM ~ Type_all, data=direct, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(GEM ~ Type_all, data=direct, ci=TRUE)
}

## Total association
if (is.na(Total)) {
  wilcox.test(GEM ~ Type_all, data=total)
  vda(GEM ~ Type_all, data=total, ci=TRUE)
  cliffDelta(GEM ~ Type_all, data=total, ci=TRUE)
}
```r
### Overall association
wilcox.test(GEM ~ Type_TM, data=att)
vda(GEM ~ Type_TM, data=att, ci=TRUE)
cliffDelta(GEM ~ Type_TM, data=att, ci=TRUE)

###########
### ABI ###
###########
# Mann Whitney U Test
# Vargha and Delaney's A
# Cliff's delta

### Disseminated association
wilcox.test(ABI ~ Type_all, data=disseminated)
vda(ABI ~ Type_all, data=disseminated, ci=TRUE)
cliffDelta(ABI ~ Type_all, data=disseminated, ci=TRUE)

### Direct association
wilcox.test(ABI ~ Type_all, data=direct)
vda(ABI ~ Type_all, data=direct, ci=TRUE)
cliffDelta(ABI ~ Type_all, data=direct, ci=TRUE)

### Total association
wilcox.test(ABI ~ Type_all, data=total)
vda(ABI ~ Type_all, data=total, ci=TRUE)
cliffDelta(ABI ~ Type_all, data=total, ci=TRUE)

### Overall association
wilcox.test(ABI ~ Type_TM, data=att)
vda(ABI ~ Type_TM, data=att, ci=TRUE)
cliffDelta(ABI ~ Type_TM, data=att, ci=TRUE)

#############################################################
### Graph Visualizations ###
#############################################################
### Before making these graphs you must dichotomize your outcome
variable, in this case, score on the Violence subscale into “high”
and “low” categories so the different shapes of the nodes represent a
high or low score on the outcome of interest

### visualize graph based on attitudes toward violence + knowing about
masculinity
V(net)[att$masculinity == 1]$color <- "plum3"
V(net)[att$masculinity == 0]$color <- "peachpuff2"
V(net)$shape <- "circle"
V(net)[att$violent == 1]$shape <- "square"
par(mfrow = c(1,1))
set.seed(0)
```
library(igraph)

# Visualize graph based on attitudes toward violence + type of person
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Seed"]$color <- "orangered1"
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Control Seed"]$color <- "royalblue4"
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Community"]$color <- "lightcoral"
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Control Community"]$color <- "steelblue2"
V(net)$shape <- "circle"
V(net)[att$violent == 1]$shape <- "square"

# Visualize graph based on knowing about masculinity + type of person
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Seed"]$color <- "springgreen3"
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Control Seed"]$color <- "thistle"
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Ten Men Community"]$color <- "turquoise3"
V(net)[att$Type_all == "Control Community"]$color <- "violetred"
V(net)$shape <- "circle"
V(net)[att$masculinity == 1]$shape <- "square"

##########################################################
## Causal Inference Methods Applied to Network Analysis ##
##########################################################

## Steps:  
# 1. Read in all data and format it correctly  
# 2. Assign community membership  
# 3. Calculate coverage  
# 4. Estimate Causal effects
## Step 1: Read in data and format it ##

### Read in adjacency matrix

```r
# Format in multiple ways (matrix, graph adjacency, edgelist)
network = read.csv("Full network.csv", header=TRUE, row.names = 1, check.names = FALSE)
m_network = as.matrix(network)
g_network = graph.adjacency(m_network, mode = "undirected", weighted = NULL)
e.list_network <- get.edgelist(g_network, names = TRUE)
```

### Calculate network characteristics

```r
transitivity(g_network)
edge_density(simplify(g_network), loops=FALSE)
mean(betweenness(g_network))
mean(degree(g_network))
assortativity.degree(g_network,directed=T)
```

### Create full network with attributes included

```r
net = graph.data.frame(e.list_network, directed = "FALSE", vertices = att)
```

## Step 2: Assign Community Membership ##

### Assign participants IDs based on number of participants and community membership

```
# 42 is the total number of participants, N
ID.a <- 1:42
V(net)$ID.a <- ID.a
net <- simplify(net, remove.multiple = T, remove.loops = T)
```

### Community detection

```
net.community<- fastgreedy.community(net)
```

### Create a new data set called data only including variables for analysis

```
```

```r
# clnum variable is the number of people in each cluster
for (i in 1:42) {
  data$clnum[i]<- sum(data$CL==data$CL[i])
}
```

### Name variables in data set

```
names(data) = c("ID.a", "CL", "witness", "race", "edu", "income", "age", "sexual", "Violence", "ABI", "GEM", "ipv", "masculinity", "clnum")
```

# Remove isolates (people who have no connections in the network)
data <- subset(data, clnum > 1)

###############################################################
## Step 3: Calculate Coverage ##
###############################################################

