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ABSTRACT

This case study is an investigation of the Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia. These men are activists seeking to prevent men’s violence against women. White Ribbon Australia is part of the social movement to end violence against women, specifically men’s violence against women. Drawing mostly on an online survey (n = 296) and complemented with in-depth interviews (n = 86), this research considers how men maintain their contribution to preventing violence against women by offering an analysis of the motivations, challenges, and personal perspectives of a representative sample of men within White Ribbon Australia. Additionally, the case study examines who these men are demographically and how their involvement with White Ribbon Australia has changed them. Through the combination of interviews and a survey, viewed through the lens of social movement theory, a narrative of men’s development and involvement as agents of change will emerge. This research will produce practical and applied sociological knowledge about what inspires and maintains men’s motivation and commitment while overcoming challenges. The practical knowledge gained from this research will contribute to increasing men’s impact as agents of change, the number of men involved in this work, and the efficacy in White Ribbon Australia as well as other anti-violence against women organisations, both nationally and internationally.
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1 INTRODUCTION

This project is a case study of White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassadors, who are men who work as activists to prevent men’s violence against women. This project combines qualitative and quantitative data analysis through the lens of social movement theory to investigate how these men become activists, the challenges they encounter, and how they overcome them. This case study will contribute to and expand the current research on engaging men within the anti-violence against women space specifically, and engaging men as agents of change in general.

White Ribbon Australia is a primary prevention organisation. Taking the public health model of mitigating disease, ‘primary prevention’ is any action taken to prevent social problems from occurring (Cohen and Chehimi 2007). The public health model also includes secondary prevention (i.e., concentrated on men at risk of committing violence against women) and tertiary prevention (i.e., responding to those men who have a history of violence against women) (Berkowitz 2004, 1-2). ‘Prevention’ is thus defined as any act or practice such as an activity or program that prevents or reduces men’s violence against women. While secondary and tertiary prevention can be seen as working ‘downstream’ and pulling people out of the water and then trying to save them, primary prevention involves ‘moving upstream’ to see why people are falling in the water.

The World Health Organization estimates that 35 percent of ‘women worldwide have experienced either physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence or non-partner sexual violence in their lifetime’ (World Health Organization 2016). ‘Violence against women’ is defined as ‘any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life’ (United Nations 1993).

White Ribbon Australia uses a combination of educational outreach, workplace initiatives, and awareness campaigns as the primary tools to confront men’s violence against women. Additionally, White Ribbon Australia has an ‘Ambassador’ program that consists of men who use their influence in their professional and social circles to address men’s violence against women. These men are from a continuum of socioeconomic statuses and with various motivations. These Ambassadors are public advocates that conduct activities ‘upstream’ to prevent
men’s violence against women as per the primary prevention model. These advocates, as men, have a ‘privileged’ status, and that status is used to supports efforts to eliminate the systemic violence and social conditions that grant them greater ‘power’ and ‘privilege’. Privilege is defined here based on Peggy McIntosh’s conceptualization of the term as something of value one group has that another group does not, simply by belonging to a group, either as an unearned advantage or an unearned entitlement (1988). These advocates publically swear to ‘stand up, speak out and act to prevent men’s violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2016). It is important to note that there are additional men (and women) that are formally a part of White Ribbon Australia in various capacities actually called Advocates, but this case study focuses solely on those men selected by the organisation to be Ambassadors.

The Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia and the organisation itself are part of the social movement to end violence against women, specifically men’s violence against women. A social movement is a collective action by a group of people with a shared or collective identity based on a set of beliefs and opinions, in which that group intends to change or maintain some aspect of the social order. This definition will be expanded and expounded upon later. White Ribbon Ambassadors are not paid1 for their efforts and volunteer in the community in numerous ways. This volunteer work includes hosting and participating in White Ribbon specific events such as walks and fundraisers. Ambassadors must demonstrate they are ‘committed to the vision and values of White Ribbon Australia’ and will ‘stand up, speak out and act to prevent men’s violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2017a). Additionally, Ambassadors, must ‘actively practice and promote gender equality throughout all areas’ of their life and ‘engage and influence other men in the prevention of men’s violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2017a).

What is the rationale for engaging men in anti-violence against women efforts? White Ribbon Australia’s maintains that ‘men are central to achieving the social change necessary to prevent men’s violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2017a). The rationale for involving men as agents of change to address injustice is men typically have more power and privilege than women do in the social

---

1 There are less than ten men on the professional staff of White Ribbon Australia that are also Ambassadors.
order. This increased power and privilege reinforces and maintains hegemonic masculinity and thus subjugates women.

Men are the ‘dominant group’ that benefits from institutionalised oppression; men commit most violence, thus must be ‘part of the solution’. Increasing the advocacy efforts of men is important because men² perpetrate the most violence against women (Flood 2004, Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). However, in most contexts, most men are not violent, and most do not condone violence. Thus a minority (in most contexts) of men commits most violence against women (Lisak and Miller 2002, Berkowitz 2004, Kilmartin and Allison 2007). While this is a complex and contested issue, it is clear since a minority of men commit men’s violence against women, ending gendered violence must come from the actions of the majority of men as all men should take responsibility for preventing men’s violence against women (Berkowitz 2004). To end men’s violence against women, men are required to engage as change agents (DeKeseredy, Schwartz, and Alvi 2000, Flood 2005-2006), because men are more apt to listen to and be influenced by other men (Flood 2004, Earle 1996). While most men are not violent, a majority of non-violent men do not challenge the violent behaviour of other men (Flood 2010).

Men have long been involved in preventing violence against women, however, ‘attempts to mobilise men as activists and organisers in grassroots anti-violence campaigns have been small and scattered’ (Pease 2008, 2). Recently, an increasing number of academics and activists have called on men to take the initiative in preventing men’s violence against women (Berkowitz 2002, Funk 1993, Flood 2001, Katz 1995, Kivel 1992, Flood 2004, Breines, Connell, and Eide 2000, Kaufman 2001a, INSTRAW 2002). This appeal has also led to an ever-increasing amount of academic research on men’s involvement in preventing violence against women, which led to an increased awareness of the issue and even more research. The research states that men can be effective in preventing men’s violence against women by speaking out and speaking up, particularly when directly speaking to other men (Flood 2004, Earle 1996). It is important to acknowledge that the growth of male involvement is not without questions and concerns. Research indicates there are several issues that can occur by involving men in violence prevention including

---

² The terms “men” and “male” or “women” or “female” are used interchangeably in this case study.
silencing women; reducing funding for women’s programs and services; and gaining more attention than women for their anti-violence efforts (Pease 2008). While it is important to acknowledge and continually research both current and potential issues related to men’s work in preventing men’s violence against women, men must be involved. Thus, the tide is turning, and efforts to engage men in eliminating men’s violence against women are growing around the world in the educational, governmental, and non-profit arenas (Casey and Smith 2010).

Numerous global initiatives have emerged in the social movement to stop men’s violence against women by engaging men as part of the solution, in addition to promoting gender equality and equity. The programs include MenEngage, an alliance of nongovernmental organisations and Promundo, which actively promotes gender equality and challenges gendered social norms. However, the world’s largest collective effort or social movement group engaging men to stop men’s violence against women is the White Ribbon Campaign.

1.1 The White Ribbon Campaign
The White Ribbon Campaign started in Canada in 1991 in response to the 1989 massacre of fourteen women by a gunman on December 6 at École Polytechnique in Montreal. Those women were:

Geneviève Bergeron, Hélène Colgan, Nathalie Croteau, Barbara Daigneault, Anne-Marie Edward, Maud Haviernick, Barbara Maria Klucznik, Maryse Laganèrè, Maryse Leclair, Anne-Marie Lemay, Sonia Pelletier, Michèle Richard, Annie St-Arneault, and Annie Turcotte.

The event shocked Canada and overnight a nationwide discussion about men’s violence against women began, and an unparalleled amount of attention was given by the media due to the tragedy (Kaufman 2012, 146). This devastating event is also known as the Montreal Massacre.

Soon after the massacre, in the summer of 1991, two women—Olivia Chow and Jan Peltier—asked their male partners and a friend, a simple question about the plethora of responses to the tragedy: Where are all the men? (Kaufman 2012, 146). Those men were Michael Kaufman, Jack Layton (Chow’s partner), and Ron Sluser (Peltier’s partner) and they founded the White Ribbon Campaign. These three men knew each other from prior work together as part of the pro-choice social movement, which contends that women should have the legal right to have an abortion. A white
ribbon was chosen because the colour symbolically represents peace in some Western cultures while representing death and mourning in some Eastern cultures (Kaufman 2012, 150). On a more pragmatic level, a ribbon was chosen because it was easy to make and since it was white, men would feel comfortable wearing the colour (Kaufman 2012, 150). The white ribbon along with the red AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) ribbon started the practice with other social movements to use a symbolic ribbon. The three founders then engaged with prominent Canadian men in the arts, business, politics, religion, and sports. Many of these men signed a statement affirming their commitment to stop men’s violence against women while rallying support across the country.

The White Ribbon Campaign started with a simple question posed by women who were looking for men to do something, anything about. Three men stepped forward, and their collective action has grown exponentially. The social movement effort that began in Canada has now expanded into over 60 countries, creating a loosely linked network of social movement organisations. White Ribbon Australia’s origins are an outgrowth of earlier initiatives prior to the Montreal Massacre.

According to Flood (2010), Men’s anti-violence groups in Australia began in the late 1980s, coupled with anti-sexism groups such as Men Opposing Patriarchy (MOP) and the Men’s Anti Gender Injustice Group (MAGIC). In the early 1990s, Men against Sexual Assault (MASA) groups formed in most capital cities across Australia; and the first White Ribbon Campaign events were conducted when MASA adopted aspects of the campaign’s message and imagery while running events. During 2000–2002, the Australian Office of the Status of Women ran White Ribbon oriented events and in 2003. Then women, working with men in the Australian division of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) began a nationally coordinated campaign that included print, radio, and television advertisements. The White Ribbon Foundation was formed 2007 to raise funding to sustain the burgeoning movement and was renamed White Ribbon Australia in 2013.

It is important to note that all White Ribbon Campaigns actively try to engage men as agents of change. However, most of the various campaigns do not have an Ambassador program including White Ribbon Canada; the notable exceptions that do have Ambassador Programs are New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Since White Ribbon Australia is the largest formal organisation engaging men to prevent
violence against women and a leader in the use of Ambassadors as representatives, the organisation provides a valuable case study opportunity to answer important questions. For example, who are these men? What is their social location? What stories do they have to tell? Specifically, why did they become involved and what challenges have they encountered? In answering these questions, this case study will provide a framework to explore and contest the role of men in preventing violence against women.

1.2 Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to offer some understanding of five key questions:

1. Who are the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors and why does it matter?
2. Why and how did the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors get involved with White Ribbon Australia?
3. How has their involvement as White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors changed their relationships with women and men?
4. What are the positive experiences of involvement as a White Ribbon Australia Ambassador?
5. What challenges have White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors encountered and how did they overcome these challenges?

1.2.1 Research Aim

The purpose of this research is to produce data about the experiences of men who identify as Ambassadors within White Ribbon Australia in an attempt to better understand the contributions they make and challenges these activists encounter in their work. This data and the conclusions will be used to engage with White Ribbon Australia on how to improve the recruitment and development of men as change agents in confronting men’s violence against women. Additionally, the research aims to expand the academic knowledge base of men as activists to prevent men’s violence against women and increase awareness of male activism in preventing and reducing men’s violence against women. These two aims will be achieved through the release of a public report, publication of several academic papers, and presentations at conferences related to gendered violence and sociology in Australia and globally. This increased awareness will spur further discussion and academic interest while hopefully, preventing some of the men’s violence against women. This research is a pilot study. The intention is to replicate this study with other
organisations around the world for cross-cultural analysis and to create a research instrument that others can use to investigate male activism in relation to men’s violence against women.

1.3 Significance
To date, there has been no academic research that focuses specifically on the motivations and challenges of the men involved in White Ribbon Australia, and limited research overall into similar organisations globally. This research will broaden existing scholarship on men’s motivations for involvement (Casey and Smith 2010, Fabiano et al. 2003, Funk 2008, Pease 2008); how men can confront gendered violence (Flood 2004, 2005-2006, Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny 2002); how organisations can engage men(Katz 1995, Piccigallo, Lilley, and Miller 2012), and the White Ribbon Campaign (Goldrick-Jones 2004, Kaufman 2001b, Spark 1994). Additionally, social movement theory has never been a primary lens used to research this type of male activism and the prevention of violence against women. This research will investigate how members of privileged groups create a collective identity and foster collective action in a social movement.

From an applied sociological perspective, by creating a dialogue to develop solutions to eliminate participation barriers the intention of the research is to increase men’s support for and involvement in efforts to prevent men’s violence against women and serve as active agents of change. This research gives voice to participants through the interviews and surveys, and these men will know that people want to hear their stories and that their voices are heard. These collected stories can be used for academic purposes and advocacy work by WRA and related organisations.

This dialogue will foster an increased commitment to involvement within the White Ribbon Australia program specifically, and engaging men as agents of change generally because participants will know their voice has been heard, see tangible research outcomes such as academic papers, and witness changes to the program. This dialogue will also produce practical knowledge of how to inspire and sustain men’s commitment and while exploring new avenues of engagement. Additionally, because White Ribbon Australia is a nationwide organisation, this research will create a demographic profile of the male engagement in anti-violence against women.
efforts across the country. The primary benefit of this research is that it can help prevent men’s violence against women. This contribution will be achieved by investigating the men that are actively trying to prevent that violence.

1.4 Context of Research

The interviews for this research began in April of 2015 and Australia was in a state of keen awareness about violence against women at the hands of men. During this time, there was heightened media coverage, increasing community attention, and feminist advocacy work (e.g., Destroy the Joint, Counting Dead Women). Additionally, new organisations in the social movement sector had risen to prominence such as Australia’s National Research Organisation for Women’s Safety (ANROWS) and Our Watch. A key reason for the increased awareness of violence against women was Rosie Batty, who was named Australian of the Year in January of 2015. Batty’s 11-year-old-son Luke was murdered by his father at cricket practice the previous February. Batty had taken steps to protect Luke, she ‘involved the police, the courts, child protection and social workers to keep her son and herself safe’ (Thompson and McGregor 2014). The death of Luke Batty echoed across the country: ‘when a grieving mother spoke out calmly just hours after her son’s murder; she gave voice to many thousands of victims of domestic violence who had until then remained unheard’ (National Australia Day Council 2016b).

Furthermore, 2015 and 2016 also saw other prominent events that drew public attention to MVAW. For example, Lieutenant-General of the Australian Army and White Ribbon Ambassador David Morrison was named Australian of the Year in 2016. Morrison rose to prominence in the public eye in 2013 when he ‘ordered misbehaving troops to “get out” if they couldn’t accept women as equals, his video went viral’ (National Australia Day Council 2016a). The video featuring Morrison posted to the Australia Army Headquarters’ YouTube page3 was in response to evidence identifying a group within the Army that produced material demeaning women and distributing it across the Internet and Depart of Defence’s email networks.

Another event was the controversy over several people speaking publicly as Ambassadors, but their message did not completely align with the message of White

---

3 https://www.youtube.com/user/AustralianArmyHQ
Ribbon Australia. For example, Tanveer Ahmed, a psychiatrist, authored an opinion piece in *The Australian* on February 9, 2015, titled ‘Men Forgotten in Violence Debate’ alleging men’s violence against women is increasingly perpetrated not because men have more power than women, but because they are now powerless. Tanveer signed this article as a White Ribbon Ambassador. Tanveer was roundly derided in the media and academic circles. White Ribbon Australia initially did not revoke Tanveer’s Ambassadorship, instead stating that he must go through a recommitment process; however, Tanveer later stepped down from his role as an Ambassador. White Ribbon Australia issued a statement that his article and ‘subsequent comments are inconsistent with the message and focus of the White Ribbon Campaign ... [and we appreciate] ... the resulting deep concern of our supporters, including other White Ribbon Ambassadors’ (White Ribbon Australia 2015a).

Two remaining events frame the experience of respondents during the research window. Tony Abbott decided to take the mantle of Minister for Women, just one of many policy issues that attracted feminist commentary and criticism. Finally, White Ribbon Australia itself was going through a restructuring process with long-time employees leaving, including the current person in charge of the Ambassador Program, and all Ambassadors had to undergo a recommittal process. This recommittal process was directly related to Tanveer’s actions and the need to deliver a cohesive message from the Ambassadors. With these key situational points in mind, let us further explore the men who publicly profess to ‘stand up, speak out and act to prevent men’s violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2016).

### 1.5 Standpoint

At times in social research, the social location of the researcher needs to be clear as it can affect the reliability and validity of the data. The primary researcher for this case study considers himself an advocate and pro-feminist. He has for several years actively worked to prevent men’s violence against women as a researcher and activist. Additionally, the researcher is a 37-year-old, white heterosexual male from the United States.
1.6 Public Report

A complementary process evaluation of the Ambassador program was conducted with Claire E. Seaman during this research. The findings from the evaluation have been made available to the public and sent to all the Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia. Additionally, several changes have been made to the Ambassador program based on recommendations from the process evaluation. For further information about the Public Report and its impact White Ribbon Australia, please see Appendix C, p. 164. The men who have become agents of change as White Ribbon Ambassadors are participants in a wider social movement. How, then, can we understand social movements? The thesis now turns to this.
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Social Movements: An Introduction
To fully understand why men become part of the social movement to end men’s violence against women by engaging as activists and how they maintain that involvement, several aspects of social movements must be considered. First, what exactly is a social movement? Secondly, what are the theoretical frameworks related to social movements? Finally, is White Ribbon Australia a social movement or part of a social movement?

2.1.1 Defining Social Movements
The definition of a ‘social movement’ itself is contested. This contestation is due to the disparate approaches to social movement theory despite notable attempts at synthesising them (Diani 1992, 1), as well as the increased theorising in the field from the 1960s onward. However, all definitions typically include a variation of ‘networks of relations between a plurality of actors,’ a collective identity, and conflictual issues (Diani 1992, 17). For this research, Diani’s long developed (Diani 1992, Diani and Ivano 2004) definition is used: a social movement is defined as ‘a distinct social process … through which actors engaged in collective action; are involved in conflictual relations with clearly identified opponents; are linked by dense informal networks; and share a distinct collective identity’ (della Porta and Diani 2006, 20). However, to understand where this definition comes from one must understand how the concept of social movements developed.

2.1.1.1 Conceptual Underpinning
The conceptualisation of social movements is based on societal change and can be traced to the work of Claude Henri de Rouvroy comte de Saint-Simon’s (1760–1825) theory of industrialism and Charles Darwin’s (1809–1882) evolutionary theory outlined in On the Origin of Species (1859). Saint-Simon would inspire Auguste Comte (1798–1857), the founder of positivism and sociology, to view society as progressing towards something. Saint-Simon and Comte — along with Herbert
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4 For additional discussion about defining social movements see Klandermans 1997, 2; Tarrow 2011, 9; Tilly and Wood 2013, 4.
Spencer (1820–1903) who coined the term ‘survival of the fittest’ — inspired Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Friedrich Engels’s (1820–1895) seminal work, the *Communist Manifesto* (1848). Marx and Engels’ work ‘identified the working class and the labor movement as the prime historical agents of social change’ (Eyerman 2006, 578). In 1848, Lorenz von Stein (1815–1890) coined the German phrase that would later translate into English as ‘social movement’ in *Socialist and Communist Movements since the Third French Revolution*. Werner Sombart (1863–1941) in *Socialism and the Social Movement in the 19th Century* (1889) would cement social movements ‘as a legitimate object of research’ (Eyerman 2006:578). Comte, Saint-Simon, Sombart, Spencer, and Stein laid the groundwork for social movement theory based on the idea of social change as a progression toward something. However, even with a working definition of a social movement and the conceptual underpinning of a social movement, the lens through which to interpret the social actors and actions therein is valuable.

2.1.2 White Ribbon Australia: A Social Movement?

White Ribbon Australia is not itself a social movement, but part of the larger social movement to end men’s violence against women. The anti-men’s violence against women social movement began as part of the women’s movement in the 1860s. White Ribbon Australia is a social movement organisation, which is ‘a complex, or formal organisation which identifies its preferences with a social movement or a counter-movement and attempts to implement those goals’ (McCarthy and Zald 1977, 1218).

White Ribbon Australia works toward its aims through primary prevention initiatives that raise awareness through educational programs in schools, workplace training, and in the community as a whole (White Ribbon Australia 2015b). White Ribbon Australia is an anti-men’s violence against women social movement organisation within the broader framework of the anti-violence against women movement and specifically seeks to make men active agents of change, because its mission is ‘[making women’s] safety a man’s issue too’ (White Ribbon Australia 2015b). White Ribbon Australia’s resources and the Ambassador’s power and privilege are used to confront men’s violence against women in a move toward the
vision that all women will ‘live in safety free from all forms of men’s violence’
(White Ribbon Australia 2015b).

The theoretical lens of social movements, particularly resource mobilisation
theory (see section 2.1.3.1, p. 16), provides a useful lens to explore how men’s
increased power and agency within the social order can be used to prevent men’s
violence against women. The men of White Ribbon Australia are an essential
resource and are utilised to achieve the goals of the movement. However, White
Ribbon Australia is also a resource for the Ambassadors to reach the goal of being an
anti-violence advocate and activist.

White Ribbon Australia is a complex organisation that challenges the society
and culture of Australia to prevent men’s violence against women and does so as a
collective group that works independent of, but closely with the government,
military, and schools. One key to challenging social norms is the Ambassador
program and men’s commitment to the cause of preventing men’s violence against
women. However, White Ribbon Australia has several key programs in its repertoire,
including the Breaking the Silence schools program and the White Ribbon
Workplace Accreditation Program.

A developmental program for principals and teachers, Breaking the Silence
intends to ‘embed models of respectful relationships in school culture and classroom
activities’ (White Ribbon Australia 2015c). The program is offered in primary and
secondary schools, and facilitates the implementation of curriculum, initiatives, and
policies to ‘promote the school as a respectful centre for education, safe workplace,
and as a vehicle for community culture change’ (White Ribbon Australia 2015c). The
Breaking the Silence Program model, ideally, fosters student engagement in
prevention efforts, reduction of conflict within the school, and gender equality and
equity. Schools that complete the Breaking the Silence Program become certified as
an Accredited White Ribbon Australia School.

The White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation program is another resource in
White Ribbon Australia’s range of anti-violence tools. The program was launched in
September of 2012 as a pilot program that included six large organisations5 including

5 “Australian Army, Telstra, the National Rugby League, Suzanne Grae, the City of Sydney, the
Office of the Coordinator General for Remote Indigenous Services and other Australian workplaces”
(White Ribbon Australia 2012)
the Australian Army, which was led by then Chief of Army Lieutenant General David Morrison and Australian of the Year for 2016. In November of 2013, the first organisations were accredited as White Ribbon Workplaces (White Ribbon Australia 2013). There are currently 107 White Ribbon Australia Accredited Workplaces with 78 total organisations participating in the program and reaching over 600,000 employees across Australia (White Ribbon Australia 2015e). The goal of the program is to prevent violence against women ‘in or beyond the workplace’ (White Ribbon Australia 2015d) and men from these workplaces often become Ambassadors.

However, how does White Ribbon Australia’s mode of operation fall in line with social movement theory in general and a social movement organisation specifically? Tilly and Wood contend that all social movements in the West after 1750 share ‘an innovative, consequential synthesis of three elements’ (2013, 5). Therefore, all social movements, thus social movement organisations, share the same aspects. The first element is campaign, ‘a sustained, organized public effort making collective claims on target authorities’ (Tilly and Wood 2013, 4). Second, a social movement repertoire includes various political actions such as demonstrations, public announcements, and pamphleteering. Finally, social movements have conscious efforts to demonstrate worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment (called WUNC displays) (Tilly and Wood 2013, 4). White Ribbon Australia has all the elements required to be a social movement as determined by Tilly and Wood. White Ribbon Australia has been active for over a decade and consistently uses political actions to aid in primary prevention efforts.

White Ribbon Australia also depends on WUNC displays to identify Ambassadors and create a sense of solidarity. Before a man can become an Ambassador, he must prove his worthiness through a series of interviews, letters of recommendations, and an online test. Then if he is accepted, he is awarded a special white ribbon pin only given to Ambassadors that signifies his new position within the organisation and the community. The Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia often show unity by dressing in White Ribbon branded shirts emblazoned with ‘I Swear’ across the front or by wearing commitment bracelets. White Ribbon Australia also relies on numbers: one of the primary features of its website is a rolling tally of people who have publicly taken the pledge to ‘never to commit, excuse or remain
silent about violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2015c). Finally, Ambassadors must show commitment by taking the pledge above as well as go through a recommitment process to assure their engagement with the organisation. According to Tilly’s typology, White Ribbon Australia has all the hallmarks of being part of a social movement, and the Ambassadors embrace the same WUNC displays as the larger organisation. While it is clear that White Ribbon Australia is a social movement organisation, within the broader social movement to prevent violence against women, a more nuanced understanding of social movement theory is needed to analyse properly the Ambassadors themselves.

2.1.3 Social Movement Theory

Social movements are defined in part by people’s participation in-group or collective behaviour. Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) and Max Weber (1864–1920) framed social movements ‘in relation to social integration, as forms of behaviour associated with periods of societal transition’ (Eyerman 2006, 578). The work of Gustave Le Bon (1841–1931) on the psychology of crowd behaviour in The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind (1895) inspired others to understand the rational and social (as opposed to irrational and psychological) underpinning of group behaviour. Durkheim and Weber, building on the work of Marx, laid the theoretical grounding for the later framing of social movements as collective action and behaviour in the 1950s.

Herbert Blumer (1900–1987), building on the work of George Mead (1863–1931), attached social learning (i.e., new behaviours can be acquired through observation and imitation of other) to social movements in Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method (1969). During the 1960s, relative deprivation theory and value-added theory (strain theory) were the dominant social movement theoretical perspectives. Relative deprivation theory contends that social movements arise due to grievances from the ‘have-nots’ against the ‘haves’.

Value-added theory, developed by Neil Smelser (born 1930) in Theory of Collective Behavior (1962), determined that certain conditions are required for collective action to occur: structural conduciveness; structural strain; growth and spread of generalised belief; precipitating factors; mobilisation of participants for action; and the operation of social control (15–17). Later research specifically into
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6 As of 31/01/2015, 185,384 men have taken the pledge.
social movements debated now only how social movements begin but what is necessary for them to succeed.

2.1.3.1 Resource Mobilisation

Social movements can only occur if people have the minimum amount of resources to mobilize, a contention that social movement theory grappled with during the 1970s. This caused an expansion in social movement theory to understand not only why social movements arise but also why they succeed or fail. Resource mobilisation theory emerged, hypothesizing that the availability of resources was a necessary but not sufficient reason why movements occur. Additionally, for a social movement to be successful, it must effectively mobilise the resources at its disposal. That is whether resources are mobilised effectively by motivated and committed actors that are recruited through networks that share a collective identity.

In the social movement to end men’s violence against women, male activists are part of the movement and a key resource that must be effectively mobilised. White Ribbon Australia values activists not only as a resource to utilise in the movement to prevent men’s violence against women but to also promote the interests of the organisation. White Ribbon Australia and the activists use ‘repertoires of contention,’ and three types of ‘capital’, to prevent men’s violence against women. ‘Repertoires of contention’ refer to the ‘set of means ... [a social group] ... has for making claims of different types on different individuals’ (Tilly 1986, 2). Repertoires of contention are simply actions or tools a person, organisation, or social movement can use to achieve their goals at a certain time and place.

