Shifting the line

Boys talk on gender, sexism and online ethics

Nicola Gavey, Octavia Calder-Dawe, Kris Taylor, Jade Le Grice,
Brandee Thorburn, Sam Manuela, Makarena Dudley,
Senuri Panditharatne, Riane Ross, Angela Carr

Shifting the line

Boys talk on gender, sexism and online ethics

Nicola Gavey

Octavia Calder-Dawe[1]

Kris Taylor

Jade Le Grice, Ngāpuhi, Te Rarawa

Brandee Thorburn[2]

Sam Manuela

Makarena Dudley, Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri, Ngāti Kahu

Senuri Panditharatne

Riane Ross

Angela Carr

Te Kura Mātai Hinengaro | School of Psychology,
Te Whare Wānanga o Tāmaki Makaurau | The University of Auckland.

[1] SHORE and Whariki Research Centre, Massey University.
Now at Te Kura Tātai Hauora | School of Health, Te Herenga Waka | Victoria University of Wellington.

[2] Now at Avondale College.

"Real men cry"
"I'm just doing my part to try break down barriers of unhealthy thinking men have around masculinity ❤"

<div align="right">Sonny Bill Williams, former All Black</div>
<div align="right">(Williams 2018a, 2018b)</div>

"I've been involved in sport my whole life and the level of sexism is unreal."

<div align="right">Andy Murray, Olympic & Grand Slam tennis champion</div>
<div align="right">(quoted in Burrows, 2018)</div>

"Toxic masculinity is everywhere. It's up to us men to fix this."

<div align="right">Jordan Stephens, hip hop artist</div>
<div align="right">(Stephens, 2017)</div>

"I'm interested in the idea of challenging patriarchy. It's obviously awful for women but it also cuts men off from their emotions side and seems to produce men who are disconnected from their feminine-feeling side."

<div align="right">David Pocock, former Wallaby rugby player</div>
<div align="right">(quoted in Christensen, 2018)</div>

"Men with privilege – our silence speaks volumes. It perpetuates systems of violence and upholds #rapeculture. We've gotta use our privilege to be part of the solution."

<div align="right">Rhys Jones, Ngāti Kahungunu, public health doctor</div>
<div align="right">(Jones, 2019)</div>

Contents

Executive summary

In Aotearoa New Zealand, as in other parts of the world, we too often hear about the latest instalment of 'toxic masculinity' to make the headlines – cases of boys and men acting with a sense of dominance and entitlement, treating women as objects that exist purely for their pleasure or amusement.[1] Globally, the spotlight has increasingly turned to the role of men and boys in countering this kind of sexism, sexual violence and harassment against women and girls, both off and online. We conducted research to explore a way of working with secondary school age boys and young men to support and facilitate their contribution to positive change away from a culture that tolerates online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse. Our work with boys focussed on online communication between boys and girls, which we framed within a broader context of gender equality and ethics. We worked with boys who were interested in thinking about these issues and helping provide insights into how boys can promote positive change in their own peer circles in relation to equality. Through workshops, we explored ways of supporting and building on these young men's willingness to recognise sexism and interrupt harmful gendered norms and behaviours.

This report presents our sociocultural approach to making sense of the persistent problem of online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse, our 'theory of change' and the nuts and bolts of how we translated this into a model for working with boys that facilitates their readiness to support positive social change. It also discusses key findings from testing this model in workshops with over 50 boys and young men in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland. The boys who participated in the project contributed as cultural informants, commentators, and sometimes critics. They offered observations and perspectives that provide a window into understanding the gendered sociocultural context that local young men grow up in. Their insights clarify some of the ways this context limits boys at the same time as it holds gender inequality in place. On an encouraging note, the boys' overall responses to the workshops suggested that by creating spaces for open, challenging and respectful conversations about these issues, there is the potential to ignite and support change.

Key points, findings and recommendations

- Some of our society's key ideas for what it means to be a man give boys and young men a narrow and limiting model for how they should be and act in the world.
- Boys notice these 'masculinity rules' and the ways they are policed, but have few opportunities to talk about them, and few positive public models for how to sidestep narrow messages about what it means to be a man.
- The restrictive norms for masculinity, which were identified by boys across diverse social backgrounds and ethnicities, included the avoidance of anything 'feminine' and a very limited repertoire of emotions.
- Boys' friendship groups, and the importance of peer group loyalty and belonging, were spoken about as powerful influences on behaviour, both in maintaining expected norms and in some cases in supporting departures from these norms.
- The powerful role of peer group norms suggests that effective strategies to promote positive change and ethical behaviour should seek to transform collective norms and action, rather than targeting individual behavioural change.
- Given the unhelpful, and in some cases dangerous, cultural baggage that traditional gender roles carry, we suggest it would be better to inspire boys and young men to be ethical *people* rather than 'good *men*'.
- Paradoxically, it could seem, a first step in this direction requires noticing how gender structures the world and most people's experiences and opportunities within it.
- Some boys and young men are interested in talking about these issues – and it is possible to create spaces that build on their curiosity and their commitment to fairness and equality, allowing them to critically reflect on gender norms and develop insights and skills that enhance their readiness to contribute to positive social change.
- This report provides a preliminary model and some tools that can be used and adapted for working with New Zealand boys and young men who are interested in contributing to a culture that promotes more ethical online behaviour as well as contributing to the bigger picture of gender equality and violence prevention.
- Further research is needed to develop this peer group workshop-based model into a more extended and sustainable intervention, and test its longer-term impact.
- Supporting even small numbers of boys and men to work together to become change agents has the potential to spark ripples of change that can shift norms of ethical behaviour among peers in the wider cultural context.

Chapter 1
Introduction

In March 2017, hundreds of young people gathered outside Parliament to protest rape culture.[2] The demonstration was sparked by a media exposé of a private Facebook group conversation, in which two Wellington College students made comments like, "if you don't take advantage of a drunk girl, you're not a true Wc boy" and "F*** women. Not even drunk, pass her out then f*** her job done". Other boys "liked" the posts.[3] Around the same time, there were reports of students at another Wellington boys' school having "inappropriately" filmed two women teachers, and shared the images on a private group on Instagram.[4] These incidents grabbed headlines in the New Zealand media, and shocked and disturbed many commentators. Young women, however, were reportedly unsurprised, describing such comments as common, off and online. As one young woman said, "It's not something that pops up every now and then, it is something that happens every single day".[5]

This project tackles the problem of this kind of unethical and abusive behaviour by boys and young men: posting misogynist speech online, taking sexualised images of girls and women without their consent and distributing them on social media, as well as onsharing[6] 'nudes' (intimate images) of peers without that person's consent. We conceptualise these behaviours under the umbrella of *online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse*.

In this report we introduce a sociocultural model for thinking about some of the underlying causes of online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse, and how to change it. We make the connection between these kinds of behaviours and the broader issues of gender inequality and systemic forms of gender-based violence against women and girls, including and as well as LBGTQ+ people. The change process we recommend here focusses on boys. We argue that working with boys to promote change is *one* of the necessary steps towards dismantling those aspects of the broader sociocultural context that permit this sort of unethical and harmful behaviour to continue.

Drawing on peer group workshops we held with over 50 boys and young men in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland in late 2017 and early 2018, we describe how boys are caught in a net of confusing messages about how to be men. We also present a more optimistic vision of how, given the opportunity to discuss and unpick these messages, boys' curiosity and good intentions can be supported in ways that potentially free them up to contribute to more ethical and egalitarian norms for behaviour.

Our project situates unethical and harmful online behaviour within a broader gendered social and cultural context that shapes communication both off and online. The sociocultural model informing this research and our recommendations takes a different path from many other approaches to working with men and boys towards gender equality and gendered violence prevention in Aotearoa New Zealand. Although this is changing, the more common approach in New Zealand has been to encourage men to be allies in these movements.[7] While that is important, we

emphasise that real change requires something more than this. It requires all of us, boys and men included, to actively question the limited and limiting norms and ideals that are held up for boys and men to aspire to. Although social norms in and of themselves are not the full problem, they are inextricably intertwined with the structural dimensions of gender inequality, which they variously obscure, naturalise and rationalise.

Background: Context and research

Shifting the Line seeks to understand online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse against girls and young women and how to prevent it. These are problems that are situated within, and connected to, the broader sociocultural context of 'rape culture' that plays out both off and online. While a fuller review and discussion of this context is beyond the scope of this report, it is important to briefly set the scene.

The wider context of 'rape culture'

Roastbusters still stands out in recent memory as an iconic case of a group of Auckland boys systematically sexually mistreating and denigrating girls – and an iconic case of our societal failure to properly address it.[8] This group came to public attention in 2013 because of their own social media promotion of their sexually coercive and exploitative behaviour with young teenage girls.

The Roastbusters case was in the news at the very same time the notion of 'rape culture' was gaining international prominence as a concept that made connections between everyday sexism and sexual violence.[9] In a nutshell, it maintains that we need to look at everyday norms, actions and values that make sexual violence possible and that cover it up when it happens. It points to the blurry line that exists between acts that would widely be regarded as criminal acts of rape or sexual assault and acts in which men pressure and force 'sex' on a woman who doesn't want it; acts that are prone to being minimised as seduction, or 'rough sex' or something else that normalises the man's behaviour and discounts the woman's version of events.

Since the time of the Roastbusters case, there has been a steady flow of news about other incidents in which young men have subjected young women to sexual harassment, exploitation and violence. This behaviour crosses a broad spectrum. It includes criminal trials for sexual violation in which men have successfully argued against rape charges on the basis that they had reasonable grounds for believing in consent, even with a woman who was saying no, physically resisting and crying[10], or with a woman who was pleading, crying, saying no, vomiting and having a panic attack[11]. It includes acts of harmful digital communication such as taking and onsharing intimate photos or videos of girls and women without their knowledge or consent.[12] It also includes online misogyny and gender and race-based denigration, such as the ways some men respond on Tinder when their interest is not reciprocated.[13]

Revelations of systemic patterns of sexual harassment and exploitation of young women within a prominent New Zealand law firm[14] and abuse within the local music industry[15] make the point that we can't just blame *young* men for this problem.[16] While some of this behaviour is widely condemned, some is widely condoned. In between lies a large grey area that is treated by many as if men's and boys' harassment and disrespect of women are simply a 'fact of life', a natural and inevitable outcome of 'boys being boys'. This reveals just how normalised the sexist denigration of women is. For example, when a group of Otago University students set up a men-only private Facebook group – the "Rack Appreciation Society" – to "post pictures of bikini clad models and to comment on women's breasts" some media commentators considered the general practice benign, disapproving only of the men who had posted images of girlfriends and ex-girlfriends without

their consent.[17] Similarly, but in an offline context, there was only muted public condemnation of Waikato Chiefs rugby players' reported mistreatment, harassment and what sounded like assault of a woman hired to entertain them.[18]

Drawing a broader arc, we can also make links to the exploitative yet normalised ways that women are used and abused for entertainment within professional sport[19] and the sex industry[20]; to the ongoing ways that women's bodies are dissected as props to advertise items ranging from hipster jewellery[21] to hearing aids[22]; to how sexist slogans have until very recently been used to adorn campervans and restaurant toilets[23]; and to the online misogynist bonding and humour that denigrates women in general, such as in the Wellington College boys' Facebook comments that we opened with.

Although the concept of rape culture can be controversial,[24] it is helpful in drawing attention to systemic gendered patterns of everyday behaviour that provide a 'cultural scaffolding' for men's sexual violence against girls and women. It also helps to draw attention to the harm caused by discourses that normalise and naturalise male sexual dominance and entitlement.[25]

In the wake of the 2013 Roastbusters scandal, we interviewed young critics of rape culture, who described a 'matrix of sexism' as a normalised backdrop to their everyday lives. They referred to "everyday trivialising uses of the word rape, normalising portrayals of male sexual conquest, and widespread victim-blaming and 'slut-shaming'".[26] Not only do these elements of rape culture provide tacit support for sexual mistreatment, abuse, and violation, but they contribute to wider social harm through disproportionately restricting freedoms and opportunities for girls, women, and gender diverse people.[27]

Until quite recently, attempts to critique this kind of sexism were often trivialised and stone-walled,[28] except where it manifest in stereotypical versions of sexual violence. Yet, as the 2017 Wellington protests showed, young people themselves have begun to mobilise against a wider context of rape culture exemplified by these kinds of everyday sexism and sexualised abuse, drawing connections between them and more explicit forms of sexual violence.

Culture, colonisation and intersectionality

Our critique of rape culture, so far, has foregrounded its gendered foundations, but the finer grain texture of rape culture is also patterned by culture and ethnicity, socioeconomic circumstances, sexuality, religion, and so on. This means that the burdens of rape culture fall differentially for people depending on their social and cultural positions in society. In very direct terms, for instance, Māori women experience a higher rate of interpersonal violence at the hands of men, than most other groups of women in New Zealand.[29] Gender-based violence, furthermore, can also be directly intertwined with racist denigration and abuse for some women, compounding its harm – as Jade Le Grice has shown in relation to her own experience as a Māori woman.[30]

In New Zealand, whānau and sexual violence experienced by Māori women and children is linked to colonisation. As many Māori scholars have discussed, myriad forms of colonial violence severely disrupted Māori social structures and undermined tikanga[31], paving the way for the imposition of colonial norms and values around gender and the introduction of patriarchal mascu-linities.[32] These Western models of gender endorsed men's dominance over women and children and destructively impacted whānau already suffering from the colonial assault on the traditional values, knowledge, structures, and practices of te ao Māori.

Brendan Hokowhitu has written extensively about how colonialism has shaped "the dominant portrayal of tāne as inherently physical, staunch, hypermasculine, and violent", creating a destruc-tive distortion of the diverse reality of Māori men's identities, roles, and behaviours.[33] While Pākehā and other men are also subject to the pull of these patriarchal models of masculinity, Hokowhitu

shows how racialised hierarchies of power and privilege afford different groups of men more or less flexibility and opportunity to move away from hypermasculine norms and values. As well as prejudicially squeezing the horizon of opportunity for Māori men in ways more cloying than for Pākehā men in general, Hokowhitu discusses how the colonial landscape casts them in an ambivalent position within dominant society – admired for their sporting prowess for example, and yet "held in contempt in moments where he fulfils hypermasculine stereotypes".[34] In a perverse irony, therefore, the introduced colonial ideals of patriarchal masculinity came to be seen, through a dominant societal lens, as 'belonging to' Māori culture.[35] One of the impacts of this has been to excessively burden Māori (and some other groups, such as Pasifika) boys and men with unfair associations with a proclivity to violence. And in doing so, problematically deflect attention away from the same potential among Pākehā (and some other groups of) men.[36]

While our study presents a first pass of working with boys and young men in relation to gender and sexism, any development of this work must navigate a more deliberate path in relation to recognising the differences among boys and men.[37] This entails recognising how they are also positioned in different and complex ways beyond gender. Work therefore must take account of the ways that patriarchal norms take shape in different cultural contexts as a legacy of our history of colonisation, the different pressures and opportunities faced by boys and men in different sections of our society, and the uneven impact of sexual violence and sexualised abuse across different groups in our society.

Attending to difference includes recognising that different cultural traditions embody values and practices that are highly relevant to promoting respect, equality and nonviolence, which can provide different reserves of cultural resources and constructive possibility. This is most immediately relevant to designing ways of working with boys and men that are attuned to their own communities and culturally specific knowledge and practice. There are also many ways in which Indigenous knowledge, for example, can inspire broader frameworks of analysis and intervention. A growing body of Māori research and policy literature applies mātauranga and tikanga Māori to the task of preventing (and healing from) whānau and sexual violence.[38]

Online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse

Digital technologies have created new venues for rape culture to flourish and have enabled new forms of gender-based harassment and abuse. These include online misogyny and harassment and image-based sexual abuse. In this project, our starting point was the ethics of onsharing intimate digital images.

When sending nudes goes wrong

'Sending nudes' is part of a broad repertoire of contemporary forms of communication in sexual and social relationships. The more formal term, 'sexting', is often used by researchers and the media, and we will use it interchangeably through the report. It involves sharing private intimate (sexual or sexualised) images via digital communication technologies. A recent New Zealand survey of 14–17 year old teenagers suggests that the phenomenon is familiar and salient for young people, even though the number of people this age who have sent a nude or nearly nude image of themselves may be relatively low.[39]

Qualitative research has highlighted many and varied motivations for sending nudes.[40] While public discourse on teenage sexting is often dominated by an emphasis on risk and harm, many researchers are wary of moralistically judging young people's consensual sexual behaviour and, in some countries, criminalising it (although this latter concern is less relevant in New Zealand). Nevertheless, sending nudes *can* go wrong, when people are pressured to send images when they

don't want to and when images that have been consensually sent to one person are then distributed to a wider audience.

U.K. legal scholars, Clare McGlynn and Erika Rackley, have conceptualised "the 'non-consensual creation and/or distribution of private sexual images'" as "image-based sexual abuse".[41] Such behaviour occurs on a continuum, including both naive sharing of images among two people or in small private friendship groups as well as malicious posting of images to so-called 'revenge pornography' sites. While the term *abuse* might seem jarring for some cases at the naive end of the spectrum, and not all these behaviours fall within the definition of criminal behaviour,[42] there is no question that all forms of nonconsensual image creation and sharing can cause deep, and potentially irrevocable, harm to the person whose image is onshared.[43] By contrast, those who do the onsharing have tended to face little or no consequences.

While both young women and young men might share their own images and both can be victims of unethical and abusive distribution, the dynamics and harms of this behaviour are strongly patterned by gender.[44] Within girl-boy interactions, girls (and women) are more likely to be asked and/or coerced by boys (and men) to share their own nude images, and feel pressured to do so.[45] For example, in the New Zealand survey cited earlier, girls were more likely than boys to have been asked to share an image of themselves, and they were more likely to agree with the statement: "there's a lot of pressure to send nude or nearly nude images/videos".[46] Similarly, in a U.S.-based study of online posts about "teens' experiences with digital drama", the researcher described the experiences of many teenage girls who reported having sent sexual images when they hadn't wanted to as a result of a young man's "persistent requests, threats and anger".[47]

There are also gendered patterns in what happens next. Men and boys are more likely to onshare the nudes they receive to other people.[48] Furthermore, the consequences from the nonconsensual exposure of private intimate images are generally worse for women and girls. The persistence of a sexual double standard, which renders very different meanings of girls' and boys' nude images, makes the reputational risks and associated social and psychological harms from exposure unequal.[49] Young Australians in one study, for instance, were quick to point out that public nudity means very different things for young men and young women. Whereas the public display of a nude male image can mean a nonchalant "'whatever'", as one young man put it, the public display of "female nudity means 'slut'".[50] This is not to deny that men and boys can be harmed through image-based sexual abuse (which they certainly can be[51]), but rather to point out that such abuse of boys is not supported by systemic features of the gendered fabric of teenage peer culture in the same way that the abuse of girls is.

In 2016, we conducted a collaborative social action research project on sexting with Year 12 and 13 girls at an Auckland secondary school.[52] We worked with seven small groups of girls, meeting with each group on three occasions. During these workshop-interviews we used a 'problem-posing' approach (see Chapter 2) that explored girls' observations and reflections on the issues surrounding sexting in their local cultural context. This provided us with a rich picture of the place of digital communication within peer group culture, and in social relations between girls and boys in particular. Nudes, the girls explained, are sexually suggestive images that are not necessarily literally nude. While not all girls experience pressure to send nudes, the girls spoke with familiarity about the phenomenon of sexting and its normative gendered dynamics. Many of the girls were aware, and critical, of a gendered double standard. They knew about the risks associated with sending nudes. At the same time, they elaborated on the ways that some boys directly or subtly pressure girls to send them. One way they described this happening, for example, was through boys sending unsolicited 'dick pics', setting up an implicit requirement of reciprocity. As one girl said, "It's kind of hard to say

no because when a girl says no a guy usually gets offended. He's like oh you aren't that cute anyway, you weren't worth it and the girl gets kind of hurt". As this girl's account reminds us, avoiding risk is not always straightforward, and can bring its own social and emotional costs.

Overall, the girls we worked with depicted the delicate balance girls can face – between pressure from boys to send nudes and pressure from parents and adult society more generally, to not send nudes. Listening to their accounts of these complex and difficult interactions highlighted the limitations of prevention campaigns that focus exclusively on educating potential victims about risks and advising caution in sharing images.

Part of the problem, as noted above, is that men and boys' behaviour in pressuring women and girls for nudes, and sharing them beyond their intended audience, is somewhat normalised. When something 'goes wrong', the girls and women who shared their intimate images in the first place are more likely to be blamed, while the behaviour of boys and men who pressured for them and/or onshared them is often not questioned.[53] As Amy Dobson and Jessica Ringrose found, when they analysed two "cybersafety campaigns" and discussed these issues with young people in Australia and the United Kingdom: "the ethics of masculinity, boys' behaviour and the norms of boys' digital sexual cultures remain largely obscured".[54]

In the current project we set out to talk to boys about some of the same dynamics we spoke with girls about, and the potential for ethical trouble and ethical solutions surrounding sexting.[55] While problems with the nonconsensual sharing of intimate images, and pressures to send intimate images, are just one specific form of online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse, it is the one we focussed on for two reasons. Firstly, this issue had been identified as a problem by colleagues and collaborators working in our local community, and we had already begun to look at it from the point of view of girls. Secondly, of all the different forms of digitally-facilitated sexual violence and harassment (to use Anastasia Powell and Nicola Henry's term[56]) relating to *young* people, it is the one that researchers have focussed most attention on. Related, and at times overlapping, issues that should also be kept in view include online sexism and misogyny, online harassment, and the full spectrum of image-based sexual abuse.[57] All of these forms of behaviour have been made possible by the interactive nature of the internet which, since the early 2000s, has developed in ways that allow ordinary users to easily create and share content, including to potentially wide audiences. But while our attention is drawn to the direct role of digital communication technologies and social media in facilitating harassment and abuse, we should not lose sight of the ways more traditional forms of media (including those delivered online) reinforce and perpetuate norms that diminish and devalue girls and women. This still happens through a full range of mainstream media, as well as in mainstream online pornography which has only relatively recently been put under a critical spotlight in New Zealand.[58]

Protesting and dismantling rape culture

Young people are not just passive victims (and perpetrators) of rape culture – and online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse in particular. Many are actively engaged in challenging and resisting it. The 2017 demonstration against rape culture at Parliament was organised by local high school girls, and girls turned out in force.[59] It was a show of solidarity that re-ignited the spirit of the early anti-rape movement from the 1970s, which first put sexual violence on the public agenda as a serious social issue.[60] Implicitly connecting to this struggle, one young woman said, "For generations our grandmothers, our mothers, have put up with this and we stand up here today for them and ourselves".[61] Their own protest actions are part of a revitalised feminist movement and a global resurgence of girls' and women's activism against sexual violence over the past decade[62] (magnified

and intensified since late 2017 by the MeToo movement[63]). Recognising the pivotal leadership of those girls and young women who organised the Wellington demonstration is essential; as is honouring the collective voice of all the young women who turned out, stood up, and spoke out against rape culture.

The role of boys and men

But what about boys and men, and their role in combatting rape culture and promoting a more ethical landscape for gender and sexual relations? While the protests on the streets of Wellington were led, and mainly attended by girls, some boys prominently joined in. One media report said boys were about a third of the crowd.[64] Some stand, in news media photographs of the event, sporting Wellington College blazers adorned with white ribbons.[65] Some carried placards, like one that read "'Boys will be boys' who respect girls"; others stood by a banner, reading "WC supports Womens' [sic] Rights".[66] Some from the College apologised and told the protest organisers that "so many boys in that school didn't support what happened".[67] Two boys from another local school were interviewed on national radio about their intention to join the protest. They were highly critical of rape culture, with one saying "it doesn't feel like it should fit into 21st century New Zealand".[68] They talked about wanting to stand against it, in solidarity with their female peers. About the protest, one said "getting the term 'rape culture' into the public consciousness and getting people talking about it is a step in the right direction".[69]

The visibility of these boys in the protest is important. It confirms what common sense might tell us – that despite public concerns about 'toxic masculinity', many boys and young men may not only decline to participate in denigrating and abusing young women, but some are very uncomfortable with the behaviour of their peers who do. Part of our inspiration for this project came from seeing these boys' actions, and our belief that failure to recognise and help harness this kind of sentiment is a massive missed opportunity for our society. The other part of our inspiration was the voices of the girls and young women we had worked with previously, who described the mundane sexism and gendered double standards that were part of their everyday lives, and raised the challenge that prevention must be aimed at stopping it where it starts.[70]

The broader prevention context

More formal measures to prevent sexual and other forms of violence against women are usually initiated by nongovernmental organisations, government bodies and other societal institutions. 'Primary prevention' – the name for the goal of stopping violence and abuse before it starts, and the activities implemented towards accomplishing that – dovetails with the more grassroots forms of activist intervention seen in the Wellington protest.

Preventing online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse

Efforts to prevent sexting-related harm – which was the original impetus for this project – have typically addressed potential victims (often implicitly, if not always directly, girls).[71] Messages have attempted to educate them about the risks of sharing intimate images, and advise caution. However, these efforts neglect the sociocultural and interpersonal pressures that make this more difficult to do in practice than in theory. For lasting change to occur, we need to refocus attention on those who solicit, share and distribute intimate and sexual images in ways that cause harm. Or, as a first step, we need to shift aspects of the peer and wider cultural context that condones such behaviour, or tolerates it through silence. Notably, an Australian survey found that young adults who more strongly agreed that it was normal for "sexts" to be disseminated beyond their intended

audience, and that it was "not a big deal", were more likely themselves to have disseminated one without consent.[72] It makes sense, therefore, to flip the focus of prevention to messages that highlight the ethical wrong of pressuring someone to share intimate images, of onsharing them without the person's knowledge or agreement, and viewing and appraising such images when they are in circulation.

Our project advocates a sociocultural focus for promoting change towards more ethical behaviour in relation to online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse. Thinking about the online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse of girls and women as a part of rape culture, or the broader problem of gender-based violence against women and girls, invites us to consider how the broader scope of preventing men's (sexual) violence against women and girls has been approached elsewhere. As noted earlier, the lens provided by the concept of rape culture emphasises the connection between everyday forms of behaviour that 'scaffold' men's sexual violence against women and girls through normalising men's and boys' denigrating and disrespectful behaviour towards women and girls that can contain the seeds of violence and abuse, and justify it when it occurs. From this perspective, prevention of harassment, violence and abuse must tackle these everyday behaviours even when they do not always look like violence or abuse themselves.

Inviting and supporting boys to be part of the solution

Critical awareness of ongoing gender inequalities and antipathy towards sexism is growing. In this context, there has been a global "turn to men", as Australian sociologist Michael Flood put it.[73] Alongside increasing recognition that narrow, rigid gender roles and gender inequality underpin many serious social and health problems, including violence and abuse, bodies like the United Nations and World Health Organisation have recognised that gender equality will remain elusive until men join the struggle.[74]

While there is a long history of men working as allies to support women's activism and organising against sexual and gender-based violence,[75] men are not often prominent among those speaking out publicly in New Zealand against everyday sexism, sexual harassment and sexualised abuse. When men do speak out, they are more likely to do so against shocking cases of murderous violence (such as the 2018 murder of Grace Millane) or high profile cases of sexual violence and abuse that are portrayed as exceptional (such as Roastbusters),[76] rather than more common forms of domestic violence and sexual harassment, coercion and abuse that often lurk below the public radar.

Globally, campaigns to engage men in the promotion of gender equality and the prevention of gender-based violence have been operating for at least two to three decades, but seem to be gaining new traction. These moves go hand in hand with widespread recognition of the link between gender equality and violence against women and girls. A 2007 World Health Organisation report noted that a range of high-level international experts concerned with gender equality "all affirmed the need to engage men and boys in questioning prevailing inequitable gender norms".[77] This view was echoed in a 2015 *Lancet* publication, where Rachel Jewkes and colleagues advocated a gender transformative approach to preventing violence against women and girls, observing a move towards interventions "that seek to transform the relations, social norms, and systems that sustain gender inequality and violence".[78]

On the international stage in 2014 UN Women launched HeForShe, a "global solidarity movement for gender equality",[79] calling upon men and boys to help end gender inequality.[80] Locally, organisations like White Ribbon, New Zealand Family Planning, and the National Council of Women have all directly targeted men to get on board in support of gender equality and/or violence and sexual violence prevention.[81] Globally, at the same time, various grassroots interventions addressing

gender equality, by and for men, have gone viral on social media. For example, Sydney Boys High School's Gender Equality Project[82] and later videos from boys at the school on the importance of feminism.[83] Also at a corporate level, as part of the trend for big-name brands to develop advertising campaigns around social justice themes, Gillette in 2019 launched a high profile campaign in response to MeToo, with the message for men to stop justifying "bad behavior"[84] of the kind typically associated with 'toxic masculinity'.