## Calculate proportion of people in each cluster who know about masculinity, know about IPV

# 4 is the number of clusters from community detection
comp <- decompose.graph(net)

order <- rep(0, 4)
prop.masculinity <- rep(0, 4)
prop.ipv <- rep(0, 4)
for (i in 1:4){
  order[i] <- nrow(subset(data, data$CL==i))
  prop.masculinity[i] <- sum(subset(data, data$CL==i)$masculinity)/order[i]
  prop.ipv[i] <- sum(subset(data, data$CL==i)$ipv)/order[i]
}

round(prop.masculinity, 2)
sort(unique(round(prop.masculinity, 2)))
round(prop.ipv, 2)
sort(unique(round(prop.ipv, 2)))

# Add proportions of knowledge of masculinity and ipv to our dataset, 'data'
data$prop.mas=prop.masculinity[data$CL]
data$prop.ipv=prop.ipv[data$CL]

###############################################################
## Step 4: Estimate Effects Using Causal Inference ##
###############################################################

## This is the package for estimating causal effects using causal inference in the presence of interference
library(inferference)

###############################################################
## Crude models (Unadjusted) ##
###############################################################

## CMNI-46 Violence Subscale
# masculinity
model.mas.crude.violence <- interference(formula = Violence | masculinity ~ (1|CL) | CL, allocations = c(0.5, 0.75, 0.99), data = data, randomization = 1, method = 'simple')
print(model.mas.crude.violence)

# ipv
model.ipv.crude.violence <- interference(formula = Violence | ipv ~ (1|CL) | CL, allocations = c(0.75, 0.99), data = data, randomization = 1, method = 'simple')
print(model.ipv.crude.violence)

## ABI
# masculinity
model.mas.crude.abi <- interference(formula = ABI | masculinity ~ (1|CL)| CL,
                                      allocations = c(0.5, 0.75, 0.99),
                                      data = data,
                                      randomization = 1,
                                      method = 'simple')

print(model.mas.crude.abi)

# ipv
model.ipv.crude.abi <- interference(formula = ABI | ipv ~ (1|CL)| CL,
                                      allocations = c(0.5, 0.99),
                                      data = data,
                                      randomization = 1,
                                      method = 'simple')

print(model.ipv.crude.abi)

## GEM

## masculinity
model.mas.crude.gem <- interference(formula = GEM | masculinity ~ (1|CL)| CL,
                                      allocations = c(0.5, 0.75, 0.99),
                                      data = data,
                                      randomization = 1,
                                      method = 'simple')

print(model.mas.crude.gem)

# ipv
model.ipv.crude.gem <- interference(formula = GEM | ipv ~ (1|CL)| CL,
                                      allocations = c(0.5, 0.99),
                                      data = data,
                                      randomization = 1,
                                      method = 'simple')

print(model.ipv.crude.gem)

##########################################################################
## Adjusted models without interaction terms ##
##########################################################################

## CMNI Violence subscale

## masculinity
model.mas.violence <- interference(formula = Violence | masculinity ~ witness + edu + age + (1|CL)| CL,
                                       allocations = c(0.5, 0.75, 0.99),
                                       data = data,
                                       randomization = 1,
                                       method = 'simple')

print(model.mas.violence)

# ipv
model.ipv.violence <- interference(formula = Violence | ipv ~ witness + edu + age + (1|CL)| CL,
                                       allocations = c(0.5, 0.99),
                                       data = data,
                                       randomization = 1,
                                       method = 'simple')

print(model.ipv.violence)

## ABI

## masculinity
model.mas.abi <- interference(formula = ABI | masculinity ~ witness + edu + age + (1|CL)| CL,
                                       allocations = c(0.75, 0.99),
                                       data = data,
                                       randomization = 1,
                                       method = 'simple')

print(model.mas.abi)

# ipv
model.ipv.abi <- interference(formula = ABI | ipv ~ witness + edu + age + (1|CL)| CL, allocations = c(0.5, 0.99), data = data, randomization = 1, method = 'simple')
print(model.ipv.abi)

## GEM
# masculinity
model.mas.gem <- interference(formula = GEM | masculinity ~ witness + edu + age + (1|CL)| CL, allocations = c(0.5, 0.75, 0.99), data = data, randomization = 1, method = 'simple')
print(model.mas.gem)

# ipv
model.ipv.gem <- interference(formula = GEM | ipv ~ witness + edu + age + (1|CL)| CL, allocations = c(0.5, 0.99), data = data, randomization = 1, method = 'simple')
print(model.ipv.gem)

# CMNI Violence subscale
# masculinity
model.mas.pair.violence <- interference(formula = Violence | masculinity ~ witness + edu + age + witness*edu + witness*age + edu*age + (1|CL)| CL, allocations = c(0.5, 0.75, 0.99), data = data, randomization = 1, method = 'simple')
print(model.mas.pair.violence)
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