Each of the activists of White Ribbon Australia has different types of capital and levels of access. These different types of capital and access can be used to prevent men’s violence against women. Pierre Bourdieu developed a capital typology consisting of cultural, economic, and social capital throughout his work such as Distinction (1984) and The Forms of Capital (1986). These three types of capital require defining to be understand correctly through resource mobilisation theory. Capital in purely economic terms is money or assets available to an individual or group that can be used to further their interests; this is referred to as economic capital. Thus, Bourdieu’s typology is an attempt to explain how cultural and social markers can serve as forms of currency within the social order.
Cultural capital refers to the cultural distinctions that develop between socioeconomic groups due to differences in access to education, occupation, and wealth. For example, higher status groups often socialise their children in proper language usage, formal manners, and appreciation for high culture such as literature and theater. This cultural capital serves as a signifier of an individual’s standing within a community. Social capital consists of the social networks or connections that an individual has available to them due ‘to membership in a group’ (Bourdieu 1986, 88). An individual who is connected to other individuals or groups with large amounts of power and agency will be able to use this to their advantage. Though not a different type of capital, symbolic capital is ‘the form that the various species of capital assume when they are perceived and recognized as legitimate’ (Bourdieu 1989, 17). The three types of capital are not a useful resource if they do not have (symbolic) legitimacy and thus are valued within the social order. In simple terms economic capital is money and assets; cultural capital is ‘what you know,’ social capital is ‘whom you know,’ and symbolic capital is ‘why you are worth knowing’.

To understand how men become involved with White Ribbon Australia, the challenges they encounter, and how they overcome them, one must holistically analyse the symbiotic relationship between the organisation, the activists, and the social movement. One way to achieve this is by understanding how the combination of repertoires of contention and types of capital are mobilised as resources to prevent men’s violence against women. Furthermore, one needs to situate that analysis within the current economic and political environment in which the organisation, the activists, and the social movement find themselves. In doing so, it is possible to answer the questions of how men are recruited within the context of White Ribbon Australia.

2.1.3.1.1 Access to Resources

Initial formulations of resource mobilisation theory focused on resource availability and the mobilisation of material resources (Edwards and Gillham 2013, 1419). However, resource mobilisation theory has shifted from availability to access (Edwards and Gillham 2013, 1419). There are four mechanisms of resource access that are essential for a social movement organisation to succeed: aggregation, appropriation/co-optation, patronage, and self-production (Edwards and Gillham 2013, 1419). Aggregation refers to the various methods through which a social
movement organisation converts resources held by different individuals into collective resources that can be utilised by the organisation as a whole. While money is an obvious aggregatable resource, the social and cultural capital of the activists is also a valuable resource. The personal stories of men used in advertising, the unique skills of men across the swathe of socioeconomic statuses, and social networks are a few key resources that White Ribbon Australia can mobilise. However, questions remain, such as how the men feel their resources are aggregated. Are the allies overutilised or underutilised? How can White Ribbon Australia better aggregate these men and improve their efforts as agents of change?

Appropriation/co-optation is simply a mutually beneficial relationship between an existing organisation and a social movement organisation. For example, White Ribbon Australia works with several sports teams throughout Australia and with the Australian Army. Both groups mutually benefit from this arrangement. White Ribbon Australia helps prevent men’s violence against women through training and awareness raising and the engaged groups benefit from affiliation with the White Ribbon brand. Without appropriation/co-optation, it is arguable that White Ribbon Australia would be far less effective in preventing men’s violence against women.

Patronage is the ‘provision of resources to [a social movement organization] by an individual or organization that often specializes in patronage’ (Edwards and Gillham 2013). White Ribbon Australia applies for grants and asks for private donations as part of monetary patronage. In 2016, White Ribbon Australia’s revenue was $4,114,176, with 90 percent resourced from the community and 10 percent from Commonwealth and States governments (White Ribbon Australia 2017b). The largest source of funding was donations (27%) from a variety of sources including corporations, schools, community events, and individuals (White Ribbon Australia 2017b). The second largest sources of funding are merchandise sales and corporate sponsorships at 17 percent each. The men themselves are a source of patronage because they are often asked to donate to the organisation, and either put on fundraising events or attend them in the name of White Ribbon Australia. The Ambassador and Advocate programs required 10 percent of the funding budget in 2016 (White Ribbon Australia 2017b). This research will provide much-needed insight into the effects of fundraising and patronage on activists.
Self-production is the process by which a social movement organisation produces resources to attain its goal (Edwards and Gillham 2013, 1419). White Ribbon Australia produces activists and change agents by engaging them with the anti-men’s violence against women rhetoric and uses them to promote that message. Additionally, White Ribbon Australia uses men as social change agents to socialise their children and children at large with the moral authority of the anti-men’s violence against women message, thus continuing the cycle. Another aspect of self-production is the creation of symbols. The white ribbon is emblazoned on mugs, posters, t-shirts, and wristbands. White Ribbon Australia uses these items for the promotion of its message and to raise money. Perhaps most importantly, the Ambassador pin is a special white ribbon that separates the selected activists deemed worthy carriers of the message from the general public.

How activists are utilised shapes the success or failure of White Ribbon Australia in the short-term and long-term. Using resource mobilisation theory, one can examine how the activists are currently utilised. Do the activists feel they can be utilised more efficiently? What challenges have the activists encountered because of mismanaged utilisation? Do the activists see themselves as a resource or do they see White Ribbon Australia as the resource to be mobilised? Resource mobilisation is one of the primary lenses through which to understand the activists’ motivations and challenges in preventing men’s violence against women. However, resource mobilisation is missing a degree of contextualisation that can be found in new social movement theory.

2.1.3.2 New Social Movement Theory

In the 1960s and 1970s, social movement theory shifted to new social movement theory, which explored emerging social movements that did not have the same ‘motivation’ as traditional social movements. The intent of traditional, class-based social movements was to increase the economic and political power of the participants, often through revolution. The traditional class-based social movements have a long theoretical pedigree and are well accepted in social movement literature. In contrast to these, new social movements are mostly based on structural transformation (as opposed to revolution) and identity politics. For example, the civil rights and environmental movements of the 1950s and 1960s are new social movements.
There are different perspectives on what makes a social movement, a new social movement instead of a traditional social movement, however, there is largely consensus on the ‘core concepts and beliefs’ that differentiate the two (Pichardo 1997, 412). New social movements arise from a shift to a postindustrial economy, are markedly different from the working class social movements (i.e., labour movements) of the industrial age based on economic inequality, and focus on the post-materialist quality of life issues instead of the instrumental issues of industrialism (Pichardo 1997, 412). New social movement theory is the dominant lens currently used in social movement research, allowing for the study of macroexternalities and microinternalties. This approach permits the study of loosely related collective actions instead of the traditional social movements, based on proletarian revolution (Flynn 2011).

New social movement theorists in the 1960s and 1970s, determined via the study of actors (i.e., participants in an act or process) in the environmental, civil rights and feminist movements, found that affecting change required ‘identity-construction, structural change, and information control’ (Flynn 2011, 91). This seemingly axiomatic idea challenged existing theoretical approaches to social movements because many scholars had previously viewed only inequality between classes as the only ‘real’ source of oppression and activists working in other areas were ‘viewed as doing cultural or psychological, not political, work’ (Bernstein and Taylor 2013, 298).

2.1.3.2.1 Identity Politics and Identity Work

New social movement theory with a focus on individual experience and identity in social movements help give rise to the idea of ‘identity politics’. As a caveat, White Ribbon Australia’s mobilisation of ‘men as men’ is certainly not as strong an argument as classic examples of identity politics movements such as gay and lesbian movements or women’s movements. However, the role of masculinity and manhood is challenged by White Ribbon Australia both in training and in awareness raising campaigns but is not as central as other social movements.

The definition of identity politics is contested but for this research will be defined as ‘activism engaged in by status-based social movements organised around such categories as gender, race/ethnicity, and sexuality, in contrast to class-based movements’ (Bernstein and Taylor 2013, 298). With this definition in mind, is the
work now being done by White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassadors an example of identity politics? One of the ways identity politics utilisation occurs is ‘with the goal of altering the self-conceptions of participants and challenging negative representations of the group’ (Bernstein and Taylor 2013, 299). Through Ambassador training and giving voice to men, White Ribbon Australia tries to enact a change in the self-conceptions of some men from passive bystanders in ending violence against women to active bystanders (for a review of bystander literature see Storer, Casey, and Herrenkohl 2015) that challenge other men’s negative actions and are therefore challenging and shifting negative representations of men. The activists within White Ribbon Australia are men whom actively speak out about men’s violence toward women, and they use or ‘deploy’ that identity to assist in their activism.

Identity deployment is defined as ‘expressing identity such that the terrain of conflict becomes the individual person so that the values, categories, and practices of individuals become subject to debate’ (Bernstein 1997, 537-538). In essence, identity deployment is when an individual uses themselves as the example and becomes the topic of conversation, thus framing the issue through themselves. Bernstein (1997) contends that identity has three primary aspects that relate to social movements. First, a collective identity is required for mobilisation in all social movements, regardless of type. Second, expressions of identity when deployed collectively as a political strategy can be ‘aimed’ at cultural or political goals. Third, identity itself can be the objective of a social movement by gaining acceptance for an identity or deconstructing identities (Bernstein 1997, 536-539). The Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia have a collective identity as activists (even if this collective identity is not even acknowledged) preventing men’s violence against women, they ‘express’ their identity as men to achieve political goals, and foster the idea of men as activists for social change or change agents as normative by seeking acceptance for the identity.

Identity politics is used to demonstrate how the role of identity affects collective action and social movements (Bernstein and Taylor 2013). The primary question that identity politics can help answer include: is their identity as activist shaped primarily by their involvement with White Ribbon Australia or something else before becoming an Ambassador?
Identity, according to Snow and McAdam (2000, 41), ‘is a pivotal concept in attempting to understand [social] movement dynamics’. Snow and McAdam then list the myriad of research topics and academic citations related to identity as evidence such as collective identities, contested identities, and insurgent identities. However, what is identity? More specifically, what is collective identity? A collective identity is ‘an individual’s cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution’ (Polletta and Jasper 2001, 285).

An individual’s identity within social movements is collective but not fixed, it is fluid and relational, emerging through interactions with other individuals to categorise and explain the world (Polletta and Jasper 2001, 298). What the allies of White Ribbon Australia share or profess to share is an ideological commitment to stopping men’s violence against women. An male activist can join White Ribbon Australia without sharing many demographic characteristics with the other Ambassadors aside from being a man. In fact, White Ribbon Australia tries to elicit support across a broad swathe of demographic indicators. Furthermore, these activists do not have to like each other or even know each other.

Snow and Anderson define identity work as ‘the range of activities individuals engage in to create, present, and sustain personal identities that are congruent with and supportive of the self-concept’ (1987, 1348). The concept of identity work arose from Snow and Anderson’s research into how homeless people create and maintain a positive identity for themselves in conflict with labels attached to them by the public. However, this concept can be used within social movement theory to refer to all ‘work involved in creating, displaying, and managing the identities that are relevant to collective action’ (Einwohner 2013, 302). White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassadors are tasked to engage other men in preventing violence against women actively. Among the tools Ambassadors use in their collective action to prevent violence is their shared identity as men and as activists. However, identity politics and identity work raises a few questions. For example, preventing and critiquing men’s violence against women has long been associated with the women’s movement and feminist theorising. Do these men identify as feminist? Why or why not? (See 5.2.3, p. 60)
2.2 Engagement

Two key questions in this thesis are who the White Ribbon Ambassadors are, and what challenges they encountered. Understanding Ambassador engagement matters because the ‘rise and fall of campaigns at the macro-level is largely the result of the shifting involvement of individuals in and out of movement organisations at the micro-level’ (Corrigall-Brown 2013b, 1). Bert Klandermans in *The Social Psychology of Protest* (1997) outlines three stages of engagement in a social movement: initial engagement, sustained participation, and disengagement. Klandermans’ typology is nuanced as an individual can leave a social movement or social movement organisation and move to another one or return later; this process can repeatedly occur during the life-course (Corrigall-Brown 2013a, 214).

2.2.1 Recruitment: Initial Engagement

For a social movement to succeed, it must recruit motivated people to the cause, and a movement’s influence is largely dependent on the ability to recruit members (Barkan and Cohn 2013). Oft discussed in the social sciences is the ‘the free rider problem’ formulated by Mancur Olson in 1965 which opined that people have limited time and energy and must choose to use these limited resources how they will most benefit. Social movement theory research indicates that people ‘join social movements because they believe that the movement’s goals, if implemented, would yield significant benefits to themselves and/or to the attainment of values they cherish’ (Barkan and Cohn 2013, 1). Initial engagement is particularly in interesting because ‘little is known about the nature or effectiveness of the strategies employed to encourage men’s initial participation’ in anti-violence work (Casey 2010, 268) but efforts to explore this issue are increasing (i.e., Casey et al. 2017). Why then do the Ambassadors participate as agents of change in the larger social movement to prevent violence against women and White Ribbon Australia, in particular, is explored in section 5.2, p. 44.

2.2.2 Commitment: Sustained Participation

Several factors keep activists committed to a social movement. Klandermans (1997) also contends there are three primary components of commitment within a social movement: *affective, continuance, and normative*. Affective commitment refers to
the level of emotional attachment a person has to a social movement. Affective commitment forms when people receive material and non-material rewards for participation or through strong ties with other participants (Taylor 1989, Nepstad 2004) and social movement leaders (Barkan, Cohn, and Whitaker 1993).

Continuance commitment occurs when a cost is associated with leaving a movement that compels people to continue. Normative commitment is the moral obligation to continue within a movement because of ideological or religious reasons. How do White Ribbon Australia activists maintain their commitment?

Studies show that social movement participants will remain engaged, in part, if the leadership of the movement is considered legitimate and trustworthy, going as far as arranging their lives for the betterment of the movement (Nepstad 2013, 124-125). There are several ways social movement organisations can strengthen the commitment of their participants such as ‘rituals, narratives, and consciousness-raising discussions – that reinforce normative beliefs and commitment’ (Nepstad 2013, 125).

The identity of White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassadors is simple—men as agents of change to prevent men’s violence against women. White Ribbon Australia relies on a commitment to this identity for its Ambassadors. However, before a man can become an Ambassador, they must go through a series of tasks. First, they are nominated by another Ambassador or by themselves for consideration. Part of this process is acquiring letters of recommendation to attest to their character. Then they must undertake a screening process and complete several training modules. Upon completion, they are in a liminal state until their application is reviewed. Moving from the position of an applicant to Ambassador is a rite of passage, and when a man becomes an Ambassador, he displays this new identity in the form of a white metallic ribbon emblazoned with Ambassador in silver, and he has joined a collective movement. Ambassadors often lead others at White Ribbon Australia events in reciting the oath while wearing their special pin. Furthermore, White Ribbon Australia regularly interacts with Ambassadors at events, through email, and social media about issues related to men’s violence against women. The social relations between White Ribbon Australia and the activists themselves help maintain their commitment. How do the types of commitment differ between Ambassadors? Are their socioeconomic statuses or other demographic markers indicative of their
commitment? While commitment to a social movement is necessary, not all Ambassadors stay activists nor do all activists perform the same level of active engagement, and this can lead to disengagement.

2.2.3 Disengagement

Even if Klandermans’ triumvirate of commitment exists, commitment can waver, no matter if the social movement organisation actively attempts to strengthen its members’ commitment. Disengagement can happen due to a number of factors such as lack of self-care, limited available time to commit due to employment and family obligations, opposition by significant others (Aho 1994), and loss of ‘faith’ in a movement (Zald and Ash 1966), or disengaging from one social movement to engage in another (Cress, McPherson, and Rotolo 1997). Downton and Wehr (1991) argue that social relations are the key component of avoiding disengagement over time and can be fostered by ideology, leadership, organisation, rituals, or social relations.

2.2.4 Limitations of Social Movement Theory and Allyship

Social movement theory harkens back to the beginning of sociology and offers an effective lens to understand why men become involved as advocates to be agents of change and how they maintain their involvement. It is clear that men acting as agents of change are required to prevent men’s violence against women and that numerous men and organisations around the world are making a stand. However, for contextualisation one needs to look deeper into the social construction of the social order, feminism and allyship, and current scholarship in the field of Men and Masculinity.

2.3 Men as Allies in the Anti-Violence Against Women Social Movement

Engaging men as allies ‘is an increasingly core element of efforts to end violence against women’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 953). An ally is an individual with a privileged status that supports efforts to eliminate the systemic oppression that grants them greater power and privilege (Casey 2010, Edwards 2006, Meyers 2008, Munin and Speight 2010, Reason, Roosa Millar, and Scales 2005, Waters 2010). Men are becoming more active in existing anti-men’s violence against women organisations and are creating numerous additional organisations focused on ‘educating, engaging,
and mobilizing other men to take an active stand against sexual and intimate partner violence’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 953). However, ally is a contested term and still developing both theoretically (i.e., beyond the original use in social movement theory) and practically on the ground. White Ribbon Australia does not refer to Ambassadors as allies but challenges men to ‘stand up, speak out, and act to prevent men’s violence against women’ (White Ribbon Australia 2016). Thus, these men are activists and are engaging as agents of change. Men can be activists in preventing men’s violence against women in various ways. For example, men can actively speak out about men’s violence against women to bring awareness to the issue, or they can intervene when encountering men’s violence against women.

However, how do they become involved in social movements? The role of advocates as social justice agents has long been established (Broido 2000, 3), for example during the Civil Rights Movement in the United States (Parsons 2000, McAdam 1986, Murray 2004, Norris 1962). The term ‘ally’ did not come into common usage until the 1990s when it was used to describe heterosexuals that advocated for bisexual, gay, and lesbian issues (Broido 2000, 3). There is a small body of research that suggests that men as agents of change to prevent men’s violence against women developed in a parallel fashion to other social justice movements. Ally building models, typically developed for racism-related issues, show that multiple factors over time ‘shape an individual’s awareness of and commitment to rectifying social inequities’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 954). These models include opportunities to reflect and learn about social inequality (Broido 2000), as well as examining one’s personal identity; receiving invitations for participation in social networks; and becoming self-aware of unearned privilege (Reason, Roosa Millar, and Scales 2005, Funk 2008, Piccigallo, Lilley, and Miller 2012). As stated, White Ribbon Australia does not refer to the men in Ambassador program as allies nor did the research instruments but it important to unpack the term here as it is applicable from a social movement standpoint. Without more specific data on individual Ambassadors, which was not collected, a more accurate term would be an ‘activist’ who is attempting to stop violence against women and the work White Ribbon Australia is undertaking is engaging men as agents of change.
2.3.1 ‘How Can I Not?’

There have been several influential studies examining men’s involvement in anti-men’s violence against women work (Coulter 2003, DeKeseredy, Schwartz, and Alvi 2000, Fabiano et al. 2003, Funk 2008, Stein 2007). Perhaps the most revealing is by Erin Casey and Tyler Smith (2010). Casey and Smith identified three common themes that, based on prior mentioned research, were key elements of allyship (2010, 956). These themes were personal experiences with or prior exposure to domestic or sexual violence; encouragement from social networks to participate, specifically from women; and ‘employing a social justice analysis of violence that includes issues of racism and homophobia and that links violence against women to sexism’. Their findings were consistent with the ally-building models related to racism previously mentioned.

Casey and Smith, building on these findings, investigated men’s pathways to involvement in anti-men’s violence against women work. They interviewed twenty-seven self-selected men who had recently attended an event or had begun working with an organisation that was focused on preventing men’s violence against women. They wanted to know how the men became involved in anti-men’s violence against women work, and using Grounded Theory, they discovered three recurring themes among the participants: a sensitizing experience, an opportunity experience, and a shifting meaning (see Figure 1, p. 28).

A sensitizing experience is an instance where a participant is made ‘aware’ of men’s violence against women. The ‘most common sensitizing experience was hearing a disclosure of domestic or sexual violence from a close female friend, family member, or girlfriend or witnessing violence in childhood’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 959). An opportunity experience is a way to become actively involved such an invitation to join a group, a job/volunteer position, or through personal networks (Casey and Smith 2010, 960). Finally, shifting meaning involves being compelled to action, changing a worldview, or joining with others because men made meaning of their experiences in particular ways (Casey and Smith 2010, 960). It is important to note that different temporal relationships exist between a sensitizing experience, an opportunity experience, and a shifting meaning. Typically, a sensitizing experience does come first but not always. For example, a sensitizing experience such as hearing a personal story can lead to an opportunity experience because a participant sought
one out; a sensitizing experience such as learning about the extent of men’s violence against women can give rise to a shifting meaning when the participant has a ‘eureka’ moment that changes their perspective.

Figure 1: Casey and Smith’s Conceptual Model of Men’s Pathways to Antiviolence Involvement.

Casey and Smith’s conceptual model will be used for several reasons. First, Casey and Smith’s worked synthesised the prior scholarship of why men become allies to prevent violence against women to create an accessible model. Second, the conceptual model is arguably the best representation of temporal ally involvement available. Third, a fundamental aspect of Casey and Smith’s model is the ‘path’ to allyship. Typically, men have a sensitizing experience(s) that leads to an opportunity experience(s) and/or a shifting meaning(s) thus leading them to active anti-violence involvement. The question is not whether each individual within the White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassador program that responded to the survey or participated in an interview experienced this pathway but whether the aggregate of these men did. Additionally, this research will explore whether Casey and Smith’s model can be
tested using large-scale quantitative data. As such, Casey and Smith’s conceptual model served as the primary basis for selectable choices on the survey.

2.3.2 Feminism

There is no single theory of feminism or a definition of feminism that is accepted universally, leading to the plurality term *feminisms*, which better encapsulates the diversity of the concept. The origins of feminism are debated but often traced to the book *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) by Mary Wollstonecraft (1759–1797) which was written in response to *The Rights of Man* (1791) by Thomas Paine (1737–1809). Wollstonecraft’s work was consciousness-raising and inspired women to seek equal rights with men, particularly voting rights through the suffragist movement and access to education.

The history of feminism is typically expressed as *waves* or historical periods. First-wave feminism began in the Enlightenment and gained momentum in the mid-19th century, seeking voting rights and educational access for women in response to abolitionism and the temperance movement. Second-wave feminism was a radical revival of feminism in the 1960s and associated with the civil rights movement and antiwar movement leading to the women’s liberation movement and reforms in abortion and equal pay legislation and challenging the objectification of women through pornography. Third-wave feminism was a reaction to early feminism influenced by postmodernism and poststructuralism arising in the 1990s, recognising a plurality of experiences for women based on class, ethnicity, gender, location, and sexual identity. Third Wave feminism was critical of the existing feminist scholarship that focused primarily on white, affluent, and heterosexual women (Osborne 2001, Hannam 2007, Gamble 2001).

Feminism, the theoretical perspective contends that women are uniquely and systematically oppressed and should be studied through that lens; this point of view also challenges dominant ideas of gender and sex roles. Feminism covers a broad range of ideologies and political motives; the term seemingly defies simple definition. Numerous types exist, and an oft commented refrain is ‘there are

7 Brief list of recognised types of feminism: anarcho-feminism, black feminism, cultural feminism, ecofeminism, lesbian feminism, liberal feminism, Marxist feminism, revolutionary feminism, separatist feminism, transfeminism, and socialist feminism.
probably as many unique definitions of feminism as there are people who identify as feminists’ (Mackay 2015, 3). For this paper, feminism will be defined broadly as ‘a global, political movement for the liberation of women and society based on equality [and equity] for all people (Mackay 2015, 3).

To unpack the effect feminism has on the Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia, male support for the women’s movement must be explored. A pro-feminist\(^8\) man is any man who actively supports feminism while promoting sex and gender equity and equality such as by preventing men’s violence against women. Pro-feminists contend, ‘that gender and sexual equality are fundamental democratic goals and that women and men should have the same rights and opportunities’ (Okun 2014, 3).

Men supporting equal rights and equitable opportunities for women are not new. Men had also spoken out for equity and equality before the Seneca Falls Convention in the United States in 1848 signaled the beginning of an organised Women’s Movement. The organised Women’s Movement had vocal supporters. Notable men in the United States in the late 1800s such as Fredrick Douglas, Ralph Waldo Emerson, James Mott, and Henry David Thoreau all spoke out in varying degrees for women’s rights, particularly the right to vote (Kimmel 1997, 11-13). Floyd Dell would later write ‘Feminism for Men’ (1914) published in The Masses, a socialist magazine that ‘Feminism is going to make it possible for the first time for men to be free’.

However, it was not until the 1960s that men started to take a more active role. This new role was in response to second wave feminism, and male led groups began to emerge as well during this time. The first large-scale pro-feminist men’s movement began in the United States in the 1970s. This movement led to the creation of the National Organization for Changing Men, which would later become the National Organization for Men against Sexism (NOMAS). NOMAS began as a group of men as allies to women but broadened its focus over the years and ‘is pro-feminist, gay affirmative, anti-racist, dedicated to enhancing men’s lives, and committed to justice on a broad range of social issues including class, age, religion, and physical abilities’ (National Organization for Men against Sexism 2016).

------------------
\(^8\) This term is typically used in the adjective form.
Since then groups, that engage men as agents of change and public activist, began to grow exponentially in the United States such as RAVEN (1978); Oakland Men’s Project (1979); MOVE (1981); Mentors in Violence Prevention (1993); Men Can Stop Rape (1997); A Call to Men (2003) and Man Up (2010). During this time pro-feminist organisations grew globally in addition to the White Ribbon Campaign (1991), such as Promundo (1997) and Sonke Gender Justice Network (2006).

2.3.3 Men, Masculinity, and Scholarship

Understanding men engaged in anti-violence efforts require yet another lens to sharpen its focus. One cannot understand men’s violence against women or how men can actively try to prevent that violence without looking at men and masculinity itself through a critical lens. In 1975, a group of men from a women’s studies class from the University of Tennessee, in the United States, held ‘The First National Conference on Men and Masculinity’. Around the same time saw the development of Men and Masculinities scholarships in academic circles, particularly in North America.

However, the notion of studying men is ‘neither new or necessarily radical… men have been studying men for a long time, and calling it ‘History’, ‘Sociology. or whatever’ (Hearn 2004, 49). The emerging discipline was not unique because of what it studied but how, as it ‘examin[ed] men and masculinities as historically and culturally variable and as politically problematic’ (Flood et al. 2007, viii). Men before this had been unmarked, as men were considered the default; now men were problematized for study.

The notion of a plurality of masculinities came to prominence with the publication of Masculinities (1995) by R. W. Connell, who proposed the idea of plural masculinities (Aboim 2010, 5). Connell rejected the notion of a ‘singularity of masculinity’ by developing a framework which opened up ‘new possibilities for understanding it as a socially constructed multiplicity’ (Howson 2006, 2). This shift toward a plurality in conceptualisation is similar to other terms such as feminisms, identities, sexualities and of course, femininities.