Despite this momentum, tensions and differences of opinion circulate over how best to engage men and boys in the pursuit of gender equality and violence prevention. Even advocates caution about potential pot-holes along the way.[85] One key point of contention concerns the efficacy and the risks of approaches that deliberately mobilise *masculinity* as a strategy to engage men as allies. This approach in essence calls upon men to be *good men*, by drawing on traditionally masculine qualities such as strength and protectiveness to effectively 'man up' to stop violence.[86] While male allies and partners are important in the movement toward gender equality and preventing gender-based violence, the problem with such approaches is that they implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, hold in place stereotypes of masculinity that are part of the problem. At best, they only scratch the surface of the degree of change that is needed, and miss a key element of requiring men to reflect on their own gendered position and the way that it sits within hierarchies of gendered power and privilege, as well as those of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, sexuality, ability, and so on.

Gender transformative approaches not only consciously avoid reinforcing problematic norms and structures, but unlike gender neutral approaches they address them head on and actively seek to change them.[87] Key to these approaches is the examination of how social imperatives and constraints around masculinity, and what it means to be a man, are deeply implicated in the problem of gendered violence against women and girls. Academics and practitioners are currently debating detail around the theory and practice of gender transformative approaches to gendered violence prevention, and raising many critical questions about how to ensure they effect real change rather than just providing ineffective window dressing.[88]

In New Zealand, as in some other countries that have historically prided themselves on relative gender equality (for example Finland, and in recent years, Denmark),[89] our government has been rather mute in promoting gender equality in relation to the connection between gender inequality and violence against women.[90] A gender transformative lens has been absent in mainstream prevention policy and practice.[91] We are therefore at a different stage, in relation to many other countries, where we first have to argue the relevance of gender for understanding and preventing all forms of violence and abuse that disproportionately affect women and girls.

We have also traditionally separated the issues of domestic violence and sexual violence, without an integrated vision of what connects these problems. Sexual violence prevention in New Zealand has mostly been approached as a problem that is quite distinct from men's violence against women in intimate partnerships (which is conceptualised as part of "family violence"[92]). As in many other parts of the world, recent efforts to prevent sexual violence here have pivoted closely around the promotion of consent, which is delivered almost entirely in gender neutral terms.[93]

In Australia, by contrast, the prevention lens is aimed at violence against women (and their children), and is underpinned by the assumption that "all forms of violence against women are interrelated and exist on a continuum".[94] This different way of approaching the problem – highlighting the primary category of victim-survivors[95] rather than the particular form of violence – has profound implications for how we understand the causes of violence and abuse and how we are able to envisage what needs to be done to prevent it. For instance, in Australia, the national policy framework for preventing violence against women and children is premised on recognition that

violence against women is "driven by gender inequality".[96] This generates a gender transformative approach to primary prevention which we argue is also needed in New Zealand.[97] Such an approach targets gendered social norms and everyday practices as well as the role of structural inequality.

In New Zealand, notable work towards these gender transformative goals in relation to violence prevention has been done by Māori scholars who bring an Indigenous approach to the task. Māori social work and social development academic, Peter Mataira, for example, says "we are reminded constantly of everything that's bad about Māori men's behaviour", and calls for a new strengths-based paradigm that invites men to "uproot ourselves from the insidious, somewhat intoxicating and enticing mix of power, privilege and dominance and liberate our hearts from these additive entrapments".[98] Mataira advocates for the need to "work collaboratively with Māori women in reshaping mainstream gender politics within institutional and cultural forms".[99] He calls for a process that challenges men and encourages them to speak; yet respects "tikanga processes and wairua"[100] and is "premised on aroha, tika, pono".[101] Poignantly, he says:

> "This is not about being sympathetic but empathetic to and critical of the processes that turn the innocence of a young boy into the anger of a violent man."[102]

Psychology academics Pita King and Neville Robertson have similarly eschewed a "deficit-focused" approach as they have theorised an alternative way to think about domestic violence prevention for Māori.[103] In their ethnographic case-based study with five Māori men, they set out to look at the everyday lives of men who are not violent, as a deliberate counterpoint to the one-dimensional negative stereotyped images of Māori men in New Zealand society. In discussing how these men "re-membered, reproduced, and adapted" "'traditional' cultural values and practices" within their everyday lives, King and Robertson were able to disrupt the dominant negative narrative.[104] Instead, they showed how Māori men can "flourish in the ways they express the plurality of Māori masculinities".[105]

Drawing on the Australian approach to the problem of violence against women, and informed by the work of Māori and other scholars of men and masculinity, we believe there is room to radically rethink how we in New Zealand approach the problem of young men's online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse of girls and women. One step in this direction entails helping mobilise boys and young men as positive change agents – building on, supporting, and expanding the kind of critical consciousness shown by those participating in the 2017 march on Parliament. Change agents would be equipped to step up to intervene when they witnessed harassment and abuse. Through promoting more egalitarian and respectful views and questioning norms that minimise and tolerate belittling and denigrating views and behaviour towards girls and women, they would also be able to contribute in more subtle ways to reconfigure a more ethical landscape.

In the next chapter, we introduce a sociocultural approach that could work as one small part within a wider gender transformative approach. It starts by inviting boys to understand their own gendered position in the world. This involves encouraging them to recognise the norms for masculinity that shape and constrain their own behaviour and experiences, and how this relates to the maintenance of ongoing gender inequality and sexism. We suggest that through working in small groups with other boys, to observe and question these facets of their social world, boys can develop understanding of their own role in this process and begin to map paths towards collective change.

Chapter 2
A sociocultural approach: Theory and practice

Common approaches to promoting social and behavioural change often focus directly on the individual, and their presumed knowledge, motivations and choices. Interventions of this kind seek to provide more information, better role models, and promote 'healthy' and responsible choices and behaviours. A sociocultural approach takes a step back, to examine the social and cultural 'conditions of possibility' that individual people encounter as they make their way through the world.[106] And it asks how that sociocultural context can enable, facilitate and support desired social and behavioural change. This means scrutinising the cultural knowledge and resources available for making sense of who we are and how we fit in the social world.

When applied to thinking about gender equality, ethics and justice, this approach starts by acknowledging that a lot of society's dominant messages about gender support an unequal status quo. While there are many different ways of being a man – academics talk about 'multiple masculinities' and how they change across time, place and culture – some are more dominant and influential than others. If a boy or young man wants to fit in, he will learn to adapt to the messages and models he receives about how men are expected to act, what is acceptable for them to be interested in, and what they should avoid in order not to be mistaken for 'the opposite sex'. The dominant 'rules of masculinity' therefore gradually shape most boys' behaviour as culture and society teach them how to be a man. While individual men can bend and break these rules, it is not always easy, and those who do are sometimes punished.

The technical concept we use to think about how this works, is French philosopher Michel Foucault's notion of 'pouvoir-savoir'.[107] The savoir part of this term refers to patterns of social and cultural knowledge and meaning. This is the kind of knowledge we learn indirectly through sayings, images, slogans, and little fragments of 'common sense' that embed and materialise social norms. Some of it comes from messages we get directly through instructions and overt rules, but mostly, it is implicit knowledge that we usually take for granted as just the way the world is. The reason we stick with the French term for this concept, is that the pouvoir part of the term has a useful double meaning. It means power, but it is also the verb 'to be able'. Pouvoir-savoir, then, means "being able to do something – only as you are able to make sense of it".[108]

Although it is not an everyday term, the idea it unlocks is simple: Our capacity (pouvoir) to understand ourselves and the world is shaped by the cultural resources (the savoir) we have access to, as are our options for how to behave. Dominant cultural ideas provide us with normative ways of seeing and being and acting.[109] When these are narrow and rigid, which many critics argue traditional norms of masculinity are, they constrain individual men's options for how to understand themselves and how to act.

According to this sociocultural view of human behaviour, an important step towards promoting social change is through tackling the savoir – in this case, the dominant norms of masculinity. Recognition is growing rapidly about just how limiting and harmful these norms are.[110] Until we stop thinking about these norms as reflecting a true unchangeable essence of manhood, calling on individual boys and men to change their behaviour away from them is likely to fail. It puts too much responsibility on individuals without recognising how culturally-embedded we all are, and without acknowledging the pressures arising from the ongoing influence of problematic social norms and the potential costs for transgressing them.

For boys and men to be able to question dominant norms, and loosen their influence, we have to create different 'conditions of possibility' that make it viable, safe and ultimately commendable. In practical terms, we need to create the spaces (both imaginative and physical) where boys and men can first notice and then question those norms, and we need to find more diverse forms of savoir and new cultural resources that offer more alternative 'ways of seeing and being' to fill their place.

This was illustrated in a recent study with a small group of young New Zealand men about the appeal of pornography.[111] They described the pornography they viewed as showing male sexual domination and female sexual submission, and containing violence and denigrating acts against women. But most had never thought about that as an issue, and did not recognise these patterns as sexist. At the time the interviews were conducted, in 2011, few people in New Zealand were publicly questioning how the messages carried by this kind of pornography contradict values of gender equality and models for ethical respectful gender relations. With little or no access to resources offering different points of view (alternative savoir), the young men appeared to have had no space or tools to think critically about the ethical challenges that violent pornography may pose. In the absence of these alternative ways of seeing this kind of mainstream pornography, they described the "extreme" content they viewed as simply "normal", mirroring the dominant laissez-faire discourse in New Zealand at the time which depicted men's pornography consumption as normal, unproblematic, and even healthy.[112] Yet in this study, when given the chance to think and talk about these questions in the space of an interview, a few of the men reflected that they were uneasy with the nature of the material they were watching. One, for instance, said "when I go home I'm going to delete some stuff".[113] This kind of invitation to notice, reflect, and question sexism that is otherwise invisible can be the first step in facilitating change for some young men.

A theory of change in action

New Zealand has egalitarian values and aspirations, and in some areas has been moving steadily, albeit slowly and bumpily, towards progressive social goals. But like many settler societies, as we strive to be inclusive and egalitarian, we are held back by vestiges and traces of older colonial values and norms that sometimes shape our common sense in ways we don't necessarily see. These include implicit assumptions about what boys are like, what girls are like, what kinds of behaviour are natural and normal between 'the sexes', and so on. While Indigenous concepts of gender and sexuality offer very different models,[114] they have been undermined and suppressed through colonisation, leading them to be less visible than dominant Western concepts within wider public settings.[115]

Understanding the problem of online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse as enabled by gender inequality and dominant sociocultural norms around gender and masculinity is not novel. The trope of toxic masculinity, for example, has increasingly been used within popular culture to draw attention to the harmful consequences of rigid narrow norms for masculinity that are based on a belief in male superiority and dominance and an almost allergic rejection of femininity. However, this notion of toxic masculinity and the critique it offers takes us only so far in diagnosing

a problem without offering a solution. How, in practical terms, do we generate change? How do we dislodge some of our hidden cultural attachments to old norms and values that undercut true equality? And how do we effect change to the structures in our society that uphold material forms of inequality? Significant social change towards equality obviously requires myriad interventions to reset the cultural, social, and economic elements of the unequal status quo. It also requires attention to understanding and gently challenging the psychological investments (passive and active) that many have in our status quo arrangement of gender. Part of the background mahi necessary for change involves helping people to see the inequalities that shape our everyday lives, and fostering ways they can join with others towards transforming these inequalities.

Our theory of change is underpinned by Foucault's notion of pouvoir-savoir, and how that helps explain the necessity of developing new norms and resources that open up different models and paths for experiencing and enacting gender. To inform the 'how' of putting this into practice, however, we turn to the work of Paulo Freire, the Brazilian educationalist, well-known for his "liberation pedagogy" developed in the mid-twentieth century when working with oppressed peoples in Latin America.[116] Freire's work provides a practical philosophy for guiding how to mobilise (open and curious) boys and young men to take up this challenge and 'get on board' with transformation related to the hierarchy of gender.

Freire saw that conditions of social and economic inequality and domination persist in part because they are taken-for-granted, naturalised, and shrouded in silence. He argued that transformative social change requires creating conditions for "conscientisation" – the process by which people "achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality".[117] These critical insights allow us to see the world how it really is, seeing how axes of power structure and shape our society in ways that privilege some groups and disadvantage others.

To achieve this development of critical consciousness Freire developed a method of "problem-posing" education. It is an approach that trusts in the curiosity and critical and imaginative capacities of people to see their social world afresh. In this process, people are invited to re-orient to the world around them as an object to be interrogated, rather than taking it for granted as just the way things are. Through this process of jointly observing and questioning, people come to see that what we might have once regarded as static facts about our social norms, structures and arrangements, are instead social artefacts that can be questioned, problematised, and thought about differently.[118]

In this dialogical approach, the teacher does not seek to transfer a body of authoritative preconfigured knowledge to their students – to tell them the 'right way' to think. Rather, the skill of the teacher (in our case, facilitator) is in providing just enough new information and ideas, and creating a learning space that allows the students and teacher to work together, gently challenging and rethinking taken-for-granted assumptions about their shared world. As Freire put it:

> "The students – no longer docile listeners – are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher. The teacher presents the material to the students for their consideration, and re-examines earlier considerations as the students express their own. The role of the problem-posing educator is to create, together with the students, the conditions under which knowledge at the level of the *doxa* [unquestioned belief] is superseded by true knowledge, at the level of the *logos* [reason]."[119]

Freire's liberation pedagogy, and related approaches like liberation psychology, are typically used in working with those who are oppressed and disadvantaged by structures of social domination. It is not so often used in working with those who could be seen to occupy dominant positions within those structures, and who arguably benefit from them (in relative terms). However, in a sociocultural and historical context where equality, justice and fairness are formally valued – as they are in New Zealand[120] – it is more likely that at least some of those who have traditionally occupied more dominant positions (boys, in this case, within a hierarchical structure of gender) may be open or even keen to explore the process of conscientisation. There is also, of course, growing recognition that restrictive dominant models of masculinity are not good for men either,[121] which some boys may recognise.

Our theory of change is premised on this hope, and faith in the possibility that instead of designing an intervention that addresses boys as 'the problem' it could be fruitful to seek out boys who want to be part of the solution. While such boys and young men are arguably not those for whom change is most urgently needed, working with them might be a more realistic place to start, as it helps to fortify peer cultural contexts less willing to turn a blind eye to unethical and abusive behaviour. By supporting and facilitating such boys to reflect upon and question the status quo of gender and the norms and ethics of online practices, and develop skills and confidence to back their commitment to equality, it could be possible for them to become agents of change. That is, boys who can, in low key ways, promote higher ethical standards and more egalitarian, respectful and caring practices among other boys and young men.

Methodology – Workshops with boys and young men

Towards the end of 2017 and in early 2018, we conducted 14 workshops with 10 groups of boys and young men (54 in total), from two secondary schools and one other organisation in Auckland. Six of the workshop groups met on one occasion, and four met twice.

Recruitment

We approached two secondary schools and one other organisation that works with school leavers embarking on university study about participating with our research. For the school students, we introduced the project as involving workshops aiming to find out more about "online communication between boys and girls in New Zealand, and how that works in relation to wider issues around gender and social responsibility". In information about the study, we explained that we were interested in working with small groups of "boys who are open to and interested in thinking about gender, equality and ethics", and who "might be able to give us insights into how boys can promote positive change in their own peer circles in relation to these and related issues to do with equality". We worded the written information provided to school leavers slightly differently, referring for example, to young men and young women, instead of boys and girls.

At the schools, we recruited participants through introducing the research at school assemblies. At one school, the Associate Headmaster read out a notice about the study, and at the other school, two members of our team spoke about the research. Volunteers signed up after the assemblies. At both schools we were surprised by the number of boys interested in participating in the project. School leavers from the third organisation were recruited through a staff member relaying information to young men involved with the organisation, and then arranging interested students into two groups on behalf of the research team.

Participants' commitment, and what we might infer about their interest in the issues, was somewhat uneven – as might be expected when conducting any research like this within institutional contexts. Most of the boys showed a high degree of commitment, with several participating in their own time, returning to school after exams. Reasons for participating included helping others:[122]

> "yeah it's, definitely something that needs to be talked about and with mates [....] Because it – like I've got a younger brother and like I definitely would not want to see him doing these things. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) So, it's also that like responsibility. Not like, just like for me for like, yeah, in terms of my brother." (*Alex)*

> "the reason why I actually did come was because I just want to like, hear the stories you know, maybe contribute" (*Manaia)*

One or two boys, on the other hand, said they signed up initially for reasons like they "didn't want to go to my last period for the next week" (*Marshall)*, and it was more difficult to gauge their commitment and know if they really knew much about what they were turning up for! It is possible such comments had a 'face-saving' quality for a boy who may have been uncomfortable declaring his interest in the material we explored; or it is possible that a few boys participated predominantly for the opportunity to hang out with their friends. Although, as in Marshall's case, who was commenting during a second workshop, while his initial reasons for coming along may have been unrelated to the kaupapa of the workshops, it is likely he was at least open to it. As he said, "but then coming to this like I actually, [....] I grew some passion to come here". It is relevant to emphasise, therefore, that most of the boys and young men who participated in our workshops had responded to a call for participants "open to and interested in thinking about gender, equality and ethics", which we contextualised in terms of our interest in "wider issues around gender and social responsibility". This is an important caveat for framing our findings, in that we can assume that most, or at least many, of the boys we worked with were already open to the idea of challenging conversations about these topics.[123]

In addition to the workshops, we interviewed four young actors with recent experience of participating in a gender transformative theatre production. These young men shared their reflections on the ways this changed their thinking about gender and power. While we do not directly draw on those interviews in the body of this report, in Appendix C we discuss their insights into how conscientisation might shape experiences, encounters, and perspectives beyond the immediate context in which 'problem-posing' takes place.

Participants

The 54 boys who participated in our workshops ranged in age from 15–19 years.[124] The majority were 16 or 17 years old (29 participants [53.7%] and 13 participants [24.0%], respectively). The mean age of participants was 16.6 years. Thirty boys (55.6%) were in Year 12 at school, 14 (25.9%) were in Year 11, with 10 participants (18.5%) having just left school and preparing to start university. Participants attended a Decile 3 public co-educational school, a Decile 9 public boys' school, or were school leavers coming from a variety of other schools. In terms of ethnicity, most boys identified with a single ethnic group, where 4 (7.4%) were Chinese, 4 (7.4%) were Indian, 1 was Māori, 19 (35.2%) were Pākehā/New Zealand European, 6 (11.1%) were Samoan, 3 (5.6%) were other Asian ('Asian', Filipino, Sri Lankan), 2 were other European (British, Scottish), and 4 (7.4%) were other Pasifika (Cook Islands Māori, Fijian, Tuvaluan). Ten boys identified with multiple ethnic groups, where 4 (7.4%) were Māori and Pākehā/New Zealand European, 3 (5.6%) were Māori and Pasifika (Cook Islands Māori, Niuean, Samoan), 1 was Pasifika (Samoan) and Chinese, 1 was Pasifika and Indian, 1 was Pasifika (Samoan) and Pākehā/New Zealand European. One boy did not state their ethnicity.

All participants identified their gender as "male", in response to an open-ended question. Although we asked participants their sexuality, our data on this included missing and some uninter-pretable responses. We also observed a degree of banter among boys in some groups as they filled in this item alongside each other, which may have discouraged boys from reporting gay, bisexual, takatāpui, or other queer identities. Therefore, it is possible that our data on boys' sexuality registers less diversity than might have existed (which may also be true for gender identity). Forty-two participants (78%) reported identifying as heterosexual, with 1 identifying as bisexual. Four boys left the sexuality question blank, and 7 (5 from the same group) responded in a way that could not reliably be classified (i.e., "male"). (For some extra detail about our participants and the workshop configurations, see Appendix A.)

Participants by pseudonym

Albert (Samoan)	Hamish (Pākehā)	Oscar (Pākehā)
Alex (Pākehā)	Harrison (Pākehā)	Noah (Pākehā)
Ambrose (Pākehā & Samoan)	Hemi (Māori & Pākehā)	Piri (Pasifika & Māori)
Andre (Pākehā)	Henry (Pākehā)	Reuben (Cook Islands Māori)
Ari (Māori)	Jack (Pākehā)	Riley (Ethnicity unknown)
Blake (Other European)	Jeet (Indian)	Rio (Filipino)
Brian (Chinese)	Kevin (Asian)	Rory (Pākehā)
Carson (Chinese & Samoan)	Krish (Indian)	Sacha (Pasifika & Indian)
Cody (Tuvaluan)	Lachlan (Pākehā)	Scott (Pākehā)
David (Chinese)	Luke (Pākehā)	Seb (Pākehā)
Dinesh (Sri Lankan)	Manaia (Māori & Samoan)	Stephen (Chinese)
Dominic (Pākehā)	Marshall (Samoan)	Taika (Māori & Pākehā)
Dion (Pākehā)	Matthew (Pākehā)	Tangi (Māori & Samoan)
Ezra (Samoan)	Max (Pākehā)	Tim (Pākehā)
Feleti (Tuvaluan)	Mitchell (Pākehā)	Viliame (Fijian)
Fetu (Samoan)	Nathan (Samoan)	Viresh (Indian)
Finn (Other European)	Nikau (Māori & Pākehā)	Wei (Chinese)
George (Samoan)	Nikhil (Indian)	Wiremu (Māori & Pākehā)

(Note that for confidentiality reasons, participants' ages have not been provided here, and in a few cases participants' ethnicities have been presented in a generalised way. In six cases throughout the report, we use alternate pseudonyms, not listed here, as a measure to further protect confidentiality.)

Although we worked with a reasonably diverse range of boys, we can't claim that our analysis adequately represents difference, especially in relation to culture and ethnicity, sexuality and gender identities, and socioeconomic factors. The brief format of the workshop, and our approach to recruitment, which for the school groups relied on boys self-selecting in response to a general invitation, meant that the workshop spaces were not as well designed as they could be to provide the kind of culturally safe context that would allow the specificity of different cultural voices and perspectives to shine through. We therefore acknowledge that different (groups of) boys may have different experiences and unique perspectives that this project does not do full justice to. This might include specific challenges as well as access to specific cultural resources that offer alternative ethical frameworks. The claims we make in this report must, in this sense, be seen as only scratching the surface of insights, knowledge and resources that boys can bring to the process of reflecting on gender, ethics and change.

'Boys Talk' – Workshop design

Three key theoretical principles guided the design of our *Boys Talk* workshops: *pouvoir-savoir, conscientisation,* and *manaakitanga.*

As we have already discussed, the concept of *pouvoir-savoir* highlights how important socio-cultural knowledge is to social change. Dominant discourses – shared patterns of understanding, thinking and talking – and the norms these patterns set out, provide roadmaps for how we can navigate everyday life.[125] We draw on this tacit cultural knowledge to sense our way through the world – guiding how we act in social and interpersonal situations. Everyday stereotypical ideas about what is natural and normal for men and women, for instance, help to shape the world according to those ideas. While they vary across cultures and change over time, they are very influential especially when they are taken for granted as just the way the world is. We don't all agree with dominant discourses (and the ideas, norms and values embedded within them), and it is possible to reject them, but this can be difficult when they are treated as 'common sense' and when there aren't other socially available alternatives.

From a sociocultural perspective, understanding and changing social problems requires examining dominant discourses, and unpacking them to notice how they shape people's under-standings of the world, and operate to guide people's behaviour. In doing so, we can identify if and how they are constraining and limiting some courses of action (and ways of understanding) and enabling others. We can also begin to see how they might guide us in ways that are at odds with other values we share, such as equality and justice. At the same time, if we are interested in social change it becomes essential to actively make room for new and diverse discourses about gender and masculinity, including culturally suppressed and marginalised forms of knowledge.

In the workshops we sought to cast light on the dominant discourses and norms associated with gender and masculinity, and create a space for boys to examine them and reflect on their influence. At the same time, we aimed to introduce some new ideas that could potentially loosen the hold of these traditional norms and open up broader, more diverse ways of thinking about how men can and should act.

The concept of *conscientisation* is another key theoretical principle guiding the practical shape of our workshop model. Using the *problem-posing* method that we described earlier, we invited the boys to observe and question the norms of gender for boys and men, how these applied to online ethics, and to think about different possibilities for intervention. Problem-posing is designed to shine a light on the issue, allowing it to become an object of joint interrogation rather than a taken-for-granted state of affairs. We structured the workshops so as to present the boys with little snippets of 'facts and figures' to highlight ongoing manifestations of gender inequality (such as the gender pay gap) and the reality of sexualised abuse of women (using the example of online misogyny directed to 2013 Wimbledon tennis champion Marion Bartoli), as well as examples that showed how some stereotypes around gender change over time (such as the association of particular colours with different genders). We also showed two or three short videos (depending on the number of workshops we did with a group). One (*Video 1: What's it like for guys?*) modelled other young people talking about some subtle gendered expectations around men and masculinity (e.g., drinking beer, being seen as tough, rejecting the colour pink).[126] The second video (*Video 2: Some men – encountering sexism*), showed snippets of older men talking about examples of sexism that they observed in their own lives.[127] These ranged from sexual harassment to more mundane examples of everyday sexism. The third video (*Video 3: Some men – challenging sexism*) showed

older men talking about responding to sexism and the challenges in doing so.[128] For example, some spoke about calling out other men and some spoke about the potential awkwardness and difficulty of doing so (such as facing criticism and not wanting to speak up).

While these materials provided concrete points of reference, the main purpose of the workshops was to generate discussion among the boys. We asked about their observations and whether or not points raised in the material we shared 'rang true' for them. We also asked about their views, in relation to general norms, specific motivations for why some boys might distribute a girl's nude images without her consent, how other boys might be able to intervene, and so on. In questioning the norms and practices of their peers and wider social context, alongside questions about the rights and wrongs of such practices, the discussions prompted boys to explicitly think about and describe issues in ways many might not have done before. In facilitating these discussions, we attempted to balance asking challenging questions with a tone that was open and non-judgemental. Sometimes we directed the conversation in ways that pointed out contradictions and asked boys to explain their views further, but we managed this carefully in a way that attempted to maintain rapport and preserve an environment in which boys would feel comfortable speaking openly about their observations and views. While the workshops were not designed to question boys about their personal experiences, many did share stories about their own experiences, which added richness and extra levels of insight to the discussions that followed.

Manaakitanga was the third key principle guiding the way that we designed and conducted the workshops. The Māori concept of manaakitanga refers to hospitality and "the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others",[129] and it is an important value guiding ethical kaupapa Māori research.[130] Influenced by this principle, we sought to create a hospitable space that welcomed boys and invited open and respectful dialogue. We were interested in the boys' views and in a reciprocal sharing of information and perspectives. Approaching the boys with manaakitanga shaped our disposition towards them in important ways. In practical terms, it meant we made time for introductions and ice-breakers, to settle the boys into the workshop and allow everyone to make connections and get to know each other a little. Our facilitators participated in this process by sharing elements of their own personal background and interests. We also provided boys with food, and in doing so created a less formal sharing time during the session. Out of cultural respect we offered boys the opportunity to say a karakia or blessing, which was taken up by one of the predominantly Pasifika groups.

Given the problem-posing approach tested sensitive and somewhat controversial subjects with boys, the principle of manaakitanga guided our interactions in a manner that provided an important counter-balance for how to have these discussions. It guided us to conduct them in ways that conveyed to the boys that we cared about and respected their views, even if sometimes we might be gently challenging them. It also informed an orientation towards the boys that anticipated their goodwill, expected their mature engagement, and expected that they would hold values supporting equality and justice.[131]

After opening the workshops with introductions and ice-breaker activities, we immediately set the scene by explaining how we would begin the rest of the workshop: by looking at gender and then moving on to discuss the issue of online communication more directly. As an example of how we did this, the extract below records the opening introduction to the workshop for Group 6, illustrating how this was presented in a low key open tone:

> *Facilitator 1:* So you probably noticed already we've kind of mentioned gender, sexism,
> online communication, um and the reason for that is we kind of have this hunch I suppose
> that um kind of restrictive ideas around gender roles and kind of what a boy can be and

what a girl can be and what's expected of everyone, um kind of has a role in shaping how we actually end up communicating with each other and kind of that kind of online communication and stuff. Um so we'll kind of start out by like looking at I suppose gender roles and stereotypes and stuff like that more generally, and then as [Facilitator 2] said we'll move on to the online communication stuff more towards the end. So to start um we just have a little video, um, that was made was it is it a few years old now? (*Facilitator 2: I– yeah yeah*) So things might be different things might be the same um but basically it's from it's based on interviews um with 16 to 18 year olds in Auckland just about um gender roles, so the people in the videos are actually actors (*Nikau:* Mmhm) but what they are saying is real and is based on interviews if that makes sense. (*Nikau:* OK) Cool so just take a watch um and then yeah just see what you think?

The workshops were purposefully designed to cover a range of discussion points while also having the flexibility to be adapted in response to the interests, observations and availability of the particular groups we were working with on a given day. As a result, the workshops were intended to cover the same broad terrain but were not precisely uniform across the different groups. We took opportunities to facilitate the workshop across two sessions where this was practicable; in other cases, we had only one meeting with participants. Moreover, some specific elements of our approach evolved over the course of the project, as we worked out what discussion points needed more structure and what concepts needed further unpacking. For example, in the first workshops we ran (Groups 1–3), we discovered that the concept of sexism was not always well understood. This led us to tweak the workshop design to allow for more groundwork on these underlying issues.

Whatever the precise format, we covered three central domains with each group of boys, moving from gender and gender roles to sexism and gender inequalities to more specific discussions about online communication practices, ethics, and boys' position as potential agents of change. As the workshops proceeded, we were also always attentive to the particular dynamics of each group, modifying our pace and style of questioning. In some sessions, for example, we deliberately emphasised contradictions to deepen the discussion.

A detailed workshop guide, outlining the rest of the structure we followed, is provided in *Boys Talk: Workshop guide*.[132]

Ethics

Boys who participated in the workshops were given a written 'Participant Information Sheet' informing them of what the study involved, and advising them of their rights to leave the workshop at any stage without having to give a reason, and to request that any information they provided be removed from our records (for up to a month after their workshop, and to the extent that it was practical). (No boys contacted us to request that their contributions be removed.)

The information sheet also raised confidentiality issues, noting that we would do our best in reports on the research to protect participants' identities. At the same time, we noted the possibility that research participants' identities could be guessed in cases where unique details were shared, and we advised them to carefully consider what they talked about in the workshops. In the analysis, we have identified participants by pseudonyms, and where we present extracts that refer to details of a participant's experience, we have on a few occasions omitted or altered minor details that we thought could potentially be identifying. In six cases we have used an alternative pseudonym.

Given that the workshops were being conducted in groups with boys likely known to each other (or who were at least in the same institutional setting), boys were also asked to respect each other's privacy and confidentiality by not repeating any personal details or stories that were shared in the sessions. In addition, we encouraged boys to be aware that we could not guarantee that other group

members would keep what they said confidential, and to take this into account when deciding what they shared with the group. We were mindful that the topics to be discussed in the workshops could be sensitive and challenging for some boys, and this was noted in the Participant Information Sheet, along with reassurance that they would not have to answer any questions or take part in any discussion that was uncomfortable for them. Boys were invited to talk to us or school staff if they were upset by any issues raised during the workshops. The Participant Information Sheet also contained website details for Youthline, Netsafe and The Line[133], as organisations and sites that could offer support and advice. Boys who participated signed a consent form, confirming that they understood what their participation involved.

The research was approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (Reference Numbers 017527, 020292).

A note about the quotes from boys

In the chapters that follow we develop our analysis through the presentation of many quotes from boys speaking in the workshops. The quotes are taken from transcriptions of audio-recordings of the workshops. Further details on our transcription process and notation conventions are provided in Appendix B, but we add a brief note here to explain the style of quotes we use. In presenting excerpts from the discussions, we have usually retained the raw transcript record, which registers hesitations, false starts, fillers, interruptions and so on. We deliberately use this 'messier' form of natural speech to convey more sense of the tenor of boys' talk – its fluency, clarity and so on. We also deliberately retained detail that shows participants and facilitators commenting and inter-rupting during and around a main speaker's turn, and referring to each other's previous comments. This helps to provide context and to convey the joint production of the boys' talk, including showing agreement and disagreement.

Participant pseudonyms

For many people, personal names carry special meanings and significance, and this is particularly the case within Māori and Pasifika cultures. Our decision to use pseudonyms in place of partici-pants' real names, therefore, deserves some explanation. We have used pseudonyms owing to our ethical responsibility to allow participants to speak confidentially through the pages of our report. While in some kinds of research, participants are sometimes identified by name, this usually only applies to those being interviewed in their roles as community or professional experts. We felt anonymity was particularly appropriate for a study with boys and young men sharing personal views and experiences alongside others in small groups. That is, if one person chose to be named, that would risk identifying others in the workshop who may not have wished to be named. It would also risk identifying people in the participant's social or family context who would not have had the opportunity to have consented to be identified.

We have used pseudonyms in preference to numerical or other sorts of codes for identifying participants, to better invoke a sense of connection between readers and the boys who partici-pated. Choosing pseudonyms for others is, however, trickier than it might seem, and there is no perfect recipe for how to do this. For example, we grappled with the dilemma over whether or not to use anglicised names when that matched a participant's real name or to use a name that more explicitly suggested their ethnicity. We ended up ascribing pseudonyms based on the following principles, developed through our team discussions: all Māori participants have been given a Māori pseudonym, and all other participants have been given a pseudonym that 'matches' as best as we can the cultural and linguistic character of the participant's own name (irrespective of their ethnicity).

Findings from the workshops

Overall, workshop participants responded keenly and positively to the challenges of exploring questions around gender, sexism and online ethics. For many (but not all) of the boys, discussing the ethics around sharing intimate digital images in the context of a broader conversation around gender and sexism was relatively new territory.

In the next four chapters, we report on how the boys responded – as cultural informants, commentators, and sometimes critics – as we tested our workshop approach. We discuss some of their key observations, insights and questions, and their reflections on gender and online ethics, as well as on the process of talking about these issues and the possibilities for shifting the line for what counts as acceptable behaviour. While our analysis focuses on the common patterns in what boys said during the workshops, it is also informed by our observations regarding the tone of boys' comments and how they were received by others within the workshop groups.

Our findings are presented in four parts: (1) *Masculine norms and their production*, in which we discuss boys' talk around gender – focussing on the norms they identified and their observations about how masculinity is shaped and policed. (2) *Norms, ethics, and sending nudes*, in which we focus on the specific issue of sharing nudes beyond their intended audience, looking at how boys talked about the gendered possible motivations of boys who do this, and their ideas about ethics. (3) *Onsharing nudes and the art of intervening*, in which we examine the complex challenges boys conveyed for what they would have to consider in order to intervene to prevent unethical behaviour by their peers, or take a stand against it. (4) *Conversations towards shifting the line*, in which we reflect with boys on the transformative potential of these kinds of problem-posing workshops.

The findings presented here make an important contribution both at the level of *content* as well as at the level of *process*. Through describing the norms and constraints that boys discussed, and their views and suggestions related to online ethics, we gain a direct insight into the nature of boys' social worlds, and avenues they identify for intervention. Beyond this, however, our findings demonstrate the kind of open and reflective talk that is possible among boys when spaces are created for critical questioning and reflection.

Chapter 3

Masculine norms and their production: How gender matters for boys too

Near the beginning of the workshops, we introduced an exercise designed to open up discussion about gender, and find out how boys understood social expectations for men. The simple act of asking this question subtly shifts knowledge about what it means to be a man away from the realm of the taken-for-granted. By asking boys to notice and articulate social expectations, sociocultural norms and values that can otherwise be internalised as 'just the way things are' become visible and more open to critical scrutiny. This seemed to us a very important, and often over-looked, component for any effort to bring boys into the conversation about gender equality. Social critics often remark that people from dominant social groups, within any particular social hierarchy (in this case gender), don't always recognise the particularity of their position and the privileges that come with it. That is, the way that men's place within the contemporary gendered world, and a masculine point of view, are given primacy. So this starting point for the workshops is a way of inviting boys to reflect on their own gendered position in the world.

We approached this discussion of gendered expectations for men in different ways as the workshops evolved. In some of the earlier groups we asked boys to identify something they liked to do that was consistent with gender stereotypes and something they liked to do that was not. In later groups, to provide some concrete prompts for boys' observations, we began this exercise by first showing a short video of local young people talking about gender roles for men.[134] We then guided a discussion around their observations about expected roles for men and women. To spark these discussions, we first asked the boys to write quick responses to the questions, "What sort of interests or behaviours are expected for guys you know?" and "What sorts of interests and behaviours are off-limits?" We provided small sheets of blue and pink paper, for the respective questions, to allow a somewhat ironic, light-hearted approach to this exercise.

Asking this more observational question, as we did in the later groups, seemed to work well as it avoided inadvertently putting boys on the spot early in the workshop. The video of young people discussing gender roles acted as a useful prompt. Most boys had no difficulty identifying stereotypical expectations for how boys and men are implicitly (and in some cases, explicitly) expected to behave. Although there were some divergences and differences in emphasis between the groups, overall boys' observations of the constrictions of gender stereotypes struck similar notes. While the video probably shaped the kinds of characteristics that were salient, there was plenty of scope for boys to come up with unique ideas and to disagree with some of the points offered in the video.

Some boys did this in relation to a specific point, most noticeably disagreeing with the strength of claims about the place of alcohol and sport.

While our focus on the workshops was on gender, boys of course don't belong to just one social category. Any boy's views and experiences related to norms of masculinity will be shaped by many factors to do with other social identities and personal circumstances. Similarly, boys' places in positions of relative social dominance may be enhanced or reduced according to the other social groups they belong to. For example, ethnicity, sexuality, socioeconomic status, ability, and even less tangible ways that young people are socially positioned (such as 'popularity') all intersect with gender, to affect how any particular boy or man will experience the expectations, obligations, and privileges related to masculinity.

Mostly participants did not draw attention to cultural or other kinds of differences in expectations, norms and values for boys and men. This is not surprising given the short duration of our workshops, which would not likely have built the degree of trust and 'cultural safety' to explore differences *among boys* in more depth. Some boys did situate *some* of their comments in relation to their own specific cultural contexts – referring for example to "Asian people" or "for us Samoans". While we have woven some of these references into our analysis, we have avoided making any claims about cultural specificities based on extrapolating from these few comments. Our methodology did not provide a robust enough vehicle for exploring this important detail, and participant numbers from any particular group (related to ethnicity or sexuality, for example) were too small to treat them as representative. To explore the potential for a kaupapa Māori-informed analysis, however, we did conduct a preliminary analysis on all comments made by all Māori participants. We found that there was substantive conformity between these boys' comments and those from the wider group, so we did not pursue further developing this as a separate analysis.

In this chapter, we describe key elements of what boys across the workshops identified as behaviours and characteristics that they typically associated with, or thought are expected of, men and boys. Unsurprisingly, several boys highlighted traditional roles for men and in some groups they talked about stereotypical behaviours characteristic of "guys our age". As well as these kinds of characteristics that could be identified by their *presence*, we noticed that boys were equally, if not more, animated and fluent in identifying ways that 'being a man' was achieved through *absence*: the studied avoidance of other kinds of characteristics – those typically associated with the feminine. Later in this chapter, we discuss how boys described how these ways of being a man were broadly shaped through social expectations and how they are directly policed within their peer culture and within other social relationships.

Boys talk about what's expected of boys and men

In response to asking boys what they thought were social expectations of men, most referred to clusters of stereotypical traditional roles, characteristics, interests, and aptitudes. Stephen and Hemi encapsulated this well:

> "a guy is to be strong but not just in a physical sense but like, strong and like not sensitive to like, ah criticism or like emotions as well and have to be like a leader, protector and like a provider for like the family or you know the individual. So to have that type of um expectation" (*Stephen*)

> "OK expected behaviour, kind of cocky, tough, strong, interested in rugby and stuff" (*Hemi*)

Elements of strength

The dimension of strength – manifest in physical and mental strength, manual labour, and sports like rugby – was repeated often and across different groups.

Sport and working out: The central place of sport and physical prowess, in particular, were highlighted by many boys:

> "good at every sport, or every physical activity" (*Marshall*)

Most often mentioned was rugby – the "physical" sport:

> "play like lots of those bigger sports like rugby sort of those more physical type sports" (*Jack*)

Several boys also referred to physical fitness and the gym – and when they did, it was not general fitness that they highlighted, but expectations associated with the muscle-building function of such activities:

> "guys are kind of expected to do again like sport the physical kind of aspect like going to the gym having a like ideal like physical manly shape being like big and bulky" (*Scott*)

> "I feel like guys are expected to be strong and so like work out constantly, and have like 24 abs and blah blah blah... whatever it is" (*Taika*)

> "men are always expected to have a big body like muscle like build some muscle. Um you must play a sport which involves a lot of contact, rugby being majority of the sport that you have to play." (*Nathan*)

Hard physical labour: Often in conjunction with physical sports, several boys also drew attention to expectations for boys and men related to manual labour. For instance:

> "I reckon um like um behaviours and stuff for guys they do all the physical labour and like activities for example rugby and like I'm always expected to take the bins out, like do all the– (*Kevin:* Yeah (*laughs*)) all the stuff that men do" (*Oscar*)

> "Ah for one guys are expected to only do hard labour jobs so yeah. All guys are yeah expected to do heavy work with their hands" (*Albert*)

> "like um, manual like labour (*Scott:* physical) like tasks at home" (*Oscar*)

In one group, two boys expanded on how this gendered expectation can work in practice, with one observing how a presumption that boys would do the 'heavy lifting' started early, and the other citing an example of how it continues even in situations where it might be counter to good sense:

> *Andre:* Even as young as like primary school, like going to a co-ed primary school, when um, teachers would come into class like a PE teacher asking for like, students to, move stuff around, it'd typically just be a group of boys who get chosen to like pick stuff up and move it around for the teacher.

> *Harrison:* Yeah yesterday I was at work and um, I was asked to move something and like there was this woman and like she, like her arms, like I'm pretty like I'm pretty small like and like she had like– she was probably yeah like stronger than me, but then, but then, but then, um the guy was like 'nah nah nah you go on instead of her' and I was like OK... (*laughs*). (*Group 5*)

Traditional masculine relationship roles: Sometimes boys associated such expectations around physical strength and "hard work" with traditional masculine roles in relation to women – such as being "provider[s]" and, according to some boys, the dominant partner. For example:

> "guys are meant to be like, the ones who work slash provide" (*Wiremu*)

"a provider, so the male has to always be the one providing for the family, the one in charge, the one that has to make sure that they're working, getting money supporting the family" (*Piri*)

"I kind of feel like it also goes back to like, it also goes back to like how, kind of the male dominant figure in the family always has to be the bread maker the one earning the salary, the one providing for the family, mmm." (*Oscar*)

Beyond the family, some boys noted a wider purview of this role expectation:

"so men would always to have to act act tough and all. Always have to act as the body-guards and stuff" (*George*)

"like guardians, like with a *group*, like protect– well not protecting but looking out for other people" (*Henry*)

One participant talked about expectations within Samoan culture for "looking after girls. Um like so like um looking after girls as if you're looking after your own sister" (*Fetu*).[135] Notably, another participant in this group of predominantly Samoan young men said he disagreed with the idea that "women had to be protected and men are always the protectors":

"that that's that's bullcrap (*George:* Yeah) that can go either way um, it that comment like belittles women (*George:* Yeah) saying they can't support themselves (*George:* Yeah) which is which is untrue and, (*George:* Definitely)" (*Nathan*)

A note on different masculine norms

As already noted, there were strong commonalities across the groups, in terms of how boys talked about the social expectations on boys and men – and we have mostly focussed on identifying those patterns in common. However, it is important to note that individual boys did, of course, have different views, perspectives and experiences, which we have tried to insert into the discussion where they are relevant to understanding the ways dominant norms for masculinity constrain boys and their avenues for manoeuvring around them. While it wasn't a strong feature of the discussions, some of the comments shared in the workshops suggested quite contradictory idealised expectations for boys and young men. For example, in one group, boys portrayed a kind of rebellious masculinity as normative or idealised:

"for expected um behaviours I just say general bad behaviour in general, ah so things like um not paying attention in class, um, getting into fights doing that sort of thing, I'd say that this in general expected for males" (*Luke*)

"I put ah being a goody two shoes in quotation marks, so like you're following all the rules and doing everything by the book and that sort of thing that's just, that's looked down upon by other people" (*Hamish*)

Ari observed a similar kind of rebellious masculine status, but with more explicit detachment from it:

"you tend to get a lot of rebels [in some classes] and they flunk classes and do– pretty much known as the– I wouldn't call it cool but I'd I'd definitely say they've got a big social status" (*Ari*)

By contrast, some boys emphasised more conventional socially desirable characteristics. For example, being "an all-rounder person that sort of does sport as well, does academics at a decent level" (*Alex*). Or being "social" – "able to, interact and talk with others and, ah, I guess try and– yeah, try and develop a friendship with a lot of people" (*David*), and have a "social life outside of school" (*Lachlan*). In a discussion about what a typical or cool boy at their school would look like, Seb offered "people who talk a lot to teachers but don't want to sort of– they don't suck up to them". Although these differences suggest that norms or ideals vary across different peer and/or school

settings, it is worth noting that both Seb and Hamish's comments seem to draw on an ideal of 'being your own man', even though this might manifest in different ways.[136] The workshops did not explore or elaborate such differences.

Boys talk about the influence of norms

In all the talk about what is expected of boys and men, boys mostly offered these descriptions as observations of shared social and cultural norms – without much discussion about if, and how, they applied to themselves. While we did not directly ask boys whether they identified with the norms, there were moments when some boys reflected on their influence, and moments when they disputed the reality of stereotypes and discussed consciously stepping aside from them.

Reflecting on being shaped by norms

In parts of the workshop discussions some boys reflected on ways they were themselves shaped by some of these norms. An example that some boys discussed were the implicit rules around their role in relation to girls – specifically how the notion of men as providers played out when paying for expenses when out with a girl. As one participant said:

> "I still find it tough to like let my girlfriend like pay for meals and pay for dates, just makes me feel like, like I like I should be doing it and I always feel bad if she, tries to put money into it" (*Tangi*)

This particular example illustrates how ambiguous and potentially confusing some expectations can be. In another group, where the boys raised this same example, they discussed the ambiguous social expectations around whether or not they should pay for a girl's meal. Dominic reflected:

> "I guess, like there's sort of an expectation about paying dinner when you go out with a girl and um, yeah just being I guess more financially ah, present. [....] even if it's like a friend, sometimes there's that expectation. You'd– and there's– it's kind of ambiguous like you don't know, if you should or you shouldn't um because I guess some girls don't like getting paid for either so." (*Dominic*)

Another boy in the same group added:

> "I remember once going out and then like, I don't know it was a kind of a weird feeling when like a girl pays for your meal. I don't know like I was like, was so insistent on paying for it so I was like– there was a bit of reluctance there, to like let her pay, (*Facilitator 2:* Right) yeah." (*Harrison*)

When the facilitator asked, "Why do you think that was?", Harrison highlighted the role of media in subtly transmitting social norms:

> "I don't know I guess just because like, I guess just through like, watching like movies and stuff like, there's always like just the guy paying for the girl and you kind of just like, oh OK I should be, I should be paying." (*Harrison*)

In this same group Andre later reflected on ambiguous expectations around 'chivalrous' behaviour, and how these can lie awkwardly in relation to judgements about manliness:

> *Dominic:* as well as courtesy like, guys are expected to like hold the door open or help the girls and stuff in that sort of world.
>
> *Andre:* But then if we do it in front of our mates then it's seen as like, we're being submissive and not dominant and, not being manly I guess. So there's that like double standard. We're expected to do something but then if we do it, then we're also seen as not being dominant. (*Group 5*)

We discuss this central theme of the shaping of normative behaviour in more detail later in the report.

Stepping aside from norms

There were several moments in the workshops when boys spoke out to signal how they did not agree with or conform to the norms that were being identified. In most cases, they did not disagree that the norms existed, but described room for manoeuvre.

In relation to sport, for example, although boys mostly agreed on some powerful stereotypes about men and particular sports, some explicitly disagreed with assumptions tied to the stereotype and some distanced themselves from these stereotypes and explicitly pointed out that they were not absolute. For instance, in Group 7, after boys were shown *Video 1: What's it like for guys?* they were asked, "So did any of those examples like stick out for you guys about what was said, or, things that you agree with or disagree with?" Taika said he disagreed with what one of the speakers said about "guys who don't play sport and that sort of thing" not being as accepted as boys who do:

> "I quite disagree with that because, I mean one I don't, um, and yet, I've surrounded myself with people who don't either and we all accept one another and we're all friends, so I don't necessarily agree that that's true, um, it just depends who you are with– like hang with out and that sort of thing." (*Taika)*

Carson, who was in a different group, shared this sentiment, disagreeing in particular with the suggestion that playing sport was associated with heterosexual success:

> "I don't think that's like entirely true eh. Like, like, not everyone who plays sports get all the girls, not everyone who doesn't, doesn't get girls" (*Carson*)

Keanu noted the power of norms and expectations around sport – saying "being the only boy that doesn't play rugby, it affected my relationship with my dad". He went on to add, however, "but I didn't care, I just did my thing".

As well as these kinds of explicit disagreement or rejection of conventional norms, sometimes boys signalled their distance from them through ironic tone and exaggeration – for example, when Taika earlier referred to guys being expected to constantly work out "and have like 24 abs and blah blah blah...whatever it is".[137]

The flight from femininity: Boys talk about what's off-limits for boys and men

As well as having lots of ideas in common about gendered expectations for boys and men, the participants shared many ideas about what is 'off-limits'. They identified many mundane everyday preferences and activities, as well as more fundamental features, such as the acceptable range of emotional expression for men. A strong thread seeming to tie all this together was a perceived pressure to avoid 'the feminine'.[138] As Wiremu said, "often like acting in any way like a girl, as a guy, is often looked down slash frowned upon".

Mundane markers of masculinity

Appearance matters

While some boys mentioned particular physical characteristics (such as muscularity) that were expected, or ideal, for men, some boys also identified other kinds of appearance-related matters in response to the question of 'what's off limits for guys?'. Some drew attention to constraints against anything that could be considered to be associated with girls' clothing or physical appearance. For example, "um you know acting like women um dressing like women anything like that yeah" (Oscar). Boys talked about learning from "a young age" (Jack) that wearing makeup or "clothing which is expected to be more girly I guess" like "dresses skirts you know" (Jack) are off limits:

"Guys have been told you know you can't wear that that's only for girls you know" (*Oscar*)

Some boys referred to practices like "dying your hair or piercings" (*Dominic*), noting:

"like you'd get judged for it because it's more of a thing apparently girls– for girls. It's OK for girls to dye their hair but for us, it's not the same" (*Dominic*)

With reference to his own physical appearance, another boy said:

"Throughout my life sort of been called a girl for, just having straight long hair, that's like, that's it" (*Anaru*)

Mundane interests and activities

While talk about activities and interests (beyond sport) didn't tend to cluster as strongly as talk about other aspects of masculinity (possibly reflecting more flexibility and diversity in what boys see as acceptable interests and activities for guys), some boys did note stereotypical expectations for boys' and men's interests, such as "being mechanically minded" (*Max*), "usually into, cars and technology, that kind of stuff" (*Krish*), or "playing video games" (*Rio*).

Similarly, while it wasn't a big part of the discussions, some participants highlighted specific interests and activities that they suggested would typically be seen as off limits for boys and men. When they did, they usually added that it was because they were associated with women and femininity. Viresh, for instance, suggested that:

"gardening or knitting, something that we have a feminine thing associated with it [....] guys feel that, if they're seen doing that, other guys will think they're feminine, and then, sort of their social standing will go down" (*Viresh*)

Albert, who had noted expectations for men to do "heavy work", also went on to say:

"whereas if they were like inside, doing, academic work, they would be seen as, close to women or like, less manly, yeah". (*Albert*)

Others referred to "dancing" (*Nathan*) or "clothes shopping" (*Sacha*):

"usually we leave shopping and painting, and things like that to, ah, to the girls but, not to say that there aren't people who do that but, um, you know that's, usually, generally ah something we stay away from" (*Krish*)

In some moments boys offered different views and experiences in relation to the perceived extent of social change around these kinds of stereotypical norms. Some were more likely to emphasise change; others were more likely to emphasise continuity. For example, the gender of colour (the notion that pink is for girls and blue is for boys) was one of the mundane norms that we introduced for discussion in the workshops (pointing to its sociohistorical specificity[139]). In *Video 1: What's it like for guys?*, a young man recalled the experience of having chosen a pink umbrella when he was a young boy, and being questioned by a teacher who asked, "are you sure?". Boys from one group described the scenario as "pretty familiar" (*Manaia*). Yet several boys from another group (Group 7) suggested that this incident, which would have occurred ten or more years prior, belonged in the past: "that kind of opinion, from the teacher then, would be expected, at that point in time, I'd say" (*Luke*). By contrast, they suggested that "colour really doesn't matter now" (*Luke*):

"how I grew up, there wasn't really a gendered colour" (*Taika*)

"I feel like personally as like a generation as well, we've kind of grown out of the colour stereotypes" (*Hamish*)

On the other hand, another boy in the same group (Group 7) reflected on how the pink umbrella example relayed by a young man in the video illustrated the way mundane norms of gender are shaped in subtle and unintended ways:

> "[it] probably shows like, those sort of– um, you know understandings for the colours of, blue is for guys and pink is for girls, it, it's engrained to us at a young age, um that– like the teacher probably thought– I was just like, it was an off[hand] comment like, it was– she probably didn't mean anything like oh you have to pick this, (*Facilitator 2*: Yeah) she probably said it just, because that's what she's accustomed to, and the guy, ah, like the guy– as a young as a young person, he probably wouldn't have like taken anything from it, but, you– the more– not– so– ahh like consciously wouldn't have taken it, like oh yeah I have to immediately, you immediately think that I have pick this blue one because it's a boy colour, but it would've been slowly, over time, all those offhand comments would've slowly built to this image that blue *is* a boys colour, pink *is* a girls colour." (*Rio*)

Styles of drinking (alcohol)

Alcohol and drinking were not discussed by participants in all the groups, and were not raised at all by those in the two predominantly Pasifika groups of young men who had just left secondary school. Some boys, however, in responding to a comment in the video we showed about gender role expectations for guys, raised the issue of "drinking culture" (*Henry*) and "drinking alcohol" as an "issue around like our age" (*Dion*). Some referred to expectations on boys their age to drink alcohol: "most guys my age are expected to be like drinkers and like, party" (*Manaia*). Not all boys in all groups agreed with this. Henry and Rory, for example, disagreed with any suggestion that a boy would not be accepted by his peers because he did not drink. We did not further explore questions related to the place of alcohol in youth culture, but what was relevant to our interest here was the way that alcohol and drinking practices were imbued with meanings related to masculinity in some of the discussions.[140]

Among boys who agreed that there was a social expectation for boys to drink, not only was the quantity of alcohol mentioned by some – "with guys it's not just how, about whether you drink or not but it's about like how much you can drink, (*Facilitator 2*: How much?) yeah like yeah like how much alcohol you can actually take" (*Dominic*) – but some also commented that social expectations extended to the particular *kind* of alcohol a boy can choose to drink:

> "Yeah I kind of agree with the, the drinking stuff [referring to a comment made in *Video 1: What's it like for guys?*], I feel like going to parties and things like that you're kind of, if you're a guy, it's more forced to drink, um at least it's more expected to, and all the like, the more hardcore stuff, um and, also I feel like it's things like beer, which is just like a guy drink, like you kind of drink it, although it tastes like total garbage, you're expected to drink it" (*Hamish*)

Mapping the familiar ways that masculine pursuits were defined through their opposition to 'the feminine', "guy drinks" were contrasted with "bitch drinks" (*Oscar, Dominic*) or "feminine drinks" (*Hamish*), which Sacha explained as "like the light 20% or like 10% [sic] drinks". In different workshop groups, Oscar and Dominic both suggested that a boy could expect to be "roasted" or have his masculinity questioned if he drank this kind of alcohol:

> "I don't know, I guess they're just expected you know like to drink like only beer. If you're seen like drinking like, you know like RTDs vodka cruisers stuff like that (*other participants laugh*) some guys might consider that as like you know '*bitch* drinks' (*another participant laughs*) and think you know like 'he's not a man he's drinking RTDs you want beer', yeah." (*Oscar*)

"it's like alcohol like, you get 'bitch drinks' and those are only for girls and guys can't– like you'd get roasted if you– well you, I don't know, you would get roasted from time to time and I guess it's the same with girls like, they wouldn't drink– yeah I guess we just don't drink the same thing as them (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm) and there's like different views of what you drink. (*Harrison:* Mmm)" (*Dominic*)

Tastes in music, television and movies

Talking about what is off-limits for boys and men also lead to some discussion of gendered tastes in music and popular media. As one boy said, "some of the stuff that guys wouldn't really do would– like listen to certain types of music like, maybe boy bands and stuff like that, yeah" (*Max*). Or, not liking "girl music, like um guys listening to girl music is just– [....] 'you listen to Cardi B oh yeah, oh you like, girl music and stuff'" (*Manaia*). Or, not "watch[ing] girly type shows or that are into like girly aspects and that, that's usually seen as off limits at times and it's kind of sad" (*Reuben*).

As we discuss in more detail later, boys described how 'masculinity rules' seemed to shadow their tastes in subtle ways, as well as through direct policing by peers through mocking, "banter"[141], and so on:

"I was getting mocked, and because I, I watch Riverdale and like shows like that (*Other participant:* Oh this guy.) (*other participants laugh*) I like watching like love movies and stuff like that, and, think everyone thought I was gay. These guys were calling me gay eh." (*Junior*)

"Um, and the music so like listening to like, music which are, which are female lead singers singing and that's like, 'oh why are you listening to that for you should be listening to like 2Pac or something, some gangsta music, but none of that trash'. Yeah that's the– that's pretty much how we live today." (*Nathan*)

Harrison illustrated how these subtle ways of influencing peer behaviour can work – if not to eradicate preferences and behaviours that don't fit the masculinity rules – to keep them quiet:

Harrison: Um, people– people get given like a bit of stick if they kind of listen to like too poppy music I guess um, like it's not rea– it's kind of, pretty surface level though it's nothing really deep like you're not going to– I find like, if my mate listened to something that was like kind of poppy like I don't think all my other mates wouldn't like judge them too harshly (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm), it's just kind of surface-level banter I guess. And that's probably just a thing guys do I guess.

Facilitator 2: Yeah, does it stop you from listening to particular types of music though?