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, the field was critiqued for its lack of critical scholarship and feminist lens. Yet, many scholars were actively attempting to collaborate with academic feminism through informed feminist scholarship and to
advocate for progressive change (Flood et al. 2007, viii). Many of these early scholars’ work provides the foundation for this research (e.g., Jackson Katz, Michael Kimmel, and Walter DeKeseredy) and even the origin of the White Ribbon Campaign, as Michael Kaufman was pro-feminist and a scholar during this time. The mid-90s saw an acceleration of men and masculinities as an academic discipline, which continues to this day. Several key factors illustrate this surge in scholarship, for example, increased numbers of academic journals such as *Men and Masculinities* (1998) and *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* (2000) and reference books such as *Men’s Lives* (1989); *The Masculinity Studies Reader* (2002); *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (2005) and *International Encyclopedia of Men and Masculinities* (2007).
3 SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM AND GENDERED UNDERSTANDING OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

3.1 Social Constructionism

This thesis adopts the social constructionist framework. Social constructionism is the theory that all reality and meaning is subjective and created through dynamic interactions with other individuals and groups. The theory was developed by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann in *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (1966). The social constructionist perspective maintains that individuals or groups and their differences are created or constructed through social processes (e.g., politics, religion, or economics) rather than an innate or essentialist quality within the individual or group. Furthermore, the categorisation of individuals into groups explains more about how society functions than about the individuals. A part of social constructionism is the social order, which is the customary social arrangement within a society.

3.2 Sex, Gender, and Femininity and Masculinity

Before continuing, it is important to define the difference between sex and gender. Sex in the simplest definition is the biological distinctions between females and males (i.e., genitalia or internal reproductive organs). Gender is the social and cultural meanings attached to the biological distinction between female and male. Gender appears as a natural extension of one’s sex because typically individuals are socialised to conform to gender expectations or codes of conduct indicative of their sex. This essentialist view normalises the notion that sex and gender are the same, but gender is informed by the body, but not reducible to the body. Additionally, gender structures society and intersects with other social structures such as class and ethnicity. Femininity and masculinity are the attributes and behaviours attached to being a woman or man. Femininity and masculinity only exist in contrast with each other and are normative; they compel women and men to act in a certain way and strive to embody an idealised version of womanliness and manliness. Gender and femininity/masculinity occur individually on the personal level and collectively at the institutional level. Sex, gender, and femininity/masculinity will be explored

3.3 Hegemonic Masculinity

Arising from a theoretically pro-feminist standpoint, perhaps the key concept in men and masculinities scholarship is ‘hegemonic masculinity’. The concept is much-debated within the field (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 830). The concept of ‘hegemonic masculinity’ rose out of research into social inequality within Australian high schools (Kessler et al. 1982), men in Australian labour politics (Connell 1982), and masculinity and men’s bodies (Connell 1983). These earlier works were synthesised in ‘Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity’ (Carrigan, Connell, and Lee 1985) and were combined ‘into a systematic sociology of gender’ (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 830) in Raewyn Connell’s influential work Gender and Power (1987). The term ‘hegemony’ is theoretically based on Antonio Gramsci’s (1891–1937) extrapolation of the Marxist construct of ‘cultural hegemony,’ which analyses the relationship between power and social order. Power is defined as the ability or capacity of an individual or group to control or influence people. Gramsci reasoned that authority within a society required both legitimacy and power. Thus, people must consent to the building and support of the principles espoused by those in power and willingly bend to their will. Connell took this conceptualisation of authority requiring legitimacy and power to explain the dominant cultural and societal narrative of what it means to be a man and why men are viewed as superior or ‘authoritative’ to women.

‘Hegemonic masculinity’ was originally conceived ‘as the form of masculinity in a given historical and society-wide setting that structures and legitimates hierarchical gender relations between men and women, between masculinity and femininity, and among men’ (Messerschmidt 2012, 58). However, Connell and James W. Messerschmidt reformulated the concept in 2005 to address criticisms of the concept, such as further explication of the gender hierarchy, geographically specific masculinity, social embodiment, and an increased awareness of the dynamic nature of masculinities. This reformulation can be defined as ‘the currently most honored way of being a man, it requires all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimates the global subordination
of women to men’ (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 832). However, what are the actual attributes of a hegemonically masculine male in Australia? Richard Howson claims the defining characteristics of hegemonic masculinity in the contemporary Western world are ‘whiteness, location in the middle class, heterosexuality, independence, rationality and educated, a competitive spirit, the desire and the ability to achieve, controlled and directed aggression, as well as mental and physical toughness’ (2006, 60).

This imagined hegemonic ideal is atop of a hierarchy of multiple masculinities or expressions of masculinity. The first type of masculinity is complicit masculinity which aspires to the hegemonic ideal but fails to achieve it and thus legitimises it, additionally, men benefit from the societal inequalities wrought by their complicity. The second type is subordinate masculinity which is in opposition to hegemonic masculinity such as expressing effeminacy or homosexuality. The third and final type is marginalised masculinity, which fails to attain hegemonic masculinity due to structural elements external to sex or gender such as age, class or ethnicity. Hegemonic masculinity is entrenched in social institutions such as the family and the state, which serve as socialisers to replicate the dominant understanding of what a man should be. However, hegemonic masculinity is not fixed; it changes over time and place, continuing to evade those that seek to reach it.

Hegemonic masculinity is coupled with emphasised femininity (originally termed hegemonic femininity) which is a form of femininity that is subordinate to men and adapted to the wants and needs of men. Hegemonic masculinity allows men to maintain their power over women because emphasised femininity has legitimacy in cultural, economic, political, and social arenas. Thus, men and women are complicit in their oppression, and this exemplifies how some men maintain their dominance over women and other men.

3.4 Doing Gender

The concept of ‘doing gender’ was developed by Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman in ‘Doing Gender’ (1987) and later expanded by West and Sarah Fenstermaker in ‘Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Social Inequality, Power, and Resistance’ (2002). ‘Doing gender’ is defined as ‘creating differences between girls and boys and women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or
biological. Once the differences have been constructed, they are used to reinforce the “essentialness” of gender’ (West and Zimmerman 1987, 137). Doing gender is thus understood as the everyday accomplishment of gender. Doing gender can legitimate ‘gender beliefs’ which are ‘universal depictions of women and men defined by a narrow set of features’ (Ridgeway and Correll 2004, 513). However, no woman or man is viewed as just their gender but an intersectional combination of characteristics such as class, ethnicity, and education. The dichotomised notions of women and men act as implicit rules that reinforce themselves because ‘[h]egemonic gender beliefs are institutionalized in the norms and structures of public settings and established private institutions such as the nuclear family’ (Ridgeway and Correll 2004, 517).

It is important to understand that doing gender by enacting gender beliefs is a socially constructed phenomenon that happens in a ‘social relational context’ and must be understood through this lens. A social relational context is ‘any situation in which individuals define themselves in relation to others in order to act’ (Ridgeway and Correll 2004, 511). Examples include attending a class or making a purchase. This concept is particularly important because of the fluid nature of sex and gender (and social movements). However, gender is not ‘natural’ or innate, as West et al. explain, one learns to do gender. Based on time and location, the performance of gender will change. Gender is created, reimagined, and recreated by a constant flux of change within social relational contexts that challenge and reify gendered beliefs.

The Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia are doing gender in a performative way by the mere fact the social movement organisation frames its work as men preventing men’s violence against women, thus as agents of change. The men are speaking out for others, in this case, women. These men are not speaking out against violence in general (but many do), but a particular type of violence—their own. The role of masculinity, sex/gender, and allyship is further explored in Section 5.3, 63.
4 METHOD

4.1 Overview
Drawing mostly on an online survey (n = 296) and complemented with in-depth interviews (n = 86), this case study uses mixed methods to explore the opinions and experiences of male activists in White Ribbon Australia that are part of the Ambassadors program. Through the combination of confidential interviews and an anonymous survey, the five primary research questions will be explored:

1. Who are the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors and why does it matter?
2. Why and how did the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors get involved with White Ribbon Australia?
3. How has their involvement as White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors changed their relationships with women and men?
4. What are the positive experiences of involvement as a White Ribbon Australia Ambassador?
5. What challenges have White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors encountered and how did they overcome these challenges?

4.2 Benefits of Research
This research directly benefitted participants by offering an opportunity to tell their stories and opinions; to know their ideas and contributions were valued. Their efforts may also lead to a greater understanding of anti-men’s violence against women specifically and efforts to engage men as agents of change in general. Participants were already motivated to assist White Ribbon Australia because they were Ambassadors; involvement in this research was an opportunity to expand that role. Additionally, this research offered an opportunity for participants to reflect on their time with White Ribbon Australia and in preventing men’s violence against women.

4.3 Ethical Considerations
There were several ethical concerns. First, because of the sensitive nature of men’s violence against women, there was a risk of discomfort. Participants were given a Participant Information Sheet outlining the research methods, and interviewees were given the opportunity to discuss any questions or concerns with the researchers. Participants were advised of potential risks associated with the research and informed that their involvement is entirely voluntary. Participants were also supplied with a list
of counseling and support services before completing the interview or survey, and
the researchers were available for aftercare.

The second set of ethical concerns involves privacy and confidentiality. All
interview participants were de-identified and referred to by pseudonyms, their
demographic details anonymised, and their data securely stored. Additionally, any
potentially identifying information from the anonymous survey was kept confidential
and presented only in an anonymised, aggregated form. Participants were assured
that no one, including White Ribbon Australia, could access the data, except for the
researchers. This research protocol was to assure no conflicts of interests arose, or
negative impacts occurred to the participants’ reputation, status, or credibility.

Finally, there was the possibility of unresolved violence (i.e., violence that is
current or was unreported) being disclosed. All participants were informed that all
unresolved violence would be reported to Crime Stoppers. The research procedure
was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of
Wollongong.

4.4 Participant Recruitment
Participant sampling was based on men now involved with White Ribbon Australia’s
Ambassador Program, all of whom were above the age of eighteen. All current
members of the Ambassador program were approached for inclusion and these men
self-selected to participate. The researchers were not provided with a sampling frame
by White Ribbon Australia. Instead, potential participants were contacted by White
Ribbon Australia via email to self-select for participation in the survey and
interviews.

An initial set of pilot interviews was conducted in early 2015 to refine the
research instruments. These participants were initially contacted directly by White
Ribbon Australia’s staff on behalf of the researchers and given a Participant
Information Sheet. Additionally, some participants gave the researchers’ contact
information to other potential participants who then contacted the researchers. Thus,
the participants themselves make initial contact with the researchers, and no personal
information beyond basic contact information was made available to the researchers
before completing a Consent Form.

After six months of data collection, the research instrument was refined, by
adding additional questions about changes in relationships due to their involvement
and resource mobilisation between Ambassadors and the corporate office. After these adjustments, other participants were recruited by an email sent by White Ribbon Australia’s staff to all the current Ambassadors. The email included a link to an anonymous online, quantitative survey and contact information for the researcher, with an invitation to take part in a follow-up interview. After the survey, survey respondents had the choice to leave their contact information so the researcher could set up a follow-up interview. The survey data and contact information were not connected to maintain the anonymity of the survey. A reminder email was sent to all potential participants a month later.

4.5 Data Collection

The primary reason to use interviews and a survey was the complementary nature of both methods. The interviews provided a rich source of lived experiences through narrative, however not all Ambassador had the time or desire to take part in an interview. There is little demographic data on men engaged in anti-violence efforts in Australia. Because of the national reach of White Ribbon Australia, this project created a useful profile of men engaging in activism across the country. The demographic data collected include age, occupation, ethnicity, religion, postcode, and political affiliation. By comparing responses across demographic markers, trends that would not be found through interviews will emerge. The combination of interviews and a survey provided an excellent insight into the experiences of individual activists and as a group. Thus, the survey serves two purposes, as a complement to the interviews and as a unique data collection source in itself.

4.5.1 Interviews

All interview participants (n = 86) completed a single interview either in person or over the phone in English. Interviews ranged from fifteen minutes to three hours in length, the mean being fifty-five minutes in length. The interviews were semistructured building on previous work (e.g., Messner, Greenberg, and Peretz 2015, Casey and Smith 2010), with broad questions related to White Ribbon Australia and general questions about their anti-violence work. The semistructured interview method allowed participants to express what they feel is relevant and to have control over the direction of the interview. (Please see Appendix C, p. 116 for the Semi-Structured Interview Schedule.)
4.5.2 Survey

An anonymous online survey was conducted using Survey Monkey. Respondents were recruited for this via an email from White Ribbon Australia. The respondents were not required to answer any questions on the survey. The survey consisted of closed, multiple-choice questions and open questions. The survey was developed via a literature review of prior research (e.g., Kimball et al. 2013, Flood 2010, Fabiano et al. 2003) and particularly larger cohort studies (e.g., Casey et al. 2013, Carlson et al. 2015), Australian Bureau of Statistics data, consultation with White Ribbon Australia, and refined by through pilot interviews. Additionally, most closed questions included an option to include an ‘other’ response to mitigate researcher bias and to be more indicative of participants’ authentic experiences (Please see Appendix D, p. 119 for the survey).

4.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis occurred concurrently with the quantitative data and qualitative data. All interviews were recorded digitally, de-identified, and transcribed. Content analysis was used to create content categories based on explicit rules of coding (Weber 1990) and inspection of the data for recurrent instances (Wilkinson 2011). Survey results were analysed using SPSS software with open-ended responses recoded using grounded theory. Due to the complexity of the project, another researcher, Claire E. Seaman from the University of Wollongong, reviewed the themes and survey data to assure trustworthiness and minor adjustments to the coding framework were made.

4.7 Research Outcomes

The results of the complementary Process Evaluation Research Report (see Appendix F, p. 164) have been sent to all Ambassadors in August of 2016 and posted on White Ribbon Australia’s website. Additionally, the research has been presented to Ambassadors in Adelaide, Benalla, Brisbane, and Melbourne with more events now being planned. There was an Internal Report given to White Ribbon Australia that exhaustively discussed Ambassador feedback and made recommendations on the future direction of the program.
5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To contextualise the results and frame the discussion, particularly in a case study, one must situate these answers in a particular place in time and reference to the demographic profile of respondents (survey takers). Thus, who are the White Ribbon Ambassadors and why does it matter?

5.1 Respondent Demographic Profile

This demographic data is taken entirely from the survey that had 296 valid responses (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.3, p. 155) and includes information and analysis from an unpublished Internal White Ribbon Report (2016) completed in concert with Claire E. Seaman (see Appendix F, p. 164 for more information). For the ease of the reader, any information or analysis from the internal report is marked with an asterisk (*). When possible the survey responses are compared to men in Australia between aged 18–80 based on data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.5, p. 156).

5.1.1 Age and Location

The Ambassadors are significantly older on average than the general population of men in Australia aged 18–80 (M = 44.76) as well as men in Australia who volunteer aged 18–80 (M = 47.02)*. The mean age of respondents was 50.6 years is (M = 50.6) (see Figure 2, p. 35). Postcode information was used to classify state location and remoteness (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.10, p. 158)*. Respondents from all Australian states took part, with a higher proportion in New South Wales and Victoria (see Figure 3, p. 35) *. Of the sample population, 62.2 percent of the respondents live in a City, 22.6 percent in an Inner Regional area, and 15.2 percent live in an Outer Regional, Remote area, or Very Remote area*. As seen in Figure 4, p. 36, this distribution is similar to the male population in Australia as a whole, but Ambassadors are slightly less likely to come from City areas than surveyed Ambassadors*.
Figure 2: Respondent Age Categories

- Under 30: 4.1%
- 30s: 10.8%
- 40s: 25.8%
- 50s: 40.3%
- 60 plus: 19.0%

Figure 3: Respondent State Location

- ACT: 10.8%
- NSW: 26.7%
- VIC: 30.1%
- QLD: 5.7%
- SA: 15.9%
- WA: 6.4%
- TAS: 2.7%
- NT: 1.7%
5.1.2 Relationships and Children

Overwhelmingly, the sampled Ambassadors identified as heterosexual (95.3 percent), with only 4.7 percent identifying as gay or bisexual or choosing another non-heterosexual identifier. Most Ambassadors reported being married (77.4 percent) or in a relationship (12.8 percent). Only 4.7 percent reported being single or widowed, while 5.1 percent indicated they were separated or divorced (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.12, p. 158). This finding is significant because as seen in Figure 5, p. 36, Ambassadors are much more likely to be married (77.4 percent) than males in Australia (52.1 percent)*. A majority of the respondents have children (84.1 percent) with 47 percent having daughters and sons, 17.9 percent have only daughters, and 19.3 percent have only sons (see Figure 6, p. 38).

Figure 5: Relationship Status: Ambassadors and Males in Australia (Fixed choice, Single response) *For confidentiality, some responses were aggregated, see
Statistical Analysis Note: 12.12, p. 158 for more information and no national data was available for ‘In relationship (other)’.
5.1.3 Country of Origin, Language, and Religiosity

White Ribbon Ambassadors are more likely than average men in Australian to have no religious affiliation. Most of the respondents (80.7 percent) were born in Australia and those that were not primarily come from the United Kingdom (10.8 percent). Almost all surveyed Ambassadors (96.6 percent) primarily speak English in the home. In comparison, 71.6 percent of males in Australia were born in Australia*. A little over half of respondents (54.4 percent) identify with a religious group, of those that do, 44.6 percent are Christian (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.16, p. 159). Most of the non-Christian survey respondents identified as ‘spiritual’ and Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism were each indicated more than once. However, 44.3 percent of survey respondents indicated no religious affiliation. This finding is notable because in the broader male Australian population, aged 18–80, only 26.1 percent indicated no religion*.

---

*Note: Data percentages rounded to one decimal place.
5.1.4 Political Affiliation

In Australia, people are sometimes referred to as being politically on the left or right, where reductively ‘left’ indicates socially progressive and ‘right’ indicates socially conservative. Respondents were asked to locate themselves on the political spectrum or state ‘cannot choose’. The respondents indicated a broad range of position but were primarily centric to left leaning; no respondent reported that they are entirely right leaning. The political affiliations of the respondents were varied but are mainly Australian Labour Part (32.4 percent) and Liberal Labour Party (29.4 percent). Additionally, 23.6 percent indicated they had no party affiliation.

Figure 7: Respondent Location across the Left/Right Political Spectrum (Fixed choice, Single response)
5.1.5 Education, Employment, and Income

Surveyed Ambassadors are significantly more highly educated than other males in Australia, as 67.2 percent have a Bachelor degree or higher qualification as opposed to 14.8 percent in the general population*. Almost all (90.5 percent) Ambassadors surveyed indicated they were employed in paid work; in contrast, only 71.6 percent of males in Australia reported being employed, including 55.2 percent employed full-time, and 12.2 percent part-time*.

Respondents indicated they were primarily employed in ‘white collar work’ when asked to specify their occupation from an extensive list. Based on the pattern of responses, occupations were grouped into common key categories (see Figure 10, p. 41) *. The categories were further coded, where possible, into ‘industry type’, using definitions from the ABS (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.18, p. 160). Close to two-thirds of the surveyed Ambassadors (63.5 percent) are employed in paid work that can be categorized as ‘white-collar’ work and very few in ‘blue-collar’ occupations (2 percent)*. The respondents primarily work in Government (15.6 percent), Law Enforcement (13.6 percent), and in Health and Wellness (12.5 percent) *.

Survey respondents were asked for their gross annual revenue by income categories with a ‘per week’ breakdown (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.19, p. 160). The Ambassadors are distinctly different to the average male population in Australia (see Figure 11, p. 42)*. The majority of Ambassadors surveyed (57.1 percent) earned over $2000 per week, which is more than triple (17.8%) the weekly earnings among the broader Australian male population. Because a majority of
Ambassadors are currently in full-time work, comparisons were made between Ambassador income and the income of the average male full-time worker in Australia, aged 18-80 (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.19.1, p. 161)*.

Figure 9: Employment Status: Ambassadors and Males in Australia (Fixed choice, Single response)

Figure 10: Respondent Current or Last Occupational Category (Fixed choice, Single response)
5.1.6 Respondent Demographics Review

All research must be properly situated in a place and time, but this is particularly important in a case study method. The research shows who the surveyed Ambassadors are in comparison to males in Australia. The surveyed Ambassadors are older and more likely to be in white-collar than blue-collar occupations. While they are geographically dispersed as compared to the general population of males in Australia, they differ from the broader population because they earn more and are significantly higher educated. Economic advantages allow Ambassadors to provide patronage (see 2.1.3.1.1, p. 17) to the organisation (but the research does not indicate that they will). The economic and educational advantage also manifests itself in social capital and cultural capital accumulation, which also aligns with the current construction of hegemonic masculinity in Australia. Thus, these men have significant resources at their disposal to use. Additionally, Ambassadors surveyed are more likely than other men in Australia to be married and have children. This finding suggests that men in Australia are more likely to become formally involved in White Ribbon Australia if they are married or have children. Finally, Ambassadors identify overwhelmingly as heterosexual which further indicates a lack of diversity.

The demographic profile indicates a dearth of diversity within the Ambassador program. However, the lack of diversity can be explained by the origins
of White Ribbon Australia reaching out to prominent men in the business, government, politics, and sports to raise awareness. Nearly half of the surveyed Ambassadors (43.9 percent), learned about White Ribbon Australia at their workplace or during a specific White Ribbon Australia’s Workplace Accreditation Program events (see 5.2, p. 44 for further analysis on this pathway) and thus far, the program seems to have focused primarily on white-collar organisations. Additionally, over a third of the surveyed Ambassadors come from Government (15.6 percent) and Law Enforcement (13.6 percent) which are often accredited workplaces. Thus, the first Ambassadors nominated acquaintances as Ambassadors, and since homophily is typical (Smith, McPherson, and Smith-Lovin 2014) in social networks, the lack of diversity reified itself overtime.

Diversity is an issue as one cannot fully engage men in preventing violence against women without engaging across a broad swathe of socio-economic groups. Additionally, the lack of research on engaging diverse men has only recently been addressed (Peretz 2017). The Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia are intended to be representative of the broader social movement to prevent violence against women in an increasingly multi-cultural country. Thus, if White Ribbon Australia is not using a diverse group of men as its formal representatives in its media messaging or local events, then it is not reaching as many men with its message as possible. Additionally, research suggests that anti-violence engagement is shaped by intersectional identities, not just by self-identification as men (Peretz 2017). Therefore, more diversity in the Ambassador program would decrease homophilic effects and perhaps increase engagement efforts within different communities.

However, White Ribbon Australia is taking strides to correct this imbalance in the Ambassador Program, and organisationally through the White Ribbon Diversity Program. For example, White Ribbon Australia’s website now has translated fact sheets in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Swahili, and Vietnamese and a video with Ambassadors and White Ribbon Australia staff reciting the White Ribbon Australia’s Oath9 in languages other than English (e.g., German, Cantonese, and Tagalog). Additionally, potential Ambassadors from diverse backgrounds are actively being sought by the organisation and prioritised in outreach efforts.

---

9 I will stand up, speak out and act to prevent men’s violence against women. This is my Oath.
5.2 Why and how did the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors get involved with White Ribbon Australia?

Why are the Ambassadors motivated to become formal representative of White Ribbon Australia to stop men’s violence against women? A man does not need to be an Ambassador to be an agent of change or to actively speak out and stand up against men’s violence against women. In the survey, Ambassadors were asked several questions to gain insight into the pathways that lead to formal involvement as a White Ribbon Australia Ambassador. For the first question, Ambassadors were asked to indicate how they initially heard about the organisation (see Figure 12 below).

Surveyed Ambassadors primarily heard about White Ribbon Australia through their workplace or the White Ribbon Australia Workplace Accreditation program (43.9 percent), a community event (13.5 percent), community club or organisation (7.1 percent), or friends (6.4 percent). The large proportion of Ambassadors who initially heard about White Ribbon Australia through the workplace or the Workplace Accreditation Program should be interpreted with caution. It likely reflects the breadth of this program in Australia, but may also be attributable to the survey method and the potential clustering of Ambassador survey responses by workplace*.
Figure 12: How did you initially hear about White Ribbon Australia? (Fixed choice, Multiple response, Other imputed)

Ambassadors were asked whether they had been previously involved in preventing violence against women before working with White Ribbon Australia. This survey question was open-ended, and responses were coded into key themes (see Figure 13, p. 46). These themes broadly categorise the nature of their earlier involvement as being either formal or informal, and as either through direct prevention efforts, exposure to prevention efforts or through indirect prevention efforts (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.26, p. 162)*. Close to 60% had been involved previously in anti-violence work, with nearly a fifth (17.9 percent) formally involved in preventing men’s violence against women in a direct, highly focused capacity and another 17.2 percent formally involved in work with direct exposure to violence against women or
prevention efforts. Whilst the data indicates that yes, over half of surveyed Ambassador were formally involved in anti-violence efforts before joining White Ribbon Australia, a lack of formal involvement is not a limitation to involvement as just over 40.9 percent are not previously involved.

Figure 13: Prior Involvement Preventing Men’s Violence against Women (Fixed response, Yes response allowed for elaboration)

5.2.1 Motivations for White Ribbon Australia Involvement, Survey Results

An additional survey question regarding pathways to formal involvement asked Ambassadors to indicate the reason(s) why they became involved with White Ribbon Australia, with participants choosing from among a set list. Top motivations to join White Ribbon Australia include; moral obligation (69.6 percent), hearing stories related to men’s violence against women (53.7 percent), and learning statistics about
men’s violence against women (43.2 percent), while the primary indicated motivation was to make a difference in their community (75.7 percent). Participants’ responses to the open-ended survey questions corroborate these findings. For example, two survey respondents added contrasting views on making a difference in their community. One survey respondent wants to use his ‘leadership position as CEO to make a difference [in] my organisation and as a role model for the community’ and another states he works as an Ambassador for ‘the love of my sisters and women in my Aboriginal community.’ One survey respondent eloquently stated his moral obligation existed because ‘violence against women is abhorrent and a most heinous breach of their human rights; so serious in fact that I could not, nor can, do nothing.’ Learning statistics is a key motivator for Ambassadors (43.2 percent), this sentiment was echoed by one survey respondent who stated ‘as a father of two young daughters I was horrified by the statistics of violence against women in our community and internationally. I wanted to lend my support and to try and change attitudes so that all women were able to live in a community free from violence.’

A third (33.4 percent) of survey respondents indicated that violence committed against someone they knew was a motivator. A similar number of Ambassadors were influenced or invited by women (24.0 percent) to join as by men (27.7 percent). One survey respondent said ‘I was proposed as an Ambassador by some female staff at my school. I have never sought formal permission or approval for the work that I do at the margins of my profession ... [and] ... having been accepted, I wear the Ambassador’s badge proudly on a daily basis.’ While women and men both influence men to participate, politically ‘right’ Ambassadors were less likely (.53 times) to be influenced or invited by women to join White Ribbon Australia as other Ambassadors*. While almost a quarter (23.0 percent) of Ambassadors indicated they were invited directly by White Ribbon Australia to join, two groups were more likely to indicate this response: Ambassadors involved for more than three-and-half years (2.02 times as likely) and Ambassadors with a personal income of $2000 or more per week (1.68 times)*.

Over a tenth of respondents indicate using the White Ribbon Australia ‘name’ as a resource (12.2 percent), as well as for profile building within their profession (11.5 percent). Two groups of Ambassadors are more likely to indicate this response, the combined Ambassadors in Healthcare and Medical, Mental Health, Social Work
or Counselling and Charity Third Sector occupations (4.01 times) and Ambassadors with daughters only (2.59 times)*. Just under a tenth (7.8 percent) of Ambassadors indicated that networking opportunities were a reason they joined White Ribbon Australia. These three findings are indications of resource mobilisation by the Ambassadors, with White Ribbon Australia as the resource. This finding indicates a mutually beneficial relationship between White Ribbon Australia, the organisation and the Ambassadors. However, Ambassadors involved for over three-and-half years, and feminist-identifying were more likely (3.38 and 2.55 times, respectively) to indicate this response*.
Figure 14: Reasons for Involvement with White Ribbon Australia (Fixed choice, Multiple response)
5.2.2 Exploring Casey and Smith’s Conceptual Model

Participants in the interviews gave responses which echoed those captured in the survey when asked why they joined White Ribbon Australia. Often during interviews, participants were taken aback with the question, intimating ‘how could they not be involved?’ or similar refrains. This sentiment was consistent with Casey and Smith’s findings (2010). Casey and Smith determined that ‘men’s engagement is a process that occurs over time, that happens largely through existing social networks, and that is influenced by exposure to sensitizing experiences, tangible involvement opportunities and specific types of meaning making related to violence’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 953). Casey and Smith divided their conception model into three themes, which make men engage as anti-violence allies: a sensitizing experience, an opportunity experience, and shifting meaning.