Harrison: Um, I guess– well personally it's just I'm kind of into like lots of genres so I'll just listen to anything anyway but yeah, there's like sometimes I guess a bit of reluctance to like share a song you think that would get given like stick from other, from other guys yeah. (*Group 5*)

Harrison later went on to expand on what in particular it might be about some music that challenges teenage masculinity norms:

"Oh yeah just going on like trying to be more specific so for what I was saying about the music before like, one song that I brought up with a mate was um, it was sung by John Mayer and it was just like, oh he's like talking about like his feelings and stuff like that and like, just like a rela– he was talking about like a relationship and like my mate was just like, like pointed it out and was just like roasting me about it and I was just like oh, alright." (*Harrison*)

Emotion rules

Harrison's account of being "roasted" by a mate for liking a song that talks about feelings is emblematic of a wider cultural aversion towards men 'showing emotion' (specifically *vulnerable* emotions)

– something that was raised across all the workshops as a perceived no go zone for boys and men.[142] It was the most dominant theme among the range of behaviours that boys identified as off limits for men and boys, and it was a notable common thread shared by boys of different ethnicities and social locations. This association of masculinity with a detachment from 'feminine emotions' has also been widely reported in other research.[143] Given the dangers of a restrictive emotional repertoire for men – something that organisations like the American Psychological Association (APA) have begun to recognise[144] – it is also one of the most concerning elements of the masculinity rules that put pressure on boys and men to distance themselves from what is perceived as feminine.

To help communicate the weight of this restriction, we present quotes from several boys across different groups who shared this observation. In response to the question about what sorts of things are off limits for guys, boys said that men and boys are expected to "not be too sensitive or like not showing too much emotion" (*Dominic*), and that they are expected to be "relatively out of touch with their emotions" (*Blake*):

> "I think that, you're expected to be, as a guy, ah more tough, that kind of indifferent– and like have this hard outer shell, not really show much emotion, um and you're– on the other hand you're not, really meant to be, sensitive, and if you're sensitive people kind of look at you and go, what are you doing? That's not really, you're kind of acting like a girl." (*Rory*)

Another boy in this group agreed:

> "it's just um, that thing, where you can't really express your, feelings too much as a, guy it's just, sort of a, ye– and as you said it, you have to keep a sort of hard outer shell" (*Jeet*)

Boys sometimes associated these expectations with a sort of stoicism. In another group, as Luke said:

> "for my off limit behaviours I put ah, showing emotion at all, (*Facilitator 2:* Right) yeah, ah in general you're expected to just not care, and to just not, not have any emotions pretty much (*Facilitator 2:* Yup), so..." (*Luke*)

The other boys in this group nodded in agreement. Another said, men are expected to be "fearless (*Facilitator 2:* Right), it's expected that you're not scared" (*Hamish*).

Going beyond stoicism, this social rejection of masculine vulnerability requires the cultivation of toughness and a "hard outer shell" as described by Rory and Jeet. This theme was echoed across the groups:

> "Oh yo being tough, (*Facilitator 2:* Yup being tough) being– expected to be like more manly kind of." (*Feleti*)

> "mentally strong like not taking shit from people" (*Tangi*)

Just as its opposite, showing weakness, was identified as off limits. For some boys, this was associated with an expectation that a boy would be ready to fight:

> *Fetu:* don't be a wussy. That's one thing, it's like as in like a like don't show any weakness towards like anything. Be a *man.* Phrase *be a man* (*other participants laugh*)
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Do you have an example of what that would be like? Not being a wuss.
>
> *Fetu:* Don't back down from a fight. (*Group 10*)

Speaking in another group, Marshall made the same point:

> "[don't] show weakness, for example like turning down a fight when someone calls you out" (*Marshall*)

We discuss this kind of peer policing of masculinity norms below.

Some young men explicitly connected the unacceptability of showing vulnerable emotions with the importance of rejecting signs of 'weakness', which in turn was linked to the importance of maintaining 'homosocial bonds' between men:

> *Ezra:* Um yeah so the same as everyone else's but like just showing– just to be like stay in your groups and with your boys so you've got to show like manly-hood um, to be like a part of with them you've got to, show that you're not weak and um showing weakness may, like sort of put you down um like in the ranks um yeah just you've got to just yeah–
>
> *Facilitator 2:* What does like you know showing weakness, like you've said like–
>
> *Ezra:* Like just emotions like, ah just showing emotions or–
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Any particular kinds of emotion because I'm sure like–
>
> *Ezra:* Like crying. (*Group 9*)

This restrictive 'feelings repertoire' extends to the idea that boys should not talk about relationships and intimate aspects of life, especially with other guys.

> "showing emotion is a really big thing that's frowned upon, so like crying or, yeah sharing things" (*Hemi*)
>
> "off limits I feel like a lots of guys don't, like at our age talk about our relationships with other guys, like so there's a lot of like, girls who talk about like their crushes etcetera with their friends whereas like we don't really, like get too into it" (*Dinesh)*
>
> *"*not emotionally influenced, so um what's expected for guys is to not be as um, like heart, like heart to heart with like some other people, especially with a group of friends especially male friends, it's not always ah seen as a real heart to heart kind of conversation they're usually just, making fun, making fun of something or, usually talking about sports or something that's like manly, that manly kind of stage" (*Reuben*)

However, Reuben contextualised how these feeling rules are not all-encompassing and that for some boys and young men there will be relationships and spaces that allow this kind of talk. In response to Facilitator 2's follow-up question, "like what would you do if you needed to have like a heart to heart with somebody?", Reuben noted:

> "Ah probably I don't know maybe with my dad or something, or or a family member, I could probably talk to friends as well about that kind of stuff, because I have a group of friends that, that are emotionally um connected and like because a group of my friends we've been together since, since childhood so we kind of know every aspect of like how our lives are, and, and what we do, so it's kind of easy for me to emotionally talk to those type of friends, I know for the majority of society it's kind of hard, for um especially males to try and emotionally talk with other males, it is particularly hard. But um yeah, personally for me it's, it's alright, so." (*Reuben)*

When boys did speak like this, they tended to position their experiences as different from the norm, thereby helping to consolidate the same picture of what that norm is. At the same time, however, their responses instilled more sense of possibility for stepping outside it. Like other boys and young men who shared experiences like this, Reuben referred to the particular relational context that made this possible – his father and family members and close friends from childhood.

While most of the quotes presented in this section help to flesh out the contours of sociocultural prescriptions against boys and men showing (vulnerable) emotion, the *tenor* of these discussions was also informative. We noticed that sometimes the mere act of raising this issue seemed to be breaking an implicit rule. But, once it was spoken about by one boy it became more widely sayable with others agreeing, both verbally and nonverbally.

Shaping and policing masculinity

In discussing dominant norms for boys' and men's behaviour, some other workshop participants also went into more depth explaining their own rejection or deliberate distance from the strict grip of these norms. At the same time, they often showed a critical awareness of the power of such norms and how they shape boys' and men's identities, interests and behaviours. We would suggest that the first step towards shifting restrictive and harmful norms is recognising what they *are*. In the discussion about what is expected of men and what is off-limits for men, Nikau for instance, took up a position that both recognised and explicitly rejected the societal norms that were being identified by the group:

> "Um... I don't know I've kind of got a– sort of like two opinions because of the fact that there's like the societal one but then like, I've been brought up with a really different sort of way and that because in my family, there's been really strong women, and all that so um, I don't know I've sort of been brought up with the perspective that like the man doesn't have to be the primary earner in the family and another thing that I have really been brought up with is like, men shouldn't be afraid to show emotion. Like I've always been brought up with like if you want to like show that you're actually strong you should be strong enough to, not be afraid of letting your emotions out and things like that. Yeah and also like, things like, guys can like pink, I like pink I'm not afraid to say that but yeah, like other things that like, sort of like, don't agree with the societal opinions but, there obvi- ously– there are the societal opinions men are supposed to be like, big and bulky and as Oscar said like drink lots of beer and stuff but then my dad like doesn't drink and if he ever drinks he'll sit on one glass of wine for like 3 hours because he doesn't (/*group laughs/*) / like/ to drink and like, trying to be physically imposing and stuff I just, yeah something that I don't really agree with but society sort of imposes on guys." (*Nikau)*

In this eloquent comment Nikau shows that he recognises norms ("societal opinions" about what men should be and how they should act) and that they are "impose[d]" on men. Like Reuben above, he also explicitly accounts for his implicitly different position – in Nikau's case, with reference to the strong women in his family and his father's nonconformity to at least some markers of normative masculinity.[145] In this conversation, Kevin followed him in the round where boys were sharing their views. He seemed not to have previously thought about the issues with as much clarity, but said "Um, yeah I pretty much you know agree with him, um I guess guys are meant to be the stronger figure in the family", and spoke about the power of social expectations to shape conformity: "I guess, it's just people are afraid to show, their real... what they're actually like and that because they're scared people are going to look at them and say oh that's just weird or something".

The next important step, which is where we now shift our focus, is identifying how restrictive and harmful norms are produced and maintained. Some workshop participants shared personal stories and observations that help illuminate *how* these norms are socially produced: through subtle messaging from popular cultural models, to more direct and indirect messages from peers, family members and other adults to act in certain ways to 'be a man', as well as forms of boundary policing for acceptable boys' behaviour through injunctions to not be a girl, "faggot" or "gay". From some of the examples boys shared, we can see how heteronormative and homophobic policing works in both subtle ways and in violent ways; how it is tied to a rejection of femininity, and how it works simultaneously to create hostile conditions for queer young men and others, as well as to marshal all boys into a narrower register of acceptable behaviours.

The silent influence of social norms

At the subtle, mundane, often invisible end of the spectrum, boys commonly identified the role of social influences in shaping how boys and young men learn how to be and act in the world. They

referred to the influence of stereotypes, patterns of peer behaviour, social media, and so on as guiding their sense of what is normal and expected. In the following exchange Nikau and Dinesh observe and reflect on how subtly this operates:

> *Nikau:* Like in a way like sexism and stereotypes sort of like, subconsciously tell you what to do. So like yeah if you're like as Oscar was saying like if you meet another guy it's– you're supposed to be like physically imposing and like big and strong and stuff but if you meet a girl you have to be like, gentle and stuff it's not something that you really think about it's just what you do (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) because of like what society kind of tells you to do.

> *Oscar:* Kind of goes back to like ladies first.

> *Other participant:* Yeah.

> *Facilitator 2:* Right.

> *Nikau:* Yeah.

> *Dinesh:* And it's not because you're like taught that, it's because you see everyone else doing it. Like it's just gone back so many ways that everyone just kind of accepts it now (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) and it's just kind of, everyone just sees the norm and just 'oh yeah' and no one bothers to like really step up, change it. (*Facilitators 1 & 2:* Mmm) (*Group 6*)

These boys' analysis resonates well with the Foucauldian idea of pouvoir-savoir (and Foucault's concept of disciplinary power). That is, they identify the power of tacit social norms to shape and guide behaviour, even in the absence of more explicit directions and teachings. Another boy, in a different group, similarly alluded to the power of normative peer behaviour in shaping a boy's sense of what he is able to do (pouvoir). In a discussion about onsharing nudes (which we discuss further in Chapter 4), Viresh said, "there is a, decent sized group of people that do, this kind of stuff and that needs to be addressed because, because it, kind of, gives the idea that I can do this as well, because it's OK".

In another group, young men talked about the influence of social media in particular, and "our upbringings" more generally in shaping "how we're supposed to act":

> *Albert:* social media, changes the way we think how others, how we're supposed to act you know um, I can't explain it but like, somewhere along those lines, you know we're supposed to act how social media *is*, or how like we see it on there (*unclear*)

> *Facilitator 1:* That sounds really interesting.

> *Nathan:* I think he's trying to say like our worldviews and how, like um our upbringings like boys are always supposed to go with, with the last guy [*referring to Video 1: What's it like for guys?, which they had just watched*] he said oh he was going to pick the pink umbrella, instead of the blue one we are always taught that blue is for boy and pink is for girl. So, our worldview is like (*Albert:* Yeah) it's it's kind of messed up and so when you pick something odd which is not used to– so say picking the pink umbrella people are like oh why are you picking that you're a boy you should pick the blue one, it's it's really funny (*another participant laughs*) the world's really funny (*laughs*). (*Group 10*)

Some boys also talked about how the social norms that infuse local peer group cultures can shape a boy's behaviour. They described how the desire to fit in and belong as part of a group can sometimes lead a boy to act in ways that might potentially contravene his intentions or values. For example, in a discussion about sexist jokes, which Nathan said he was "guilty of" and George said "guilty as well", they highlighted how the (likely implicit) norms of the group can lead a boy to join in, in the interests of belonging:

> *Nathan:* Also what [he] was saying. Like, most people don't really mean the joke they just say it because they want to be a part of the group. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) Like, they just want

to be with like the boys like because like everyone else is making a joke it's like oh I think I'll say a joke to be like, so I can feel like I'm a part of the group and that everyone's you know on the same level. So yeah. That's mostly why I make stupid jokes. Most of the time.

[....]

Fetu: Oh yeah carrying on with what Nathan said. Yeah most people only do it just so they can blend in. Like if you're that one person that doesn't laugh at a joke and everyone else laughs like, you just feel like left out eh. You feel like oop, killed the buzz. (*Group 10*)

Teasing, mocking and banter – peers putting on pressure

In addition to these subtle influences, which can often remain invisible, boys described a culture of peer social interaction through which boys policed each other's gendered behaviour.[146] References to teasing, judging, mocking, "roasting" and "banter" ran through many of the discussions, and boys described these kinds of peer reactions as working in both direct and more subtle ways to reign in boys' interests, behaviour, and so on. As we noted earlier, boys referred to being "called a girl" (*Wiremu*) or the likelihood of being "judged" (*Dominic*) for breaking implicit rules around masculine appearance. Harrison said:

"I guess like kind of clothing, like people get given shit for like wearing certain things or like diff– like certain colours and stuff like that. Like, I really like a bit of banter about it but like, like yeah it does happen I guess." (*Harrison*)

In other examples we have already discussed, boys also referred to having been questioned, "mocked" (*Junior*), given "a bit of stick" (*Harrison*) or a "roasting" (*Harrison*) for popular cultural tastes in music, television, and so on that were regarded by their peers as too feminine. This expectation of peer judgement (and presumably the risk of social marginalisation) was highlighted by one boy as generating boys' conformity with everyday norms in a way that was more constrained, and more strictly enforced, than it is for girls:

"Ah, I'm not sure if it's entirely correct but, um, I have a feeling like, girls are more able to express themselves and their own thing, rather than... um, like conform to those, sort of, expectations but boys on the other hand, might not be able to, um, get into those more arty things or, feminine things (*Facilitator 1:* Mm), but um, like now days you see girls doing all sorts of sports and things but for boys, may not be able to do the, like same feminine things without being judged." (*Jeet*)

Although the workshop discussions didn't explore this theme in great depth, some boy's comments suggested that this kind of peer pressure might propel boys into crossing lines (related to ethics, and in the example below, safety) that they otherwise might not. Following a discussion about gendered expectations for boys and men, boys in one workshop were asked if they'd had any related experiences, and Scott raised the example of this kind of peer pressure during school camps:

"I think with the like coward and fighting one on like camps, with like– school camps you don't really want to like not do anything that everyone else is doing because like if all your mates are doing something you don't want to be the one guy that didn't do it because everyone will be like teasing you about it for a couple of days (*other participants agree*)." (*Scott*)

Man up, harden up

While teasing and banter seemed to work to show boys what is expected of them as boys, and to make it potentially uncomfortable and difficult to buck those norms, boys also described more direct injunctions to act in particular ways. Some participants shared experiences of being

admonished to 'be a man' and to 'harden up'. These messages, often from adults, operate as a fairly explicit way of policing the masculine emotion rules that we describe above. When participants did talk about this, they did so in a way that was critical of this social message for men. As Fetu said:

> "Like um, like crying. Like crying is like taken as a weakness. So, like the idea 'to be a man' is to not cry, just get over it. That's what, I was taught. I don't like it though. I want to cry (*laughs*) Nah yeah but like like for– like whenever like whenever I cry in front of my family they're always like 'be a man man up don't cry stop crying... only girls cry'– That's what they would say and I'll be like oh OK." (*Fetu*)

In this same workshop, other young men discussed experiences related to how they, as boys and young men, were expected to take this message on board to the extent of ignoring injuries – both relatively minor and relatively serious. George described an experience of getting hurt while doing some work for a friend's father:

> "I was working for my friend's dad, (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) and um I got really bad blisters because I've got real really sensitive skin. (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) And I was going– oh so I was scraping the paint and I was going really really hard at it, and then I felt this little (*makes slicing noise*), the little cut on my hand and oh damn. And then the dad just happened to walk by obviously, (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) and he goes 'oh that's not a big enough cut', and I was like can I just get a plaster please? because it's bad. (*Facilitator 2 laughs*) But to me um I didn't really take that into consideration, (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) but just thinking about it now, I should have really said 'oh but shouldn't [you] be caring about your workers?' Instead of saying 'you should be a man' you know?" (*George*)

Other young men in this group continued the conversation:

> *Nathan:* Yeah just what George said like ah, even I've said to someone 'oh just harden up' and like, it just keeps going back and forth like if you get injured in the game you're like 'oh harden up' and so you just pick yourself up and then injure yourself more. And like (*laughs*) they still tell you to harden up. Yeah it's just, men are just funny these days. They just tell you to harden up. Like you have the worst injury known to man they say 'oh just harden up take a concrete pill' (*laughs*).

> *Carson:* That was like um, my case I um I got injured at the start of last year. And um, one of the dads um, he was like oh just harden– He said– the dad– oh just harden up, you'll be all good. So then we went on tour and I played again and got injured again and then we went to the doctors and they were like you've oh you've torn your rotator cuff (*Several participants and Facilitator 2 /respond with shock/*) /you shouldn't have kept playing/. (*Facilitator 1:* Yikes) Try to harden up, for nothing. (*Group 10*)

Don't be a girl, "faggot", "gay"

In many of the examples that boys shared about how peer pressure and direct comments from adults shape boys' behaviour, the underlying messages were: don't be like a girl and don't be gay. Fetu described his own experience of being on the receiving end of these intertwined messages:

> "Like um when I was little um I always like found sport as like um, like not fun. So I usually hang around with like the like girls because they will just chill or read books and everything and I'm like oh sweet. And then um, I think then right after that because– when you're all like– so when when you're kids like it's it's innocent so the basic idea is they will go like oh you're a faggot because you're chilling with girls you come play rugby with the boys." (*Fetu*)

Fetu's experience of being called "a faggot" because he preferred playing with girls when he was a younger child was echoed and expanded in Andre and Nikhil's talk about the irony of heteronormative expectations for boys. On the one hand, Andre noted, boys are expected to "like girls" in a

heterosexual sense but, on the other, they are expected to prefer spending their time with other guys. This exchange took place in the discussion about what is expected of men and boys:

> *Andre:* Ah the expectation of like, I guess lots of people accept it, but being attracted to the opposite sex there's still always more of a normality and acceptance behind being attracted to the opposite sex but then at that same time, when you are attracted to the opposite sex there's also the expectation that you're, hanging out with your friends that are guys, more than you are hanging out with a girlfriend (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) or something, you know so yeah, you're expected to like girls but then you're expected to not being hanging around with them as much, (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) as your other guy friends.

> *Nikhil:* Yeah like carrying on from that like being whipped and like hanging out with girls too much it's not accepted by guys, like our mates, like they get annoyed when we're like always with girls but if a girl does that it's OK. (*Facilitator 2:* Right, yeah)[147] (*Group 5*)

While Andre and Nikhil don't explicitly refer to homophobia, Andre highlights expectations that assert the normality of heterosexuality, and imply that other sexualities are not normal. Researchers who study young men and masculinity have noted that "compulsory heterosexuality" and homophobic talk go hand in hand.[148] C. J. Pascoe, who spent one and a half years doing ethnographic research in a Californian high school, concluded that teasing and mocking about homosexuality (what she referred to as "fag discourse") was used to police all boys' behaviour (although in varying ways depending on race[149]); and that it was as much about the regulation of gender as it was the regulation of sexuality:[150]

> "homophobic bullying is a part of boys' gender socialisation into normatively masculine behaviors, practices, attitudes, and dispositions. In other words, it is through this kind of homophobic behavior that boys learn what it is to 'be a boy'."[151]

As part of our process of sharing knowledge and ideas within the workshops, we presented boys with quotes taken from participants in a U.K. study on sexting among high school students (as well as quotes from other research). One was an example of "what guys say" about what would make it difficult to stand up to peers who were showing around naked pictures: "'If they had a picture of a girl naked and you told them 'That's wrong', they would think straight away you are gay'".[152] In the earlier workshops, to lead into discussion, boys were each given different quotes and asked to read them back to the group. As they responded to this particular quote, boys agreed that being called gay in this way was a negative judgement. From these brief discussions, boys seemed to indicate that it worked as a slur because it invoked diffuse associations with 'non-masculinity', as Pascoe found. For example, as presented in other parts of this report, Junior and Manaia both referred to having been called gay, or the threat of being called gay, because of behaviour judged by their peers as inconsistent with 'what boys do' – watching a particular television programme and not joining in sexist banter, respectively. In discussing the quote from the U.K. study, some boys seemed to want to tease out the intent, meaning, and functions of such homophobic slurs, clarifying that calling someone gay did not directly necessarily relate to that person's actual or implied sexuality. Ari's response to this is slightly ambiguous:

> "I– I can see that, it's not meant gay as in your, gender is gay, but it's like, oh, it's not meant like that you're gay, like you're homosexual, it's meant that you're like a friendly gay and that you– you're like the stereotypical person who hangs out with the opposite sex but you're not, interested in them." (*Ari)*

The following exchange within Group 3, further supports Pascoe's findings about how the 'figure of the homosexual' – part of her notion of "fag discourse" – operates to discipline boys' gendered behaviour, regardless of their sexuality. In this case, the boys had been asked if the quote from the

U.K. research (about the likelihood of being thought of as gay if a boy intervened with his peers) resonated with them or whether they thought it was different here:

> *Seb:* I think here, you can speak out against it and people will not (*Finn:* Mm) think you're gay. Like they'll think that, you're not cool, or you're strange or not *normal* maybe, but not gay and it's not– like it's– it's–
>
> *Matthew:* It really depends on the person like I know one person (*Seb:* Yeah yeah) who'd definitely say, 'Oh, yeah, you *are* gay,' and then there's lots of other people who s– who would just /yeah–/
>
> *Seb:* /But they're not,/ Yeah. They, might say it quickly and in a joking manner–
>
> *Matthew:* Yeah, yeah, they might– they might not actually think you are, they might just do it because they're trying– they're feeling defensive and they're trying to actually make you (*unclear*) (*Seb:* Defend their actions I guess.) yeah and not actually–
>
> *David:* Make a joke of it
>
> *Matthew:* Yeah. (*Group 3*)

Our research did not explore in any depth these dynamics of if and how references to something or someone being "gay" operated in the boys' peer contexts. But even if such labels and *accusations* are not intended to refer to a person's sexuality, it is clear that using references to gay sexuality as a denigration actively contributes to a cultural context that is hostile to LGBTQ people.[153]

Homophobic harassment also obviously directly targets boys who are gay or questioning of their sexuality, in ways that can have heavy personal consequences (as Pascoe also emphasises[154]). On a few occasions, boys talked about incidents or feelings that revealed hostile conditions for queer young men. In one workshop, boys discussed a particular incident in which homophobic harassment had turned into violent abuse.

Rio told a poignant story about the violent homophobic harassment of a friend of his and some other boys in the group. He had just observed that "wearing makeup, like being really feminine" (Rio) is off limits for boys. He then described an event in which his friend – who "wore makeup" – was out with a couple of his friends, walking along the street:

> *Rio:* and then, um just as a joke the friend who had makeup on ah called out to some intermediate kids, ah– they were boys like just, call me, just as joke as a passing, and then they started walking away, and then, the, that, that group of boys started– um, it was a little couple of them right? (*Luke:* Yeah like three maybe?) yeah they started following, following um my– our friend and then, once they got to like a closed road, um, (*simulates slap*) right in the ear, but it was like, they ran up, hit him on the ear, um and then they just ran away right? (*Luke:* Pretty much yeah.) mmm. And so, well long story short he had a burst ear drum, and–
>
> *Hamish:* And they were shouting gay slurs as well right (*Rio:* /Mmm/) /yeah/. Like 'what are you?, gay fag'

Another boy in this workshop group, Van, had previously shared his observations about the direct policing of heteronormativity. In Rio's friend's case, it was violently enforced; for Van, he described how the reaction of other guys would make a boy who 'liked his own gender' feel unsafe:

> *Van:* liking your own gender, so like nowadays, if another guy sees another guy liking, like your own gender like they kind of like freak out and all that, and they say 'oh what are you doing?' and all that, they like, question you, and make you feel like, um unsafe and all that, and they just ah judge you and stereotype you, and all those things
>
> *Facilitator 2:* So is that like, homophobia or?
>
> *Van:* Yeah. Like, yeah. (*Group 7*)

Examples like these, of explicit heteronormative policing and direct homophobic abuse, were not widely discussed (and were not raised in all groups). This is not surprising, as our workshop format was not designed to directly raise these questions, and it may have been territory that boys would have been cautious to bring up. Even so, we did notice traces of Pascoe's "fag discourse" through the way that boys in some groups interacted. This included, for example, in some groups boys teasing each other while they filled out demographic questionnaires which asked about their gender and their sexuality.

Seeing sexism and gender inequality

During discussions about the norms of gender, boys' comments were mostly offered as matter of fact observations or occasionally as low key endorsements.[155] Of particular interest to us, however, was the way that many boys observed these social expectations and conventions with critical awareness of how these kinds of 'masculinity rules' constructed and constrained the socially acceptable ways that boys can behave. Going beyond this, in some of the discussions, boys shared comments showing ways they were seeing sexism and gender inequality, and were critical of it.

In the first workshop with Group 10, for example, although joking and banter shaped the general tone of a lot of their discussion, several boys shared serious observations and critical insights about sexism and gender inequality. For example, following *Video 1: What's it like for guys?*, the young men in Group 10 were asked "does it matter if you're a guy or a girl these days?", and Nathan responded in a way that recognised sexism – in both high profile and everyday ways:

> "Um we think not but... in reality it does (*other participants agree*). Like um with, Donald Trump in power, (*other participants laugh*) he's like– ah he just belittles women and thinks of them as objects, not as human beings. Just the way he talks, in private. Like I was watching this one video of him and he was like, talking about women in a sexual way as if they're just something that he owns, and um yeah it's just really sad that our world's come to that. Um but everyone does it– I've done it I I'll admit that, I've belittled women. They've probably done it to me but, the cycle just continues I guess and, um, I don't know when it's going to stop." (*Nathan*)

Later on in this group, when the discussion turned directly to sexism and gender inequality, the young men were easily able to identify different examples. George described how, during a leadership programme for young Pasifika, he had learnt about gender pay disparities, and how relating this to his mother's work lead him see and feel its injustice.

> "Yeah and um, the most, the most thing that really blew my mind was, was um that I didn't know that men were getting paid more than women. I didn't know that. And that really hit me because I was like whoa that's that's pretty big because my mum's out there working hard or other men are making more money than her, even though she's like out there– No no offense to, her, but um, it was it was crazy eh because like, like, it just really it really opened my mind to other things and stuff." (*George*)

Nathan followed, identifying a very different manifestation of sexism:

> "Ah I think about um, anime, and how the most powerful character is always a strong big male and the person by his side is always a female whose got like um, like inferior female gaze like she's got, it's like she's portrayed as really sexual, yeah and like big breasts and like a lustful body. That that's what comes to mind when I think of sexism." (*Nathan*)

Later on in this workshop, another participant, Carson, shared critical insights about gender, race and political leadership:

> "So like– with with Jacinda... how, (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) she's kind of like the most powerful person in our country right? But, (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) then again like, that doesn't mean

like, everything for females will suddenly go up. (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) So that's like similar
with like Barack Obama (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) and Blacks... like, it still doesn't mean that the
average Black person, is like treated equally." (*Carson*)

Similarly, in Group 9, after watching *Video 2: Some men – encountering sexism*, several boys
identified examples of underlying sexism and gender inequality:

Facilitator 2: So any of that seem um, real or you guys recognise any of that kind of, stuff in
your everyday lives? Is any of it surprising?

Reuben: Yeah probably that last one. [referring to broadcaster Wallace Chapman's
observation in *Video 2: Some men – encountering sexism* about the sexism that underlies
a boys' school being named after its location alone while the girls' school in the same
location was qualified by 'Girls' in its name]

Facilitator 2: The last one?

Reuben: That was a bit yeah, that was a bit surprising um categorising just Nelson College
instead of Nelson Girls College was one of the (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) yeah it's kind of yeah.[156]

Piri: We have that in Auckland though eh Auckland Grammar (*Facilitator 2:* Auckland
Grammar yeah.) and Auckland Girls' Grammar.

Facilitator 1: Mm.

Ezra: Yeah it's like sport as well like you wouldn't say men's rugby you would– but you
would say women's rugby.

Facilitator 2: Mm yeah that's a good one. (*Ezra:* Yeah) Yeah or like um Peter the cricketer
who's an ex Black Cap saying about yeah women's cricket makes, you know women
cricketers make significantly (*Reuben:* Yeah) less.