The key aspect of the Casey and Smith’s conceptual framework (see Figure 1, p. 28) is that ‘the impact of a sensitizing or opportunity experience or the particular ways men made sense of it, constituted the motivating factor that allowed men to take or seek an opportunity to get involved’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 959). Thus, the question is whether Casey and Smith’s conceptual model is analogous to the aggregated survey data and are the various pathways (individual-based) to anti-violence involvement found within a case study (group-based) of White Ribbon Australia (a social movement organisation) and how are they created or can be created and fostered (to further the movement of preventing violence against women)?

5.2.2.1 Sensitizing Experience

Casey and Smith define a sensitizing experience as a ‘previous experience that rendered the issue of violence against women more salient or visible ... [that] ... may have made the issue of violence more important or “real”’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 959). Casey and Smith found five types of sensitizing experiences: disclosure/witness; social justice consciousness; learning opportunity; hearing stories; influenced by women (Casey and Smith 2010, 960). The survey respondents and interview participants echoed all of Casey and Smith’s sensitizing experiences,

---

10 Casey and Smith use the phrases “anti-violence against women work” or preventing “violence against women. This paper specifically refers to men actively speaking out against men’s violence against women as this is the focus of WRA.
and these experiences will be discussed below. Additionally, Casey and Smith found most of their participants experienced more than one sensitizing experience that made the issue of violence against women more real to them (2010, p. 959).

Casey and Smith found the most common sensitizing experience was ‘disclosure of domestic or sexual violence from a close female friend, family member, or girlfriend or witnessing violence in childhood’ (Casey and Smith 2010, p. 960). When asked, ‘Why did you become involved in White Ribbon Australia?’ respondents indicated three key sensitizing experiences, ‘domestic or sexual violence committed against someone you know’ (33.4 percent); ‘domestic or sexual violence committed by someone you know’ (15.9 percent); and ‘domestic or sexual violence committed against you’ (6.8 percent)\(^\text{11}\). Interview participants had a range of experiences of violence in their lives. Gordon (59, NT, Architect)\(^\text{12}\) said that his motivation for participation began during his younger years working security in ‘hotels, clubs, city night clubs, and things’. Gordon had many female friends who worked in places ‘that weren’t considered all that socially correct, but they were nice people’. Gordon continued that the female friends he knew, didn’t deserve to be treated like that. They used to get beat up all that time. I used to get fed up with a lot of them, and I always thought ... I knew it was wrong and I would try to stop it wherever I could but they’d come into work beaten up and it’s just not good, but it was just ... those days, back in the sixties and early seventies people just accepted that this went with the job.

Gordon was sensitized to the issue by experiences of violence against women in his ‘younger days’, and these experiences would later drive him to become part of White Ribbon Australia. Leonard (43, NSW, Engineer), felt a moral obligation to join White Ribbon Australia after becoming aware of the scope of men’s violence against women after a divorce, and when he starting dating again and ‘realised there’s a lot of women out there with very, very bad stories about men’ and he wanted ‘to try and be part of the solution.’ Gordon and Leonard’s experiences were about violence perpetrated against people they knew within their social circles. Several interview participants shared stories about domestic or sexual violence committed directly by someone they knew. For example, Chad’s (60, WA, Finance) daughter was murdered by her former partner who ‘stalked her, hunted her and found her, and when she

\(^\text{11}\) It is important to note that 1.4 percent of respondents indicated that “domestic or sexual violence committed by you” was a reason to they sought to join WRA.

\(^\text{12}\) All names assigned by a random name generator to protect the confidentiality of participants.
refused to comply with his wishes he attacked her’. Chad said he became involved with White Ribbon Australia ‘to lend my voice to a cause and to try and raise the profile of the notion of preventing or stopping men’s violence against women’. Chad also remarked that before his daughter’s death he ‘was just like 90 percent of other people in the world you know ... it doesn’t happen in my street, doesn’t happen in my town, doesn’t happen in my family ... it’s not any different than any other traumatic events in a person’s life’. Chad’s story is similar to Marcus’ (35, Queensland, Sales) whose partner was murdered by her previous partner, and he became aware of White Ribbon Australia because of that incident. Marcus said he got involved, so ‘other women didn’t suffer the same way my partner did’. It is important to note, however, that violence perpetrated against the surveyed Ambassadors (6.8 percent) is also a motivating factor to join White Ribbon Australia.

Marcus and Chad experienced violence against their loved one at the hands of people they knew. These experiences sensitized them to the issue of men’s violence against women. These four men experienced violence directed toward people they knew or by people they knew. However, some people experienced violence directly and sensitized because of it.

Several interview participants experienced violence directly perpetrated against them; exposure to violence committed against their mothers; or other family members that led to them becoming sensitized to men’s violence against women and thus joining White Ribbon Australia. Cory (63, NSW, Social Work) said, ‘I think that I grew up in a home where my father was quite controlling. So, even though the abuse was not physical. I come to realize in my adult life that there was a lot of emotional abuse going on in my childhood.’ Cory’s words are a common refrain among interview participants. Curtis (48, WA, Psychologist) said, ‘My dad’s an alcoholic, but I have seen him be very abusive when he is drunk, only when he’s drunk other times he’s been fantastic. I have seen that type of emotional and psychological abuse growing up.’ Stanley (50, WA, Union Representative) shared his story: ‘Well, my father’s a recovered alcoholic, recovering alcoholic. And in 1980, one night he very severely bashed my mum in my presence. He broke her nose; he pulled a gun on her. It was a nasty experience.’ Alvin (32, Victoria, Construction) said,

I was raised in a very violent home. It got to the point where we had to flee our house. There was myself with my sisters, and my mom and my father
threatened to kill us all, so we had to flee our house. A year after we fled the house my dad actually tracked us down, and he actually murdered my mom. Cory, Curtis, Stanley, and Alvin all experienced violence in their own life and this sensitized them to the issue of men’s violence against women. Their experiences lead them to join White Ribbon Australia and perhaps toward a path of social justice consciousness.

Another sensitizing experience is a social justice consciousness, which is a pre-existing or an ‘egalitarian value system’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 959). Several survey respondents indicated having a social justice consciousness in the open response option. For example, Randall (51, Community Organiser, Western Australia) said ‘I joined White Ribbon when the issue of family violence wasn’t on the front page as it is now. Part of it was I had three sisters, so I’m the youngest son. I married into a family of women ... So my background I guess is social justice already any anyway, I’ve been fairly passionate about social justice issues and worked with street kids.’ Alfred (45, NSW, Government Worker) had similar thoughts on why he became involved with White Ribbon Australia. Alfred said he always had,

a fairly strong social justice streak in me right from the start, I guess I always wanted to see equality and fairness and justice, as long as I can remember ... I sort of saw equality as a key platform for everyone. I guess I took that maybe from my parents but I saw it as an essential requirement for community living.

Jerome (54, Teacher, Victoria) said he became a part of White Ribbon Australia to ‘create awareness about the significance of family and domestic violence. That it’s a significant issue in society; it’s not class-based, it’s across all socioeconomic levels, it’s particularly an issue in our Aboriginal and indigenous populations. I have very strong social justice beliefs.’ Interview participants Alfred, Ralph, Jerome and a survey respondent each had a ‘preexisting social justice consciousness or egalitarian value system’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 959).

One of the key learning experiences of the respondents was learning statistics about men’s violence against women, which 43.1 percent of survey respondents indicated as a reason for participation and another possible sensitizing

---

13 A direct question related to a social justice mindset was not asked, but the open response option allowed for elaboration.
experience is a learning opportunity. This survey finding is echoed in the interviews. For example, Philip (34, Personal Trainer, Tasmania) commented,

The statistics on the [White Ribbon Australia] website were horrifying to me. It’s something that struck a chord with me. My mother was a victim of domestic violence. Her story always rang a cord with me. But, I also sort of thought ‘I just want… I don’t want my beautiful wife involved in that at all, ever.’ She is one of four women in her family. She has got three other sisters. Statistics said one in four. I sorta thought I don’t want any of my sister-in-laws involved in anything like that. I don’t want my daughter growing up in a world where that seen to be okay.

Philip experienced a learning opportunity after reading statistics on White Ribbon Australia’s website related to violence against women. However, Philip’s ‘learning opportunity’ was coupled with the knowledge of his mother’s experience as a victim of domestic violence.

Philip had another sensitizing experience identified in Casey and Smith’s model, which is hearing stories from violence survivors. A majority of respondents (53.7 percent) indicated that having heard stories related to men’s violence against women was a reason for their involvement. Another interview participant, Rodney (65, Restaurateur, Tasmania), told the story that led him to commit to working to prevent men’s violence against women after he had researched violence against women and White Ribbon Australia.

I was over in Malaysia ... there was a case of a father, who had left his wife, he came back and he poured acid on his wife [Cheong Swee Lin, 50 years-old] and his daughter [Tan Hui Linn, 17 years-old14], all over both, asleep in bed. And the young daughter almost lost her eyes. And what caught my attention was, that this daughter was doing an equivalent of a high school certificate exam, and despite her injury, she vowed that she was going to complete the test.

Rodney uses that story when he speaks as an Ambassador for White Ribbon Australia. However, he continues, ‘I hear you say it, what happens in those countries [is horrible], well, let me tell you another story about a woman called Donna Carson’. Rodney is referring to Donna Carson, Australia’s Local Hero of the Year in 2004. Carson is a survivor of domestic violence; in 1994, her then partner doused her with petrol and lit her on fire. Carson spent six months in a hospital burns unit and another fifteen months in rehabilitation. Carson then became a volunteer advocate for victims of violent crime and spoke at White Ribbon Australia events. Interview

14 Tan Hui survived and continued on to university.
participant Gavin (48, Diversity Officer, Western Australia) heard stories of violence toward women from a ‘family friend’ who was part of a ‘high profile murder’ and it was through conversations with her that ‘basically sowed the seed that a heterosexual male, influential male within a male dominated workplace’ should get involved in anti-violence work. Philip, Rodney, and Gavin were each influenced by stories of violence that led them to White Ribbon Australia. However, Philip’s story like many interview participants had aspects of several types of sensitizing experiences within Casey and Smith’s conceptual model. For example, Philip heard stories of violence survivors, but specifically concerning his mother.

The final sensitizing experience is being in close relationships with and influenced by women. Survey respondents and interview participants had a lot to say about women in their lives. From partners to sisters and mothers, to coworkers and friends, and daughters—men were affected by the women in their life. For example, 23.4 percent of survey respondents were ‘influenced or invited by women to join [White Ribbon Australia]’. Interview participants echoed the sentiment, such as Alton (60, Professor, New South Wales), who said, ‘my mother was a senator ... and outspoken about issues ... and because of the family links [to violent relatives] it sort of inspired me to become involved’. Jay was strongly influenced by women due to his parents being separated and as he puts it, ‘living in the house with just my mother, my sister, and my grandmother ... I had a very strong upbringing on the female side of things’. It is clear from the examples that sensitizing experiences do not happen siloed, but occurs in multiple ways. Most of the examples can be listed under multiple headings.

5.2.2.1.1 Sensitizing Experience Creation

Importantly, White Ribbon Australia actively creates sensitizing experiences. For example, White Ribbon Day and Night activities are often built around and even in memory of women’s stories of experiencing violence. White Ribbon Australia has a large social media presence that shares women’s stories of violence against them, men’s stories of speaking out for women, and resources for learning opportunities. The White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation program provides ample learning opportunities to participants as the program discusses violence against women and gendered inequality within the shared work location. However, being sensitized to the issue of violence against women requires opportunity before one can actively
become involved. In essence, as a primary prevention organisation, White Ribbon Australia’s *raison d’etre* is to create sensitizing experiences coupled with opportunity experiences.

5.2.2.2 Opportunity Experience

An opportunity experience is a ‘tangible entrée into antiviolence involvement’ (Casey and Smith 2010, 960). Casey and Smith found four types of opportunity experiences: *personal invitation/nomination, personal/community connections, looking for a community,* and *job/volunteer-position seeking.* Sensitizing experiences within Casey and Smith’s conceptual model typically come first, but not always and similar to sensitizing experiences; opportunity experiences can occur multiple times. White Ribbon Australia and the Ambassador program is itself an opportunity experience.

White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors have become part of the program through several mechanisms and how Ambassadors are recruited has changed over time. Aspects of this change will be discussed further in relation to social movements and identity. When White Ribbon Australia began, men were actively recruited by the organization. Now, most Ambassadors are nominated by others or by themselves and go through a lengthy process before they are given the title of Ambassador. Thus, entry into the program is being optimised to produce quality allies over a larger quantity of allies with the title Ambassador. However, each of Casey and Smith’s type of opportunity experiences is found among the Ambassadors. For example, 23.1 percent of survey respondents indicated they were directly invited to join by White Ribbon Australia; this is in line with *personal invitation/nomination* from the conceptual model.

The next opportunity experience is *personal/community connections.* Interview participant Reginald (40, Judge, New South Wales) initially learned about the Ambassador program through White Ribbon Australia’s current campaigns and in reference to Rosie Batty, who at the time was the Australian of the year. Reginald had ‘attended a couple of White Ribbon events ... [was] ... happy to get involved in White Ribbon day’. However, the primary impetus to join was from one of his old friends from school who was ‘interested in becoming a White Ribbon Ambassador’. Reginald explained,
My best friend from school that I still see quite a lot of, he had mentioned that he was interested in becoming a White Ribbon Ambassador and to be honest I hadn’t really heard about the Ambassador program through White Ribbon. I knew that White Ribbon was an organization that was obviously had been promoting eradication of violence against women and other gender equality issues but I didn’t know that they had an Ambassador or an Advocates program. When he mentioned that he was getting involved in this I did a little bit more research and thought that it would be something that I could also get involved with. Part of the reason while we’re friends now and why we’ve friends for ages I think we see the world in the right way and we have the right sort of moral and social compass.

Reginald’s story is not unique amongst the interview participants. Several others shared Reginald’s path into the Ambassador program. Reginald’s story is echoed in the survey findings as well, in that 27.1 percent of respondents stated they were ‘influenced or invited by other men to join’.

The next opportunity experience is looking for a community. Some of the survey respondents stated they ‘wanted to join a community organisation’ (6.1 percent) as a reason for joining White Ribbon Australia. While not specifically an indicator of looking for a community, the surveyed Ambassadors are largely community oriented. The most common reason that respondents indicated in becoming involved with White Ribbon Australia is to ‘make a difference in my community’ (75.6 percent). However, the demographics of participants vary greatly between the two research projects. The Ambassadors as a whole only rarely get together with other men and in Casey and Smith’s example, these men are looking for ongoing groups of men who meet on campus.

The final opportunity experience is ‘job/volunteer-position seeking’. Casey and Smith found men became involved in anti-violence work because of a job or volunteer position in violence prevention, with a few leading to a formal position. While the survey data cannot specifically state the same opportunity experience was experienced, a considerable number of the survey respondents are in Law Enforcement (13.6 percent), Health and Wellness (12.5 percent), and the Third Sector (i.e., non-profit sector (4.1 percent). For a complete breakdown of survey respondent’s occupations see 5.1.5, p. 40. Interestingly, ‘profile building at work and within my profession’ (11.5 percent) and ‘professional directive, expectation, or request’ (10.8 percent) were two other reasons why men became involved. These motivations for engagement are missing from Casey and Smith’s conceptual model.
5.2.2.3 Shifting Meaning

Casey and Smith determined that a ‘shift in meanings’ was a key component of male ally anti-violence engagement (Casey and Smith 2010, 961). Casey and Smith found that ‘the impact of a sensitizing or opportunity experience or the particular ways men made sense of it, constituted the motivating factor that allowed men to take or seek an opportunity to get involved (Casey and Smith 2010, 959). Casey and Smith found three primary types of shifting meaning: feeling compelled to action, having a changing worldview, and joining with others. The meaning experienced by survey respondents and interview participants by being White Ribbon Ambassadors is evident in previously mentioned aggregated data and participant responses. However, it is important to note that shifting meaning was not directly researched. The impetus of being compelled to act is clear as the two most common reasons men became involved with White Ribbon Australia were to ‘to make a difference in my community’ (75.6 percent) and ‘moral obligation’ (69.8 percent). The drive to make a difference and live up to self-professed ethical responsibility compelled the respondents into action. Aforementioned interview participants complement these findings. For example, Marcus’ partner was murdered by a previous partner, and he got involved, so ‘other women didn’t suffer the same way my partner did’. In sadly similar circumstances, Chad’s daughter was murdered by her former partner; he states that he became involved with White Ribbon Australia ‘to lend my voice to a cause and to try and raise the profile of the notion of preventing or stopping men’s violence against women’.

Survey respondents indicated that ‘to make a difference in my community’ (75.6 percent) and ‘to positively change how my family and friends treat women’ (36.6 percent) were two reasons they joined. These two responses indicate that men became involved with White Ribbon Australia to affect men’s violence against women in their community or family and friends groups. Thus, these men can be said to think the issue is not only a problem but also one they can help solve and they intend to do so in their immediate surroundings. The survey respondents are older on average than the larger Australian population and have a wealth of social and cultural capital amassed during their careers. When asked why they joined, one respondent added in the open response option:
I think I have skills that would enhance the work of White Ribbon ... [which is] ... good at awareness raising and finding good men to speak out against family violence. However, I would like to ensure that conversations with men at risk of using violence are well-informed and high-quality conversations. There are opportunities to work with sporting and community clubs or organisations for this to happen.

The survey respondents indicate that they not only think that violence against women is a problem to be addressed but one that can be addressed. They indicate this position by actively dealing with the issue in their communities or among their family and friends. A survey respondent with a social justice consciousness reflected on why he was compelled to act by saying, ‘violence against women is abhorrent and a most heinous breach of their human rights; so serious in fact that I could not, nor can, do nothing’. The respondents were compelled to action because due to a shift in meaning because they felt a mandated drive to prevent violence against women, felt that not only is violence against women tangible but also changeable, and they felt they could make a positive change using their strengths.

There is evidence of changing worldviews in the aggregate survey data and the interviews. As an example, survey respondents stated that having ‘heard stories related to men’s violence against women’ (53.9 percent) and ‘learned statistics about men’s violence against women (43.1 percent) were two key reasons they joined White Ribbon Australia. Jerome is a university teacher who became involved with White Ribbon Australia because of a class he taught. In this class, Jerome came to realise that ‘when you’re looking at groups like Indigenous peoples as a group and homeless people as a group that the issue of domestic violence came through as a theme, as an underlying issue for Indigenous peoples but also an underlying issue for homelessness, particularly amongst females fleeing from domestic violence or family violence’.

The final shifting meaning in Casey and Smith’s conceptual model is *joining with others*, which is evident because 6.1 percent of survey respondents ‘wanted to join a community organisation’. Whilst Casey and Smith’s participants emphasised building connections with others, particularly with other men to foster a community and provide mutual support, the surveyed Ambassadors. Whilst both groups discussed and wanted ‘community’, one cannot accurately assume each group is referring to community the same way.
White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors both as survey respondents and as interview participants on the aggregate level show the paths from Casey and Smith’s work: sensitizing experience, an opportunity experience, and shifting meaning. However, it is important to note that even though Casey and Smith’s work did form the basis for many of the questions on the survey and the interviews, but one-to-one comparisons are not possible. Casey and Smith’s work provides valuable insights into how men become allies and activists to prevent men’s violence against women and thus ways White Ribbon Australia and similar organizations can increase involvement by proactively fostering these pathways. For example, White Ribbon Australia is a primary prevention organisation and needs to create proactively, pathways to engage men in preventing violence against women by assuring that sensitizing experiences are equally met with opportunity experiences and consistently followed up with meaning making through reflective practise. Another lens that is necessary to understand why and how White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors formally become get involved is how they enact masculinity and engage with feminism.

5.2.3 Feminism

When asked if they considered themselves a ‘feminist’ (without a definition provided) over half (61.1 percent) of the Ambassadors surveyed indicated they were not (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.21, p. 161). The Ambassadors were also provided with space to add further comments to this ‘yes or no’ question. On the survey, 99 of 296 respondents added comments to the questions. The key themes are outlined below in Table 1 and subsequent quotations.
Table 1: Additional Comments to Feminist-Identification Survey Item: (Fixed choice, additional comments, Yes/No key themes identified)

**Note:** Percent of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes - I identify as a feminist</th>
<th>No - I do not identify as a feminist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments made:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Qualifiers</td>
<td>Equalist/alludes to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>equalism/equitability without using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the term as opposed to the term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feminism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profeminist</td>
<td>No but yes, if the definition of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>feminism is: Equality or equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between the sexes and genders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsere whether/told</td>
<td>They believe in equality but do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>either think of themselves as feminist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that men cannot be</td>
<td>or are concerned by negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminists</td>
<td>connotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No qualifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is also/prefers the term</td>
<td>Unsure of definition as it means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>‘many things’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘humanist’</td>
<td>Against labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term is ‘polarising’ or ‘loaded’</td>
<td>Feels the term have too many negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>connotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - but a specific kind of feminism</td>
<td>Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure about use of the term</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number (excluding ‘pro-feminist’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No but yes, men cannot be feminist - I am pro-feminist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who indicated that they do consider themselves to be feminists, one-quarter (23.5 percent) provided a comment, which directly supported their ‘yes’. For example, one respondent supported having a feminist identity by saying, ‘Yes! I want my daughter to have the same opportunities and level of safety in her life as my sons.’ A few respondents indicated they were pro-feminist because ‘I consider myself “a pro feminist male”. I’m out of the school which has women as the only people who can describe themselves as feminist.’ A pro-feminist is a man who actively supports feminism but believes that only women can adopt the label ‘feminist’. The ‘pro-’ suffix is often used to avoid ‘colonising feminism’ or men ‘looking like [they’re] saying [they’ve] got all the answers (Flood 2002). This point
is exemplified by 3.9 percent of Ambassadors indicating they are ‘unsure if men can be feminists’ or ‘have been told they cannot be feminists’. The pro-feminist framework is often identified as a ‘key paradigm’ in gender equality work (Carlson et al. 2015, 1407).

Over a third (34.5 percent) of survey respondents indicated that they consider themselves a feminist and nearly two-thirds (61.1 percent) did not. This finding suggests that a self-given feminist identity is not a key motivator for joining White Ribbon Australia as an Ambassador and a feminist orientation does not always indicate a feminist self-identification (Williams and Wittig 1997). However, these results may have differed if the respondents were given a basic definition of feminism such as equal and equitable access to rights and resources between the sexes and genders. Additionally, the surveyed Ambassadors are older than the broader Australian population, and the average respondent age is $M = 50.6$ (see Figure 2, p. 35). The shift toward open discussion of feminism and social justice at universities and in the popular press could influence social attitudes toward feminist self-identification; however, the age of the cohort limits the affect. The surveyed Ambassadors’ response should not be used to draw ‘cosmic’ conclusions about feminism and men who engage in anti-violence work, especially as this is a case study and no definition of feminism was provided. The limitations of the data and case study method do not offer full insight into a feminist orientation across Australia among men, merely a select few and measuring feminist orientation amongst older men is understudied.
5.3 Ambassadorship and Personal Change

Research into social movement participation has found individuals experience long-term transformative effects and are likely to remain consistent with their ideology over time and continue to participate in political organisations (Corrigall-Brown 2013b, 5). Over one-third of Ambassadors (39.5 percent) report that being involved with White Ribbon Australia has changed how they relate to women (see Figure 15, p. 66). Most of these Ambassadors indicated from a fixed set of provided options (see Figure 18, p. 71) that they are more conscious of what they say and how they say it (86.3 percent) or are more conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in their professional life (84.6 percent) and personal life (84.6 percent). Survey respondents had a range of additional comments, but two primary themes emerged, ‘evolving understanding’ and ‘commitment’.

Respondents explained their evolving understanding stating ‘Although my attitude towards women has always been one of respect, as an Ambassador it has only grown and expanded’ and ‘I am no longer intimidated by the feminist movement, and no longer see that movement as a threat to my masculinity or male freedom! I feel I can stand side by side with strong women who have been fighting against gender inequality.’ Respondents expressed how the title of Ambassador comes with commitment. As one man said, ‘It’s something I think about really frequently – I’m really conscious of the commitment I have made.’ The responses from the survey were echoed in the interviews. Ralph (55, Tasmania, Security) for example said,

I wouldn’t be so presumptuous as to say that [my relations with women are] equitable. They’ve certainly improved, I’m a much better listener, I don’t take personally women’s anger and fear and frustration. I take personal responsibility for my roles in my individual relationships, of course, but I also don’t take it personally when women struggle with masculinity or rather, I see it for the bigger picture that it reflects, I don’t see it as just about my failings, which are still present, of course. I speak up more, obviously, in lots of contexts, so I’ve been talking to friends about their struggles in their relationships. I am much better able to articulate what might be going on.

During interviews, it was clear that many Ambassadors had gone through a process to understand how their views of women and behaviour toward them had affected their lives and the women in them. Often men shared stories of change in which they had reflected upon their early years of marriage, how they were as young men, or
how they had changed since becoming a father. Additionally, interview participants discussed being able to see inequality and inequity in workplaces clearly because of work by White Ribbon Australia, which probably relates to the large number of Ambassadors who were a part of the Workplace Accreditation Program.

The respondents who reported that their relationships with women had not changed (60.5 percent) largely contended that they already respected women or believed in equality and equity (73.7 percent). Typically, the open-ended responses related to participants stating they understood the issue of men’s violence against women before Ambassadorship, and this was the impetus to join White Ribbon Australia. An overwhelmingly common response on the survey was ‘I have always respected women.’ Other survey respondents expressed their position more fully such as ‘I was sensitive to my relationships with women prior to becoming an Ambassador – I did not sign up to learn’ and ‘White Ribbon complements my attitudes and behaviours, which I held before I became involved with White Ribbon’ and ‘I have been a campaigner ... before I was a White Ribbon Ambassador ... the White Ribbon organisation and structure and opportunities have validated my own beliefs, values and actions. How I relate to women has not changed.’ This position resonated in the interviews as well. For example, Alvin (32, Construction, Victoria) said,

Actually it wasn’t the White Ribbon Campaign that changed my views or my attitude, it was really seeing what my mother went through and the abuse that she copped and what we as kids – myself and my sisters, what we went through. That was the only turning point. We joined the White Ribbon campaign, it didn’t really affect my perspective or my talk as such but the only thing that it did change was the volume of my voice. Before I was just a victim or a witness of domestic violence but being part of the White Ribbon campaign ... as I’m introduced at events, as an Ambassador, it just adds a lot more momentum and oomph into what I’ve got to say. That’s how it’s changed.