Reuben: I think that's for like all aspects of sport for women, (*Facilitator 2:* Mm hm) it is
harsh because of the whole television deals and all that stuff, (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) they
don't really um kind of promote the women's games as much as it should be (*Facilitator 2:*
Mm yeah) promoted. Probably maybe bar tennis, that's probably the only real sport that
probably like really does– like yeah promotes the girls, (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) but otherwise
like sports like rugby and that it's not really– like you don't really see it on banners you
don't see it on, the big um, the big posters and all that man, (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) like the All
Blacks it's just All Blacks like you never see women's– the Black Ferns like hardly any time.

[....]

Piri: I so agreed with the second one of this guy was talking about that males influence
women's achievements, (*Facilitator 2:* Mm hm) because um take Beyoncé for example you
know Beyoncé, people think it was because of Jay-Z (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm) because Jay-Z's
the man behind it all that she's the one– I mean he's the one who did the records– her
records and that but it was through Beyoncé's *talents* that actually made her famous
(*Facilitator 2:* Mm) her singing her dancing it was all her but they look at him (*Facilitator 2:*
Mm) as (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) she would not be famous without him. (*Group 9*)

As well as these examples observed from popular culture, some boys directly connected exam-
ples of gender inequality to their own lives. Just as George, in Group 10, thought about his mother in
relation to the unfairness of gender pay inequity, Tama raised this example in relation to his aunty's
work situation:

Facilitator 2: Does that make any of you guys think about any examples in like your own lives
like where, things get, I don't know things that you might have thought oh that's a bit weird?

Tama: Yeah the first one as well [referring to cricketer Peter McGlashan's observation in
Video 2: Some men – encountering sexism that women international cricketers get paid

less than men] that um men make more money than women, (*Facilitator 2:* Mmhm) I think that's– because my aunty she's the [manager of a large organisation] and she has a manager um they work together but one's a male and she's the female (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) and she does the same workload but the male gets paid more than her she was telling me because– but she has also more workload to do than him, because she has to do [specific activities], yeah so she does actually more than he does.

Ezra: Yeah that's like stupid that the, gender pay gap still exists. (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) I don't know why that is. (*Group 9*)

In conclusion

In this chapter we've reported on how boys discussed gender norms for boys and men. Consistent with a wide body of international research, they readily identified restrictive ideals for masculinity that crystallised around rejection of the possibility of being or acting like a girl or woman. This 'flight from femininity' spans everyday mundane interests and styles of presentation, as well as the poignantly restrictive repertoire of emotions that men and boys are expected to show. Boys described what these norms were, and how they are shaped and policed within peer culture and wider society. While there were some differences of opinion around the edges of the picture they drew of normative masculinity (for example around stereotyped preferences and interests), boys from diverse ethnicities and social backgrounds appeared to recognise a similar social template for how to be a man. In particular, they strongly agreed that men are not supposed to show vulnerable emotions, even though many explicitly rejected this cultural norm.

Our problem-posing methodology created space for thinking about these norms as a feature of boys' social worlds that could be identified and questioned, rather than as taken-for-granted facts about the essential nature of men and boys. We would argue that this simple shift in orientation is potentially radical in the way that it allows or validates boys being able to understand their own experience as simultaneously shaped in relation to social and cultural norms and at the same time possibly divergent from those norms. In this sense, it begins to 'externalise' masculinity as a social object rather than an essence they need to conform to.[157] With consolidation, this would potentially open room for boys to have greater freedom to make sense of themselves and the possibilities for how they can be and act in the world in a wider range of less restrictive ways. Boys often observed norms in ways that implicitly or explicitly disagreed with the values these norms upheld, and some shared stories of finding them odd, uncomfortable and discrepant with their own experiences and values.

Chapter 4
Onsharing nudes beyond their intended audience I: Norms and ethics

A pivotal focus of this project is on the ethics of sharing nudes beyond their intended audience. We were interested in boys' observations about peer group norms for this behaviour, their views about the ethics around it, and their thoughts about what – if anything – they would or could do to intervene if they knew this was happening. In this chapter we present the picture that boys conveyed about how this practice fits into their peer cultural context. In general, boys said these were issues they rarely discussed.

We did not systematically ask boys to describe what they meant by nudes, but when we did ask what kind of image a nude would be, they agreed it would include things like "probably topless picture" (*Oscar*), "topless picture or like full body" (*Kevin*)**,** "maybe like it's not exactly a nude but maybe like a bra picture, like in their undies or something, yeah" (*Oscar*).

Across the groups, boys had diverse views about the rights and wrongs of sharing nudes in general – and about responsibilities for when things go wrong. That is, for when someone (usually a boy) shared someone else's (usually a girl's) nude beyond its intended audience. However, the discussions often settled on agreement that the practice of onsharing or distributing another person's nude beyond its intended audience was "unethical" (*Krish*), "not being quite right" (*Riley*) "a bit dodgy [....] a bit wrong" (*Dominic*):

> "like like you're taking someone's, um, nudity and you're showing it to a bunch of other guys, and that's just not cool (*other participants agree*)" (*Sacha*)

> "the idea of actually showing someone– someone else's like nude body's creepy in the first place (*Wei:* Yeah (*laughs*)) yeah. (*other participants laugh*)" (*Riley*)

> "It's not really very, ethical is it? So (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm) when someone's trusting you with, something pretty personal, to just, throw away that trust (*Facilitator 2:* /Mmm/) /and,/ go and, violate them, so– yeah." (*Krish*)

However, when participants discussed the ins and outs of if and how to respond as a bystander to onsharing, they strongly conveyed that it would be an ethical quagmire for teenage boys (as we discuss in more detail later).

In this chapter we first set the scene by summarising what boys said about the practice of onsharing nudes, their views on boys' motivations for doing it and on the likely effects on girls. We then look explicitly at the ethics of these practices, including different views about where responsibility lies. In the following chapter, we look at participants' responses to the ethical and practical dilemmas boys face in relation to what to do when they encounter ethical lines being crossed. As our

problem-posing discussions were focussed on looking for opportunities for critical reflection and ideas for action, the current research did not set out to illuminate how common these practices are, or to systematically assess boys' views on the topic.

In several groups, boys suggested that seeking nudes from girls was more likely "something younger boys would do" (*Dominic*); "typically nudes tend to happen around the 13 to 15 age" (*Andre*), "like Year 8, Year 9" (*Tim*). Talking specifically in relation to "a case" where a nude had "got out", "I think like a few years ago and got round to like three or four thousand people" (*Alex*), boys in Group 2 agreed that the problem was more specifically with younger boys, although it was not entirely restricted to them:

> *Dion:* I don't know any six, seventh formers or fifth formers that (*Tim:* Yeah) (*Alex:* Nah, not like–) could do that.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Mm.
>
> *Mitchell:* Yeah. I've never heard of like a case in, yeah, fifth, sixth, seventh form that's gone like where hundreds of people have it or either– Maybe a little less than that but I've (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) never heard of a– a case like that for our sort of age group and above.
>
> *Dion:* Yeah.
>
> *Tim:* It was definitely an issue in third and fourth form though.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Mm.
>
> *Dion:* Yeah, and I think that's an issue not just at [our School].
>
> *Tim:* Oh yeah for sure.
>
> *Mitchell:* Yeah. It's all over.
>
> *Dion:* It's the whole (*other participants talk over each other*) it's the whole thing.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Yeah.
>
> *Dion:* Yeah. So, it's– yeah, it'd be– it's hard to determine exactly what that comes down to why it stops but– (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) it's– I think it's a number of things. And then, yeah, obviously you'll have the exceptions. Like there will be 6 and 7th formers (*Tim:* Yeah) that do that kind of stuff (*Mitchell:* Yeah) but like you can't–
>
> *Mitchell:* You can't really help the– (*Dion:* Yeah) but–
>
> *Dion:* Yeah, there's always going to be those people. (*Group 2*)

Like the participants in many groups, these boys gave the impression that although some senior boys would unethically distribute a girl's nudes, they would be acting against the norm; a norm they suggested had shifted significantly from the earlier years of secondary school. Boys attributed this shift to maturity and changing relationships with girls. For example, Nikhil spoke about an immature developmental stage in which a boy might have an urgent superficial desire for getting nudes from a girl – which he implicitly contrasted with a more mature relationship to girls as friends you could talk to:

> "you go away from that immature sort of like, oh yeah I want nudes, I want nudes, I want nudes it's more like oh yeah I just want a friend, just want somebody to talk to. Because you, you can't actually talk to guys in the same way that you can talk to girls, like, with the pink thing [*referring to one of the workshop exercises*] it's emotional discussions with guys aren't, they don't happen as often, as they do with a girl" (*Nikhil*)

Similarly, boys in Group 2 (from an all-boys school) talked about how a sort of implicitly undisciplined interest in seeking nudes from girls decreases after the third or fourth form, when boys start

to have "more exposure" (*Dion*) with girls – "seeing them in real life" (*Tim*), to "hang out with them and that kind of stuff" (*Dion*) and "going to parties with them" (*Tim*):

> "Like they co– [be]come like less alien and stuff like (*Dion:* Yeah (*laughs*) Yeah) Like you become mates with them and stuff" (*Tim*)

Some boys emphasised that seeking nudes from a girl (as well as sending nudes themselves) was something only certain groups of boys did, with some suggesting it was far removed from what went on in their own social circles. One young man in one of the groups that had just left school, simply said, "Oh I've I've never interacted with anyone that shows me their nudes or anything so I wouldn't have that kind of, um knowledge about that" (*George*). Similarly, Matthew told us that, "we don't know anyone personally that– in in our groups that, send nudes or receive them". Boys in Matthew's workshop group suggested that while in some friendship groups boys might joke about sending and receiving nudes, and that "everyone knows a guy who knows a guy who's done it" (*Finn*), it only occurs "within groups": it is "not normalised within the whole school because they do it, but the whole school knows about it" (*Seb*).

In Group 8, boys from another school (a co-educational school) gave a similar impression that the case of boys asking girls for nudes and then sharing them around their friends was widely known about even though it was probably not widely practiced: "it was just one, like one group of boys. It's not, it's not common like, at our school, (*Ambrose:* But I think,) [....] but, yeah it happens" (*Marshall*). While Hemi said it was "very familiar", when asked for an example, another boy in the group explained:

> "Yes. Um so I know a group of, boys, from [our School] sadly um, yeah um so one guy would, he asked for nudes from a girl that, I suppose he liked. Um he got them, and, because he thought yeah I'm cool now, he decided to share them around on a group chat and, yeah that, that's what happened yeah he shared it like, because he was like yeah I'm cool a girl sent me nudes, and then, so– it's quite normal for him to receive them, and now I think has gotten used to it like, sharing them around with all the friends and then, yeah, I'm sure it makes the girl insecure a lot. A lot a lot, because not only she trusted him but, yeah, so..." (*Marshall*)

It was difficult to tell from the boys' talk overall how widespread this sort of practice is. Within this same discussion, Manaia later described this sort of behaviour as "very common":

> *Manaia:* Oh, well I know that it's very common, between these two schools ah [School X] and [our School], (*Facilitator 1:* Right yeah) it's usually just, girls here and girls from [School Y]. And so boys here like to um, oh well sometimes well people that I know have friends in [School X] and they've got group chats on Facebook and they just you know, ask girls from, [School Y] to send nudes and stuff and the boys from [School X] share them with some of the boys here, yeah. And I know of one incident, ah I think it was last year, that a girl from this school but, she's actually moved now, to another school I'm not going to say which one, because of what happened.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Right.
>
> *Manaia:* Ah like Marshall said, ah she sent nudes to a boy and he sent it to a group chat and ah, he's shared it around and it started going around the school, (*Other participant:* Yep) so she moved away. (*Group 8*)

The way that Manaia identified one incident the previous year, and Marshall who earlier said "I just happen to know one dude from my class that [did it]", and that "I think it happened early last year" seemed to suggest that although the issue was salient, it may not necessarily be a frequent occurrence. In Group 1, Ari similarly pointed to a specific situation the previous year:

"There was a situation last year where a girl sent a full body nude to a boy she trusted and, he sent it to his best friend, his best friend showed it around the class and then sent it to a few more people and then– then it's started spreading like a spider web." (*Ari*)

This impression of a practice that is prominent, but not necessarily widespread, was countered in some other discussions however, such as in the response by boys in Group 6 (which we present in the section below), which conveyed a sense that it was, at least within some groups, more normalised.

Gendered patterns, motivations and consequences

Across the groups, boys shared similar accounts of the gendered dimensions of sending nudes and, in particular, boys' presumed motivations for seeking and sharing them, and the different likely consequences for girls and boys. These discussions were prompted by quotes we presented from young people from other studies about sexting that highlighted gendered assumptions about sexual desire and subtly alluded to a gendered dynamic around sending nudes.[158]

Not all boys agreed that there were gender differences related to sending nudes. For example:

"I say it's perfectly equal each way so if you have a nude of yourself and it it can just (*Facilitator 3:* Yeah) go backfire if you're male or female, works both ways. (*Facilitator 3:* Yeah) So, I see it equal that way." (*Ari*)[159]

Mostly, however, when boys spoke about the practice of sending nudes, they implied or directly stated that expectations and consequences related to it were different for boys and girls. Some highlighted that "there's very few boys sending nudes that would be a tiny percentage of the school" (*Seb*) – a comment that was quickly agreed on by other boys in that group. Some boys observed differential pressures contributing to this possible gendered norm:

"It's a lot more normal for, like it seems to be a lot more normal for girls to send nudes than for guys (*Facilitator 1:* Yep), um, I guess, I don't know maybe girls feel like they need to, they can, they need to rely on their bodies more to, appeal um, to guys than guys don't, maybe don't have that pressure on them to, kind of like, show their bodies off in order to um, attract girls." (*Rory)*

Boys in another group made a similar point:

Riley: I mean it goes back kind of that gender like stereotypical thing like (*Seb:* Yeah) I don't know but I feel like some girls are more like, oh, I have to meet this, meet this (*Seb:* Yeah yeah) like, um, /what do you call it/ (*Seb:* /Demand/), yeah, demand. Meet this kind of like–

Seb: Sort of social progression (*Riley:* Yeah) in the relationship (*Riley:* Yeah) maybe. And that's like sort of (*David:* Yeah yeah yeah yeah) the milestone now for some people. Not for everyone. (*Group 3*)

In the following exchange between participants in Group 6, we gain a rich picture of some of these dynamics at play; a picture that resonates with discussions in other groups:

Facilitator 2: So I'm going to give you guys a scenario, and I want you guys to tell me whether you think this is realist– first of all whether it's realistic, so a friend tells you that he's trying to get a girl he knows to send him nude picture, and that when she does he'll send it right through a group of friends. Does that sound real?

Several participants: Yeah.

Facilitator 2: Yeah? You guys have experienced that kind of thing before or heard about that kind of thing?

Oscar: I've had like– I have a mate I'm not going to say his name but, he's you know told me you know oh, I've got a girlfriend who gives nudes, when I get them I'll show you,

Facilitator 2: Mm. So you guys have those kind of (*Other participant:* Mhmm) experiences as well? (*Other participant:* Yep) Lots of nodding, I'll say to the audio recorder (*Facilitator 1 laughs*) all nods, (*Facilitator 1:* Lots of nodding) (*group laughs*) all around the table, inaudible nods. Um, so, why do you think your friend might be telling you this, like–

Kevin: So he gets like– seems cool like oh I got nudes of a chick (*Facilitator 2:* Yep) yeah, and it's known as an achievement rather than oh that's bad like you know.

Nikau: Like for it to be an achievement you need it to be recognised (*Kevin:* Yeah) like you have to tell people (*Facilitator 2:* Right).

Kevin: Wants to have like the attention from his mates,

Other participant: Mmm

Kevin: Boost, boost of the self-esteem. To feel good–

Scott: Like for example that bloke will feel like the man for like the next week, um telling all his mates and stuff.

Facilitator 2: Why do you think that is? Why do you think that he'll feel manly?

Kevin: I feel, maybe, a girl you know likes that guy to a point where she's willing to send, nude picture I guess maybe the fact that not only did he receive a nude picture but the fact that a girl likes him, may have made him feel good and that he'd want to share that information, to other people.

Dinesh: Yeah it's just a bit of bragging rights I guess like when he says 'oh I'll send it to all of you guys', um like it's just like bragging rights like yeah I got this you guys didn't, etcetera. Um and maybe it's like someone that like, you guys don't really know well so it's just like adding to– kind of like you'll broaden the people you know, as well kind of thing. (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) And he's like oh yeah it's someone that we don't know well so, let's really, capitalise on this (*Group 6*)

Masculine status

The themes raised in this exchange between the boys in Group 6 were echoed across the different groups. Other participants described how getting a nude would seem like "an accomplishment" (*Nikhil*), especially for a younger boy (if not so much "at this age" [*Andre*]). Many explained why a boy might be motivated by seeking status. As Marshall, who we quoted earlier, noted, sharing a girl's nudes could be driven by some boys thinking "I'm cool now", and wanting "attention from his mates" (*Nikau*). It's about "ego" (*Sacha*) and "show[ing] off" (*Hemi*):

"like bragging, in a sort of way like I can do it and I will do it just because I can?" (*Viresh*)

"he's showing off, how hot she is to his friends, and then they'll think he's cool because he's got this, hot girl on his shoulder" (*Rory*)

"Might want a reputation of, oh yeah I get girls' pictures and like oh yeah I'm a, (*Ambrose:* Mmm) (*Marshall:* Yeah) ladies man." (*Manaia*)

"Show you got more dominance within your group or something that you're more good looking or something. (*several participants nod*)" (*Sacha*)

"at the time he spread those nudes he would never have thought about that [consequences for the girl] because he would have thought just in short-term, yeah, get the status. Um, short-term he would be, really popular I guess because he has this– this status with a girl to the point where she'd send nudes." (*David*)

This was a dynamic that some boys described as being reinforced by some boys' friends – in a way that resonates with what masculinities scholars have observed about the way in which 'manhood' is often associated with the display of 'heterosexual achievement'[160]:

> "There's some– some people that will do that, they'll hype up the friend, and they're like, oh you're the man you're pulling all these girls" (*Marshall*)

Some participants explicitly linked this status of 'being a man' within a heterosexual matrix where masculinity is equated with dominance:

> "boys don't think this but, it's like in the back of their mind like, oh I'm going to get this nude so I can show you that I'm the man like (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) I can get any girl I want and, like um, I can manipulate girls into doing, into sending me things" (*Nathan*)

In a discussion in Group 5 about the sexual double standard, boys had been shown a quote taken from our research with secondary school girls.[161] As Facilitator 1 explained:

> "Here's just another quote: 'So I guess there's sort of an expectation put on guys that they should have sexual desires like girls are not expected to be like that but guys kind of are like it's more acceptable'." (*Facilitator 1*)

The boys went on to explain how underlying notions about the value of male sexual control shapes norms governing the patterned timing of sending nudes between girls and boys:

> *Nikhil:* With the with the last slide um, I feel like, it's more accepted that a girl is to send a nude than a guy rather than a guy is to send a nude. (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) Like it just doesn't happen often that, a guy does send pictures to girls (*Other participant:* Mmm) whereas girls it's more– it just happens more. (*several participants agree*)
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Why do you think that is?
>
> *Dominic:* Is it maybe because we ask for it more than they might (*Nikhil:* /Yeah/ *Harrison:* Mmm/) /ask for it?/
>
> *Nikhil:* It goes with that as well–
>
> *Dominic:* I don't think it's us that don't want to send nudes I think it's them that don't, ask for nudes, as much I guess.
>
> *Harrison:* And like sometimes there will be like an exchange of nudes right, but like if you're, if you're a guy like you'd be like oh nah, I'd– you'd be like oh she had to send something first before you get, like you send one back or something like that. (*Nikhil:* Yeah) A lot of the time like if you like, if you said to your mate like oh um, I sent one first they'd be like oh you couldn't even get one off her first? or something like that, yeah.
>
> *Andre:* Yeah it's like not OK for you to, send your– send a nude first you have to receive it and you have to ask for it like kind of often. Like you have the expectation to ask for it or like be the recipient, before like you send one.
>
> *Dominic:* I guess it might come back to like kind of, male like kind of control thing like, you have control over the situation if she's sending one first, whereas if you send one first you're kind of put in a kind of submissive position almost like, you're– you have to like send one like oh please send one back like. (*Group 5*)

Although we may implicitly imagine the boy who onshares nudes as agentically seeking status, it is also important to consider how this might come about through other forms of social coercion and peer pressure.[162] When Facilitator 2 asked the boys in Group 5, what would happen if it was "your mate saying, 'show me the nude that you got'?" (rather than the scenario we'd given of a boy promising to onshare nudes), they agreed that it would be unlikely at their age to feel pressure to share, but that that might not be the case for younger boys:

> "But like, if you're like third form you'd like feel pressured to do it just for the like, sort of sense of like popularity like people want something from you and you could give it to them but like now like, nobody cares like you could just say no and they'd just be all good with it." (*Andre*)

At other times, however, boys talked in ways that did not demarcate those pressures so clearly as belonging to the past:

> "It couldn't just be like the person who got the picture sending what if, it was, like peer pressure. What if the guy was like, what if his friend (*Other participant:* Yeah) like, ah, we all believe that you got a nude, and if you show it to us then, there's kind of like peer pressure to send it." (*Viresh*)

In this discussion, Blake went on to elaborate on a form of pressure specifically related to the digitally-mediated texture of contemporary (particularly youth) culture in which he suggests images may take on particular significance in verifying to others that an event or experience has happened.

> *Blake:* It's like this kind of, attitude, um to people it's like 'send pics or it didn't happen'. Kind of.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* What does that, what does that mean?
>
> *Blake:* So like, you say you did something but, they won't believe you unless you send a photo of, (*Facilitator 2:* Right) yourself doing it, it's like, they don't believe you received the nude unless you show them the nude.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Right. Why is it important to be believed, do you think?
>
> *Blake:* I don't know (*Facilitator 2 laughs*), it just is.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* It just is?
>
> *Viresh:* Yeah.
>
> *Blake:* I guess it's kind of the whole acceptance thing, people's like comments being like, you're lying. You don't want people to think you're a liar. Want people to accept you, yeah. (*Group 4*)

Occasionally boys mentioned motivations for seeking nudes that were related more directly to heterosexual desire and/or reassurance, as opposed to seeking status (or peer acceptance). These were not clearly related to motivations for showing other boys, however. For instance, Wei referred to the kind of relational validation it might offer:

> "there's also a bit, like the personal aspect, like you feel like you're um you're worth um, someone sending these to, um, you feel like, um, you're important enough for a girl to care about you (*Facilitator 3:* Mhm) and I guess, um, that's, um, that may be important." (*Wei*)

Seb similarly seemed to be referring to motivations for sending and receiving nudes, as distinct from onsharing them, but he also did not emphasise masculine status. He suggested that heterosexual desire might be a motivation in itself: "also a reason for doing it is sexual desire as well (*Other participant:* Yeah) and that can (*Other participant:* Yeah) cloud a lot of boys' judgements (*laughs*) as well".

Sexism and a sexual double standard

Researchers who study masculinity have argued that some of the negative ways (some) men talk about women are motivated by the desire to reinforce their peer relationships with other men, and enhance their masculine status.[163] Some have argued that when men sexually objectify women, or support other men doing it, they do so for this kind of reason.[164] In several of the workshop

discussions boys directly connected the gendered norms around onsharing nudes with sexism and the objectification of women. When talking about boys' possible motivations for onsharing a girl's nudes, Blake, for example, referred to a kind of detached objectification:

> "Kind of like... I guess objectifying, women like, 'I don't really care, about her it's kind of all just, I'm I'm using her to get these, nude pictures and I'll just send them because I don't really care'." (*Blake*)

Several boys referred to the sexual double standard that operates to judge girls and boys differently for the same kinds of sexual behaviour – both off and online. Dion linked this to sexism:

> "Yeah it comes down to like the whole like sexism thing in terms of like if girls are known to [do] that kind of thing they get names that– like named, um, certain things that obviously they don't want to be called. Guys can be viewed as different. Um, like that could be like the cool guy (*Tim:* Yeah) thing, like, you're (*Mitchell:* Yeah) the cool guy if you send that kind of stuff where girls, can be doing exactly the same thing and get a really bad reputa-tion. (*Facilitator 2:* Right) And I'm not saying that's 100 percent of the time but I think more often than not the girls are viewed... not– ah– more badly" (*Dion*)

Participants in other workshop groups made similar observations – suggesting that boys would be less at risk of judgement than girls would be from sharing their own nudes in peer contexts.[165] As Rory notes, for example, it is not unrealistic to think of a boy enjoying the kind of attention he might get from the exposure of his image (if he was confident about the way he looked):

> "I feel like if you were, a guy and you were, um... like confident with your body... um, and a girl had your picture she sent it to, her friends you'd, you wouldn't be, as disappointed with that you might almost be happy because– (*Blake:* /More people that (*unclear*)/) /that you've got a/ whole bunch of girls seeing how hot you are?" (*Rory*)

At the same time, according to Jack, if a boy had shared his own nudes it would be less likely to become as widely known:

> "It's kind of like if a guy was to send someone nudes it wouldn't spread out as far and wide towards people as if a woman was to send nudes (*Other participant:* Yeah) then a lot more people would find out about it, which just seems to be the general trend at our age" (*Jack*)

Dinesh agreed:

> "To add to Jack's point I think, like, if with a guy you wouldn't really hear about his nudes being sent, whereas if like, with a girl you'd be like 'oh, this person sent me her nudes last night' like and telling his mates, not even to show them, like knowing it's out there, so like a lot more people know that the photo's out there rather than with guy's [nudes], like you won't really you know talk about it too much." (*Dinesh*)

Not all participants agreed that boys would be immune to a potentially serious negative impact of having his nude image distributed beyond its intended audience. For example, in response to Rory's comment above, that a boy "might almost be happy" about girls seeing his nude (if he was confident with his body), Blake immediately followed with the comment, "But if you weren't confi-dent with your body you'd be, hurt at the same time", to which Rory agreed, "Yeah". In a similar vein, when boys in Group 3 considered the question of whether boys would be at the same reputational risk as girls if their nude image 'got out there', they initially seemed to err on the side of suggesting a less serious impact before Matthew argued that "a guy would still feel just as much pain" but would be more likely to try to conceal it:

> *Facilitator 3:* So– but what about, um, I mean, do you think that the risk to your reputation is the same for guys and girls if they had, you know, nude images that get out there?

Seb: I think it's... (*Matthew:* I think–) the girl might be called slut or (*Several participants:* Mm) whatever, called offensive terms and a boy it might be like, embarrassing but, I don't think... I don't know, what do you guys think, (*Riley:* Oh) for a boy.

Matthew: Tricky one.

Finn: Yeah, because no one can really say but I don't think anyone here has any experience of that. I do– I– I honestly haven't been.

Facilitator 3: It's just, no, more– (*participant laughs*) more in general.

Finn: Yeah, I know, but, I mean, like I've never heard of a case of some man (*Seb:* I've–) sending a nude and then–

Seb: I've heard of cases (*Finn:* ah OK.) but when I've– like I'm not friends with this particular person but he sounded pretty proud that he'd got it. He's pretty screwed up but– (*laughs*)

Riley: Wait wait– (*Seb:* /he's, ah, yeah./) /Oh yeah, proud that he got it sent round./

Matthew: I reckon it would be obvious– obvious it would be pretty emotionally and mentally scarring if that got out for both, either sex, but, yeah, I don't know if there would be too much of a difference. I reckon that the– the g– guy would keep it in more and just pretend he's OK about it and then, a girl, I would be more express about it. A guy would still feel just as much pain because it would have just the same amount of effect but it's just he wouldn't show it because it's just how–

Seb: Yeah, I think they'd both be definitely embarrassed.

Matthew: Yeah obviously (*Facilitator 3:* Yeah) would be both embarrassed (*Riley:* Mm)

Facilitator 3: Yeah.

Matthew: And I reckon the guy would probably try and conceal it more. (*Group 3*)

By contrast, boys in other groups frequently observed that girls and women would be likely to be judged negatively if her nudes were exposed. Boys in Group 8 told the story of a girl who had shared her nude with a boy who had then onshared it in a group chat, with the images then spread around the school. Participants agreed that she would be negatively judged:

Facilitator 1: And what actually happens if like, the images are shared in the group chat like what are the responses,

Manaia: Oh they just go like oh yeah she's easy or (*Group 8*)

One boy from a different group, suggested that the "slut shaming" a girl may face would also likely have longer lasting consequences than any reputational consequences that a boy might face:

"from what I've seen, that, women– once a status is ruined for a woman it's a lot harder to get it back, than a man" (*Lachlan*)

Following the discussion in Group 6 in which boys were asked to speculate about why a friend might tell them he was trying to get nudes from a girl and that he would send them around his group of friends when he did (which we presented earlier), one boy said "some guys who do like receive nudes kind of use them as like blackmail in a way, so they try get things off girls or, yadda yadda yah, *but that also happens with guys*" (*Nikau*, our emphasis). The example that Nikau then went on to describe, however, had involved two boys. He had observed "a full on fist fight at school", because "one guy got [another] guy's nude and um tried to spread it", "he was trying to blackmail him" (*Nikau*).