However, some of the interviews offered a different insight. Often men would say ‘no’ it has not changed, but later in the interview, they would express ways that it had such as listening to women more closely and discussing changes in their relationships with their partners. The difference between the survey finding and the interview insights indicates that perhaps more than the reported 39.5 percent had changed their relationships with women through White Ribbon participation.
What about Ambassadors’ relations with other men? Nearly three-quarters (68.6 percent) of surveyed Ambassadors indicate their involvement with White Ribbon Australia has changed how they relate to other men (see Figure 15, p. 66). Most of these men said they are more likely to challenge sexist behaviour (89.2 percent) or as one survey respondent stated, ‘I believe I am more likely to challenge men about the language they use and what they think is acceptable’. Another respondent indicated that before, when he had spoken up against inappropriate language his concerns were dismissed because he was in Law Enforcement. However, now he says, ‘I am able to assert that I’m also an Ambassador for White Ribbon along with many other men ... this statement alone holds a lot of weight and even more weight with the growing strength and recognition of the White Ribbon brand.’ Some survey respondents had even lost friends because of their position on violence (8.9 percent).

The Ambassadors who had not changed how they relate to men (31.4 percent) indicated they had always been clear with other men on where they stood against men’s violence against women (34.4 percent) or always had respectful relationships with men (30.1 percent). Survey respondents explained their position typically by adding ‘I would challenge men’s reactions to women before I became an Ambassador’ or ‘All my male friends and colleagues knew how I felt about violence towards women prior to becoming an Ambassador. Far more Ambassadors said their relations with men had changed than said their relations with women had changed. One explanation is that men who become involved in anti-violence advocacy already have respectful relationships with women, and thus it is their relations with men that must change more. Additionally, perhaps they had patriarchal and violence-supportive attitudes in the past and expressed these behaviours in their everyday interactions with other men, and this is what they changed.
5.3.1 Masculinity and Activism

The Ambassadors were asked a series of questions on the survey related to masculinity and how their participation with White Ribbon Australia had changed them. The surveyed Ambassadors indicated that three-fourths (74.7 percent) of them are ‘more aware of the need for positive male role models’. These Ambassadors also ‘question the notion of “boys will be boys”’ (47.6 percent) and ‘have increased their “ability to self-reflect” as a man’ (45.9 percent). Finally, close to 50% of surveyed Ambassadors placed more ‘emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity’ in their personal life (49.7 percent) and professional life (49 percent). As the statistics
and quotes below indicate the meaning of masculinity and how a man should be in Australian society is complex and evolving.

An example how masculinity and being a man is changing in Australia is evident in the actions of Lieutenant General David Lindsay Morrison, who recently retired as the Chief of the Australian Army. Before this in 2013, Morrison suspended several members of the Australian Army for a series of emails that made derogatory statements about women. Morrison released a video on YouTube where he described the behaviour of the suspended soldiers as ‘direct contravention’ of the Army’s values. Morrison added that he had been committed ever since becoming Chief of Army to making the Australian Army an inclusive force. Morrison continued, stating empathically, ‘If that does not suit you, then get out!’ as ‘there is no place for you amongst this band of brothers and sisters’. Morrison also asked for support from others in the Australian Army, stating ‘the standard you walk past is the standard you accept’.

Additionally, White Ribbon Australia’s website has a page that challenges men to ‘let the world know where you stand’ and shows images of prominent Australian men who are Ambassadors (White Ribbon Australia 2015c). Among them are athletes such as rugby players like Adam Goodes and Hazem El Masri, boxer Daniel Geale; musicians such as Jimmy Barnes and Shannon Noll; and politicians such as Joe Hockey.

Arguably, men preventing violence against women as activists are an example of men who choose not to walk past a situation without speaking up and speaking out because it would be unacceptable to them to do so. Male activists potentially symbolise a societal and cultural shift, an acknowledgment of shifting expectations and norms of equality and equity for men and women. White Ribbon Ambassadors and male activists, in general, may not understand their experience or role as change makers, but they are still part of the larger social movement. A male by using their identity as a man as a tool to prevent violence against women and focusing on other males creates new models for activism while encouraging men to become part of the solution. Morrison embodies some hegemonic masculine qualities of the Australia male, particularly the institutional power of the Australian Army and he uses that power and agency to stand up as a change maker and anti-violence advocate. However, some male activists would reject the notion of embracing their
masculinity as a tool for change and would seek to disinvest from, and encourage other males’ disinvestment from, maleness, ‘being a man’ or ‘being real men’.

The question then becomes how do men negotiate masculinity in the course of their involvement with White Ribbon Australia? Ambassadors were asked, ‘How has being involved in White Ribbon Australia changed your view of what it means to be a man?’ A small proportion (13.9 percent) of Ambassadors reported that they had experienced ‘no change’ in their view of what it means to be a man (see Figure 17 below). Some survey respondents had quite negative responses to the question or ‘tickable’ choices. For example, ‘I don’t like the option of “less emphasis on proving my manliness.” This denigrates men and shouldn’t be in this survey! A man is a man as is a woman is a woman. Proving or disproving is not what this about and any suggestion of either is offensive.’ Another survey respondent wrote extensively in his ‘other’ response about confronting masculinity in his life and being an Ambassador:

If anything the campaign has made me feel that all men are complicit in violence, including myself, even though I have never been violent towards women. It has made me feel that at no point am I allowed to get frustrated or lose my temper in response to the actions of women in my life (no matter what they do) because the campaign is very black and white (literally, but also in that there is never any excuse for violence, and there is a very broad definition of violence). I believe part of the issue with the campaign is that it makes an implicit connection between being a man (a man’s man) and violence. So the only way to prevent violence is for men NOT to be men, but to be more feminised versions of men - more like women. This then creates a dissonance for men about their identity and creates further issues in relationships because, in my and others’ opinions, women are attracted to the masculine (not violent) qualities of men. Women lose respect for men when they don’t demonstrate strong male qualities (not violence) such as strong character, mental strength, decisiveness and being in control (not controlling). The White Ribbon campaign has muddied the waters around men’s masculinity.

This question elicited charged responses and is clearly a difficult issue for Ambassadors and thus White Ribbon Australia to navigate. The negotiation of masculinity and men’s involvement in anti-violence activism is difficult and early involvement by men ‘was a contentious alliance fraught with tension and apprehension’ (Macomber 2015, 2) and it appears to continue today, even when men lauded because it is ‘cool to care’ about violence against women (Piccigallo, Lilley, and Miller 2012).
In this multiple response question, the majority of Ambassadors indicated they are ‘more aware of the need for positive male role models’ (74.7 percent). However, one survey respondent questions ‘what a “positive male role model” looks and sounds like.’ Additionally, close to half placed more ‘emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity’ in their personal life (49.7 percent) and professional life (49.0 percent). Finally, almost half of the Ambassadors surveyed ‘question the notion of “boys will be boys”’ (47.6 percent) and ‘have increased their “ability to self-reflect” as man’ (45.9 percent).

The role of masculinity and the shifting understanding of masculinity is understudied in the men and masculinities field in a synthesised manner. The evidence suggests that meaning making and shifting attitudes continue to develop through formal involvement with anti-men’s violence against women initiatives. The finding that three-fourths (74.7 percent) of surveyed Ambassadors are ‘more aware of the need for positive male role models’ indicates not only an awareness of the need for their involvement but also of the involvement of others. Almost half of surveyed Ambassadors now place more emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity in the personal life (49.7 percent) and professional (49.0 percent) life suggesting a shift through participation.

Thus, White Ribbon Australia and similar organisation need to focus on continuing education for it formal participants and offer the same types of educational opportunities to the broader community. When this research began, White Ribbon Australia had few continuing education modules in place. However, now they have developed an online eLearning platform that anyone can use and are embedding information to inform practice monthly in the new White Ribbon Ambassador newsletter.
Figure 17: Change in what it means to be a Man (Fixed choice, Multiple response, Other Imputed)

- I am more aware of the need for positive male role models: 74.7%
- More emphasis on promoting gender equality/equity in my personal life: 49.7%
- More emphasis on promoting gender equality/equity in my professional life: 49.0%
- Greater understanding of how personal attitude/behaviour impacts others: 48.3%
- I question the notion of "boys will be boys": 47.6%
- I have an increased ability to self-reflect on my role as a man: 45.9%
- Greater understanding of how dominant ideals of masc. have shaped my life: 33.4%
- I place less emphasis on proving my manliness: 22.6%
- It has changed what I view to be a "good" man: 20.6%
- No change: 13.9%
- Other (please specify): 8.8%
- I more aware of the complex nature VAW and men relating to women: 2.0%
- WRA has put me further down the road I was already on: 1.7%
- I know that men can be part of preventing VAW: 0.7%
Figure 18: Yes, I have changed how I relate to Women (Fixed choice, Multiple response)

Note: 39.5% of survey respondents indicated a change.

- More conscious of what I say and how I say it: 86.3%
- More conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in my professional life: 84.6%
- More conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in my personal life: 84.6%
- More empathetic to women: 48.7%
- Listen more to what women have to say: 41.0%
- Treat women with more respect: 36.8%
- Other (please specify): 8.5%

% of Ambassadors who answered 'Yes' (multiple response item)
Figure 19: No, I have not changed how I relate to Women (Open-end, Themes identified)
Note: 60.5% of survey respondents indicated no change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Ambassadors who answered 'No' (key themes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always/already respected women and/or believed in equality/equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Family instilled respect and belief in equality/equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already aware of VAW issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change, but I increased my awareness of the issues and “think” more about...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/previous experience in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong females, female relatives, female friends, work colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience with violence, led me to respecting women and/or...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Yes, I have changed how I relate to Men (Fixed choice, Multiple response)
Note: 68.6 percent of survey respondents indicate a change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Ambassadors who answered 'Yes' (multiple response item)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to challenge sexist behaviour toward women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lost male friends because of my position on violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more confident in my ability to speak about MVAW with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained friends or grown closer to my friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 21: No, I have not changed how I relate to Men (Open-ended, Themes identified)

Note: 31.4 percent of survey respondents indicated no change.

Responses from surveyed Ambassadors clearly indicate their involvement with White Ribbon Australia has changed how they relate to other men (68.6 percent). Among the Ambassadors who reported that they had changed their relationships with men, nearly all (89.2 percent) indicate they are now more likely to challenge sexist behaviour towards women. Interestingly, most men have not changed how they relate to women (60.5 percent). This statistic suggests that most surveyed Ambassadors considered themselves to have respectful or equal and equitable relationships with women already. The purpose of White Ribbon Australia is to actively engage men in preventing violence against women by getting men to speak to other men. The responses from the Ambassadors indicate that this has occurred, but what about fostering changes in relationships with women?

The data suggests that Ambassadors become formally involved with White Ribbon Australia because of their pre-existing ideas of gender equality and equity, their involvement perhaps reinforces these ideas but the real change is how they relate to men. However, this could be a limitation of the method and resulting data, that collects self-reported treatment of women, in a fixed-choice, quantitative survey and there may be gender inequalities or changes positive changes that cannot be found with this method. While it is clear that involvement with White Ribbon Australia can change relationships with women and other men, what other changes occur?
5.4 Positive experiences of involvement as a White Ribbon Australia Ambassador?

The fourth research question focuses on positive experiences of Ambassadorship and implicitly how these can be increased to prolong the engagement of men. The surveyed Ambassadors were asked what aspects of their experience as Ambassadors were positive and were presented with a fixed response question allowing for multiple choices. Ambassadors were most likely to choose (see Figure 22, p. 76), that increasing their understanding of violence against women (75.0 percent) and knowledge of violence against women (72 percent) were positive experiences of Ambassadorship. More than half (56.1 percent) of the Ambassadors surveyed felt that they helped reduce or prevent men’s violence against women, as one respondent eloquently said in a further, open-ended response,

Positive experiences are many and varied ... It’s about educating people, men, to stop violence against women. Being a part of an organisation that has a large market share allows you to be heard better. Your voice singularly and as a collective is heard. This, in turn, educates men about the issue. This is the positive experience – educating men to stop the violence and hence protecting women from violence.

Over half of the respondents (55.1 percent) indicated they had increased confidence to stand up for what they believe. One survey respondent echoed the sentiment of others by saying because of being an Ambassador ‘I am no longer reticent about speaking up or committing myself to stopping violence against anyone’. Half of the Ambassadors surveyed also felt a sense of purpose (50.7 percent). Marcus (35, Queensland, Sales) achingly describes how White Ribbon Australia provides him with purpose:

I think well it’s just the sense of trying to let my partner’s [death] not be meaningless. You know, I want to make sure that she didn’t die for nothing. You know, she was a good person and she had a lot to offer the world, and she can no longer physically be here, so I feel that it’s just my responsibility to try and do whatever I can to ensure that that ray of sunshine doesn’t completely extinguish. So I feel it’s a really important thing for me in terms of my recovery and in terms of remembering and honouring her, it’s an important part of what I do.

Half of the Ambassadors indicate a sense of personal fulfillment (49.7 percent) as a positive experience, with feminist-identifying Ambassadors indicating personal fulfillment more often (1.31 times) than other Ambassadors*. Several Ambassadors in both the survey and interviews discussed about how the community reacts to them
as Ambassadors including one how said he received ‘personal thank you[s] and encouragement messages from complete strangers whom have been affected by such violence.’

Ambassadors also feel a sense of community or solidarity with other Ambassadors (45.9 percent) and felt positive about meeting other Ambassadors (30.7 percent). Ambassadors involved for more than three-and-half years were more likely (1.58 times) than other Ambassadors to indicate meeting other Ambassadors as a positive experience*. For example, one survey respondent said he enjoyed ‘meeting & exchanging thoughts with other likeminded men & women at [White Ribbon Australia] events and hearing their stories.’ (See 5.2.2.2, p. 56 for further discussion of community). Ambassadors also indicated they had more equal and equitable relationships with women in their professional life (44.3 percent) and personal life (41.9 percent). A little over a third (35.5 percent) reported that their friends and acquaintances viewed them more positively, with Ambassadors employed in government positions more likely to indicate this response (1.49 times)*.

A fifth (19.9 percent) of respondents indicated that the title of Ambassador assists in profile building at work and within their profession. A small number (1.7 percent) indicated they use the title as a tool and to add credibility. As one respondent said,

The Ambassador title simply gives me more credibility when I speak at a meeting or run an event. It has also increased my profile in the local media, who now use the title (and occasionally a white ribbon motif alongside the article) when I speak about domestic abuse.

The positive experiences of Ambassadors are varied, but perhaps they can be summarised by one respondent who said, ‘I believe I am playing a very small part in that process. The quote “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing” is quite true in my opinion. I believe I am a good man “doing something”.’ These men feel that working with White Ribbon Australia is one way that they can achieve change.
Figure 22: Positive Experiences of Ambassadorship (Fixed choice, Multiple response, Other imputed)

- An increased understanding of MVAW: 75.0%
- Greater knowledge of violence against women: 72.0%
- Helped reduce or prevent MVAW: 56.1%
- Increased confidence to stand up for what I believe in: 55.1%
- Sense of purpose: 50.7%
- Sense of personal fulfillment: 49.7%
- A sense of community and solidarity with other Ambassadors: 45.9%
- More equal/equitable relat. w/ women in my professional life: 44.3%
- More equal/equitable relat. w/ women in my personal life: 41.9%
- A positive change in how I am seen by friends and acquaintances: 35.5%
- Meeting other Ambassadors: 30.7%
- Becoming a better father: 30.7%
- Positively changing how my family and friends treat women: 27.4%
- More equal/equitable relat. w/ men in professional life: 21.6%
- More equal/equitable relat. w/ me w/ men in my personal life: 20.3%
- Profile building at work and within my profession: 19.9%
- No positive experiences: 2.7%
- Other (please specify): 9.8%
- Negative experiences: 1.7%
- The use of WR as a tool/A chance to be heard/credibility: 1.7%
5.5 What challenges have White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors encountered and how did they overcome these challenges?

The fifth and final research question focuses on negative experiences of Ambassadorship and implicitly how these can be decreased to prolong men’s engagement in anti-violence efforts. The primary challenge the respondents encountered was ‘lack of time’ (36.5 percent). However, the next most common response (24.7 percent) was ‘no challenges faced’. The respondents were equally likely to report that they were ‘not being utilised properly’ (24.3 percent), for example, their particular skill-sets were not being used. The respondents also lamented the ‘lack of year-around involvement’ (21.6 percent), for instance, ‘only being called upon during White Ribbon Day and Night’. Three further challenges for the respondents are ‘lack of a grassroots feel to the organisation’ (19.9 percent), ‘lack of communication from White Ribbon Australia’ (19.3 percent), and ‘short notice from White Ribbon Australia to assist in an activity’ (17.2 percent). Of the top seven challenges encountered by the respondents, five relate directly to issues of resource mobilisation.

There was less consensus on challenges encountered by Ambassadors than on positive experiences. This question was a fixed response with multiple choices allowed. However, a quarter of Ambassadors provided further insight into their challenges by indicating ‘other’ (24.7 percent) and providing a response. The most commonly cited challenge was ‘lack of time’ (36.5 percent). One survey respondent had a unique position on the question, stating ‘The word challenge is probably not the correct term for me. I have been called upon numerous times, quite often at short notice, but I see this as an opportunity and not a problem or issue.’

Ambassadors indicated they are not being utilised properly (24.3 percent). As one respondent said, ‘I’d like to be used more to speak ... I’m a huge, appropriately skilled resource.’ Ambassadors are also concerned about not being utilised often enough due to lack of year-round involvement (21.6 percent) or, as one survey respondent said, ‘I have never been contacted personally to attend speak or participate.’ Short notice from White Ribbon Australia to assist (17.2 percent) is another challenge as one respondent stated,

Some invitations (not all) have only been given a few days’ notice to attend when they were not able to find an available Ambassador. It would be more helpful for the Ambassador (whoever it may be) to have ample time to
prepare a message or speech suitable for the event rather than just a face who shows up last minute.

The Ambassadors also felt that White Ribbon Australia lacks a grassroots feel (19.9 percent) and this is evidenced by the following representative survey responses which stated that ‘generally there is a feeling that White Ribbon Australia targets celebrities and ignores grassroots actions’ and ‘I am not a celebrity and thus am not an attractive Ambassador for public events’ and ‘no database or contact with other Ambassadors except what you create yourself’.

A tenth (9.8 percent) of the respondents disagree with decisions that White Ribbon Australia has made. For example, one respondent said, ‘I felt extremely uncomfortable with the way White Ribbon seemed to corporatise the Ambassador program, choosing powerful people to be Ambassadors regardless of their ideology ... Tony Abbott [a former Australian Prime Minister] is renowned for his sexist, outdated views of gender roles.’ Additional disagreements often mentioned by survey respondents include working with alcohol companies, closing down White Ribbon Australia offices around Australia, having too many women in corporate positions within White Ribbon, and the lack of funds directed to local White Ribbon Australia committees.

One survey respondent expressed that being an Ambassador ‘made advocacy more difficult’ due to the perception that White Ribbon Australia ‘is only really active for a couple of days a year’ and ‘is a male lead initiative taking credit for the work women have been leading for decades.’ He continued, ‘as an advocate before becoming a White Ribbon Ambassador, I actually found I had more cut through’ as ‘it was easier to engage with men without the pretext of representing White Ribbon’ and ‘feminist spaces are highly critical of White Ribbon’s role and strategy’ which makes ‘meaningful partnership and engagement within these spaces more difficult too.’ Another survey respondent stated,

I personally feel that there is a huge difference in public perception of how White Ribbon operates and how the reality works at an internal level. For example, there seems to be limited engagement with individuals [Ambassadors]. In particular most events appear to have a ticket price, formal dress code. Personally, it would be more beneficial if there was an ongoing grassroots support network that Ambassadors didn’t need fancy clothes, big wallets or large job titles could tap into.
Many other respondents echo this Ambassador’s comments. For example, other respondents said, ‘I am disappointed as I feel left out of being a part of a global movement because I’m not rich’. Another Ambassador lamented,

White Ribbon events seemed to cost hundreds of dollars to attend. I understand this was to fundraise, and that many of the businessmen involved could easily spend that money, but it locked out a large portion of other interested people, and certainly negated any attempts White Ribbon made to being perceived as grassroots. I volunteered at some events just to be able to attend, and the speeches and atmosphere were excellent. People should not miss out on those speeches simply because they do not have enough money.

Several survey respondents indicated they had withdrawn from White Ribbon Australia or focused their efforts elsewhere. The respondents did this for a number of reasons. For example, ‘they [White Ribbon Australia] seem to not really care about the local communities directly.’ When discussing activism, one respondent said he had ‘continued [his] activism against male violence towards women, but distanced [himself] from the White Ribbon brand’ and another said he had ‘disengaged from formal White Ribbon Day events, instead focusing on small grassroots events which recognise WRD.’ One respondent summarises others’ complaints saying ‘Unfortunately I did not feel heard and ... feel isolated from the White Ribbon community and not exactly empowered.’

A tenth of Ambassadors indicated they had a ‘lack of confidence in [their] ability to affect change’ (11.5 percent) and ‘lack of knowledge and skills to engage’ (9.5 percent). As one respondent said, ‘It is such a huge issue and it is difficult to see how we are truly making a difference’. Another Ambassador agreed that he was ‘Unsure what I am being asked to do, beyond my own personal undertaking not to commit commitment or condone violence’. Ambassadors are also concerned about other Ambassadors and want them to be ‘skilled up’, as one respondent said,

Not so much for myself but perhaps for other Ambassadors, it may be helpful to have an annual day where there is training given regarding public speaking, how to prepare an address, face to face discussion about how to answer certain questions of how to present to various groups without losing or altering the central message of the campaign.

Another Ambassador said that ‘some of our current Ambassadors have little or no understanding about gendered violence, and I’ve heard comments such as “men are equally affected by [domestic violence]” coming from some Ambassadors.’ There is a variety to the challenges encountered by Ambassadors. However, they neatly fit
into five groups. These are a lack of proper utilisation, isolation from other Ambassadors, a lack of grassroots feel, a lack of confidence to make a change, and disagreements with White Ribbon Australia’s corporate decisions. It is clear that the Ambassadors of White Ribbon Australia encounter a myriad of challenges but are primarily concerned with personal capacity to affect change due to limited time, confidence, and knowledge or skills.
Figure 23: Challenges of Ambassadorship (Fixed choice, Multiple response, Other imputed)

- Lack of time: 36.5%
- No challenges faced: 24.7%
- Not being utilised properly: 24.3%
- Lack of year-around involvement: 21.6%
- Lack of a "grassroots" feel: 19.9%
- Lack of communication from WRA: 19.3%
- Short notice from WRA to assist: 17.2%
- Lack of confidence in my ability to affect: 11.5%
- Disagreement with decisions WRA has made: 9.8%
- Lack of knowledge and skills to engage: 9.5%
- Lack of support from WRA: 7.8%
- Lack of work support for involvement: 6.8%
- Lack of recognition for my contributions: 4.1%
- Lack of support from family or friends: 1.7%
- Burnout from too much work: 1.4%
- Other (please specify): 24.7%
- Cost of attending/Lack of local funding: 2.7%
- Lack of community support or awareness: 2.4%
- Challenges or lack of support from other men: 1.7%
- Lack of collaboration with other ABS: 1.4%
- Lack of Indigenous-specific resources: 0.7%
- Lack of knowledge from other Ambassadors: 0.7%
- Not male led: 0.7%
- Issues in allyship because of WR association: 0.7%
5.5.1 Resource Mobilisation

Social movements can occur because people have resources to mobilise collectively, and this affects how they succeed or fail (see 2.1.3.1, p. 16). Resource mobilisation theory contends that the primary determinant of a social movement success is the mobilisation of resources by motivated and committed actors with a collective identity to achieve a goal. In the social movement to end men’s violence against women, male activists are a strategic resource that must be harnessed.

For example, the respondents were asked: ‘What do you think is or has been your primary contribution to White Ribbon Australia?’ (see 5.1.5). The respondents predominantly said ‘raising general awareness of men’s violence against women and having discussions with others’ (54.7 percent), followed next by specifically ‘raising awareness in my workplace’ (26.7 percent); followed next by ‘wearing my Ambassador pin’ (19.9 percent) and ‘running/assisting with White Ribbon Australia/anti-men’s violence against women events or being on a White Ribbon Australia/anti-men’s violence against women committee’ (14.2 percent). These findings illustrate how the Ambassadors are being mobilised to assist White Ribbon Australia, the social movement organisation, and the broader social movement to end violence against women.

One of the challenges encountered by the respondents was in the ineffective use of their ‘repertoires of contention’ which are a ‘set of means ... [a social group] ... has for making claims of different types on different individuals’ (Tilly 1986, 2). The respondents have a plethora of repertoires of contention to achieve their goal of preventing men’s violence against women. Bourdieu’s typology of capital cultural, economic, social, and symbolic capital is essential to understanding the resources the respondents possess and White Ribbon Australia can actively use. Reductively, economic capital is money and assets; cultural capital is ‘what you know,’ social capital is ‘whom you know,’ and symbolic capital is ‘why you are worth knowing’.

A key issue with the resource mobilisation of Ambassadors is not just mobilising men, but men with certain ‘capital’ that can be converted to ‘repertoires of contention’. For example, a quarter (24.3 percent) of Ambassadors feel underutilised not only generally, but specific to their skill sets. The resource pool is immense and needs to be harnessed. Many of the Ambassadors have careers in law enforcement (13.5 percent) and health and wellness related fields (12.5 percent).
These Ambassadors expressed concern that their skills are not used to train or present to others. The surveyed Ambassadors are well educated, motivated, and underutilised. However, this research did not explore how Ambassadors create opportunities for themselves through everyday activism (Mansbridge 2013) and this is a limitation of the method; but the findings do suggest that further research needs to explore why these men are not doing more to use themselves as resources to make social change.

5.5.1.1 Activists as Resources to each Other
Repeatedly interview participants indicated that they would like to meet other men who are Ambassadors and research shows the use of social networks is a key strategy to engage men (Casey 2010). A majority of the survey respondents want local White Ribbon Australia committees (or they mentioned a similar solution) to facilitate planning of events, resource exchange, and networking opportunities; including low or no cost monthly meetings. Finding room for morning tea in key locations would provide a drastic change. The need for community is evident in social movement theory and the drive for a collective identity and collective action (van Stekelenburg 2013). This contention is further evidenced in Casey and Smith’s work that indicated looking for a community was a pathway to engagement. The exchange of resources in advocacy networks (Bozzini 2013), particularly social and cultural capital would propel the movement (Edwards 2013). Social movement theory would describe the social capital of White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors as a networked access to resources (Edwards 2013). Social movement theory building on Bourdieu’s typology further contends that,

social capital is a relational and structural concept referring to the ability of individuals or groups to utilize their social relations and positions in various social networks to access a variety of resources, and to accumulate a reservoir of accessible resources by consciously investing in social relations (Edwards 2013, 2).

Both surveyed and interviewed Ambassadors expressed the need to engage with other men and to share resources with each other. The Ambassadors recognise the limitations placed on them by not being connected to other Ambassadors.
Additionally, the Ambassadors recognise that White Ribbon Australia can provide the socio-organisational equivalent of an infrastructure (Edwards 2013, 2) to address the issue but is also currently serving as an insider limiting access to limited knowledge (i.e., linkage to other Ambassadors). Unless a social movement organisation fully understands and engages the ‘content of the social relations and … specific resources available through them’ it ‘cannot assess the amount of social capital …[it] has at its disposal and are thus limiting the outcomes of its efforts (Edwards 2013, 3).

5.5.1.2 White Ribbon Australia as a Resource

The respondents wanted certain things from White Ribbon Australia. Several respondents mentioned the need for a monthly newsletter with key talking points, new research, and updates on events in their area. Additionally, the newsletter would include strategies to engage with men, useful resources, and a section highlighting ‘less famous’ Ambassadors. Furthermore, Ambassadors want access to more resources that can be used for presentations, such as multiple time-length presentations with accompanying scripts, including bullet points explaining key issues and responses to common questions.

It is clear from the research and social movement theory in general that typically Ambassadors and White Ribbon Australia mutually benefit from involvement with each other. What the Ambassadors need from White Ribbon Australia are further examples of self-production which is the process by which a social movement organisation produces resources to attain its goal (Edwards and Gillham 2013, 1419). The Ambassadors lament that White Ribbon Australia is not adequately providing them with the tools necessary to effectively engage as change agents to prevent violence against women. However, the research did not investigate how many surveyed Ambassadors has used the current resources available on White Ribbon Australia’s website or contact the organisation for more information. White Ribbon does provide a wealth of information to Ambassadors such as information sheets about what is violence against women, different types of violence, and an e-learning module.

Social movement organisations build partnerships to achieve their goals. White Ribbon Australia creates male activists as partners by engaging them with the
anti-men’s violence against women rhetoric and uses them to promote that message. White Ribbon Australia also uses activists as social change agents to create a cycle that socialises other men and young adults (male and female) to become barriers of the anti-men’s violence against message. However, some Ambassadors are challenged by what they feel are inadequate resources. For example, some interview participants lamented the high cost of self-production artefacts such as the White Ribbon Australia’s mugs, posters, t-shirts, and wristbands. The interviewees felt these should cost less in order to get the message out more. However, White Ribbon Australia uses these items not only for promotion but also to raise money. Arguably too, the most important self-production artefact is the title Ambassador itself and the special pin that comes with the title. This Ambassador pin is a special white metal ribbon that separates the general public from the selected allies deemed worthy to be the formal carriers of the message.

White Ribbon Ambassadors indicate that some aspects of the corporate entity of White Ribbon Australia do pose challenges, but it is a valuable resource to get out the message of preventing violence against women by engaging men. How the activists and White Ribbon Australia utilise each other could determine the success or failure of White Ribbon Australia in the short-term and long-term.

The Ambassador’s comments are in line with social movement theory (Everett 1992) on the corporatisation and professionalisation of movements leading to the “‘bureaucratization of social discontent,’” by mass promotion campaigns, by fulltime employees, whose professional careers are defined in terms of social participation …and… philanthropic foundations’ (McCarthy and Zald 1973, 2). The lens of resource mobilisation theory makes it clear that Ambassadors are an incredible resource that must be mobilised to make a positive change in preventing violence against women.

While the Ambassadors express concern, they understand the corporate nature of the organisation, even while lamenting the loss of a grassroots feel. These findings are understandable because grassroots movements strive to keep control at the local level, with an egalitarian and decentralised leadership structure that values decision making through participation (Horton 2013). The key challenges Ambassadors encounter as a resource are a need for more opportunities specific to their skills that ‘highlight and value local knowledge and direct experiences’ (Horton 2013, 2), more opportunities to work with each other, and more or better resources.
from White Ribbon Australia. Perhaps the most valuable resource White Ribbon Australia has to offer Ambassadors is a connection to other Ambassadors.
5.5.2 How do Ambassadors overcome challenges they have encountered during their work with White Ribbon Australia?

When asked to indicate, ‘What do you think are areas for improvement for White Ribbon Australia?’ respondents were also given the opportunity to indicate the various ways they have responded to the challenges of Ambassadorship, through a fixed response question, allowing multiple choices (see Figure 24, p. 88). The most often-used strategy among Ambassadors was increasing their knowledge base (33.1 percent). The challenge with the highest proportion of Ambassadors who indicated ‘Balanced my work life and Ambassador position’ was actually ‘No challenges faced’, followed by ‘Lack of time’. This coping response, therefore, appears to be most common among Ambassadors who faced challenges largely outside the scope of White Ribbon Australia, or none at all. Conversely, the more common challenges faced among those who ‘contacted the White Ribbon organisation for support’ or ‘contacted other Ambassadors for support’ are much more directly related to Ambassadors’ experiences with White Ribbon Australia. Finally, among those who have indicated that they have ‘prioritised my work with White Ribbon Australia’, the common challenges relate to time pressure from both White Ribbon Australia and externally, and feelings of lacking confidence, knowledge or ability. The survey data did not provide much more evidence to explore the topic further nor did the interview provide any additional complementary data.
5.5.3 Successes, Areas for Improvement, and Ways to Increase or Sustain Ambassador Involvement

To understand the challenges Ambassadors encountered and how they overcome them, one must also understand the successes of White Ribbon Australia and the areas for improvement as well. The following data provides insight into how White Ribbon Australia works or does not work, through the eyes of the Ambassadors and ways to increase or sustain their involvement.

5.5.3.1 Successes of White Ribbon Australia

When the Ambassadors were asked to identify White Ribbon’s Australia’s successes from a set of fixed responses, the vast majority of Ambassadors surveyed (91.6 percent) indicated ‘creating a “brand” that helps promote an anti-violence message’ is a primary success of White Ribbon Australia. This finding was consistently found in the interviews as well. For example, Vernon (60 Student, ACT) said,
I think at a broader national level, created a platform that has a reputation that has recognition in Australia and I’ve not seen anything else that’s been out to, that to me is really big win. I think at the workplace level, and I’ve run a number of functions, it has again provided a platform where you can invite guys in and most of our presentations have been about explaining what [domestic violence] DV is and often bring in someone who has experienced DV to bring a testimony to that experience and I think you got an audience that traditionally, you just wouldn’t rate with I don’t believe. So I think there have been two really great wins for the organization.

For these men, other significant successes include ‘enabling men to speak to men about stopping men’s violence against women’ (83.1 percent); ‘spreading awareness of men’s violence against women’ (79.7 percent); and ‘increasing male engagement in anti-violence initiatives’ (77.4 percent). Over half of the survey respondents indicate that ‘enabling men to speak to men about gender equality and equity’ (64.2 percent); ‘creating a sense of community around violence prevention’ (61.8 percent); and ‘helping to influence government policies’ (54.7 percent) are successes as well.

The successes that received the lowest endorsement were ‘working with diverse communities to increase awareness and engagement’ (29.1 percent), and ‘working with other anti-violence organisations’ (24.7 percent), although one-quarter of respondents still felt that WRA had been successful here.

These are not the only successes Ambassadors endorsed, and several respondents took advantage of the ‘other’ option to provide additional feedback. For example, one survey respondent stated another success is ‘sending the message to women that when men commit violence against them, that this is not acceptable under any circumstances. It informs women that people take this ... issue extremely seriously, and it is not their fault that this occurs to them.’ Another respondent pithily exposed a missing option from the survey, stating a success is ‘actually reducing violence against women - after all, isn’t this the main purpose of White Ribbon[?]’
**Figure 25: Successes of White Ribbon Australia (Fixed choice, Multiple response, Other imputed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th>% of Ambassadors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a 'brand' that helps promote an anti-violence message</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling men to speak to men about stopping MVAW</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading awareness of MVAW</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing male engagement in anti-violence initiatives</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling men to speak to men about gender equality and equity</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a sense of community around violence prevention</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to influence government policies</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resources to men to use in their community</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting research into MVAW</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with social institutions i.e., the police and military</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with schools through the Breaking the Silence school program</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with sports teams</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with other community organisations</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a safe space for men to be involved in prevention of MVAW</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with diverse communities to increase awareness and engagement</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with other anti-violence organisations</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging workplaces</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.4 Areas for Improvement for White Ribbon Australia

When presented with a fixed choice question, about areas of improvement for White Ribbon Australia, Ambassadors shared a range of opinions. Surveyed Ambassadors were given the option to provide feedback on how to ‘fix’ these areas for improvement. As seen in Figure 35 (p. 93), the majority of Ambassadors surveyed (59.5 percent) believed that ‘better communication between Ambassadors in the same community’ was an area for improvement. Furthermore, this being the most selected choice indicates the gravity of the issue. Ambassadors lament the lack of direct interaction between them. As two survey respondents said, Ambassadors need ‘a place where Ambassadors can discuss and exchange ideas, whether online or in person’ and ‘more networking/training opportunities for Ambassadors and Advocates would be great. This research is a great step toward developing an Ambassador group which is focused and committed.’

The Ambassadors comments are aligned to social movement theory about how social movements operate and earlier research into maintaining involvement in efforts to end violence against women (i.e., Tolman et al. 2016). Research suggests that ‘contrary to the public impression that movements rely mainly on charismatic leaders’ there are actually a myriad roles including veterans, brokers (prior participation other relevant events), experts, representatives (report back to relevant stakeholders), mobilisers, organisers (e.g., agenda creation, venue selection), and facilitators (Haug 2013, 2). The lack of engagement between Ambassador indicates a missed opportunity to promote ‘amorphous and distributed leadership characteristic of social movements’ (Haug 2013, 2).

Additionally, Ambassadors want better use of their unique skill sets (49.0 percent). The Ambassadors as a group are highly educated, and many work in Law Enforcement or Social Work. These men indicate they are not being utilised properly, for example, to train other Ambassadors. Three-quarters of Ambassadors (75.7 percent) indicated that they largely joined White Ribbon Australia to make a difference in their community. This finding is supported by the fact Ambassadors want ‘better integration with local support services’ (39.9 percent) and ‘more of a “grassroots feel”’ (35.5 percent).

The interviews provided insights not found in the survey results. For example, Ambassadors mentioned that people who are or hope to be Ambassadors
must show true commitment to the ideals of White Ribbon and continually prove that commitment. Interview participants also referred to the role of fatherhood as not only an impetus to join White Ribbon Australia but also how fatherhood has served as a tool of reflection on their anti-violence work. A failure of this research was not investigating fatherhood more as a motivator and a source of meaning making. Finally, this question provided a unique opportunity to complete a process evaluation of the Ambassador program from the Ambassadors themselves. This lead to the release of a public report (see Appendix F, p. 164). Portions of this thesis were used in the public report, and a series of infographics were created to promote the research.
Figure 26: Areas of Improvement for White Ribbon Australia (Fixed choice, Multiple response, Other imputed)
6 Conclusions and Recommendations

This research took place during a tumultuous period of increasing public awareness in Australia of violence against women, and White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassador Program was undertaking a dramatic reorganisation. Ultimately, this research is not about White Ribbon Australia the organisation but the men that become Ambassadors and thus activists to prevent violence against women. However, this is a case study and an accurate understanding of the place and time must be coupled with the data and analysis. Thus, the applicability of the research outcomes for non-Western or non-formally corporatised organisations and different models of allyship should be carefully considered. With these caveats in mind, the primary research questions were:

1. Who are the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors and why does it matter?
2. Why and how did the White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors get involved with White Ribbon Australia?
3. How has their involvement as White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors changed their relationships with women and men?
4. What are the positive experiences of involvement as a White Ribbon Australia Ambassador?
5. What challenges have White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors encountered and how did they overcome these challenges?

The surveyed White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors are older (mean age 50.6 years), wealthy (57.1 percent make $2000+ per week), are more likely than males in Australia to be married and have children. The surveyed Ambassadors are also more likely to be in white-collar than blue-collar occupations than the general Australian population, with only 2 percent of surveyed Ambassadors in blue-collar occupations. While this imbalance is clearly due to the origins of the organisation in Australia and current programming decisions, it matters because the lack of socio-economic diversity within the program indicates an opportunity for expansion into underexplored areas. Importantly, White Ribbon Australia is taking strides to correct this imbalance in the Ambassador Program, and organisationally through the White Ribbon Diversity Program.

While these men do have more symbolic capital such as social capital and cultural capital, diversity is an issue that needs to be addressed to engage men more
broadly in anti-violence efforts. The economic and educational advantages and the current construction of hegemonic masculinity in Australia grant the surveyed Ambassadors power and agency as resources to make change within the social movement to prevent men’s violence against women. However, ascertaining if they use their resources and how to increase their use was not studied in this research.

Surveyed Ambassadors became involved with White Ribbon Australia for a variety of reasons but primarily ‘to make a difference in their community’ (75.7 percent), out of ‘moral obligation’ (69.6 percent), because they ‘heard stories related to men’s violence against women’ (53.7 percent), and because they had ‘learned statistics related to men’s violence against women’ (43.2 percent). The pathways to Ambassadorship typically occurred through learning about White Ribbon Australia at their workplace or during a specific White Ribbon Australia’s Workplace Accreditation Program event (43.9 percent), and over a third of the surveyed Ambassadors come from Government (15.6 percent) and Law Enforcement (13.6 percent). White Ribbon Australia and similar organisation need to increase pathways to involvement both in a formal and informal capacity by understanding current Ambassador motivations.

Involvement as White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors has changed the surveyed Ambassadors’ relationships with women and men. Over one-third of Ambassadors surveyed (39.5 percent) report that being an Ambassador has changed how they relate to women and 68.6 percent report that has changed how they relate to men. The takeaway is that surveyed Ambassadors, and thus activists typically come to formal involvement with White Ribbon Australia with a social justice mindset about relationships with women and violence against women. However, this is a self-reporting of attitudes, and that bias must always be acknowledged in social research. The fundamental shift is in their relationships with men and changing how men relate to each other an opportunity to prevent violence against women.

The surveyed Ambassadors indicated ways their involvement with White Ribbon Australia had changed their view of what it means to be a man. These changes include being ‘more aware of the need for positive male role models’ (74.7 percent) and placing more ‘emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity’ in their personal life (49.7 percent) and professional life (49.0 percent). Furthermore, almost half of the surveyed Ambassadors ‘question the notion of “boys will be boys”’ (47.6 percent) and have increased their ‘ability to self-reflect as men’ (45.9
percent). Capacity to self-reflect as men came through from interviews was a powerful tool to help male activists question traditional notions of masculinity, particularly toxic masculinity and the constraints of a hegemonically masculine mindset to the individual and public. The experiences of the Ambassadors is similar to early research on the construction of gender-equitable masculinities that indicates that activist men are ‘attempting to be the change they wish to see in the world’ through counterhegemonic practice by undermining their own gender privilege (Flood 2014).

However, the surveyed Ambassadors also encountered challenges during their time with White Ribbon Australia. The primary challenges were ‘lack of time’ (36.5 percent); ‘not being utilised properly’ (24.3 percent); ‘lack of year-round involvement’ (21.6 percent); and a ‘lack of a “grassroots” feel’ (19.9 percent) were key challenges. The lack of proper resource utilisation is an underlying current throughout the research project. The Ambassadors in both the survey and interviews want to be used more for their unique skills and to make a difference in their local community. The Ambassadors are rich sources of social and cultural capital, not just economic capital and the resource must be mobilised to prevent violence against women. Perhaps the most useful research finding for not only White Ribbon Australia but also similar organisation is that men working as men as change agents need three things: information, opportunity, and networking.

6.1 Recommendations
Future research should focus on not only identifying who are the men that actively engage in anti-violence efforts and their motivations but also methods to measure how they use their social, cultural, and economic capital. Once the motivation and methods of measurement are determined, investigate what are the best practices to increase their use and proper application. The role of self-reflection to help negotiate privilege to promote meaning making requires further investigation, and this should include the development of additional strategy models specifically targeted to preventing violence against women that build on earlier research (i.e., Casey 2010). During conversations about this research during data collection and subsequent interactions with Ambassadors at presentations, the need for implementing meaning making within the activist framework of White Ribbon Australia and similar organisations became apparent.
A limitation of this research was investigating fatherhood as a pathway to engagement and its role in meaning making. This limitation occurred due to the existing research on men’s anti-violence activists was among university-aged young men and thus often neglected fatherhood. The role of fatherhood, particularly as a form of meaning making as an impetus to enact social change, should be investigated further.

The role of resource mobilisation as a tool of mobilisation and social change in the prevention of violence against women needs further investigation and models of identifying not only resources of individuals but also methods to mobilise them need careful consideration. White Ribbon Australia has a vast amount of various types of capital that it can utilise, but the truth is that a small non-profit organisation like White Ribbon can have numerous possible tools but not enough time or resources to implement their use. Resource mobilisation within the social movement theory framework needs more investigation to engage men in preventing violence against women.

The value of this research is expanding the knowledge based for understanding male activists, particularly those that are older and underrepresented in the literature. A key outcome of this research was the complementary process evaluation co-created with the Ambassadors (See APPENDIX F: Public Report, p. 164). This report includes ten recommendations to White Ribbon Australia to improve the Ambassador program and is useful to similar organisation around the world. Additionally, the initial engagement of men in the anti-violence activist space is understudied (Casey 2010, 268) and this research provides insights into pathways and motivation, and potentially encourage more initial participation by men. Perhaps the primary contribution of this research practically and theoretically is identifying challenges of collective action amongst the Ambassadors and ways to decrease these challenges to increase participation in the social movement to end men’s violence against women.
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Research Title: Case Study of White Ribbon Australia: Men as Allies to Prevent Violence Against Women

Researcher: Kenton Bell
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Date: 10/08/2015

Purpose of the Research:
The aim of this project is to study participants in White Ribbon Australia (WRA) to understand: Why men participate in the antiviolence against women movement, what challenges do they face, and how do they overcome those challenges? The benefits of this research include increasing awareness of WRA, producing knowledge about men’s motivations and commitment to WRA, and improving engagement efforts. This research is being conducted by Kenton Bell, as part of a Masters of Philosophy supervised by Dr. Michael Flood in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry at the University of Wollongong (UOW).

Investigators:
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Kenton Bell
kb759@uowmail.edu.au

Primary Supervisor
Dr. Michael Flood
mflood@uow.edu.au
(02) 4221 4063

Method and Demands on Participants:
If you choose to be included, you will be asked to participate in an interview either in person or on the telephone or through Skype. It is preferred to complete this interview face-to-face, however due to the constraints of time and locality; a telephone/Skype interview may be required. The interview, lasting 60-90 minutes, commencing at a time of your convenience, asks open-ended questions about you and your experiences with and opinions about WRA. Additionally, the interview will
be audio or video taped for later review. Your names and any identifying details will be changed in any public materials such as presentations or journal articles, to protect your confidentiality.

**Possible Risks, Inconveniences and Discomforts:**
Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may withdraw your participation any time during the interview and withdraw any data that you have provided anytime within one month of the interview. Any instances of unresolved violence revealed to the researchers will be referred to Crime Stoppers (1 800 333 000). Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with the WRC or the University of Wollongong. You may experience negative emotions and memories due to the sensitive nature of the topic. The researchers will be available by phone and email to assist you in aftercare, and a list of mental health services are included below. Your confidentiality and privacy are guaranteed by the researchers according to the best practices as determined by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioral Science) of the UOW. Specifically, your information will be stored on a password-protected drive viewable only by the researchers, not WRA, and your personal information is de-identified to assure your privacy.

**Benefits of the Research:**
This research may benefit you by providing an opportunity for you to tell your stories and opinions; to know your ideas and contributions are valued. By providing a confidential space to reflect upon your experiences with the WRA, you may develop a deeper understanding of yourself and the WRA. Additionally, your efforts will lead to a greater understanding of WRC specifically and similar organizations in general. Your efforts will lead to increased awareness of the WRA, produce practical knowledge of how to inspire and sustain men’s motivation and commitment to the WRA, and improve outreach efforts. You will also have the opportunity to receive a copy of any final, primary academic outcomes of this research project such as copy of the Master’s thesis or journal articles.
Ethics Review and Complaints:
This study has been reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioral Science) of the University of Wollongong. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted, you can contact the UOW Ethics Officer on (02) 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.

Thank you for your interest in this study.
Mental Health and Community Outreach Services

• List of mental health services in Australia

• 1800Respect
  o Sexual Assault, Domestic and Family Violence Counselling Service
    o 1800 737 732
    o [https://www.1800respect.org.au/](https://www.1800respect.org.au/)

• beyondblue Support Service
  o Support for anxiety and depression related matters.
    o 1300 22 46 36

• Black Dog Institute
  o Support for mood disorders such as bipolar disorder and depression.

• Lifeline
  o 24-hour telephone counselling service
    o 13 11 14
    o [https://www.lifeline.org.au/](https://www.lifeline.org.au/)

• Mensline Australia
  o Support for men with family and relationship concerns.
    o 1300 78 99 78

• Relationships Australia
  o Relationship support services for individuals, families and communities.
    o 1300 364 277

• SANE Australia
  o Support for mental illnesses.
    o 1800 187 263

• Suicide Call Back Service
  o 24-hour telephone and online support for people affected by suicide.
    o 1300 659 467
    o [https://www.suicidecallbackservice.org.au/](https://www.suicidecallbackservice.org.au/)
Consent Form for Interviewees

**Research Title:** Case Study of the White Ribbon Campaign of Australia: Men as Allies to Prevent Violence against Women

**Researcher:** Kenton Bell

**Version:** 1.2  
**Date:** 10/08/2015

I was given information about the research project: *Case Study of White Ribbon Australia: Men as Allies to Prevent Violence against Women*. Additionally, I had the opportunity to discuss the research project with Kenton Bell, who is conducting this research as part of a Masters of Philosophy supervised by Dr. Michael Flood and Dr. Richard Howson in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry at the University of Wollongong (UOW).

I was advised of the potential risks and burdens associated with this research. Additionally, I have had the opportunity to ask Kenton Bell any questions I may have about the research project and my participation.

I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, I am free to refuse to participate and I am free to withdraw from the research at any time during the interview. My refusal to participate or my withdrawal of consent will not affect my relationship with the White Ribbon Australia or UOW.

If I have any enquiries about the research, I can contact the following people:

**Researcher**  
Kenton Bell  
kb759@uowmail.edu.au

**Primary Supervisor**  
Dr. Michael Flood  
mflood@uow.edu.au  
(02) 4221 4063

I understand that this study was reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioural Science) of the UOW. Additionally, I understand if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research was conducted, I can contact the UOW’s Ethics Officer on (02) 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.

By signing below, I am indicating my consent to participate in the *Case Study of the White Ribbon Campaign of Australia: Men as Allies to Prevent Violence against Women* through a face-to-face interview or a telephone/Skype interview.
I understand that the data collected from my participation could be used for conference presentations, journal articles, a Master’s thesis, or other academic works, and the findings by White Ribbon Australia, and I consent for it to be used in that manner. I understand that my participation is confidential and that my confidentiality and privacy are guaranteed by the researchers according to the best practices as determined by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioural Science) of the UOW. Additionally, if I would like to receive a copy of the final primary, academic outcomes of this research project such as copy of the Master’s thesis or journal articles; I have included my email address below.

Email Address:
______________________________________

Signed:                                      Date
__________________________________________  __/__/__

Name (please print)
______________________________________
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Semi-Structured Interview Schedule

Research Title: Case Study of White Ribbon Australia: Men as Allies to Prevent Violence Against Women

Researcher: Kenton Bell

Version: 1.1
Date: 30/08/2015

I - Introduction:

- Name: Kenton Bell
- Affiliation: University of Wollongong
- You should have also received a Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form as well, if you did not, I need to email both to you for review before this conversation can continue.
- Discuss Project
  - Why this information is important?
  - Explain interviewer’s personal positionality.
- Review Personal Information Sheet
- Review and ask for Verbal agreement to the Consent Form
- Reminder: Every 5 minutes ask if participant would like to continue.

II - Demographic Questions:

- Name
- Age
- Postcode
- Sexual Orientation or Identity
- Religious Affiliation
- Educational Background and Current Status as a Student
- Employment Status and Occupation
- Political Affiliation
- Ancestry

III - Questions and Potential Follow ups:

- How long have you been involved with WRA?
- How did you hear about WRA?
  - Friends
  - Family
  - Media
0. Social Media

- What made you join WRA?
  - Any friends or family members in WRA?
  - Are you part of any other anti-VAW organizations?
  - Are you part of the Ambassadors programs?
  - Do you have personal experience violence (DV/IPV) in your life?

- How do people respond when you discuss WRA?
  - What are the common misconceptions you feel people have about WRA and VAW?

**REMEMBER PARTICPANT ABOUT STOPPING AT ANY TIME.**

- What do you feel motivates others to join WRA?
  - What else can be done to increase participation?
  - Why do think some men do not participate in WRA?

- What have you gained from being a White Ribbon Ambassador?

- What challenges have you encountered during your time with WRA?
  - Were you able to overcome those challenges?
  - How did you do it?
  - Do you expect different challenges in the future?
  - What challenges do think other people in the WRC have faced?

- How have sustained your involvement with WRA?
  - What would help increase or sustain your involvement as an Ambassador?
  - How long do you intend to be a part of WRA?

- What do you think is or has been your primary contribution to White Ribbon Australia?

- What do you think is your primary contribution to preventing and reducing men’s violence against women?

- What primarily does White Ribbon Australia provide you with, to prevent or reduce men’s violence against women?

- Did you ever leave WRA?
  - Why did you come back?
  - Do you know anyone who has?
    - Why did they leave?
    - Do you think they would return?
    - What would it take?
  - What would make you leave the WRC?

**REMEMBER PARTICPANT ABOUT STOPPING AT ANY TIME.**

- What do you think are the successes of WRA?
  - What areas can they improve upon?
    - What can be done to change this?
  - What have other people said are the successes and failures of WRA?

- What would you like to see WRA do in the future?
  - More integration with other organizations?
  - Additional programs?

- Has being an Ambassador changed how your relate to women?
- Has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to men?
- Do you have anything further you would like to discuss?
- What question did I not ask that I should have?

VI - Thank the participant for their time and answer any remaining questions they may have.
11 APPENDIX D: SURVEY

White Ribbon Ambassador Survey

White Ribbon Australia Ambassador Survey

The aim of this project is to study participants in White Ribbon Australia (WRA) to understand: Why men participate in the anti-violence against women movement, what challenges do they face, and how do they overcome those challenges? The benefits of this research include increasing awareness of WRA, producing knowledge about men’s motivations and commitment to WRA, and improving engagement efforts.

This research is being conducted by Kenton Bell, as part of a Masters of Philosophy supervised by Dr. Michael Flood in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry at the University of Wollongong (UOW).

Method and Demands on Participants: If you choose to be included, you will be asked to participate in an online survey. The survey can be completed in 15 minutes. However, the survey has open-ended questions that may take longer to answer depending on your experiences with and opinions about WRA. Additionally, you may provide your contact information for a follow-up interview. Your contact information cannot be connected to your survey results in anyway.

Possible Risks, Inconveniences and Discomforts: Your involvement in the study is voluntary. You may withdraw your participation any time by exiting the survey and your data will not be saved. However, after submitting your survey you cannot withdraw the data. Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with WRA or the University of Wollongong. You may experience negative emotions and memories due to the sensitive nature of the topic. The researchers will be available by phone and email to assist you in aftercare, and a list of mental health services are included below. Your confidentiality and privacy are guaranteed by the researchers according to the best practices as determined by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioral Science) of the UOW. Specifically, your information will be stored on a password-protected drive viewable only by the researchers, not WRA, and your personal information is de-identified to assure your privacy.