Despite some contrary views, in most groups boys seemed to recognise a sexual double standard that leads to girls and boys facing different kinds of judgement for sending intimate images. In several discussions, boys also recognised how it applied to wider realms of sexual or sexualised behaviour. Boys in Group 4, for example, brought up gendered (implicitly societal) expectations regarding women's and men's different sexual natures, including how that can translate into some boys acting in ways that are sexually exploitative towards girls:

> *Viresh:* guys are, like, they can have– like they can be open about their sexual desires. While women, can't. Like, either way in social media or, like kind of in person. They, they're expected to be more, I guess, like not, sexually driven. Men are supposed to be sexually driven.

> *Henry:* Yeah, I along that note, um... like the biggest example for me of this where it was like made most apparent was, um, I'd been talking to my mate about our, um, respective relationships, and, he um, he proposed, that we had a competition to see who could lose our v cup first, and I was, I was like, what? That's weird, um, no, no thank you (*laughs*). But I was just like, that just kind of made it apparent, that, like, some guys are just, like he was treating it like it was game, like he could try and, like who could try and manipulate their partner first. And I was like, that's not, that's not right, that's not OK. (*Group 4*)

Boys in Group 6 similarly endorsed the suggestion that a sexual double standard applied to how acceptable it is for women and men to openly express sexual desire:

> *Kevin:* Yeah um so with that if a chick gets with a lot of guys that's known as slutty but with a guy it's like something mean you know you've got with a lot of chicks [....]

> *Oscar:* Especially like around maybe like New Year's or something for guys I feel like you know if you get with a lot of girls obviously (*Kevin:* Yeah) you know you congratulate it but then with girls you know, if you're seen you know getting with say the same number that a guy did that's kind of just seen as like *'fuck'* (*group laughs*). (*Group 6*)

In Group 5, Nikhil initially rejected this idea:

> "I don't think it's as true as it used to be like maybe two or three years ago but now it's like accepted for girls to have that thought, to be a bit more, like a bit more open about it and a bit more accepting whereas yeah, a couple of years ago that's yeah." (*Nikhil*)

Other boys in the group, however, were quick to qualify that although this might apply at a theoretical level, or in terms of accepting a girl might have sexual thoughts, acting on those would still likely risk negative judgement in a way that it would not for boys:

> *Andre:* like that's true with thoughts but then if a guy gets with a bunch of girls and a girl gets with a bunch of guys there's still like that kind of, approach to it.

> *Harrison:* It might not be as like drastic as it was a few years ago but it's still like, yeah.

> *Andre:* Yeah it's still like girls are like more slut– slutty if they get with more guys. Like that's the general thought of society rather than a guy getting with a bunch of girls. (*Group 5*)

Underscoring the point that this kind of judgement of girls is 'societal', Harrison noted within this discussion, that "even girls react to other girls":

> "they're like ohh she gets with everyone and like she's a slut and stuff like that so, it's like, it's not like, it's like guys and girls contribute to like kind of condemning um girls for getting with multiple people." (*Harrison*)

In the discussions about what might drive boys to onshare a girl's nude, two other kinds of motivation were raised: humour and revenge. As boys discussed these motives, they also touched on the complicated relationship between causing harm and boys' *intentions* to cause harm.

Revenge, humour and/or not seeing the harm

The popular colloquial term 'revenge pornography' is a misleading misnomer for most image-based sexual abuse,[166] however *sometimes* men do post and distribute women's nude images (usually those of former partners) for the purposes of revenge.[167] Although it was mentioned only occasionally by the boys in this study, a few did suggest that revenge could also possibly motivate or spark a boy to onshare a girl's nudes, implicitly for the purpose of deliberately causing harm:

> "I know there's been a couple of stories I've heard where the girl would break up with the guy and then the guy would post nudes as revenge." (*Lachlan*)

> "Yeah it's almost maybe if like, you're in a relationship with someone and maybe, one person in the relationship kind of like, cheated on someone, the person that got cheated on may use the nude images or like, you know, sex, or something as kind of like revenge (*Nikau:* Get back at them) to get back at them like showing their mates, and putting it out, on public and stuff." (*Oscar*)

> "Um, I think a lot of this, actually happens on impulse, so (*Viresh:* Yeah), maybe, you weren't thinking straight at the time or you didn't have these things in your mind but, um, I know like for me maybe, I would never, do something like that, so, never like betray someone's trust like that but, I can see how maybe if you got really angry or really jealous, of someone, maybe just as revenge you just, leak it like that." (*Krish*)

More commonly, however, boys gave the impression that harm was caused to girls as a by-product of other motives taking precedence and overshadowing recognition about the harmful consequences for girls. That is, participants implied that boys who did onshare girls' nudes were ignorant or unthinking about the consequences. For example, during a discussion in Group 4 about the complexities and challenges for bystander intervention, Jeet said, "I think the root cause of the problem is, I mean at least part of it is that, um they don't see the seriousness of the consequences that can happen, and how they come to really affect the girls". Viresh followed:

> "Just to elaborate on that, I think that in kind of online especially like Facebook and a lot of social media, it's since it's not, you're not talking to someone face to face like you're not talking to someone 'hey, I'm going to leak your nude', you're doing it [online] and that kind of detaches from looking at the sense of consequence, so you don't have to deal with the problem that you make. And you can get away with a lot more things online. You can say a lot more hurtful stuff and you can be a lot more offensive online because, things are not person person you're not actually like, seeing their reaction, like the actual, kind of like real life reaction." (*Viresh*)

Awareness of consequences was a recurrent theme throughout the discussion in Group 2:

> "They think it's like acceptable but they don't know the consequences. That's why it happens so often. (*Tim:* Yeah)" (*Alex*)

In several discussions, workshop participants showed clear recognition of the serious real-world implications of the sexual double standard and the dangerous potential consequences of these kinds of judgements on girls whose nudes were onshared beyond their intended audience:

> "we kind of understand that there's a responsibility with that picture then you know, if that girl finds out that not only– like that she that she finds out that it's not only just you but other people have seen the picture it's probably quite you know, humiliating and she must feel devastated by that fact yeah." (*Oscar*)

> "This is actually how like depression starts, because like, if you think about it, it's just basically, picking sides and the majority of people take the guy's side, and the girl will feel like sad and alone and then more girls will start calling her a slut, and all that and that's

how, depression starts and that's how like she will like, like start suicidal thoughts and all that, writing death notes" (*Sacha*)

"I think, most guys don't actually have the responsibility to realise what the major consequences could be. So, I mean worst case scenario the girl, she shamed so much she commits suicide because I'm sure that's probably happened sometimes." (*David*)

Similarly, although Nathan uses gender neutral language the context of the conversation before and after this comment suggests he was also referring to a gendered dynamic that he understood to potentially cause extreme harm to girls:

"Some people manipulate others to send you them nudes and then they send them to everyone else to embarrass them. Or, then they– it becomes bullying. Which leads to other serious things like suicide and stuff." (*Nathan*)[168]

In direct contrast to the seriousness of these concerns, some young men emphasised the role of humour in boys sharing girls' nudes, again suggesting that at some level the boy doing it might not be doing so with the intention of hurting the girl. For example, George said:

"Um, from an outsider's perspective I'd probably say he just wants to do it because he thinks he's funny. Or he doesn't see he's not being considerate of the other person. Um, but if you're looking at it from the inside, you, you just, you just want everyone to know that you're like eh eh don't mess with me I've got this on you." (*George*)

George's reference to an underlying message of threat also, however, indicates that humour can be a front for power plays.[169] Another young man in this same group also referred to the way humour might work to provide a minimising cover for behaviour that has more serious undertones:

"Yeah um with that one, like. My friends they have those kind of videos and, pictures like I've seen some of them. They don't send it they mostly show you. (*Facilitator 2:* Right) And um, they don't initially think that it's wrong. Oh, they know it's wrong but it's not wrong to them. Like, the way that boys think is really, really weird like um they– they don't want to do it in terms of bullying the girl. They want to do it just to, um, you know have a laugh with the boys and just show them like oh look at this. Like they don't want to bully the girl if you know what I mean. They don't intend on hurting her because they like act– Some of my friends they are like really genuine boys like really nice if you meet them. But they just– boys will [be] boys. Oh that's like a common saying like boys use that as an excuse (*laughs*). 'Boys will be boys'. But some boys will use it as oh look at this. Look at this girl she's not– she doesn't even care about herself I wonder what her parents would think. But some boys they just, like going back to just banter. But they don't see it they don't initially see oh it's a– this is a form of bullying. Like I would think that too if I sh– if I showed my friends a picture of a girl. I'd say 'oh look at this' and just all start cracking up. I wouldn't think oh that's bullying. At first." (*Nathan*)

As Nathan describes this typical scenario characterised by humour and banter among boys, he reflects on how powerful masculinity norms can shape interactions among boys and men in ways that minimise and rationalise harmful behaviour towards girls and women. His account is very interesting as he notices and distances himself from his own complicity, insightfully commenting on how phrases like "boys will be boys" operate as an "excuse", providing cultural permission for boys and young men to suspend serious ethical concerns.

Wrestling with the ethics

As we noted earlier, boys took up different positions as they wrestled with ethical details around the 'dos and don'ts' of handling nudes. These differences seemed to hinge on different views about trust and responsibility:

> *Krish:* I mean, if you're, if you're going to do, something like that [sending someone a nude image of yourself], then you should probably be, um, aware of the consequences so– or of possible repercussions so... Not to say that it would happen but, you should know that taking this picture means that this could happen. And, for someone, you know to like distribute it or, you know, expose it, that's unethical so on their behalf that's wrong but... ah taking taking nudes isn't like wrong, per se it's, ah a choice I guess. Or, yeah.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* What do you guys think?
>
> *Blake:* Um it should be... if you *want* to take a nude and send it to someone, who you trust, then that should be, that should be fine you should be allowed to do that. Um, and it shouldn't be that you have to *not* do that because you're afraid that it'll be sent to lots of people like you shouldn't you shouldn't have to be afraid of that. (*Group 4*)

One position, as outlined above by Blake, endorses an ideal in which a sender should be able to act on trust in sending a nude. A contrary position, however, rests on an assumption that trust is inherently unwise. From this basis, a person who made the mistake of trusting another person with their (usually her) nudes was also responsible for what happened to them. In Group 7 there was quite a bit of talk around this position, and participants blended strong ethical judgement against onsharing another person's nude with what was in effect victim-blaming towards the person who shared their nude in the first place:

> "I don't know it– I feel like yes– I agree with Cody there it's like, it's yet it's their fault for um you know sharing it and then, it's the other person– it's the other person's like property now but I feel like the blame should be shared out to both people this is like one– for one thing, you shouldn't have been sending that picture to that person regardless of whether you trust them or not and the second– on like the other hand as well, why are you being an asshole and sharing it around?" (*Rio*)

Another participant in this discussion made a more direct link to the sexual double standard, showing how accounts about shared responsibility translate into specifically gendered forms of denigration and harsh judgement against girls:

> "I think that's the reason why they call like girls slut because, when the girls like give the picture or the nude to the guy the guy often like shares it around, and then that's how the other people call her a, like, um, like 'she's a slut she's a ho, she's done this or that', but it's just really the guy showing their friends and then their friends doing it to other people, there's other people just spreading across. And it's basically like, that's not cool in a way but like, it's her fault for sending it and like for trusting him, or her." (*Sacha*)

In response to a later scenario question asking boys how they would respond if a friend told them they were trying to get a nude from a girl and would then send it around or show them on their phone, this same participant clarified that he would regard it as ethically unacceptable – illustrating how critical views about the wisdom of a girl's (misplaced) trust did not necessarily negate placing ethical responsibility on the boy who passes it on:

> "Like in our– like, in my group, if if a person says that [that they were going to get a girl's nude and show them], like a random or someone, we'd just tell them to like f off because that's just not cool nowadays. (*Taika:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Like like you're taking someone's um, nudity and you're showing it to a bunch of other guys, and that's just not cool (*other participants agree*)." (*Sacha*)

Another dimension to some boys' ethical deliberations, seemed to be a more practical distinction between the ethics of literally *sending* on nudes versus *showing* them to someone else (usually on a phone), which several boys suggested would be a more common scenario (as we discuss below).

Although bottom-line judgements held this also to be wrong, the practice of *showing* another person someone else's nude was given a wider ethical berth by some boys, as we see in the following discussion:

> *Nikhil:* Yeah when you show it in person it's like, it's like two seconds and then it's gone, and the moment's over. But whereas with like, getting it online, from like your mate you can always go back to always look at it again, and so… yeah it would be obviously more accepted like oh yeah here have a look at this whereas sending it to the person like, (*Dominic:* I feel like it's a bit dodgy eh) yeah, yeah–
>
> *Dominic:* Like sending someone's nude around it's a bit, it's a bit wrong. Well I guess both ways it's sort of wrong but, um but just sort of giving the person the ability to keep the photo is sort of worse.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Yeah
>
> *Nikhil:* Because like… if I, like hypothetically speaking if I got a nude and I showed a whole bunch of people, it's still only on my phone, (*Facilitator 2:* Right if you were showing people on your phone) yeah yeah yeah it's still only on my phone only I have access to it. But if I send it to one person, that person could send it to, 50 other people and then everyone has it. And that would have a lot more, like a greater effect on the girl if she were to find out.
>
> *Harrison:* Mmm, like if you're, if you're a guy or a girl you'd be like, you'd feel much better off if like, well like you still feel pretty shit but like, you'd feel much better off if like just– just shown to multiple people rather than actually sent like you– once it's sent you'd feel like you'd probably feel real vulnerable and yeah.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* But wouldn't– isn't that, I mean like you know, in, like sharing it around in the first place and showing other people in the first place is already it's sort of…
>
> *Harrison:* Oh yeah of course, that's still really bad like I'm not saying that was– like it's fine to do that but like you'd feel probably a bit more safe, but then I guess you'd definitely mistrust them if they're going to show someone else like then they've like broken your trust basically. (*Group 5*)

In conclusion

In this chapter we have discussed how boys described the norms and ethics of onsharing nudes beyond their intended audience. Mostly boys described this behaviour as familiar, and several discussed examples from their own wider peer contexts in which they had observed or heard about this happening in problematic ways. Many, however, said it was not something that would happen in their own social circles. They often said that unethical behaviour associated with seeking and onsharing nudes was associated with younger boys, rather than boys of their own age.

While not all workshop participants agreed, most recognised gendered norms in the possible motives they thought might drive boys to act in these ways. Many speculated that it could be a desire for masculine status that might lead some boys to act unethically in onsharing a girl's nudes beyond their intended audience. Some boys also mentioned humour and revenge (although this in particular was not a common reason they raised) as relevant to understanding why a boy would do this. In some of the discussions boys juxtaposed a boy's potential humorous intent with the serious potential consequences for a girl of having her intimate images shared beyond their intended audience. Some suggested that boys who harm girls through onsharing their nudes would not be thinking about or understanding the consequences of their behaviour. Again, while not all boys agreed, most thought there were gendered patterns in the consequences of onsharing nudes, with many referring to the relevance of sexism and the sexual double standard creating outcomes for girls that were often harsher than they were for boys.

Boys generally agreed that sharing nudes beyond their intended audience was unethical. Overall, however, they portrayed a complex set of ethical dilemmas that boys would face in deciding if and how to respond, as bystanders to such behaviour. We discuss the practical intricacies of these dilemmas in more detail in the next chapter.

Chapter 5
Onsharing nudes beyond their intended audience II: The art of intervening

When boys talked about the possibilities and obstacles for intervening to prevent harm associated with unethical and abusive digital communication, they portrayed it overall as complicated and difficult territory. They also gave the impression that they would be operating in a relative vacuum of ethical guidelines, having to figure out on their own the nuanced dos and don'ts of sexting, let alone if and how they could and should intervene if they were a bystander to unethical onsharing. Some boys described the whole topic of nudes as "taboo", noting that boys didn't really talk about it, and that they weren't encouraged to:

> "Boys don't talk a lot about (*Finn:* Yeah) these kind of things. (*Finn:* Yeah) They might show it and say, 'aw, (*Other participant:* Yeah) nah' or, 'yes that's cool', but they won't go into any more depth than that. (*Other participant:* Yeah)" (*Seb*)

> "I think there isn't any encouragement from society to talk about these things and make them clear, as it is a, you know, a bad topic to talk about. Like it's a taboo topic." (*Lachlan*)

Overall, boys gave the impression that they had no relatable roadmap for navigating the ethics of intimate digital communication. As an illustration, Taika mentioned an item that a "reporter comedian … in America" had done on nudes, which concluded:

> "the only thing– ah advice they could find ah is just 'don't do it' and, it's just like well thanks what happens to the people that have done it?" (*Taika*)

To gain a sense of boys' inclinations towards ethical bystander action, and the options they saw they had, we presented hypothetical scenarios and asked them how they would respond. In one scenario (as discussed in the previous chapter), a friend told them they were trying to get nudes from a girl and that they would show them. We gave some possible prompts, and asked boys what they would do. In the process, we gained a sense of whether or not this kind of scenario was familiar and realistic.

As discussed earlier, it is important first to note that participants gave the impression of having quite different levels of experience and exposure related to boys' discussion and exchange of girls' nudes. In some of the workshop groups, some boys indicated that they had not had direct personal experience of a scenario like this – suggesting, for example, that it would not happen in their friendship groups, and/or while they might know about the practice of onsharing nudes, it was distant from their own peer context. For example:

"Um honestly no idea, it's actually an alien situation, really, it's like, it would be so out of the blue, (*Facilitator 1*: Right) would be like, what, what, what are you doing? I mean like–" (*Luke*)

"I guess it depends on your group of mates (*Other participant:* Yeah) like, for example like I know with my group of mates it probably wouldn't happen like that that would be unlikely whereas I definitely know like another group of mates that would definitely do that, and um, it's all sort of social different social circumstances, I guess it comes down to that." (*Scott*)

While it was not always clear whether boys' responses reflected their own distance from the practice of onsharing nudes, or whether their reticence was face-saving in a context where ethical judgement was implicit if not explicit about the practice, boys repeatedly associated it with particular groups of boys – such as in the following exchange:

Blake: I've, I've heard of groups of people doing this.

Facilitator 2: Uh huh. I see a couple of other nods?

Rory: Yeah. (*Group 4*)

In some of the other workshop groups, however, boys readily signalled their familiarity with this kind of scenario of a boy seeking a girl's nudes and showing them to his friends. In these groups, several boys said yes (*Group 9*) or nodded their agreement (*Group 6*) that the scenario sounded familiar. This is not to say that the participants necessarily thought such talk from other boys corresponded with what might actually happen, however. In Group 9, for instance, Reuben said, "I'll be shocked if he gets it (*laughs*). Yeah nah–", indicating such talk could more likely be heard as bragging than an actual plan likely to be executed. Several boys also pointed out that while key elements of the scenario were familiar, it needed nuancing as certain details were not realistic. They suggested that it would be more likely to happen in more subtle ways. For example, several indicated it was more likely a boy would *show* others a nude on his phone rather than *send* it on. In Group 8, Marshall said that showing and sending would be equally common, but went on to say that:

Marshall: I think more people, show them instead of sending it to them, to their friends. Just because, they don't want to get suspended or something.

Facilitators 1 & 5: Mmm

Manaia: I think that they would use their phone to be more safe, as in it doesn't come back to them. Whereas if you give it to a group chat it might go everywhere, you got it from from this guy you got it from him, or he'll just, yeah just get them fast in trouble (*other participants agree*). (*Group 8*)

Boys in other groups agreed:

"I think that that statement is sort of like the second half is a bit unrealistic like, at least with the people that we sort of know is that um, like they'll say that first part saying that they're trying to get nudes off a girl or something but they won't really say, that they're going to share it around with them like they just do it anyway so when they get them they will show their mates but they won't necessarily send them around but they will like tell people they're doing it. Yeah so I think more of it's like, a lot of people do say that they'll do it but they don't necessarily say that they'll send them around." (*Nikau*)

"the kind of way that, I think nudes get sent around as far as I've heard, is that it's usually– it's not in a group sense where they say 'oh, here's it' and send out in a group. It's usually passed from one person to another, another, or it's shown face-to-face and then someone goes oh, can I have that and then send it individually so it's in an individual chat. So, it's– it's unlikely to be in a sense where you can talk about it. (*Other participant:* Yeah)" (*Seb*)

(Mostly) wanting to intervene

As we discussed earlier, mostly boys regarded onsharing nudes as unethical.[170] With the exception of one group (*Group 9*), in which the boys predominantly said they would nevertheless not get involved, and a few boys from other groups who said, for example, that they "would just stay out of it" (*Nathan*), most boys appeared to recognise a moral responsibility to intervene to stop unethical onsharing. Many indicated that they would try to intervene, or that they would at least hope and aspire to. Some boys told stories about having already done so. However, threaded through and alongside aspirational and confident talk were hesitations, stories of defeat or 'reality checks', and anxieties about the consequences. Some boys, for example, claimed they would intervene, but went on to acknowledge troubling potential consequences. Other boys, on the other hand, said they wouldn't intervene, even though they thought it would be the right thing to do.

During these discussions we also offered prompts, to ask boys whether they would consider directly intervening with the friend himself (generally the preferred option), telling the girl (a possible option for some boys, but with many complications, according to others), and telling authorities such as the school or police (a widely rejected path). Of all the questions we addressed in the workshops, this generated the most collective uncertainty, and probably the widest range of different kinds of responses.

In the section below we identify this range of complex responses, organising the discussion around different positions boys articulated. While there were individual differences among the boys in what they said, we think it's more helpful to emphasise the sociocultural patterns of possibility for response, because, as noted above, so often boys drew on more than one and/or nuanced their answers with caveats. Many didn't have a straightforward position about either what they would do, or what the right thing to do was. And while boys differed in the level of confidence they projected about if and how they would intervene, when they did project confidence it was almost always spoken with the implicit backing of 'their group'.

"I'll tell them straight eh"

Some boys indicated that they would do something in response to our hypothetical scenarios. George and Rory, for example, confidently settled on the idea of a straightforward, direct intervention with their friends:

> "Um yeah um. I'll probably– Nah I'll probably [....] so I'll distance myself from whoever's with us. And I'll tell them straight eh I'll tell them 'Bro you're you're not really doing what you should be doing. Your parents sent you to school to, to get a good education and stuff'" (*George*)

> "when, they're behaving, um, unethically online, (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) just, call them out for it. And I think, if it *is* your friend that they will listen to you" (*Rory*)

Nikhil also suggested intervening with the friend, but in a less direct fashion:

> "I think another way to just, get rid of that whole situation occurring is like, if somebody says that to you like 'oh yeah, um, I'm going to send this all around' even if you just shrug it off in itself, that even might like, put the second thought in their head like oh, he doesn't care (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) so what's the point of me going through all that trouble, if he doesn't care. If you just completely ignore the whole conversation. (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm)" (*Nikhil*)

While Lachlan noted that it would be "a really bad situation to be put in", he emphasised a personal moral position justifying taking action in spite of potentially difficult consequences. In contrast to most workshops participants, he said he might try to warn the girl (especially if he knew her):

"personally I would try to stop it because that's just who I am and I don't really believe that– that– a– that would end up well in the end especially if I knew the girl he was talking about. Um, but I think that trying to avoid it or– and trying to maybe, in terms of stopping it warn the girl about it. And yes, that will ru– ruin the relationship but that will protect her from what may come, you know, and, you know, slut shaming because that can be seen as, ah, a bad thing and it (*Facilitator 3:* Mmhm) ruins a girl's status as well" (*Lachlan*)

In another hypothetical scenario, in which boys were asked to imagine what they would do if they came across a younger boy saying he was going to get a girl's nudes, boys in Group 8 favoured a direct and, in Manaia's case, creative approach:

Facilitator 1: so like would how you respond kind of change depending on other factors so say, um, I don't know say the person telling you– you actually just overheard it in the corridor and it was like say a Year 10 boy, saying this, would you, you know be like 'hey (*performatively laughs*) stop that' or would you just keep walking or, how does that kind of change? (*pause, some participants speaking very softly*) Like if it was a younger kid, would you tell the school, is that /something?/"

Hemi: /I wouldn't/ tell the school I'd tell him, /(outbreath) (unclear)/

Manaia: /Oh just,/ you'd be like oh what's the girls name? and you'd say the girl and be like oh that's my cousin (*group laughs*), and just go why why you doing that to my cousin? (*group laughs*) Square on bro. Just scare him out of it. He might not do that again he might rethink, what he's doing. (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) ohh cautious like be too scared to ask girls for pictures.

Facilitator 1: Yeah, and what if the guy was like, I don't know someone who was seen as like real cool, at school.

Marshall: Then I won't think of him as cool anymore, (*Facilitator 1 laughs*) but then I'd tell him– yeah I'd tell him, *if* I heard him, (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) like from like my own ears though, not if it was like rumours, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) but, if it was rumours I wouldn't go up to talk to him but if I heard him like on my, on my, my own then I'd definitely, I'd tell him what I think. (*Group 8*)

In this example, Manaia's idea of jokingly pretending that the girl involved was his cousin resonated with suggestions made by Pasifika boys in other workshop groups, who suggested bringing in a "personal vibe" (*Nathan*) and relational connections to try to make a serious point with another boy. Nathan elaborated:

"I think that um the way to deal with it is to say like, um, yeah get personal with them like 'oh imagine if this was your, your sister or your, or some, or like someone that you know that you have a personal relationship with just' I don't know– 'Oh think of that as your sister like and if a boy was doing that to your sister would you want to share it or would you just delete it right now?' (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) And then make them feel guilty. (*Facilitator 2:* Right) That's one way to approach it like because if he get– If you say 'oh bro don't do that that's not good' then they're not like going to take you seriously they're just going to laugh in your face and just send it. But if you get make them give them another perspective (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) then maybe they'll they'll– even if they don't do it it'll make them think twice. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) At least you have a chance of them not sending it." (*Nathan*)

Sometimes, boys referenced their friendship group, invoking an implicit collective position (a theme we will return to). For example, Sacha's earlier comment about how "*we'd* just tell them to like f off" (our emphasis) if another boy said they were going to get a girl's nudes and show them. Other times, boys talked within the workshop group about the possibilities for intervening in a way that conveyed a shared sense of what they 'should' do:

> "Try and talk them out of it. And try them and say, 'don't do this because you– it will affect your friendship and, she or he will not– not appreciate that because (*Finn:* Well–) they sent them just for you, not to send round to everyone'." (*Matthew*)

> "Think you definitely try to talk them out of, sending it to you guys as well, just saying I don't know, 'don't send it. We don't need it. Don't bother. Keep to yourself.'" (*Seb*)

A few boys told us that they already had, in similar situations, intervened. For example, referring to an example introduced in Chapter 4, Ari explained:

> "There was a situation last year where a girl sent a full body nude to a boy she trusted and, he sent it to his best friend, his best friend showed it round the class and then sent it to a few more people and then– then it's started spreading like a spider web. And then, I tried to, tell the person who was distributing it because I didn't know the girl personally but I tried to tell him that, 'If you show this round she's going to get shamed and it's going to put her in,' I think I used the word 'mental instability'. And, um, that didn't change anything so" (*Ari)*

"You'd love to think that as a person you would jump in"

Coexisting with these expressions of intent to intervene, and accounts of having done so, however, boys frequently acknowledged how delicate the act of intervening would likely be (or actually was) in practice. The exchange below from Group 7 highlights this. These boys were responding to the hypothetical scenario in which they were asked to imagine what they would do if they were walking down the corridor and overheard a Year 9 or 10 student talking about trying to get nudes to onshare:

> *Taika:* Mmm. Yeah I would, I would, walk past that situation. I I wouldn't get involved. I I know it's probably not, the right thing to do, but I just, I try not to get involved in anything that doesn't concern me my friends or my family, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) I, I specifically try not to.

> *Luke:* I mean it's certainly the easiest option.

> *Rio:* Yeah, you'd love to think that as a person you would jump in, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) prevent something like that from happening but it's like– I don't know if that actually did happen to me I wouldn't know how to respond because I don't know these people, I don't know, how their dynamic works, I don't know if this is a normal thing or if this person randomly woke up today and was like I'm going to be a dick today.

> *Sacha:* Nah because like, last month this actually happened, like I was going to rehearsal, and, I saw these ah three boys and they're like oh g come look at this and then one guy's like oh what?, he's like oh I got this girl's nudes, I felt so sad for the girl but I just walked past like, because you didn't know what to do in the situation when it's like actually happening, in your mind you're like oh I'm going to stop this I'm going to do that, I'm going to tell the teacher, but in like reality you're just going to keep on walking because you don't really know what to do in that matter.

> *Facilitator 2:* Yeah it's tricky eh like it's,

> *Facilitator 1:* Mmm so hard.

> *Cody:* And it's weird, (*Luke:* Yeah) borderline weird.

> *Taika:* It's just impossible to know what you'll do in real world situation it's just impossible. (*Group 7*)

As boys navigated this challenge of if and how to intervene – with a friend or with other boys – they fleshed out complex constraints around doing this in practice. They talked about how they didn't always know what to do, and they also illuminated various roadblocks and hurdles

boys might face in the process. Often times, these related to the power of boys' peer culture (and homosocial norms and bonds) to shape and constrain what they thought they could or should do, and how they would have to go about any action carefully. Specifically, they interwove concerns about loyalty and the impact on their friend (in the scenario involving a friend), who they would in effect have to challenge, the maintenance of their relationship with that friend and their wider friend group, as well as their own standing and reputation among their peers.