Benefits of the Research: This research may benefit you by providing an opportunity for you to tell your stories and opinions; to know your ideas and contributions are valued. By providing a confidential space to reflect upon your experiences with WRA, you may develop a deeper understanding of yourself and WRA. Additionally, your efforts will lead to a greater understanding of WRA specifically and similar organizations in general. Your efforts will lead to increased awareness of WRA, produce practical knowledge of how to inspire and sustain men’s motivation and commitment to WRA, and improve outreach efforts. You will also have the opportunity to receive a copy of any final, primary academic outcomes of this research project such as copy of the Master’s thesis or journal articles.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. On the next page, you will see information about the research project and a consent form.
White Ribbon Ambassador Survey
Personal Information Sheet and Consent Form

Ethics Review and Complaints:

This study has been reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioral Science) of the University of Wollongong. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted, you can contact the UOW Ethics Officer on (02) 4221 3386 or email mo-ethics@uow.edu.au.

Questions or Concerns?

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey or the research project please email Kenton Bell at kb755@uowmail.edu.au or call 0438 977 746 before consenting and completing the survey.

If you wish to discuss your Ambassador role or other White Ribbon Australia specifics please contact ambassadors@whiteribbon.org.au or 02 9645 8415.

* Research Participation Consent Form: Please tick the boxes if you agree with these sentences. You will have to tick ALL the boxes to proceed with the survey.

- I am 18 years old or older

- I was given information about the research project: Case Study of White Ribbon Australia: Men as Allies to Prevent Violence against Women including the purpose and methods of the research; demands on me; and benefits of the research. I was advised of the potential risks and burdens associated with this research. Additionally, I have had the opportunity to ask any questions I may have about the research and my participation.

- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, and I am free to refuse to participate. I understand I am free to withdraw from the research at any time by not completing the survey and that incomplete surveys will be deleted. I understand that my anonymous (non-identifiable) responses cannot be withdrawn once submitted, and they will be securely stored.

- I understand that these findings may also be prepared for academic works and conference presentations.

- I understand that this study was reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, Humanities and Behavioural Sciences) of the UOW. I understand if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research was conducted, I can contact the UOW’s Ethics Officer on 4221 3386 or email mo-ethics@uow.edu.au.
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Survey Overview

This survey is divided into three sections:

1. Ambassadorship
2. How you relate to women and men
3. Demographic information

The first section, Ambassadorship, will focus on how you became involved with White Ribbon and ways to improve that involvement.
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Ambassadorship

About how long have you been involved with White Ribbon Australia?

Select

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you initially hear about White Ribbon Australia? (Tick only one)

- Community Club or Organisation
- Community Event (White Ribbon Day, White Ribbon Night)
- Family
- Friends
- Primary and Secondary School
- Print Ad
- Radio Ad
- Social Media
- Sporting Event
- Television Ad
- Breaking the Silence Program
- University Program
- White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation Program
- Workplace
- Other (please specify)


Are you currently involved with any other community organisations?

- No
- Yes, please list them

Were you involved in preventing men’s violence against women prior to your engagement with White Ribbon Australia?

- No
- Yes, how so?
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Ambassadorship: Why become a White Ribbon Ambassador?

Why did you become involved in White Ribbon Australia? (Tick all that apply)

☐ Domestic or sexual violence committed by you.
☐ Domestic or sexual violence committed against you.
☐ Domestic or sexual violence committed by someone you know.
☐ Domestic or sexual violence committed against someone you know.
☐ Heard stories related to men’s violence against women.
☐ Influenced or invited by other men to join.
☐ Influenced or invited by women to join.
☐ Invited to join by White Ribbon Australia.
☐ Learned statistics about men’s violence against women.
☐ Networking opportunities.
☐ Professional directive, expectation, or request.
☐ Profile building at work and within my profession.
☐ Moral obligation.
☐ To make a difference in my community.
☐ To positively change how my family and friends treat women.
☐ To use the White Ribbon name recognition as resource.
☐ Wanted to join a community organisation.
☐ Prior participation with a similar organisation.
☐ Other (please specify)
How familiar are you with the following White Ribbon Australia programs? (Tick only one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only know the name</th>
<th>Basic information about the program</th>
<th>Detailed knowledge of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Silence Schools Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Accreditation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement with Youth Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are some of your positive experiences as an Ambassador? (Tick all that apply)

- A positive change in how I am seen by friends and acquaintances.
- A sense of community and solidarity with other Ambassadors.
- An increased understanding of men's violence against women.
- Becoming a better father.
- Creating a more equal and equitable relationship with women in my personal life.
- Creating a more equal and equitable relationship with women in my professional life.
- Creating a more equal and equitable relationship with men in my personal life.
- Creating a more equal and equitable relationship with men in my professional life.
- Greater knowledge of violence against women.
- Helped reduce or prevent men's violence against women.
- Increased confidence to stand up for what I believe in.
- Meeting other Ambassadors.
- Positively changing how my family and friends treat women.
- Profile building at work and within my profession.
- Sense of personal fulfillment.
- Sense of purpose.
- No positive experiences.
- Other (please specify)
What challenges have you encountered as an Ambassador? (Tick all that apply)

- Burnout from too much work related to being an Ambassador.
- Disagreement with decisions White Ribbon Australia has made.
- Lack of communication from White Ribbon Australia.
- Lack of confidence in my ability to affect change.
- Lack of a "grassroots" feel to the organisation.
- Lack of knowledge and skills to engage with the community and peers.
- Lack of recognition for my contributions.
- Lack of support from family or friends.
- Lack of support from White Ribbon Australia.
- Lack of time.
- Lack of work support for involvement.
- Lack of year-round involvement (i.e., only being only being called upon during White Ribbon Day and Night).
- Not being utilised properly (i.e., my particular skills are not called upon).
- Short notice from White Ribbon Australia to assist with an activity.
- No challenges faced.
- Other (please specify)

How have you responded to those challenges? For example, how did you overcome them? (Tick all that apply)

- Balanced my work life and Ambassador position.
- Contacted the White Ribbon organisation for support.
- Contacted other Ambassadors for support.
- Increased my knowledge base.
- Prioritised my work with White Ribbon Australia.
- Other (please specify)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, at least once</th>
<th>Yes, in the past 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended a White Ribbon Australia event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed the issue of men’s violence against women with friends or family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised or helped organise a public event for White Ribbon Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted White Ribbon Australia through social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted White Ribbon Australia by distributing leaflets or hanging posters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a talk or presentation about White Ribbon Australia at a school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a talk or presentation about White Ribbon Australia at your workplace or discussed men’s violence against women with colleagues in your work network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or developed personal networks to help promote White Ribbon Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wore a White Ribbon pin, bracelet, or t-shirt to promote White Ribbon Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would help increase or sustain your involvement as an Ambassador? (Tick all that apply)

- [ ] More suggestions and guidelines for activities.
- [ ] Frequent networking opportunities.
- [ ] Regional based committees.
- [ ] Training opportunities.
- [ ] Better use of my skills.
- [ ] More recognition for my work.
- [ ] Year-around opportunities outside of White Ribbon Day or Night.
- [ ] Opportunities to assist other Ambassadors.
- [ ] Increased transparency from White Ribbon Australia’s corporate office.
- [ ] More online resources.
- [ ] Integration with other organisations such as women’s groups or shelters.
- [ ] Other (please specify)

What do you think is or has been your primary contribution to White Ribbon Australia?

What do you think is your primary contribution to preventing and reducing men’s violence against women?

What primarily does White Ribbon Australia provide you with, to prevent or reduce men’s violence against women?
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White Ribbon Australia: Successes and Opportunities for Improvement.

What do you think are the primary **successes** of White Ribbon Australia? (Tick all that apply)

- Creating a 'brand' that helps promote an anti-violence message.
- Creating a sense of community around violence prevention.
- Enabling men to speak to men about gender equality and equity.
- Enabling men to speak to men about stopping men's violence against women.
- Increasing male engagement in anti-violence initiatives.
- Integration with schools through the Breaking the Silence school program.
- Helping to influence government policies.
- Providing a safe space for men to be involved in prevention of men's violence against women.
- Providing resources to men to use in their community.
- Promoting research into men's violence against women.
- Spreading awareness of men's violence against women.
- Working with diverse communities to increase awareness and engagement.
- Working with social institutions i.e., the police and military.
- Working with other anti-violence organisations.
- Working with other community organisations.
- Working with sports teams.
- Other (please specify)

---
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What do you think are *areas for improvement* for White Ribbon Australia? (Tick all that apply)

- Better use of each Ambassador’s unique skill sets.
- Focusing on all violence not just on men’s violence against women.
- Different use and distribution of funds.
- Better communication from White Ribbon Australia.
- Better communication between Ambassadors in the same community.
- Better culturally appropriate tools.
- Better integration with local support services such as domestic violence shelters.
- Better integration with women’s groups.
- More marketing in traditional media such as television and newspaper.
- More men in leadership positions within White Ribbon Australia’s corporate structure.
- More resources and support for Ambassadors.
- More of a “grassroots” feel.
- Less focus on “famous” Ambassadors.
- Less focus on sport.
- Other (please specify)

Do you have any suggestions on how to improve these areas?
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How do you relate to women and men as an Ambassador?

This section focuses on how you relate to women and other men.

Additionally, there are questions about the movement to prevent violence against women.

The purpose of this section is to understand how being an Ambassador has impacted your life.
### White Ribbon Ambassador Survey

Ambassadorship: Change in how you relate to **women**?

Has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to **women**?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
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Ambassadorship: Change in how you relate to women?

How has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to women? (Tick all that apply)

☐ I am more conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in my personal life (e.g., with friends and family).

☐ I am more conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in my professional life (e.g., with colleagues and business contacts).

☐ I am more conscious of what I say and how I say it.

☐ I am more empathetic to women.

☐ I listen more to what women have to say.

☐ I treat women with more respect.

☐ Other (please specify)
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Ambassadorship: How you relate to women?

Why do you think how you relate to women has not changed?

[Blank space]
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Ambassadorship: How you relate to other men?

Has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to other men?

☐ Yes
☐ No
**White Ribbon Ambassador Survey**

**Ambassadorship: Change in how you relate to other men?**

How has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to other men? (Tick all that apply)

- [ ] I am more likely to challenge sexist behaviour toward women.
- [ ] I am more conscious of being a positive role model for other men.
- [ ] I have lost male friends because of my position on violence against women.
- [ ] Other (please specify)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ambassadorship: How you relate to other men?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Why do you think how you relate to men has not changed?**

[Blank space for response]
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Ambassadorship

How has being involved in White Ribbon Australia changed your view of what it means to be a man? (Tick all that apply)

☐ I am more aware of the need for positive male role models.
☐ I have a greater understanding of how the dominant ideas of masculinity have shaped my life.
☐ I have a greater understanding of how my personal attitude and behaviour impacts others.
☐ I question the notion of “boys will be boys”.
☐ I place less emphasis on proving my manliness.
☐ I have an increased ability to self-reflect on my role as a man in society.
☐ I have placed emphasis on the importance of promoting gender equality and equity in my personal life.
☐ I have placed emphasis on the importance of promoting gender equality and equity in my professional life.
☐ It has changed what I view to be a “good” man.
☐ No change
☐ Other (please specify)

Do you consider yourself a feminist?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Any comments to add to this question?

---
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#### Demographic Information Introduction

The following questions concern basic demographic information about yourself.

The purpose of these questions are to create a profile of men in Australia who actively try to prevent violence against women.

**Reminder:** This is an anonymous survey, your answers cannot be used to identify you.
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Demographic Information

Postcode of primary residence. Please enter a 4-digit postcode, for example, 2522 or 0870.

What year were you born?

What is your current marital status?
- Single, never married
- De facto
- Married
- Separated but not divorced
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Other (please specify)

Do you identify as...
- Heterosexual or straight
- Gay
- Bisexual
- Cannot choose
- Other (please specify)

Do you have children?
- Yes
- No
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Demographic Information

Do you have a daughter(s)?
☐ Yes

Do you have a son(s)?
☐ Yes
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Demographic Information: Language and birth place?

Do you primarily speak a language other than English at home?

- No
- Yes, Italian
- Yes, Greek
- Yes, Cantonese
- Yes, Mandarin
- Yes, Arabic
- Yes, Vietnamese
- Other (please specify)

Were you born in Australia?

- Yes
- No
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Demographic Information: When did you move to Australia?

What year did you move to Australia?

Where were you born? (Tick only one)
- United Kingdom
- New Zealand
- China
- India
- Philippines
- Other (please specify)
Do you identify with a religious group? (Tick only one)

- Anglican/Church of England
- Baptist
- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Hinduism
- Islam
- Juedaism
- Lutheran
- Pentecostal
- Presbyterian and Reformed
- Uniting Church/Methodist
- Spiritual without a denomination
- I do not identify with a religious group
- Other (please specify)
Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Labor, Liberal, National or what? (Tick only one)

- Liberal
- Labor (ALP)
- National
- Australian Democrat
- Green
- One Nation
- Family First
- No party
- Other (please specify)

In politics people sometimes refer to being on the left or on the right. Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?
Please select one box for each of these questions to show how important you think it is for getting ahead in life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Fairly Important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Cannot choose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is coming from a wealthy family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is having well-educated parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is having a good education yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is having ambition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is hard work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is knowing the right people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is having political connections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is giving bribes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is a person's race?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is a person's religion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is being born a man or a woman?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your gross annual income, before tax or other deductions, from all sources? - Please include any pensions and allowances, and income from interest or dividends. (Tick only one)

- Nil income
- $1 - $119 per week ($1 - $6,239 per year)
- $120 - $159 per week ($6,240 - $8,319 per year)
- $160 - $199 per week ($8,320 - $10,399 per year)
- $200 - $299 per week ($10,400 - $15,599 per year)
- $300 - $399 per week ($15,600 - $20,799 per year)
- $400 - $499 per week ($20,800 - $25,999 per year)
- $500 - $599 per week ($26,000 - $31,199 per year)
- $600 - $699 per week ($31,200 - $36,399 per year)
- $700 - $799 per week ($36,400 - $41,599 per year)
- $800 - $999 per week ($41,600 - $51,899 per year)
- $1,000 - $1,499 per week ($52,000 - $77,999 per year)
- $1,500 - $1,999 per week ($78,000 - $103,999 per year)
- $2,000 or more per week ($104,000 or more per year)
- $3,000 or more per week ($156,000 or more per year)
- $4,000 or more per week ($208,000 or more per year)
- $5,000 or more per week ($260,000 or more per year)

What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Tick only one)

- Primary School
- High School
- Trade qualification or apprenticeship
- Certificate or Diploma (TAFE or business college)
- Bachelor Degree (including Honours)
- Postgraduate Degree or Postgraduate Diploma
Which of the following best describes your current occupational situation? (Tick only one)

- Working full-time for pay
- Working part-time for pay
- Unable to work due to illness, injury, or disability
- Unemployed
- Unemployed - Looking for work
- Retired from paid work
- Working without pay in the home
- Other (please specify)
Which of the following best describes your current occupational situation? (Tick only one)

- Working full-time for pay
- Working part-time for pay
- Unable to work due to illness, injury, or disability
- Unemployed
- Unemployed - Looking for work
- Retired from paid work
- Working without pay in the home
- Other (please specify)
What best describes your current or last occupation? (Tick only one)

- Accounting
- Administration and Office Support
- Animal Care
- Architecture and Design
- Arts and Entertainment
- Automotive
- Banking and Financial Services
- Building and Construction
- Call Centre and Customer Service
- Charity/Third Sector
- Defence and Military
- Education and Training
- Engineering
- Farming
- Government
- Healthcare and Medical
- Hospitality and Event Planning
- Human Resources and Recruitment
- Insurance and Superannuation
- Internet Technology and Telecommunications
- Law Enforcement: Police and Security
- Law: Courts, Lawyer, Paralegal
- Manufacturing
- Marketing, Advertising, and Public Relations
- Mental Health
- Mining, Resources and Energy
Performing Arts: Actor, Dancer, Musician, and Singer
Pharmaceuticals
Property Management and Real Estate
Public Servant
Publishing: Author, Editor, and Journalist
Research
Retail
Sales
Social Work
Software Developer
Sports and Recreation
Transportation and Logistics
Travel and Tourism
Other (please specify)
White Ribbon Ambassador Survey

Thank you for submitting your demographic details.

Anything to add? Please take this opportunity to share any suggestions or concerns about the survey or White Ribbon Australia.
12 APPENDIX E: Statistical Analysis Notes

This methodological information is taken almost verbatim from the unpublished Internal White Ribbon Ambassador Report (Bell and Seaman 2016, 104-111). This report was prepared for White Ribbon Australia by Kenton Bell and Claire E. Seaman. This report was not made publically available due to privacy issues; however, a public report was released outlining a majority of the findings (see Appendix C, p. 164 for the full report).

12.1 Sample

A total of 2062 Ambassadors were approached by White Ribbon Australia, via email, and invited to participate in the study. Of these, 296 were considered satisfactorily completed (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.2, p. 155) for inclusion in the research reported here, giving an 80 percent completion rate and a 14 percent final response rate (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.4, p. 156). A total of 86 participants completed an interview. Of these, 10 were completed face-to-face, and the remaining 76 were completed via audio-only Skype/telephone calls. For the survey component, an overall response rate of approximately 17.9 percent was attained with 370 surveys undertaken.

Table 2 (below) provides a breakdown of Ambassadors contacted by each state, as well as the corresponding final response rate. Due in no small part to the changes associated with the Ambassador program being undertaken at the time the survey was administered, it is likely that the sampling frame included Ambassadors who had already ceased their affiliation with the Ambassador program. It is therefore likely the true final response is higher than the 14.4 percent reported here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Emails sent (sampling frame)</th>
<th>Response received (sample achieved)</th>
<th>Response rate (Percent of emails sent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT &amp; TAS</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12.2 Avoiding Inflated numbers

Descriptive statistics are presented as proportions of the total 296 Ambassadors surveyed, rather than as proportions of the total ‘valid’ responses to each survey question. Extensive recoding of responses to demographic questions was also undertaken to maximise the usability of responses, and to maintain the confidentiality of respondents. To meet one of the main objectives of the report—understanding ‘who’ Ambassadors are relative to males in Australia generally—comparisons were made to 2011 Australian Census data across key demographic categories. Permission to use the ABS’ online Table Builder application, and to access confidentialised Australian Census data, was obtained by both researchers. Table Builder facilitated the extraction of 2011 male population data across key demographic variables to Excel where summary statistics were produced with Australian Census items that best match survey categories, where possible (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.5, p. 156). Inferential analysis using one-sample binomial and t-tests were undertaken for comparisons to Australian Census statistics obtained. For Ambassador survey responses, chi-square tests for independence were used to examine differences across key Ambassador demographic characteristics. Independent samples t-test were used to examine differences in count variable responses as they produced the same results as nonparametric testing. The alpha level was set at .05, and significant findings are included where relevant.

### 12.3 Criteria for ‘Complete’ Surveys

Surveys were selected as ‘satisfactorily complete’ if participants provided valid responses to all of the following questions: ‘How did you initially hear about White Ribbon?’, ‘Has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to women?’, and ‘Postcode of primary residence’. These questions were chosen as they provided the best indication of participation across the different sections of the survey and were close-ended questions.
12.4 Response Rate and Assessment of Attrition Bias
The response rate of approximately 14 percent is low. We expect that there are several factors for this. Firstly, White Ribbon Australia uses email to communicate with Ambassadors en masse. Along with email addresses not always being a fixed point-of-contact, we expect that many Ambassadors may simply have not been aware that the survey was running. Secondly, White Ribbon Australia is undergoing a period of significant change, including alterations to Ambassadorship. It is not known how many of the 2062 emails were read or received by Ambassadors who were still active as Ambassadors.

Attempts were made to assess whether surveys omitted had systematic differences to those included in order to evaluate the presence of attrition bias. The first question, ‘How long have you been involved with White Ribbon Australia?’ was answered in 50 percent of omitted surveys and had a mean of 4.30 years and standard deviation of 2.51. This was not significantly different to the completed survey results ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 2.47$) and does not provide evidence for the presence of attrition bias.

Comparisons on further survey items were hindered by a steep decline in valid item responses among omitted surveys from this initial question.

12.5 Use of 2011 Australian Census data
2011 Australian Census Data was accessed using the Table Builder Basic platform available for use, with permission, from the ABS. Tables were then exported to Excel to calculate relevant statistics. Data was refined to include only men in Australia aged between 18 and 80 years old, inclusive, unless otherwise stated. Percentages were calculated using ‘Total’ figures that then had any ‘Not stated’ and ‘Inadequately described’ responses deducted (ABS 2015).

12.6 TableBuilder Basic Tables Generated
12.7 Limitation on Interpretation

Another assumption, which is unique to chi-square testing, is that the expected frequency count is above 5. Fischer’s Exact Test was not used. Where this second assumption is not met, and there is a key qualitative insight, the statistics are presented in descriptive rather than inferential terms.

12.8 Calculation of Ambassador Length of Involvement

Respondents’ length of involvement as indicated in ‘Months’ and ‘Years’ responses was coded into a single continuous variable. Respondents who indicated between 1 and 9 on the ‘Months’ measure had these added in decimal form to the number of years they indicated they had been involved (i.e.: 1 month, 2 years = 2 + .1 = 2.1 years). Respondents who did not provide a response for one of the variables had their response imputed as ‘0’ (i.e.: 0 months, 5 years = 5 + 0 = 5 years). Respondents who provided ‘0’ or missing responses to both questions were coded as ‘missing’ so that the lowest possible length of time is .10 of a year (imputed from 0 years, 1 month). Respondents who indicated 10 months were imputed as +.9 years rather than an additional year. Respondents who indicated 11 or 12 months were recoded as +1.0 months; an additional year. This process facilitated the fitting of responses into a base-10 continuous variable outcome. While this slightly over-inflates time of involvement for many respondents (1 of a year is greater than 1 month), this recoding process was undertaken for its relative simplicity and transparency. 98 respondents provided valid ‘month’ responses, meaning 183 respondents provided only ‘year’ responses (there were 281 total valid responses to this question). Given the high number of ‘year’ responses only, it is likely that respondents may have ‘rounded-up’ their time of involvement with White Ribbon Australia. The variable should be interpreted cognisant of these factors.
12.9 Creation of ‘Age’ Categories
 Respondents’ years of birth were recoded into a continuous variable, Age, which indicated the age the respondent turned in 2015. To maintain respondent confidentiality in displaying frequency data, ages were also coded into five categories:

- Ages 18-29
- Ages 30-39
- Ages 40-49
- Ages 50-59
- Ages 60+

12.10 Creation of ‘Remoteness’ Categories
 The distribution of Ambassadors is based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics Remoteness classification, relative to the males in Australia aged 18-80 years, according to 2011 Census data (ABS 2013).

12.11 Creation of ‘Sexual Orientation’ Categories
 To maintain respondent confidentiality, this variable was recoded into two categories. The first encompasses those who indicated they were ‘heterosexual’, and the second contains an aggregate of the responses, ‘gay’, ‘bisexual’ ‘can’t choose’, and valid ‘other’ responses.

12.12 Creation of ‘Relationship Status’ Categories
 To maintain respondent confidentiality, responses were coded into aggregated categories. ‘Married’ was retained as its own category, ‘de facto’ was recoded to a new category, ‘in a relationship (other)’, which included the five ‘other’ responses to this question who indicated they were currently in a relationship but not necessarily ‘married’ or ‘de facto’. ‘Separated but not divorced’ and ‘divorced’ were combined into a new category, ‘separated or divorced’, and the remaining categories ‘widowed’ and ‘single, never married’ had low sample sizes and so were also combined into a new category, ‘single or widowed’.

12.13 Comparability of ‘Relationship Status’ Variables to 2011 Australian Census Data
 There was no comparable category in the 2011 Census item, ‘Registered Marital Status (MSTP)’ for ‘in a relationship’. Instead, responses of never married people
who are in relationships are included under ‘never married’ and people previously married and in a relationship fall under the relevant categories, ‘separated’ or ‘divorced’ or ‘widowed’ (ABS 2011a).

12.14 Creation of ‘Primary Language’ Categories
Responses to this question were coded into two new binary variables. ‘No’ responses were recoded to variable ‘primarily speaks English at home’, and all responses to the stated options, including valid responses to ‘other’ were recoded to comprise the variable ‘primarily speaks a language other than English at home’.

12.15 Creation of ‘Place of Birth’ Categories
Responses to this question were coded into new categories; ‘yes’ to ‘Australian born’ and, ‘no’, to ‘born overseas’. The survey item, ‘What year did you move to Australia’ was not included in this report. Several respondents noted that they experienced issues with the ‘drop-down box’ used to indicate a response to this question. To maintain respondent confidentiality, countries of birth were coded as two new aggregate categories. The United Kingdom was retained as a dichotomous categorical variable, ‘born in the UK’, which included ‘other’ responses which also indicated being from the country. A second binary variable ‘Born elsewhere’ encapsulated all valid ‘other’ responses, as well as responses to the stated options; ‘New Zealand’, ‘China’, ‘India’, and the ‘Philippines’.

12.16 Creation of ‘Religiosity’ Categories
Responses to this question were coded into three new categories. People who indicated ‘I do not identify with a religious group’, or who provided an ‘other’ response that indicated they did not identify as religious were coded into the category ‘no religious affiliation’. To maintain respondent confidentiality, those who responded with a Christian religion (‘Anglican/Church of England’, ‘Baptist’, ‘Catholic’, ‘Lutheran’, ‘Pentecostal’, ‘Presbyterian and Reformed’, and ‘Uniting Church/Methodist’ or a relevant ‘other’ response) were coded into the category, ‘Christian religions’. Similarly, respondents who indicated ‘Buddhist’, ‘Hinduism’, ‘Islam’, ‘Judaism’, and ‘Spiritual without a denomination’ or valid ‘other’ response were coded into, ‘Other religions or spiritualities’.
12.17 Creation of ‘Political Party Affiliation’ Categories
To maintain respondent confidentiality, responses for ‘Liberal Party’ and ‘National Party’ were joined to form the response, ‘Liberal or National Parties’, as representative of the current Coalition alliance in Australian politics (there was no set responses for other Coalition parties). Any responses to ‘Australian Democrats’, ‘One Nation’, or ‘Family First’ or ‘Other’ were coded into a single ‘other’ response.

12.18 Creation of ‘Key Occupation’ Categories
Only a few occupations indicated could not be coded (1.4 percent), and 26 respondents did not provide a valid response. Occupations were classified based on ABS working definitions of blue and white-collar occupations used in the Australian Social Trends (ABS 1997).

- ‘Blue-collar occupations ... refer to the following major groups of the Australian Standard Classification of Occupations: tradespersons; plant and machine operators, and drivers; and labourers and related workers. These major groups are predominantly associated with trades and lower-skilled jobs that are often physical.’

- ‘White-collar occupations ... refer to managers and administrators; professionals, para-professionals; clerks; salespersons and personal service workers. These major groups are predominantly associated with higher education and specific skills or with lower-skilled jobs that are mainly social rather than physical.’

12.19 Creation of ‘Income’ Categories
To maintain respondent confidentiality and to facilitate comparisons with available census data, income categories were condensed into four groups:

- ‘<$400 per week’ for all income categories at and below this amount
- ‘<1500 per week’ for all income categories between $400 and $1499 per week
- ‘<2000 per week’ for the income category ‘$1500 - $1999 per week’
- ‘$2000+ per week’ for all income categories greater than and including $2000 per week.
12.19.1 Comparability of ‘Income’ to 2011 Australian Census Data

Weekly income does not include any deductions such as tax or superannuation. Additionally, Australian Census ‘Negative income’ responses were considered equivalent to ‘Nil income’ (ABS 2011b).

12.20 Quotations from the Survey

Quotations taken from survey responses were corrected for spelling.