Loyalty and belonging in friendship groups

In the rest of this chapter, we will discuss different elements of what appeared to be strong over-arching norms and values related to peer loyalty and belonging. Although boys didn't use these words (loyalty and belonging), when they weighed up different possible actions they spoke prominently about inter-related considerations for not wanting to "cause beef" (e.g., *Nikhil*) for their friend, and the risks, as several participants noted, of "ruin[ing]" friendships. Relatedly, they widely eschewed options that involved seeking outside help (framed by some as being a "snitch"). We also briefly discuss boys' views in relation to the value of humour in intervening with another boy, and the ins and outs of potentially going directly to the girl involved. Finally, in this section, we will hone in on some of the finer details of some conversations that provide a unique insight into the challenges and skills required of boys to navigate challenging norms that support unethical behaviour, such as onsharing nudes. Two exchanges, in particular, show extraordinary insights into subtle communicative practices, and the sophisticated emotional and relational labour that some boys report undertaking.

"We don't want to cause beef with our friend": Loyalty and belonging

A dominant theme underlying almost all of the discussions about the possibilities for intervention, was the primacy of boys' friendship groups and the need to take into account how to preserve those relationships in the course of any intervention. For example, when boys considered different options for what a boy might do, the option of speaking to the girl was regarded by some as likely to be frowned upon as disloyal. For example:

> "Probably what's not acceptable, like not as acceptable is like supporting the girl, in my opinion because like even though it's the morally correct thing to do it's just like you're not behind your mate you're not supporting him and it's just like, um, ah, stating your friendship I guess, that type of stuff, and, there's an expectation that you have to back your boy, even though, it's not exactly correct what he's doing." (*Stephen*)

Similarly, some of the boys in Group 6 said that the option of "supporting the girl being targeted" (*Oscar*) would be unlikely:

> *Oscar:* because it goes kind of back you know like 'dogging the boys'
>
> *Kevin:* Yeah you wouldn't do that to your mate.
>
> *Oscar:* Yeah. It's kind of like you're– kind of just like, almost humiliating your mate (*Other participant:* Yeah) for the fact that he's like, said that he wants to get nudes off a girl and then telling the girl that he wants his nudes (*Other participant:* Yeah), he must feel you know embarrassed by that, yeah.

Jack continued in this exchange to add:

> *Jack:* I think most people in that situation probably just wouldn't have the confidence to say anything about it or would just maybe say it light and then try to brush off the subject, all together. (*Group 6*)

Similarly, in Group 5, Andre said that to call someone out in person when no-one else was doing that: "you've got to be pretty confident to do that though".

This idea of the importance of confidence seemed to be linked to the risks of transgressing friendship group norms, including the possibility of being ostracised. Another boy in Group 6 said that by saying something "in real life" (as opposed to online):

> "you wouldn't want it to get– escalate, and like a few good mates just kind of freezing like getting frozen out from a group of mates" (*Dinesh*)

Underlying these kinds of concerns seemed to be the importance of group norms charting possible paths of action, as well as the importance of protecting friendships and a boy's sense of belonging within a group.[171]

In Group 8, some boys suggested a direct response of calling out the friend. However, one of the boys in particular persevered with the idea of telling the girl. The exchange below is interesting for how it reveals an unwritten rule against this course of action, with one boy asking three times whether he would do that if the boy was his friend – clearly implying it would breach implicit codes of loyalty among male friends. Manaia who had suggested telling the girl, continued with this idea, indicating possible room for stretching or breaking such codes, but by the end of that part of the conversation, he agreed it could have dire consequences for the friendship:

> *Facilitator 1:* Mmm and so what are your kind of options to respond in the situation? Like if we imagine that this is actually happening to you, what can you kind of do or say or?
>
> *Marshall:* I'd say don't send it.
>
> *Hemi:* Yeah tell him off. (*Marshall:* Yeah) Call him an idiot. (*laughs*)
>
> *Marshall:* But then, I don't think my friends would do that, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) yeah because, we're from [our School] (*other participants laugh*), nah yeah I mean,
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Cool so one is that maybe this isn't a realistic scenario for you personally. (*Marshall:* Mmm) Um, yeah that's, um, fine, another option would be to like tell your friend off and to kind of say not to do that (*Marshall:* Snap it out.) yeah. (*participants laugh*) Is that a realistic thing to do?
>
> *Marshall:* Yeah. (laughs)
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah. Anything else you could do?
>
> *Marshall:* Um,
>
> *Manaia:* I'd probably tell the girl–
>
> *Hemi:* Warn the girl eh.
>
> *Manaia:* 'Hey don't talk to this guy, he's just, sneaking around.'
>
> *Marshall:* Your friend?
>
> *Manaia:* I'd talk to the girl, just say, (*Marshall:* If he was your friend?) I've heard my friend,
>
> *Marshall:* Would you tell the girl if that dude was your friend? If your friend was–
>
> *Manaia:* I'd just go 'hey I know this guy, don't talk to him. He's just going to backstab you.'
>
> *Marshall:* Um, sometimes.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* It's a good question though like if it was your friend does make it a bit harder to like,
>
> *Hemi:* Makes it harder.
>
> *Manaia:* Oh definitely, because then she might tell him and then, it's like, end of your friendship. (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) (*Group 8*)

This overall theme, about the enormous importance of friendships and friendship groups, was repeated in many of the workshops sessions. For example, Taika talked about how he thought most of the boys in his friendship group would not challenge another boy in relation to the prospect of onsharing nudes (and a few might actually defend that person). But in the process, he also highlighted how important having support from some of his group would be if he were to challenge another boy who was sharing around a girl's nudes:

> "in that situation probably a majority of our group would, not ah, challenge it or would not be averse, and then, a few would probably just defend the person who was sharing. I, I can see, that ah, I can see probably at least one person in our group defending that if it was someone else, however I would imagine most of our group has enough common sense to not be sharing that around. (*Rio:* Mmm) I trust a few people in our group to, you know not ah, do that sort of thing and to certainly back me up if I were to challenge it." (*Taika*)

When boys in Group 8 were asked about the pros and cons of speaking directly to a friend, 'calling it how you see it' and challenging his behaviour overtly, they raised issues related to loyalty and belonging for both the pros and the cons. Hemi suggested that an advantage would be that "you're not going behind his back so he doesn't feel betrayed". At the same time, Marshall noted, "he could be offended, like his pride could be, his pride could like, it could go lower [....] then I think he would be like oh I shouldn't be his friend, so that can challenge, like your friendship".

"You're really influenced by your mates": Silencing and the power of peer culture

In Chapter 3 we discussed how participants described the role of peer pressure in shaping boys' behaviour in line with social norms for masculinity. Boys also described how their sense of peer group norms played an important role in shaping whether or not they felt they could intervene against unethical or sexist behaviour they observed. Kevin, for instance, made a general point about the power of a boy's friends to influence him:

> "Yeah I think it comes back to the ethics and um how you're brought up, what you know is right and wrong, like, you're really influenced by your mates. Obviously you can have good mates who show you the right way ah but once like other ones like the group he was saying they can make you do stuff that you don't want to do when you necessarily like oh you're like nah this is not good but, then they'll tell you to and for you, you don't want to look like you're scared to do it so you'll do it because of that, so it comes back to the effects of your mates on you and what you stand up for." (*Kevin*)

As Kevin suggests, the importance of saving face in front of his peer group can be so strong for some, possibly many, boys that it can override his ability to act in accordance with his own values, let alone be able to intervene to prevent others causing harm.

Some boys shared specific examples of their own experiences in group situations where they disliked or were uncomfortable with what was being said or done by other boys, but felt unable to take a stand, and in some cases where they were carried along by the mood of the peer group. Some described how difficult "having a voice" (*Kevin*) can be in these situations, and how they can end up silenced. Dominic reflected on the "really lame" dynamics that occurred in his group in the third form when a girl sent one of the boys a nude. His story shows how boys can get caught up in the implicit norms and values shaping such behaviour. In this case it's not clear if, and how, uncomfortable he felt at the time. But as Harrison, one of the other boys in this workshop, observed, boys will likely feel encouraged to 'go with the flow' in such cases, in order to avoid being isolated from the group:

> *Dominic:* Are we allowed to give examples? (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) Um when we were in third form I think there was like a thing going around like there was a, a girl who sent a nude to

a guy in our group and um she got body shamed pretty bad for it, and that was like, if you look back at it now, um it's like, it's really lame whereas back then it was like a thing like it was, because, yeah.

Facilitator 2: Like everyone was in that...

Dominic: Yeah everyone saw it everyone, like thought it was funny and, now when you look back at it it's kind of like gross (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah). Especially because we were so young.

Facilitator 2: Yeah but of course you don't know that at the time.

Dominic: Yeah at the time you think you're cool, you're like fourteen.

Facilitator 1: And then if you do like if you're the only one or you feel like the only one in that situation (Harrison: Yeah) who thinks it's a bit, kind of, not right it can be quite hard to, /tell anyone you know?/

Harrison: /Yeah you're going to be by/ yourself basically (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) because most people are just going to follow through like, they all think it's funny and stuff so (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) you'll be by yourself and like you don't want to be isolated I guess? (*Group 5*)

Other examples that boys shared highlighted the same kind of group dynamic, although in relation to offline examples of sexualising and sexist behaviour:

"I've got a situation, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Um when I was Year 7 um, this was like at the very start of the year, all my friends were coming in and I was just making out friends and stuff you know and then half way through the year, a new boy came into our class or my class, and, when it came up to ah, athletics day, we were walking around, it was just in our normal group and new, the new guy was like oh yeah I'll just be right back and do something and then he walked off in to the crowd and he came back– we we're all in a group we were just like in a circle and he came back and he said 'oh yeah I just touched so-and-so's um arse' and, then all the boys were just like oh yo you're the man high-five-ing and they laughing and stuff and like, you're just in that situation where you want to like, 'oh that's you know that's not right you shouldn't be doing that kind of thing' but all your boys are, going 'yeah yeah that's cool, you should, you're the man' and so and so. You're just there by yourself and you can't really, say that because then they'd look at you and go like 'oh, you're gay and later, later mate, you can go find your own group' you know, just quit you from the group. That's that's a situation that I've been in where you just want to say something but everyone else is agreeing with the wrong side." (*Manaia*)

One of the videos (*Video 3: Some men – challenging sexism*) we showed boys had snippets of interviews with "older guys" speaking about situations that showed how tricky they can also find it to take a stand or call someone out. One of the men interviewed (Te Radar, comedian) talked about how angry he was and yet how he hadn't known what to do when another man had told him he had "grabbed [a woman] on the arse" at an awards function. After watching this video, boys in Group 7 followed up on this theme, and discussed how difficult it was to be in situations with a group of other boys who were sexualising girls:

Facilitator 2: Do you guys come up across, do you, does that kind of, scenario come up at all for you guys? Yeah? (*Cody:* Yeah) Couple of nods.

Cody: Like um, 'oh look at that girl's ass'.

Sacha: Yeah. Like 'she fine' and all that like.

Taika: I was I was hanging out with a couple friends, um, we had just gone to the movies, this was a few years back and, they, um were just, as– we were waiting outside for the bus and then they were just pointing out girls as they walked out and, were just saying,

'nice' ah ah, well, um 'nice' etcetera, whatever, and I was just sitting there quite awkward because I'm just like, what are you two doing? (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm) (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) That shouldn't that shouldn't be, the first thing that comes to your mind.

Facilitator 1: Mm. Yeah it's like what can we do in those situations, as the guys were kind of talking about it can be quite difficult to, /respond to./

Taika: /Yeah, because, um, because,/ the first, they said the first comment and I'm just like, I looked at them weirdly and said 'what are you, ah doing what are you talking about?' (Facilitator 1: Mm) and they said um 'you're *not* thinking about that?' (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) (Facilitator 1: Mmm) and I'm just like, no, I'm not, and then I was just silent for the rest of the time until the bus came and while they were just talking about that sort of thing. It was, yeah, it was quite awkward and weird for me /because yeah./

Facilitator 1: /Mmm./ Yeah so like the risk of even, being kind of, attacked in some way yourself for, saying something.

Taika: Mmm, yeah.

Rio: Mmm I really sympathise with the guy [in *Video 3: Some men – challenging sexism –* Andrew, musician from band Die! Die! Die!] who was talking about like, first seven minutes of meeting someone, it's just, I I I get that, like I've had I've had a couple situations where like, some people I've just met, will have said something that like offends me, but I don't, I don't know how to like respond to that, because like do I make an argument of someone that I *just* met (*Facilitators 1 & 2:* Mmm) or do I just kind of, like leave it at that and then still disagree with that person (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm), but it, is it my– do do I– should like– ah, it's like a moral question there like, should I, openly disagree with this person and like, like take a side here, (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm), (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) or should I just leave it so that it's the smoo–, the smoother version is just not talking about it. (*Group 7*)

As these boys talked about the difficulties of speaking out and even knowing what to do, they help to show the constraints boys face against standing up as an individual against other boys' sexism. In Taika's example, he was left feeling awkward and silent after questioning his friends about their sexualising and objectifying comments about girls who were walking past. Like many boys who acknowledged they often didn't know what to do, Rio took up this general point, reflecting on the moral dilemma he would feel in relation to how to act towards a person he has just met who offends him. As he explains, he is caught between wondering if you should "openly disagree" or just not talk about it as a "smoother version" option for expressing disagreement.

Confidence in/from friendship groups

Boys referred prominently to their friendship groups throughout the workshop discussions. As we've shown, they highlighted how concerns about loyalty and belonging, as well as more direct forms of peer pressure, could act to constrain their ability to intervene against unethical or abusive behaviour. At the same time, however, it was clear that when group norms endorsed ethical behaviour, peer group belonging also operated in a constructive way to support boys' ability to intervene. In fact, for most of the boys who implied having the backing of their friends, having this support seemed to be the only way they could imagine being able to take a difficult stand.

In the conversation below Kevin and Dinesh talked about the broader challenge of how to respond to peers' sexist jokes and so on (rather than unethical online behaviour per se – this exchange was also part of a discussion related to *Video 3: Some men – challenging sexism*). Both describe how "the group" (*Kevin*) can operate "collaboratively" "as a team" (*Dinesh*) to assert some influence on a boy who has gone "gone too far" (*Dinesh*) and crossed a line. They both suggest that although on their own boys might not feel like they can speak out, boys together as a group can:

Kevin: Um I think in those situations like in a group of your mates, I think having a voice is really hard because, some of you might be like oh, like the, say the ring leader of the group and everyone probably listens to them, but if you're like one of those ones in the group that doesn't really have a say, and you want to say something, y– you can't because like no one will listen to you, but I think in the case like, I think um if you're in a group and you're just having a good time like having a few beers or something, and then someone does say something but it goes too far and the like group kind of just like oh nah mate that's too far you know that person will back down, so I think kind of, having a few mates who agree with you, you know generally does stop it ah I think as one person you can't really do much.

Dinesh: It's about recognition, like some people like in Kevin's scenario, you know it's about when people realise it's gone too far, so if it's like one little sexist joke and you're at a lads drinks you just kind of look past it and just move on to other topics of conversation, yeah you just kind of forget it and let it happen. Whereas like if someone keeps going on and on and on and then eventually people start realising yeah nah this isn't right and then as a collective group you guys are like mate that's enough, so yeah, like feeling like you don't have a voice alone but like the, collaboratively realising as a team, yeah this isn't right. (*Group 6*)

Boys referred to their friend "groups" in many of the workshops, echoing the point that the extent to which a boy can act as an individual is strongly shaped by the norms of the group. For example:

"Um maybe, like for me I I know I'd be like, don't do that but that'll be because, like the group of friends I have at the moment are all kind of, would all be on the bandwagon of, why? (*Facilitator 1:* Yes) whereas I think if I was in a group of people that that was kind of acceptable that was the norm, they would have had a harder time saying no, just because, you'd be very against what, people did in that group." (*Krish*)

Presumptions about what everyone else is thinking can clearly constrain boys from speaking out, especially when it is assumed that everyone else accepts or is untroubled by sexist behaviour. For example, in Dominic's example, presented earlier, he believed that everyone in his third form group thought it was funny that their friend was showing them a girl's nude. Yet, juxtaposing this example with the many comments boys made about keeping quiet because they presumed they were alone in their views, raises an obvious point that while sometimes that might be the case, at other times a boy might not be as out of step with his friends as he fears. Other group members might similarly be keeping quiet or going along with group behaviour to fit in even if it doesn't coincide with their beliefs and values. Blake raises this point and, in conversation with a workshop facilitator, suggests one course of action for how to test out this possibility in a way that is attentive to the very constraints we have been discussing:

Blake: I think, chances are if if you're feeling that they've crossed a line, that, other people, probably are as well and I think you just kind of have to be the first one that said, 'what you're doing isn't OK' and other people will chime in, (*Facilitator 2:* Right) as well.

Facilitator 2: It can be difficult to be that first person can't it?

Rory: Yes.

Blake: I guess I could try, and be (*laughs*)

Facilitator 2: But like how can you make it easier, like are there ways that would make that easier to, you know, to be the first person, are there, tools that you could use?

Blake: Just, just knowing that other people, like because maybe if you um, um if you're in a group chat with someone, says that and then you go into private messages with someone

else and be like, are you, seeing what he's saying and the other person's like, yeah that's not OK then you know that at least one other person's got your back. (Group 4)

Similarly, when boys in Group 3 discussed trying to persuade another boy not to send a girl's nudes on to other boys, Finn referred to organising within the group towards trying to stop it happening:

Facilitator 3: Is that like– in reality though is that something that's possible to do? To have that conversation? Or is that uncomfortable?

Seb: It generally would– I mean, I've personally never had someone send a message saying, 'hey, I'm going to send something round', but, if that was to happen it would probably be in a group chat, and yeah it's probably quite difficult in a group chat to have that kind of conversation, and then it would be /pretty uncomfortable/

Finn: /If you could organise/ the members of the group to get him to ta– to talk him down (*Other participant:* Yeah) to get him to stop. (*Group 3*)

Blake and Finn's comments reinforce how important it seems to be for many boys to feel that they have the backing of their group in order to intervene.

The complex social art of intervening within a peer group

As boys highlighted the importance of group belonging and loyalty, they revealed how complex the art of navigating peer group space is. How does a boy act in accordance with his own values, such as by not colluding with sexism or by attempting to influence another boy not to do something that disrespects and potentially harms a girl? Although some boys, as we've discussed above, implied a 'just do it' approach, mostly workshop participants explained that these situations were difficult and challenging. They required weighing up how to make a point at the same time as maintain a friendship.

Humour

For example, when asked how they'd respond to the hypothetical scenario where a friend told them he was going to get a girl's nude picture and send it around their friend group, Nikhil chose the option "make a joke of it in a way that communicates that it's not cool" (*Facilitator 1*), as "the one where you go most towards":

"because we don't want to cause beef with our friend but we don't want to like be away from it just let it happen, I think that's like, accepting on both, for both individuals" (*Nikhil*)

Some other boys also suggested humour as a strategy that might 'soften the blow' of challenging a friend:

Andre: I feel like just adding 'ha ha ha' at the end (*group laughs*) if you say like 'nah that's rats' and then just laugh at the end they'll get the message but they won't see it as like a, confrontation, they'll just see it as your opinion.

Facilitator 2: Yeah.

Stephen: Something like– oh sorry– um something like, just lie and be like 'I've already seen it ha ha' or something so like it defeats the purpose of what he's doing. Like yeah if you've not seen it then you'd be like 'oh I've already seen it' there's like, there's no point of sharing of it.

Facilitator 2: But that won't stop him sharing it to other people.

Stephen: Oh yeah but at least you take yourself out of the equation. (*Group 5*)

Across the groups, boys presented an ambivalent picture of how likely humour was to work, with others suggesting that it would not be possible to embed a serious message within a humorous response:

> *Taika:* That wouldn't work for us, if we made a joke, no matter how– like even if we were like, like doing– communicates in a way that's not cool it's just, it, any form of joke in our group is, taken completely un-seriously. It will not, get past anything, it will just, OK, laugh, and then ignore everything you just said.
>
> *Rio:* It doesn't– yeah, it wouldn't resonate with the person if you just turned it into a joke. (*Group 7*)
>
> *Manaia:* A con of that would be he probably wouldn't take it serious.
>
> *Marshall and Hemi:* Yeah.
>
> *Manaia:* 'Oh you're just joking around man.' (*Group 8*)

Nathan said he would expect the same reaction even if he tried to seriously challenge his friend, suggesting that in his peer group context humour shapes the flavour of all interactions, in a way that makes it difficult to cut through:

> "Um… I think my friends wouldn't really take me seriously, because like we always joke around. Like for you to just be the serious like oh come on bro that's not right, they'd just look at me like, oh what shut up and then just do it anyway. They think that I'll– I'm [still] joking I'm just being sarcastic in what I'm saying, but really you're trying to be serious. (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) So that's a hard one. That's like ah– you don't– I wouldn't know how to approach that." (*Nathan*)

Complex peer pedagogy

While humour was one strategy that some boys thought might work to influence their friends (albeit one that other boys were sure would be unsuccessful), some of the workshop discussions also revealed complex interactional work that at least some boys might do within their groups to "address the situation without causing like unnecessary drama", as Tim put it. In this section we present two fairly long excerpts from these discussions that help to illustrate the nuanced interactional and communicative labour required of boys to navigate the dilemma of how to take a stand while still maintaining peer relationships and group belonging.

In the exchange below, boys from Group 2 responded to the scenario in which they were asked what a boy might do if a friend told him he was trying to get a girl he knew to send him a nude which he'd then send around their group of friends:

> *Mitchell:* I would try talk them out of it. (*Dion:* Mm) (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) And like I mean, yeah, because you– like you don't want to– like if you go to support the girl then you're sort of, almost making a deal out of it, or if you get outside help or tell other friends like you're sort of making a deal about it but you don't, want to do that to like him or the girl really. (*unclear*)
>
> *Tim:* He's your friend, that you're talking to, (*Mitchell:* Yeah. So) exactly so, I mean, he's obviously your mate for a reason so you're not going to go and like shaft him like saying– get like, school involved and like (*Facilitator 2:* Mm hm) tell his girl. There's there's definitely ways to, um, address the situation without causing like unnecessary drama like just like one-on-one like, like go on like (*Mitchell:* Yeah) it's not really like cool like (*Dion:* Yeah).
>
> *Dion:* Yeah. I think it's about telling him like yeah, it's not cool but like, obviously it's his decision. I think that's a lot about what the– more of the guys and the girls do. Like, I don't think you should– like I wouldn't do it but like at the end of the day it's your decision. Like not saying he should but like you can't be that person for him. So, you got to do (*Tim:* Yeah) as much as you can but– (*Mitchell:* Yeah)
>
> *Mitchell:* You do as much as you can in there.

Tim: It's– it's finding that bit where you can like, talk them out of it but not like tell them not to do it. Like (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) make (*Mitchell:* Yeah) (*Dion:* Mm) them see why they shouldn't do it. (*Facilitator 2:* Mm)

Dion: Yeah. Yeah, Put it back on them and (*Tim:* Yeah like–) get them to see why.

Mitchell: /Make them understand actually–/

Tim: /Yeah like 'think about this bro,/ like you really like kind of like mucked up eh, like you don't really want to do that eh?'

Facilitator 2: Yeah.

Facilitator 1: Yeah.

Facilitator 2: Because it can be quite a difficult thing to challenge someone directly and say (*Tim:* Exactly), you know, this (*Dion:* Yeah) (*Tim:* Mm) what you're doing is– especially if they're your friend right, (*Dion:* Yeah) (*Other participant:* Yeah) it's difficult to be like, oh, that's lame. So, like yeah, how do you, (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) how do you manoeuver around that, you know, do (*Mitchell:* Yeah) you joke about it do you like– what do you guys reckon?

Dion: I– I think (*Tim:* Er) the biggest thing is making them aware of the consequences (*Tim:* Yeah) like because you say like, you know the guy, you know, maybe, 'our other friend had to leave [our School] for this, you don't want to be that guy like, and you know you're better than that', and I think it's comes down to like a conscience, like (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) that person probably knows deep down that oh, I probably shouldn't be doing that. So, if you can (*Mitchell:* Yeah) kind of– (*Tim:* Yeah) kind of like (*Mitchell:* /get that out of them/) / expose that a bit,/ that will help.

Tim: And the consequences for the girl and be like, oh do you know the girl? Like, is she your friend? Like because if she's your friend, why are you going to do this to her? Like you would– you would– trying to get like a nude picture of her and spread around your friends, and she is your friend you're talking to her so it's like is she your friend then? Like–

Facilitator 2: Mm.

Dion: And I think almost–

Tim: 'What– what's a girl done to you?' like

Mitchell: You just got to make– just got to make sure they, know what they're they're actually doing. Like, I mean, they– look, if they're– probably if they're thinking of doing this they're not thinking about the consequences. (*Tim:* Yeah) I think it's probably quite important to actually remind them what can happen, what can be the effects of it happening (*Facilitator 2:* Right) to, the girl especially, but him as well. (*Group 2*)

This exchange illustrates the complex interactive dynamics of what we are calling peer pedagogy. That is, complex ways that boys describe how they could go about trying to inform and influence their friend to behave more ethically. It highlights forms of influence that shy away from didactic messages, and rather aim for the final result to be "his decision" (*Dion*). According to these boys, you should try to "talk them out of it but not like tell them not to do it" (*Tim*). For these boys, this meant trying to get their friend to understand the consequences – "what can be the effects of it happening to the girl especially, but him as well" (*Mitchell*).

While the boys in Group 2 spoke in a way that implied confidence and ease in trying to direct their friend along a more ethical path, in the excerpt below from Group 8 we get an insight into the finer grained mechanics of how such interaction might unfold, especially perhaps from the point of view of boys who would be less certain of their authority within the group. In this exchange, the boys were talking about how to respond in a friendship group situation where another boy (or

boys) have acted in sexist or abusive ways and made sexist comments. Manaia had just shared an experience from when he was younger, in which a new boy's story of sexually harassing a girl was being celebrated by their friends (see the section on *Silencing and the power of peer culture*). He felt uncomfortable but unable to say anything:

> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah that's a really good, um good example. And I suppose was there anything in that situation that may have helped, you like if you could kind of change anything about it?
>
> *Manaia:* What do you mean? Like can you re-explain?
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah like if this was um, in that situation would there be anything that would've helped you to, say something or to do something? (*pause*) Can anyone else think of something that would like, make that situation less tricky?
>
> *Hemi:* Well if everyone wasn't like egging him on and stuff it would be *a lot* easier to approach, (*Marshall:* Way easier) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) and bring him down but if, if there's a whole group of them then it's, really hard, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) (*Other participant:* Yeah) because then they turn against you, as a group instead of just one-on-one.
>
> *Marshall:* Mmm
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah. So if... that's a really good point so it's like the fact that *everyone* else is kind of (*Hemi & Marshall:* Yeah) doing it that's what makes it quite hard?
>
> *Ambrose:* Mmm
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah. Have you ever wondered if maybe like everyone else is thinking what you're thinking (*laughs*) ... Everyone's thinking that, everyone else doesn't care and so then you're all just... (*laughs*)
>
> *Marshall:* I think it depends on how fast they, (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) they react, because if they're into like, if they said it and then they waited for like, for like ten seconds (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) to, to be like *'oh you're the man'* then I think then I'd probably say it because oh he's probably thinking, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) it (*Other participant:* Mm) so, if I was too, say it then he'll probably back me up but then if they like, they hear it then they're like 'oh you're the–' then I'd, then I probably will hold back just because yeah, it won't be a one-on-one it will be a whole group against you.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* So it's like we need to figure out how to get people to back each other up, I *suppose.*
>
> *Marshall:* Yeah. And how to think too, because they'll probably just so hype, (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) and they– because some people will just like, not because they actually appreciate the idea of that, (Facilitator 1: Mm) their mate touched a girl's ass but they're like, just hype and being sarcastic (Facilitator 1: Mm) because I know some guys that– I like to be sarcastic too (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) so it would just like 'oh cool you're cool' [*sarcastic tone*] and then, 'yeah I know right' [*tone implying the person did not understand the sarcasm*], it will just, (*deep outbreath*)
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Mmm, yeah it's hard it's like in that situation like the example that Manaia gave like what can you say, that will change people's minds?
>
> *Manaia:* Well maybe you could talk to like a friend that you saw, that like had that face that he didn't really agree with, (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) maybe talk to him after– 'oh do you think, this person, shouldn't have done that or, think this was right?' And just talk about it in general, (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Get their point of view, and then maybe yous two could talk to another friend and see where it goes from there.
>
> *Facilitator 5:* That's a good idea you know.