12.21 Creation of ‘Feminist-identifying’ Categories

A small proportion (4.4 percent) of respondents did not provide a response to this question. A total of 34.5 percent of Ambassadors responded affirmatively while 61.1 percent indicated that would not consider themselves a feminist, including 2 percent who explicitly stated they identified as ‘pro-feminist’. Overall, 36.5 percent of Ambassadors surveyed were classified as ‘feminist-identifying’ or ‘pro-feminist’.

12.22 Religiosity and Joining White Ribbon Australia.

Of the Ambassadors surveyed, 1 in 6 from ‘other’ religious faiths indicated this response, relative to 1 in 20 Ambassadors surveyed from Christian-based religious faiths or with no religious affiliation. The associated chi-square test failed the expected count assumption.

12.23 Primary contribution to White Ribbon Australia

Common themes to this open-ended question were identified. Where possible, responses were categorized into one or more categories. A total of 264 Ambassadors provided a response to this question with 247 providing valid, codifiable responses. Proportions are calculated from the overall sample total of 296.

12.24 Primary contribution to preventing or reducing men’s violence against women

Common themes to this open-ended question were identified. Where possible, responses were categorized into one or more categories. 263 Ambassadors provided a response to this question with 249 providing valid, codifiable responses. Proportions are calculated from the overall sample total of 296.
12.25 What does White Ribbon Australia provide you?
Where possible, responses were categorized into one or more broad categories. 258 Ambassadors provided a response to this question with 245 providing valid, codifiable responses. Proportions are calculated from the overall sample total of 296.

12.26 Classification of Formal or Informal Involvement
This research developed the concept of formal and informal involvement. Direct involvement refers to Ambassadors, who have explicitly engaged in preventing men’s violence against women in a direct, highly focused capacity. It may be formal or informal. Direct, formal involvement includes Ambassadors whose paid professional work, or community work has been or is currently primarily directed towards ending and preventing men’s violence against women. It is a broad group which includes (but is not limited to) Law Enforcement who have specified they have been involved in Family Violence units or similar, professionals working with victims or perpetrators of violence, and people working for organisations directly targeting men’s violence against women. Direct, informal involvement refers to Ambassadors, who stated that they have personally intervened to stop violence and/or have assisted a victim, including those who have assisted family or friends experiencing men’s violence against women. Not too dissimilar to direct involvement, ‘Formally involved in Work with Direct Exposure to violence against women or Prevention Efforts’ refers to Ambassadors who did not report informal direct involvement, and whose formal work was not specified as being primarily focused on preventing men’s violence against women but which included some exposure to violence, providing safe spaces for victims, as well as advocating against violence. Finally, indirect involvement categories refer to Ambassadors, who reported working through either formal or informal relationships with a focus on shifting the culture around men’s violence against women.

12.27 Limitations
While this is a case study of White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassador population, the representativeness of this study is limited by the self-select nature of the design. For instance, it is likely that results may reflect social network clusters of Ambassadors (e.g., Ambassadors from the same workplace), and that the Ambassadors that agreed to participate were the most motivated to do so. Additionally, the population was in flux during the research window as White Ribbon Australia was going through
corporate restructuring and the Ambassador program was being overhauled, with each potential participant being asked to recommit concurrently to the organization. With the application of inferential statistical tests, it is assumed that 2011 Australian Census data is representative of true population parameters and that the Ambassador sample is representative of the Ambassador population despite the nonrandom sampling method. Some caution should, therefore, be taken in interpreting the statistics (see Statistical Analysis Note: 12.7, p. 157). Finally, this is the first research project of its kind due to the scope and intention of the project. The results should be viewed through a case study framework and as a pilot study.
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Project Overview

This project is a case study of White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassador Program. This project was independently conducted by Kenton Bell and Claire E. Seaman, under the auspices of the University of Wollongong and supervised by Associate Professor Michael Flood and Associate Professor Richard Howson.

Through in-depth interviews and an online survey, this project investigated how and why men become part of the Ambassador Program; how they enact their role as an ally to end men’s violence against women, the challenges they encounter, and how they overcome them.

The project has two primary aims. First, to provide an independent assessment of the Ambassador Program through analysis of Ambassador perceptions of White Ribbon Australia’s successes and areas for improvement, and to create an Ambassador demographic profile. Second, due to the scale of the research and the position of White Ribbon Australia as a leader in engaging men to prevent men’s violence against women, the case study aims to inform at a broader social level. It seeks to provide insight into Ambassadors’ motivations and experiences which may assist other organisations in Australia and around the world to similarly engage men in preventing men’s violence against women.

Recommendations to White Ribbon Australia

These recommendations have been made from both the survey and interview data.

1. Ambassadorship

From the interviews, Ambassadors felt strongly about maintaining the legitimacy of the Ambassador Program. Thus, the position of Ambassador should be limited and granted solely to those men who have proven (and continue to prove) their commitment to the mission of White Ribbon Australia, and when men fail in this commitment, their Ambassadorship is removed.

2. Diversity

Responses indicate that Ambassadors are overwhelmingly socioeconomically advantaged, and collectively, they are an immense resource. It also indicates that further work should be done to achieve greater diversity in the program to spread the anti-violence message more effectively. Having an Ambassador community that embodies a diverse and progressive range of masculine identities is vital in moving towards what White Ribbon Australia’s recently released Strategic Vision (2016–2019) calls a ‘new vision of masculinity’ (see Key Findings: 1).
3. Communication

A monthly, regionally directed email newsletter solely for Ambassadors from White Ribbon Australia needs to be implemented. The newsletter should comprise key points outlining White Ribbon Australia programs, new research, and updates on events in their area. Additionally, this newsletter should include helpful tips and information on preventing men’s violence against women. For example, methods to engage with men such as the bystander approach, links to useful resources, and a section highlighting ‘less famous’ Ambassadors (see Key Findings 4, 6).

4. Fatherhood

White Ribbon Australia should focus more on family and fatherhood to engage the Ambassadors and the broader community. During the interviews, Ambassadors repeatedly discussed their children as motivators for their involvement, often seeking to ensure that their children did not encounter the pain they had experienced as children (see Key Findings 1, 2).

5. Integration

As indicated by Ambassadors in the survey and interviews, White Ribbon Australia should seek to collaborate more closely with other anti-violence organisations. The Ambassadors can assist in building stronger relations with other violence prevention organisations and women’s groups (see Key Findings 6).

6. Motivation

The Ambassadors surveyed and interviewed do not necessarily work to prevent men’s violence against women because of White Ribbon Australia. Instead, the organisation is a platform—many Ambassadors were doing the work both formally and informally, long before the organisation existed and would continue to do so if White Ribbon Australia disappeared. Many of the Ambassadors have knowledge and experience in the anti-violence area and large amounts of social capital (whom they know) and cultural capital (what they know) that are coupled with conviction, and these men need to be utilised to help train other Ambassadors (see Key Findings 3, 6).

7. Reflection

From the interviews, it became apparent that the Ambassadors appreciated the opportunity to reflect on their role as men preventing men’s violence against women. Men involved in the campaign should have opportunities for critical reflection regarding masculinity, gender, and violence, through discussion groups or education sessions, to inspire both personal change and collective action. These opportunities for reflection should be included in Regional Forums, Regional Committees, or the monthly newsletter and can be facilitated by other knowledgeable Ambassadors (see Key Findings 9).

8. Regional Committees

Most of the respondents want local White Ribbon Australia committees and working groups to facilitate planning of events, resource exchange, and networking opportunities — including low or no-cost monthly meetings. These committees can provide information about preventing men’s violence against women, further opportunities for participation, and networking with other Ambassadors to increase solidarity while improving resource utilisation (see Key Findings 4).
9. Resource Mobilisation
Ambassadors report needing information, opportunity, and networking to improve the effectiveness of their efforts. Additionally, Ambassadors feel underutilised in general and specific to their unique skill sets. The resource pool among the Ambassadors is immense and must be identified and harnessed in working to prevent men’s violence against women in Australia (see Key Findings: 1, 3, 4, 6).

10. Transparency
White Ribbon Australia should send a single email to all Ambassadors highlighting these research findings, and a follow-up responding to the research. During the interviews, Ambassadors reacted positively to being asked their opinion and are eager for a response from both the researchers and White Ribbon Australia. This research is a critical opportunity for White Ribbon Australia to acknowledge the previous issues regarding the Ambassador Program and discuss any changes moving forward.

Method

Data Collection
This research was completed using data obtained through an online survey and from in-depth interviews. Given the breadth of the aims of this study, the primary source of data for this report is the survey. The survey data is further contextualised by the interviews, which provide rich insight into lived experiences through narrative.

An opportunity to participate was sent, via email, to all White Ribbon Australia’s Ambassadors in September 2015. From the 2022 envelopes sent, 296 online surveys were sufficiently completed, and 86 Ambassadors participated in an in-depth interview. Through the Ambassadors’ insights, this research project will help inform the future direction of the Ambassador Program.

Ethics Approval
The Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Wollongong approved all research procedures employed in this study. Approval number: HE14/451.

Data Analysis
For the survey, open-ended responses were recorded with both researchers reviewing the themes and data to ensure consistency. Descriptive statistics are presented as proportions of the total 296 Ambassadors surveyed. Recording of responses to questions, including the creation of larger, composite demographic categories, was also undertaken to maximise the usability of responses and to maintain the confidentiality of respondents. In examining the Ambassador’s characteristics, comparisons were made to the most recent available Australian Census data (2011) where equivalent categories could be ascertained. Differences are reported as significant with an alpha level set at .05. All interviews were recorded digitally, de-identified (i.e., names, locations, and ages were changed), and transcribed. Interview data was thematically analysed and serves a complimentary function in this report. The key findings are presented below. Results are interpreted through the theoretical lens of social movement theory, particularly concerning resource mobilisation.
Key Findings

1. Demographics

- Ambassadors surveyed reported a mean length of involvement of 4 years, with a median length of involvement of 3.6 years.
- Ambassadors were just as likely to come from regional and remote areas (excluding very remote areas) as the broader male population in Australia but are slightly less likely to come from city areas.
- The mean age of Ambassadors is 50.6 years of age. This is significantly older than the mean age of adult males in Australia (46.1 years), as well as the mean age of adult male volunteers (47.8 years).
- Ambassadors identified overwhelmingly as heterosexual and were significantly more likely than males in Australia to be married and have children.
- There is a significant, distinct lack of religiosity amongst the Ambassadors compared to the broader male population in Australia.
- Overall, Ambassadors surveyed identified across the ‘left-right’ political spectrum, although more identified towards the political ‘left’, and none identified in the furthest ‘right’ category (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. In politics people sometimes refer to being on the left or on the right. Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means left and 10 means right?

- While Ambassadors reported comparable levels of employment to the broader male population, they do have significantly higher levels of formal education, and they are significantly more likely to be in higher income brackets relative to full-time adult male workers (see Figure 2). The relatively higher incomes of Ambassadors were not accounted for by increases in the wage price index since 2011. Only a small minority of Ambassadors reported being employed in occupations that could be classified as ‘blue collar’ work (e.g., Labourers, Machinery Operators and Drivers, Technicians and Trades Workers), according to Australian Bureau of Statistics’ classifications.
2. Why Men become White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors

- Most Ambassadors surveyed initially heard about White Ribbon Australia through their workplace or the White Ribbon Australia Workplace Accreditation program.
- Ambassadors indicated their primary reasons for becoming part of White Ribbon Australia were ‘to make a difference in their community’ (73.7%), due to ‘moral obligation’ (42.8%), because they ‘heard stories related to men’s violence against women’ (53.4%), and because they had ‘read statistics related to men’s violence against women’ (43.2%) (see Appendix: Figure A1).
- From the interviews, the role of fatherhood as a catalyst for initial involvement is apparent and provides opportunities for meaning making.

3. Ambassador Contributions to White Ribbon Australia and White Ribbon Australia’s Contributions to Ambassadors

- The Ambassadors surveyed indicated that their primary contributions to White Ribbon Australia are raising awareness of the issue with others (54.7%), raising awareness in their workplace (26.7%), speaking at events as an Ambassador (19.9%), and running White Ribbon Australia events or being on White Ribbon Australia committees (14.2%).
- Half (49.7%) of Ambassadors surveyed had attended a White Ribbon Australia event in the last twelve months, while a majority (88.4%) had worn the White Ribbon Australia pin, bracelet or t-shirt. Most (74.4%) had discussed men’s violence against women with friends or family during this time.
- When asked about their knowledge of White Ribbon Australia programs, the surveyed Ambassadors had the most limited knowledge of the Diversity Program, with 48.3% only knowing ‘the name’ or not being familiar at all with the Diversity Program. This finding is larger than the proportion of Ambassadors who only knew the name or were not familiar at all with the Breaking the Silence Schools Program (26.0%), and the Workplace Accreditation Program (20.3%).
• Common themes regarding what Ambassadors feel White Ribbon Australia provides them with to help prevent men’s violence against women are information such as resources and research (51.1%), opportunity such as a platform, means, or purpose (24.6%), legitimacy through the White Ribbon Australia brand or the title of Ambassador (16.9%), and support and encouragement (14.9%).

4. Experiences, both Positive and Challenging, Commonly Encountered by White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors

• The positive experiences of Ambassadorship are an increased knowledge of men’s violence against women, specifically (75.0%) and violence against women in general (72.0%). Other positive experiences include helping to ‘reduce or prevent men’s violence against women’ (56.1%); ‘increased confidence to stand up for what I believe in’ (55.1%); a ‘sense of purpose’ (50.7%); and a ‘sense of personal fulfillment’ (49.7%) (see Appendix: Figure A2).

• The Ambassadors reported that ‘not being utilised properly’ (24.3%); ‘lack of year-round involvement’ (21.6%); and a ‘lack of a “grassroots” feel’ (19.9%) were key challenges. However, the primary challenge encountered by Ambassadors is a ‘lack of time’ (26.5%), while one-quarter (24.7%) of the Ambassadors indicated ‘no challenges faced’ (see Appendix: Figure A3).

• From the interviews, Ambassadors want to do more — not less — and often lament the lack of opportunities outside of White Ribbon Day and White Ribbon Night.

• Most Ambassadors reported feeling underutilized by White Ribbon Australia not only in general but specific to their unique skill sets. While this finding is apparent from the survey, this was repeatedly found in the interviews. Law Enforcement Officers, Social Workers, and Counsellors indicated they had skills and the desire to serve, but no outlet.

• These challenges can be summarised as a lack of proper utilisation, isolation from other Ambassadors, and a lack of confidence to make a change.

5. Effect of White Ribbon Australia involvement on Ambassadors’ Lives

5.1 Changes in Relationships with Women

• Over one-third of Ambassadors surveyed (39.5%) report that being an Ambassador had changed how they relate to women (see Figure 3).

• Of the Ambassadors who indicated that they had changed how they relate to women, 86.3% are ‘more conscious’ of what they say and how they say it, while 84.6% are ‘more conscious of promoting equality and equity’ in both their personal and professional lives (see Appendix: Figure A4).

• Of the Ambassadors who report they had not changed how they relate to women, 73.7% provided extended responses indicating they already respected women or believed in equality and equity.
5.2 Changes in Relationships with other Men

- Most Ambassadors surveyed (68.6%) report that their involvement with White Ribbon Australia has changed how they relate to men (see Figure 4).
- Of the Ambassadors who indicated they had changed how they relate to men, nine-tenths (89.2%) were “more likely to challenge sexist behaviour toward women” (see Appendix: Figure A5).
- Of the Ambassadors that reported they had not changed how they relate to men, one-third (34.4%) provided extended responses indicating they were always clear where they stood on men’s violence against women, other men or had spoken against men’s violence against women, and one-third (30.1%) reported having always had respectful relationships with men and other people in general.

5.3 Changes in the Meaning of being a Man

- When asked whether being involved with White Ribbon Australia had changed their view of what it means to be a man, three-quarters (74.7%) reported they are “more aware of the need for positive male role models”.
- Half placed more ‘emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity’ in their personal life (49.7%) and professional life (49.0%). Finally, almost half of the Ambassadors surveyed “question the notion of ‘boys will be boys’” (47.6%) and have increased their ability to self-reflect as men (45.9%) (see Appendix: Figure A6).

6. White Ribbon Australia Successes and Areas for Improvement, and Ways to Increase or Sustain Ambassador Involvement

6.1 Successes

- The vast majority (91.6%) of Ambassadors surveyed indicated that “creating a “brand” that helps promote an anti-violence message” is a primary success of White Ribbon Australia. Other significant successes include “enabling men to speak to men about stopping men’s violence against women” (85.1%), “spreading awareness of men's violence against women” (79.7%), and “increasing male engagement in anti-violence initiatives” (78.4%) (see Appendix: Figure A7).
- The successes that received the lowest response were “working with diverse communities to increase awareness and engagement” (29.1%) and “working with other anti-violence organisations” (27.4%).

6.2 Areas for Improvement

- When asked about areas of improvement for White Ribbon Australia, Ambassadors nominated “better communication between Ambassadors near each other” (57.9%) and “better use of each Ambassador’s unique skill sets” (49.5%) as the top areas of concern.
- The Ambassadors also recommend better integration with both ‘local support services’ (39.9%) and ‘women’s groups’ (34.8%) (see Appendix: Figure A8).
6.3 Increasing or Sustaining Ambassador Involvement

- The key methods Ambassadors recommend to increase or sustain their involvement are ‘year-round opportunities’ (46.6%); ‘training opportunities’ (40.8%); ‘opportunities to assist other Ambassadors’ (37.3%); and ‘more suggestions and guidelines for activities’ (37.5%) (see Appendix: Figure A9).

Limitations

This is a case study has provided unique insight into the experiences, motivations, and challenges of White Ribbon Australia Ambassadors. However, the authors note that there are some limitations in the generalisability of results. Primarily, as is common with surveys, the representativeness of this study is limited by the self-selection nature of the design. For instance, the results may reflect social network clusters of Ambassadors (e.g., Ambassadors from the same workplace), and it is likely the Ambassadors who agreed to participate were the most motivated to do so. Although sample bias could not be checked for, there was no evidence of an attrition bias among incomplete surveys. The Ambassador population was in flux during the research window as White Ribbon Australia was going through corporate restructuring and the Ambassador Program was being overhauled, with each potential participant being asked to recommit concurrently to the organisation.

Inferential statistical tests were applied under the assumption that the 2011 Australian Census data remained representative of true population parameters at the time the survey was administered (2015), and that the Ambassador sample is representative of the Ambassador population despite the non-random sampling method. It should be noted, however, that all Ambassadors were invited to participate and that the sample obtained therefore comprises a relatively large proportion of the population of interest. This research is the most comprehensive of its kind to date given the survey and interview response, and overall scope and intention. It provides rich insight into the background and experiences of Ambassadors, as they work under the Ambassador Program, contributing to the broader social movement of preventing men’s violence against women.

Additional Research Outcomes

1. Reports

In addition to this report, there was an exhaustive Internal Research Report presented to White Ribbon Australia’s staff and board. Due to the sensitive nature of the data, particularly demographic information, portions of this report will not be released to the public.

2. Presentations and Papers

A series of academic articles are planned from the research findings. Additionally, the research findings will be disseminated to the public through a series of articles and discussions via broadcast, print, and online media. The goal has always been to create awareness about men’s violence against women while researching applied and practical ways to stop it. Because of this, the findings will be presented as broadly as possible, including at Regional Committees and Regional Forums.
3. Future Research

This research was a pilot study. Based on the work completed with White Ribbon Australia, the survey and interview schedule has been changed to reflect what worked and what did not. The intention is to replicate this study with other White Ribbon organisations and similar organisations around the world for cross-cultural analysis. These efforts will create a research instrument that others can use to investigate male allyship in relation to men’s violence against women and improve programming within their organisation.
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## Appendix

Figure A1: Why did you become involved in White Ribbon Australia? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice action</th>
<th>Themes identified from “Other” responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To make a difference in my community - 75.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral obligation - 69.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard stories related to men’s violence against women - 52.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned stances about men’s violence against women - 41.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To positively change how my family and friends treat women - 36.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic or sexual violence committed against someone you know - 33.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced or invited by other men to join - 27.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced or invited by women to join - 24.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited to join by White Ribbon Australia - 23.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic or sexual violence committed by someone you know - 15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use the White Ribbon name recognition as resource - 12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile building at work and within my profession - 11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional directive, expectation, or request - 10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities - 7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic or sexual violence committed against you - 6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior participation with a similar organisation - 6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to join a community organisation - 6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic or sexual violence committed by you - 4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) - 12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a role model/provide leadership - 3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to my profession - 2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatherhood - 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired by White Ribbon Australia’s work - 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist/human rights advocate/believer in equality - 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence how my profession is perceived - 0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compelled by/desire to work within Indigenous communities - 0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A2: What are some of your positive experiences as an Ambassador? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from &quot;Other&quot; responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An increased understanding of men’s violence against women - 75.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater knowledge of violence against women - 72.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped reduce or prevent men’s violence against women - 56.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased confidence to stand up for what I believe in - 55.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of purpose - 50.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal fulfillment - 49.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of community and solidarity with other Ambassadors - 45.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equal and equitable relationships with women in my professional life - 44.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equal and equitable relationships with women in my personal life - 41.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive change in how I am seen by friends and acquaintances - 35.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting other Ambassadors - 32.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a better father - 30.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively changing how my family and friends treat women - 27.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equal and equitable relationships with men in my professional life - 21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equal and equitable relationships with men in my personal life - 20.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile building at work and within my profession - 19.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No positive experiences - 2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) - 9.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative experiences - 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of White Ribbon Australia as a tool to build credibility - 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A3: What challenges have you encountered as an Ambassador? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from &quot;Other&quot; responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No challenges faced</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being utilised properly</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of year-round involvement</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a &quot;grassroots&quot; feel</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication from White Ribbon Australia</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short notice from White Ribbon Australia to assist</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence in my ability to affect change</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement with decisions White Ribbon Australia has made</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and skills to engage</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from White Ribbon Australia</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of work support for involvement</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition for my contributions</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from family or friends</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout from too much work</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of attending/Lack of local funding</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community support or awareness</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges or lack of support from other men</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with other Ambassadors</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of indigenous-specific resources</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge from other Ambassadors</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not male led</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in allyship because of White Ribbon Australia</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure A4:** How has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to women? - % of total respondents who indicated a change (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from &quot;Other&quot; responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More conscious of what I say and how I say it - 86.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in my professional life - 84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More conscious of promoting gender equality and equity in my personal life - 84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More empathetic to women - 48.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen more to what women have to say - 41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat women with more respect - 36.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) - 8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a greater understanding of violence against women - 7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A5:** How has being an Ambassador changed how you relate to other men? - % of total respondents who indicated a change (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from &quot;Other&quot; responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to challenge sexist behaviour toward women - 89.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lost male friends because of my position on violence - 8.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more confident in my ability to speak about men's violence against women with others - 5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) - 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more confident in my ability to speak about violence against women with others - 3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More aware of sexist attitudes/behaviour - 2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained friends or grown closer to my friends - 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Figure A6: How has being involved in White Ribbon Australia changed your view of what it means to be a man? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from “Other” responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am more aware of the need for positive male role models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity in my personal life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis on promoting gender equality and equity in my professional life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater understanding of how personal attitude/behaviour impacts others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I question the notion of “boys will be boys”</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an increased ability to self-reflect on my role as a man</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater understanding of how dominant ideals of masculinity have shaped my life</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I place less emphasis on proving my masculinity</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has changed what I view to be a “good” man</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- More aware of the complex nature of violence against women and men relating to women: 2.0%
- White Ribbon Australia has put me further down the road I was already on: 1.7%
- I know that men can be part of preventing violence against women: 0.7%
Figure A7: What do you think are the primary successes of White Ribbon Australia? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from “Other” responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a ‘brand’ that helps promote an anti-violence message</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling men to speak to men about stopping men’s violence against women</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading awareness of men’s violence against women</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing male engagement in anti-violence initiatives</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling men to speak to men about gender equality and equity</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a sense of community around violence prevention</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to influence government policies</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resources to help men to use in their community</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting research into men’s violence against women</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with social institutions i.e., the police and military</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with other schools through the Breaking the Violence School Program</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with sporting teams</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with other community organisations</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a safe space for men to be involved in prevention of men’s violence against women</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with diverse communities to increase awareness and engagement</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with other anti-violence organisations</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging workplaces</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 100%
Figure A8: What do you think are areas for improvement for White Ribbon Australia? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice action</th>
<th>Themes identified from &quot;Other&quot; responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better communication between Ambassadors near each other - 59.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use of each Ambassador’s unique skill sets - 49.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better integration with local support services - 35.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication with White Ribbon Australia - 33.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better integration with women’s groups - 34.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources and support for Ambassadors - 33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better culturally appropriate tools - 30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less focus on “famous” Ambassadors - 27.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More marketing in traditional media - 25.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on all violence, not just on men’s violence against women - 23.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More men in corporate positions within White Ribbon Australia - 18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less focus on sport - 9.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different use and distribution of funds - 6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - 16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration with other groups - 2.0%  
More accountability and effectiveness of Ambassadors - 1.0%  
More training - 1.0%  
More support for rural Ambassadors - 1.0%  
Changes to language used by White Ribbon - 1.0%  
More focus on children and schools - 0.7%  
More focus on sport/Increasing focus on sports clubs - 0.7%
Figure A9: What would help increase or sustain your involvement as an Ambassador? (multiple response item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed choice option</th>
<th>Themes identified from &quot;Other&quot; responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-round opportunities outside of White Ribbon Day or White Ribbon Night - 46.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities - 40.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to assist other Ambassadors - 37.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More suggestions and guidelines for activities - 37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with other organisations such as women’s groups or shelters - 34.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent networking opportunities - 28.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use of my skills - 28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More online resources - 26.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional based communities - 26.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased transparency from White Ribbon Australia corporate - 14.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More recognition for my work - 5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - 13.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All good/no change needed - 2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regional/&quot;grassroots&quot; focus - 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing, I withdrew - 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More work in schools - 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC REPORT: CASE STUDY OF WHITE RIBBON AUSTRALIA’S AMBASSADOR PROGRAM: MEN AS ALLIES TO PREVENT MEN’S VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN
KEY FINDINGS

70%
Of Ambassadors felt a moral obligation to join a movement to end men’s violence against women

83%
Of Ambassadors felt one of WRA’s successes was enabling men to speak to other men about men’s violence against women

“I WANT MY DAUGHTER TO HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITIES AND LEVEL OF SAFETY IN HER LIFE AS MY SONS”
- SURVEY RESPONDENT
Fatherhood is a strong motivator for many men to become White Ribbon Ambassadors

41%
Of Ambassadors want more training opportunities

“IT’S ABOUT EDUCATING PEOPLE, MEN, TO STOP VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN”
- SURVEY RESPONDENT

1 IN 2
Men have become a White Ribbon Ambassador after hearing stories about men’s violence against women

SHE WAS A GOOD PERSON AND SHE HAD A LOT TO OFFER THE WORLD AND SHE CAN NO LONGER PHYSICALLY BE HERE. SO I FEEL THAT IT’S JUST MY RESPONSIBILITY TO TRY AND DO WHATEVER I CAN TO ENSURE THAT RAY OF SUNSHINE DOESN’T COMPLETELY EXTINGUISH.
- INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT

Results are of the total Ambassadors surveyed.

Researchers: Kenton Bell and Claire E. Seaman, University of Wollongong. Corresponding Author: Kenton Bell, email: k.sbell@uowmail.edu.au