> *Facilitator 1:* Mmm, yeah it can be tricky.
>
> *Manaia:* What I now know from that situation that most of the boys all going oh yeah that's cool and stuff they're like oh now that I think about it like today they're like nah that wasn't cool you know because back then, being so young, (*Marshall:* Yeah) all his motive was his hormones and so and so, yeah. (*Group 8*)

As these boys reflected on what it could have been possible to do in the situation where Manaia uncomfortably witnessed another boy and his friends celebrating that boy's sexual harassment or assault of a girl, they describe needing to be attentive to subtle signs of dissent within the group. Showing sophisticated 'conversation analytic'[172] skills, they highlight how a boy who was weighing up whether it was safe to speak out might need to scan other boys' facial expressions, the length of their pauses, and the tone of their speech, in order to judge if they might also have reservations about whether the boy who was boasting about sexually violating a girl really merited celebration. What is interesting in this exchange is what it tells us about both the degree of communicative expertise and labour that would be required to intervene, *and* that these boys seemed to have at least the theoretical knowledge and skill required. From their accounts, it would seem that unless a boy was able to register that kind of likely support from other boys, it could be perceived as too risky to take a stand on their own (as we have discussed earlier).

With close friends it might be different

While taking a stand within a group was portrayed as difficult by boys in general, several boys noted that within the bonds of a close friendship there would be more degrees of freedom for how a boy could raise a difficult issue. Some boys suggested that within a trusting friendship it could be more possible for a boy to bring up concerns in a caring way, and for him to have more chance of positively influencing that friend:

> "I mean, if it if it's a close friend and you talk to them face-to-face then, um, you– (*Other participant:* Yeah) you could probably convince him, [....] [depending on] how much your friend like trusts you, like trusts your opinion and your judgement. (*Seb:* Yeah)" (*Wei*)

Marshall and Ambrose elaborated this point in more detail:

> *Marshall:* Yeah it depends how well the, the person getting told knows the person who's telling him. So like, I'm a straight up person but, I don't like to start beef so instead of telling him straight I like to like, add some stuff to it so, so I'm still giving my point, but I'm not creating this, this hate between us, because, yeah, but if, um, yeah if you're close to him, close enough to him that he knows oh this guy's a straight up person um, he'll, [....] but if you're close to him like if you're so close to him that, um you know how he reacts in different situations, if you're that close to him then I guess they'll either tell him straight up, because they know that that person won't take it to heart or, or that person can just be like add some stuff so they don't have beef, ah it's hard to explain.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* No it is really tricky eh.
>
> *Ambrose:* Yeah so like I could probably back up him um me and him have been very close for since primary so I've been in situations where I'll ask him, for his point of view and examples and like he'll be straight up with me and I know that he's straight up and he's got my back so like, the negative space that he said that could be created depending on how close we are, um it's not really, that doesn't really happen between us two, we're kind of like brothers so it doesn't really, it doesn't really create anything negative but like kind of, gives his point to me and that kind of makes me rethink.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Sorry do you mean your relationship, you guys?

Ambrose: Yeah just to back up his thing.

Marshall: And he knows, and because I know the way he reacts, I will tell him straight up because I know (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah), yeah, like he doesn't think of it as, this guy's hating on me (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah), so that's why he's telling me this no he thinks of it as oh he cares for me so I should, take some of his advice, if not all. (*Group 8*)

"No one wants to be a snitch": On getting help from authorities

Across most of the workshop groups, boys showed resounding wariness about any strategies for intervening that involved seeking help from authority figures, such as the school or police. In several groups, this was framed as snitching – with the sentiment, "no one wants to be a snitch" (*Tim*). Snitching, according to the boys' talk, would risk not only hurting the boy who was being told on (which breaks the code of loyalty), but it also jeopardises the friendship (hence threatening peer group belonging for the boy who reports). For example:

Nathan: Boys are like, all stuck on to 'snitches get stitches' (*Facilitators 1 & 2:* Yup yup) like if you– no one will like you if you snitch, or, get outside support. Like I wouldn't go– I wouldn't go to the school, because then that's being– then your friend will get in trouble and then–

Facilitator 2: Yeah. And if it came back to you–

Nathan: Oh if it came back to me I'll be like oh, no I feel, I feel bad like I feel good but I feel bad that I helped the victim but, my friend is like– you have the victim that you didn't know. But your friend like doesn't really like you anymore. (*Group 10*)

Boys in other groups talked about the same kind of code, identifying a strong peer prohibition against seeking outside help. Referring to the hypothetical scenario of hearing Year 9 or 10 boys talking about trying to get a nude picture from a girl with the intention of sharing it around, Facilitator 1 asked the boys in Group 7 about the viability of this option:

Facilitator 1: Would it be like, possible to, like that 'get outside help' one [option we asked about], like is that something that would work? Or is it–

Taika: There's also a precedent to not ah, snitch, (*Facilitator 1:* Yep) and that sort of thing.

Sacha: Yeah like 'snitches get stitches' or something.

Facilitator 2: Yeah.

Rio: Yeah.

Taika: Yeah it is a very big precedent in certainly our generation to– you just, you never go to– it's like– especially on friends but um– and if it's not your friend then it doesn't concern you that's really– it's like, never snitch on your friends and if it's not your friend it doesn't concern you that's just really the precedent that I find that there is. (*Facilitator 2:* Mmm) It's just, yeah.

Rio: That sort of sentiment is as prevalent even in our group I feel like (*Taika:* Mmm) don't don't speak about this if you not, directly a part of it.

Facilitator 2: That can make it tricky like if a friend of yours was doing it then like,

Taika: Yeah exact– exactly like I would– I would feel like I couldn't go to a teacher or something but I would, I just, I wouldn't know what to do, which is yeah, because I just, yeah I wouldn't go to a teacher, it's my friend, I, I– snitches get stitches... um, ah but it's ah, I wouldn't know what to do because I don't know how to deal with that like I mean I wouldn't go to a teacher as I said it's my friend um despite what he is doing is bad and, I just. (*Group 7*)

Similarly, the boys in Group 8 portrayed getting outside help as an "extreme" course of action. As they appeared to pick up on, and react against, the option of calling the police was clearly (and perhaps unsurprisingly) portrayed as an unthinkable, 'beyond the pale', option:

> *Facilitator 1:* Get outside help? School, police? (*several participants murmur and laugh as in disbelief*) Nope lots of shaking heads (*laughs*).
>
> *Marshall:* That's pretty extreme. That's your friend so, I don't think anyone would call the police.
>
> *Manaia:* Definitely if it was your friend yeah.
>
> *Hemi:* No crime until it's sent. There's no criminal activity, like nothing's happened.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* So you would probably lose your friend you think if you like went to the police?
>
> *Marshall:* Definitely.
>
> *Manaia:* It would be the talk of the school 'oh this guy called the cops on this guy, don't talk to him you might get ...'
>
> *Marshall:* And then beef would happen. A lot of beef would happen. (*Group 8*)

Although the phrase 'snitches get stitches' implies the threat of retaliatory physical violence for taking the issue outside the group, in these discussions the boys were more likely to emphasise that what is at stake through any consequential conflict would be their own group belonging.[173]

References to a wider 'mind your own business' ethic (although it wasn't framed in those terms), as expressed by Rio above, often sat side by side with, or were interwoven with boys' rejection of the option of seeking outside support for intervening. For example:

> *Facilitator 1:* Say you were like walking around the school and then you happened to overhear some third former saying that they were going to do this, do you think most people would... do anything? (*Several participants:* Nah, nah) Or would they just leave it?
>
> *Dominic:* Most people wouldn't.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah, so why do you think?
>
> *Max:* It's none of your business.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Right.
>
> *Andre:* Mmm just the expectation that you don't really like tell on people (*Facilitator 1 & Other participant:* Yeah), regardless of, like if, you can't be affected by it then you, then there's the expectation that you don't have to do anything about it, because it has nothing to do with you. (*Group 5*)

Despite boys' general antipathy towards seeking support from an authority like the school, some boys spoke appreciatively of efforts their school made to guide students' ethical behaviour and install consequences for serious transgressions. Participants in one workshop spoke approvingly about a recent case in which their school had "come down hard" (*Mitchell*) when "a boy like got sent nudes and then shared them round to everyone else" (*Alex*). They said that the boy had left the school, having been asked by the school to do so:

> *Dion:* The school, um, I think [our School's] very good in that they do get involved more than other schools but I think that's actually a good thing in terms of they're keeping the environment a bit kind of cleaner as a [our School] community, like people are not doing this as much because of the school's intervention where other (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) schools it happens a lot more because the school kind of turns a blind eye on it.

> *Mitchell:* Yeah. We did– like at [our School], er, everyone sort of knows the effects
> of getting caught doing that. Like, you know, you're in big trouble because of what's
> happened to all the other people and like [our School] has definitely come down hard on
> it which is definitely I think, as Dion said, a big factor that decreases the amount of people
> that (*Other participant:* Yeah) do it.
>
> *Dion:* Probably a good thing at the end of the day. Like, you know, (*Mitchell:* Yeah) boys
> would be like, 'Oh, it's kind of like I don't like it that school gets involved', but, you know,
> in– in five years' time when you're like the more cool guy because you're not sending that
> kind of stuff, (*Mitchell:* Yeah) it comes down to like maybe it was a– maybe it was a good
> thing. (*Group 2*)

Boys from another group at this school (*Group 3*) debated the issue of punishment and
consequences. Wei noted that the punishment of expulsion was "pretty serious punishment
already", adding: "I'm not wanting to sound like I'm ACT but, um, um (*laughs*) hard punishment
and deterrents, um, does– does help".[174] Another boy in this exchange moderated the talk about
punishment with concern about the fairness of having such consequences for a particular boy
become public knowledge:

> "And you got to remember these people who are doing this, they're just– they're kids and
> they're not thinking about the consequences or their actions, and even if they do sort
> of know, they're, you know, driven by other forces and they're not– I don't think they're
> always completely to blame. You can't put a huge punishment on that. I don't think that's–
> that's not fair to the kid." (*Seb*)

Seb suggested that boys who would onshare girls' nudes might (somewhat innocently) not under-
stand the harm they could cause:

> "So, I think, you know, if they knew a bit more about what it was causing or the harm, that
> it could do, they'd be more inclined to say, 'hey, nah that's wrong'." (*Seb)*

On the other hand, in other parts of the discussion in this workshop group, such boys were
portrayed as more callously not caring about the impact of their behaviour on the girls involved.
Finn for instance, suggested that:

> "The problem is that they, they [boys who show girls' nudes to others] consciously know
> they're [the girls] going to be seeing them sending them around they know that the per–
> person won't enjoy it [....] (*Matthew:* Mm, mm, mm) but, they're going to compromise their
> feelings (*Other participant:* Mm) so, they're only– the only way to reason with them, would
> probably be, so you have to tell them that they'll get in trouble or, yeah." (*Finn*)

Given this almost active disregard that Finn attributes to these boys, he and others in Group 3
implied that although educating boys about the impact on girls could be helpful – "You could try,
um– show them the consequences, put a human face on it" (*Finn*) – this alone would likely not be
enough to persuade some boys to change their behaviour. For those boys, they implied some kind
of punitive consequences (from the school) might be necessary.

Telling a girl: "You don't want to also embarrass her"

When we asked boys what they might do to intervene if a friend or another boy was going to
onshare a girl's nude, another option we asked about was whether they would tell the girl directly.
Sometimes boys endorsed that option:

> "Personally for me, the, best solution, seems to be, to go to the girl, and maybe explain to
> her, what you've heard. Um, and probably not get outside help. Because, I'd [not] see how

that would help calling the police to... because, I mean, just complicate things and you might get stuck in, something you weren't part of to begin with." (*Krish*)

"I would definitely do it– I'll definitely warn her if I did or did not know. I'll be like hey this dude's going to send you something be aware. Have fun have a good day bye." (*George*)

Mostly, however, boys were more likely to reject the idea of telling the girl, as mired in too many potential complications. As Nathan said:

"You don't want to also embarrass her. (*Facilitator 2:* Right) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Like or or like be– Or um, like dog your boy (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) and your friend. You don't want to make him sound like a like a dick. (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) So you wouldn't– Like it's, it's kind of a hard it's hard like you don't want to be– Because then if you say 'oh he's got a nude of you' then her initial thought is like oh you've seen it." (*Nathan*)

Nathan raises several issues here. Related to the importance of peer group belonging, which we discussed earlier, telling the girl risked being judged as disloyal to a male friend, and potentially hurting his reputation. Beyond the act of disloyalty, however, Nathan raises some other concerns, including the potential effect on the girl involved, such as embarrassing her, and the potential awkwardness of how this information would land in terms of their relationship (given it could imply he has seen the nude image of her). Viresh noted that other actions that would draw attention to what had happened (like seeking outside help from the school or police, and so on) might also backfire in ways that exacerbated harm: "I think it would escalate the problem a lot more than, and then, threatens to expose that girl, before anything bad happened".

Echoing sentiments expressed by other boys during other parts of the workshops, Nathan said "I wouldn't really know how to react in a situation like that", but he also noted how a sense of self-protection would stop him "gett[ing] involved" by telling the girl:

Nathan: Um, like that's a hard one. Because you don't want to get involved in all of it (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) because then it could end up bad for you. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Yeah so–

Facilitator 2: How– how how would it end up...?

Nathan: Like um. Well your friends could start mocking you. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Or... Yeah then it just... You wouldn't– Like you didn't– and you'd think to yourself man I should have just stayed to myself and just, um distanced myself from that instead of getting mixed up and (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) all of a sudden they're starting to mock me. (*Group 10)*

Some boys imagined ripples of negative effects, affecting the 'whistle blower' himself, the boy who onshared the nude, their groups of friends, as well as the girl herself. Some gave the impression – using metaphors like "catch[ing] fire" and causing a tower of cards to come "crashing down" – that they would expect telling the girl might escalate the situation, and exacerbate harm for everyone involved:

"Yeah it's like, you wouldn't know, really because– you could like go up and tell the girl like ah this is what's happening, um, but she could al– it could just like ruin, friendships and the group dynamics because of you doing that and if you were a– you were literally just a stranger who suddenly went up to the girl like 'hey! this guy is, sharing your nudes around', like you'd feel momentary satisfaction for 'I helped this girl' but, you, you won't be present for the aftermath where, everyone's taking sides everyone's arguing about it and it's just this entire like, what's a good analogy for this like a, you know ah card towers. It's like you telling them this person is sharing your nudes is like you pulling that one card out and then it all coming crashing down." (*Rio*)

"I think it's better for the girl not to know but I think that at the same time it would cause less trouble if she didn't know and if it's something that um, like obviously yeah, she would want to know I guess but it, it wouldn't– the situation wouldn't um, catch fire as much." (*Dominic)*

In conclusion

In this chapter, we have discussed the complex factors shaping boys' options for being able to intervene as bystanders to sexist behaviour, and unethical online behaviour in particular. Through asking workshop participants to respond to hypothetical scenarios we were able to explore what they considered desirable, acceptable, and do-able if they were in the position of witnessing another boy's intention to onshare a girl's nude images. As boys discussed the scenarios, and inter-wove references to their past experiences and observations, they revealed the fraught dilemmas boys likely face in these circumstances. Overall, they portrayed a relative vacuum of ethical guidelines surrounding the dos and don'ts of onsharing nudes. Questions about what to do and how to respond to information that a friend or peer was behaving unethically (or abusively) appeared to be left to boys to figure out on their own. Many simply said they wouldn't know what to do. Seeking help from outside authorities was uniformly dismissed as inappropriate – or indeed, as extreme. Although some did suggest that strong messages from schools, backed up through consequences for boys who breached the rules, was helpful in reinforcing ethical standards and building norms against such behaviour.

Most (but not all) boys suggested that intervening to try to influence a friend or another boy at their school against unethical onsharing was the right thing to do. Others indicated that the norms in their peer context weighed against getting involved. Among those who favoured intervening, at least in principle, some suggested a straightforward 'just do it' approach to directly speaking with the boy. Mostly, however, as discussions unfolded, the workshop participants unpacked how tricky this would be. Several indicated that although in theory they would like to get involved, in practice they likely would not feel able to.

The importance of peer loyalty and group belonging were central to most boys' considerations of what they could do, and how. They were very sensitive to the risks, in taking action, of breaching implicit codes of loyalty to their friend groups, and "ruining" friendships. With a close individual friend, some boys thought it would be more possible to try and influence his behaviour. In all cases, though, it was clear that peer group norms play a critical role in either preventing or supporting such bystander interventions. Where boys are unsure what their peers think, and/or assume that their own views stand apart from the norms in their group, participants indicated that it would be very difficult to speak out and take action. On the other hand, it was clear that where boys believed 'their group' shared a similar ethical stance to their own, and would support an attempt to inter-vene against unethical behaviour, it seemed more likely that they would be able to do so.

Through creating space within the workshops for boys to problem-solve how to approach the art of intervening, some groups came up with nuanced and creative ideas for how to manage ways of taking a stand that maintained friendships and saved face for their friend. While the complexity of navigating friendship group dynamics often made direct confrontation untenable, boys considered options like using humour or gentle forms of persuasion to more subtly talk someone out of acting unethically. In some of the workshop groups, in particular, boys showed sophisticated understand-ings of how it would be possible to read group dynamics and test out the safety of speaking out. What they described was a very delicate and challenging endeavour. This strongly suggests that in order to promote more ethical behaviour it is important to intervene at the level of peer group norms.

Chapter 6
Conversations towards shifting the line

It would be unrealistic to expect that one or two short workshop sessions could dramatically change the ways boys understand gender, sexism and online ethics, let alone equip them to stand up against disrespectful, unethical, and abusive behaviour within their peer settings. Discussions during the workshops aired a range of different views among the boys, and of course they did not deliver worked-up solutions for how to combat online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse. However, the way boys did respond during these workshops gave us optimism for the potential of this kind of problem-posing approach to facilitate and support significant movement in the right direction. Across the groups, boys showed the ability to observe and critically interrogate social norms for gender, including how the norms of masculinity are policed and how they shape boy's behaviour. They also had a lot to say about sending nudes and the ethics of boys sharing them around and showing them to others beyond their intended audience. In the workshops, boys keenly grappled with questions about the possibilities and challenges associated with being an ethical bystander willing and able to intervene with their peers in response to potential (or actual) unethical online behaviour. Their discussions also showed evidence of their openness to transformation and hints of actual seeds of change in process.

For the majority of the boys participating in this project, the workshops seemed to provide a novel space for beginning to talk about issues related to gender, sexism and online ethics. Many indicated that "we never talk about this stuff" (*Fetu*) – as noted earlier specifically in relation to online ethics around sharing nudes.[175] In reflecting on the value of such workshops, boys were virtually unanimous that the first step to change is talking about the issues. As Fetu, one of the boys who had just left school, said "I wish I had this in school":

> "It helps them like open up to like what they want to talk about. Like for us like for us– I don't know about you guys but for me like I'm never I've barely had these type of conversations. Yeah. But having one of these is like really good it really opens up like what you actually think about like a topic or whatever. Yeah." (*Fetu*)

On the topic of nudes in particular, several participants described it as a "taboo topic" that boys don't talk about. Boys who said this, also said that it was an issue that should, however, be talked about – as these comments from boys in Group 1 illustrate:

> "nobody's really talking about it [....] it should be something that we are aware of and if we're aware of it then people will take measures to, um, stop what they're– or think about what they're doing before they actually do it" (*Lachlan*)

"it is a taboo topic but it– you– you're not going to solve anything if– if you keep it taboo. You need to actually I guess you make it open, make it an open topic that anyone can talk about" (*David*)

Boys reflecting on the impact of the workshops

Several participants indicated that they had gained new knowledge from the workshops, and suggested the activities and discussions had equipped them with new ways of seeing and planted small seeds for change. Boys in the groups that had two workshop sessions reflected in the second session on how even after one short workshop, they had started to question and think differently about what they were observing and experiencing in their social worlds. In Ezra's case, this included starting to see sexism:

"I think like learning ah what [we did] last week you get more of a idea like now I know about um, sexism and like how men aren't aware of it as much and now talking about it now, I'm sort of... You sort of, you sort of see it and yeah." (*Ezra)*

Another young man in this group later on agreed that this kind of workshop "is actually really good to um help people understand" "the culture of like sexism and all that", what it is, and how "it might hurt people" (*Reuben)*.

We asked the boys in Group 4 (who only had one workshop) whether they thought a model of rippled change would work. That is, the idea that boys might leave these kinds of workshops and "going back to your like close friend groups, [....] do you think that that would work in terms of maybe, shifting people's opinions or changing minds?" (*Facilitator 2)*. Rory endorsed this idea:

"I think we should be going, ah away from this with, um, kind of ideas, to think about and stuff to tell our friends. And maybe not overtly going straight from this and telling them, all the stuff that we've talked about (*group laughs*) [....] But maybe, like when, when it becomes relevant, you can, talk to them about it." (*Rory)*

When we asked for examples, another boy in the group suggested he could share insights about gender stereotypes and mundane sexism:

Facilitator 2: So what sort of things would you, um, do you think would be beneficial to share, like what sort of things would you guys, think that you would actually use in real life situations.

Blake: Well some stuff from like the beginning where it's like sexism, *why*, um, is pink a girl's colour and blue a boy's colour like, why is there this kind of, distinction, between, girls and guys? Um, yep you just kind of, take that out with you and then you, kind of when people are like this is just how it is you can be like, *why? (Group 4)*

Some boys from the groups that did two workshops told us about having already, after the first session, brought new insights to life through reflecting on, and in some cases modifying, their own behaviour. For example, Marshall, who was in Group 8, suggested that the experience had shifted the way he was behaving and relating to girls:

"But then coming to this like I actually, I actually really, started to, like, I behaved I started to behave like a lot better and respect like, girls so I've, and, I grew some passion to come here (*Manaia:* Yeah)" (*Marshall)*

Similarly, in another group, Taika, from Group 7 described having become more thoughtful and careful about his behaviour:

Taika: in the last week I've found that, what I say, I've been a lot more self-conscious of, rather than just, saying what first comes to mind and that sort of thing, and, yeah, it's just, these conversations made me think a lot about what I say ah, online offline wherever, yeah.

Facilitator 2: Do you have like an example or,

Taika: Um, (*laughs*) mostly in our friend group we make a lot of, rude jokes that have just become, a part of our humour basically and, they, really, they really shouldn't be OK [....] and, I just, I, w– I, I made a joke um, that– and I just thought about it and, and I also thought about how I wouldn't have, like even thought about how that might have been ah, rude or wrong to say or things like that before our conversation, yeah. (*Group 7*)

Nathan, who was in Group 10, gave a specific concrete example of "not judging boys by what they wear", after his response to another participant who was "wearing a pink shirt" in the first session:

"So I looked at it in a different way. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) Because of our last session so I was like I didn't really judge him around his colour [of clothing]. So yeah so that was good pretty good." (*Nathan*)

At the same time, Nathan was realistic about what sort of change was likely in a one-off session:

"It takes time. Like they're not going to change after one session (*Facilitator 2:* /No no./) /It/ takes a lot of time." (*Nathan*)

Boys' ideas about how to create spaces that facilitate change

Feedback that boys shared at the end of some of the workshops provided useful tips on how to set up and facilitate constructive workshops. Some of their comments were spontaneous, some were in response to our direct questions about what they liked or didn't like about the workshops and what we could do differently. (We didn't ask this systematically in all workshops, due to time constraints.)

One of the challenges for workshops like this, particularly when there is limited time, is creating a space that balances introducing new knowledge and challenging questions alongside fostering participant-led inquiry in a style that leaves participants inspired and curious rather than over-whelmed and potentially feeling judged and inadequate. In designing the workshops (as discussed in Chapter 2), we were guided by Freire's pedagogical technique of problem-posing. While this can be challenging as it brings into question elements of taken-for-granted knowledge and assumptions, we approached it guided by the over-arching principle of manaakitanga, privileging care and respect for our participants. This took shape in some very practical ways, such as showing hospi-tality through providing food, as well as in the general tone of facilitation, which we aimed to be as respectful, low key and open as possible.

Several boys commented that they appreciated the simple gesture of being fed – as Marshall said, "I like that you guys brought food"! Others liked that there "wasn't too much pressure to talk" (*Hemi*), that the tone was "chill" (*Sacha*), and that "it wasn't like a, [*using a stern voice*] *lecture*, it was, a polite conversation, which was nice" (*Luke*). Another boy in this group added that "small groups" are "more effective than like one person just, yelling in front of the whole assembly, no one would like listen" (*Sacha*) – as it allows participants to "share with other people" (*Sacha*). This sentiment about the value of small peer-based groups was shared by boys in other groups. As Alex said "like if we're like a huge seminar or like a meeting about it down there [*signaling the School assembly hall*] just go in one ear, out the other. Especially when it's like from an older person." Fetu explained that small groups like the one he was in were "really good", and that "if you expand it any bigger, then like people *will not* get personal about it".

Several boys reflected on the more general ethos and tone of the workshops in ways that demonstrated exactly what Freire's problem-posing approach aims for, through inviting partici-pants to reorient to the social world as an object to be interrogated rather than as a static, taken for granted, reality. Dinesh's comment illustrates his participation in this process, as well as his insight into how such a process fosters social change:

"It's the thing like like one of the guys [in *Video 1: What's it like for guys?*] said like, obviously Nikau's just said guys need to be the protector and no-one really questions it, like the first guy [in the video] said you just kind of like come to accept it and I everyone, I think to start with, just accepts it and doesn't really question it and so questioning it is kind of where the main part– kind of improving the social justice I guess it could be." (*Dinesh*)

Another critical part of the success of such interventions, is that the insights and wisdom required for change are generated by the participants themselves. In Group 7, Taika highlighted the value of a space that was open, where boys could all contribute, and the facilitation was non-didactic and conveyed an interest in all participants' views. Rio further emphasised how important the respect embedded in that process is for engaging boys in a process of reflection and potential change:

"what I liked is that we could all, share our thoughts and, ah, we could all discuss with um, you guys adding on your own comments ah every now and again rather than ah, leading through everything but all of us had our turn and we could say what we wanted to say, yeah. And then and then– yeah and you guys added on your separate comments as examples and that sort of thing." (*Taika)*

"I support groups like this where people can speak about it [issues like ethical online behaviour] because, it means that, the criticisms for whatever we're discussing isn't coming from an outside source it's coming from like within, the community where, people have actually done it like and you know that person [....] like if they have something to [say] then I'm going to listen to them because it means that, what they say has like, some value, like you know, because I know them." (*Rio*)

Similarly, in Group 6, when we asked boys if the session had been what they "were expecting or different?", they said:

Nikau: I thought it was different. I thought you would just like go around saying like [*mockingly*] 'have you ever sent a dick pic?'

Scott: Yeah we were discussing outside– (*group laughs*)

Kevin: Yeah we were– we were discussing outside, like oh my–

Scott: Yeah we didn't think it would be like so informal and it was just like chatting. We thought like, there would be people crashing out and like what we've done, and then trying to like kind of gather what we– (*Kevin:* Yeah) our experiences and (*Jack:* Yeah) like put that to use. Rather than like our ideas and stuff.

Other participant: Yeah that was really cool.

Other participant: Yeah.

Jack: A lot more chill than we expected.

Other participant: Yeah.

Other participant: Yeah definitely. (*Group 6*)

The boys from this group went on to advocate for a style of intervention that was "open" and non-didactic:

Oscar: I feel maybe being like less imperative about it, and kind of more open, I feel would be a better, better way of you know dealing with that issue.

Nikau: I think that's a bit more like personal way as well like it gets through to people better than just like, having a billboard that like says 'don't send nudes' or whatever (*group laughs*).

> *Dinesh:* I feel like people would be more responsive if they feel like they have the idea themselves rather than sort of being imperative and being like, 'don't, do that' etcetera whereas if it's formulated in a personal way and you come up with– formulate the idea of not doing something yourself then I feel like you'd be more responsive to it. (*Group 6*)

These boys' ideas for how to encourage ethical behaviour show a sophisticated appreciation for the mechanics of successfully generating behavioural change. Instead of telling boys what to do (and what not to do), Dinesh explains how interventions that facilitate boys coming up with solutions themselves ("if they feel like they have the idea themselves") are likely to be more successful. This observation meshes perfectly with the principles underlying Freire's pedagogy, as well as the therapeutic principles underlying behavioural change.

One participant in another, predominantly Pasifika, group highlighted an important issue for researchers doing research in ethnically diverse Auckland, in particular for non-Pasifika researchers working with Pasifika participants:

> *Nathan:* Nah I don't want to be racist or anything like when we see– We get intimidated when we see like palagis (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) or like white people and when they come to survey us it's like (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) we're being tested /or/
>
> *Facilitator 2:* /Yeah/ yeah I can see that.
>
> *Nathan:* But like um, but you made it really comfortable /for me./
>
> *Facilitator 2:* /Oh cheers./
>
> *George:* Yeah with the /food–
>
> *Other participant:* What?/
>
> (*group laughs*)
>
> *Nathan:* /Not not/ just food but like if you like get everyone involved (*Other participants:* Yeah) and like (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) make them feel welcome then they'll they'll start to open up (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) and just show like what they truly feel. (*Group 10*)

As well as endorsing the gist of the Freirean problem-posing approach, which provided a context and space for boys to question and share their own views, in some of the groups, boys also shared more specific ideas for the kinds of resources that would help facilitate boys engaging in this kind of process. Nathan and George had several suggestions, including using videos of school students (boys and girls) sharing their personal experiences around unethical online behaviour, as well as videos of famous people like well-known sportsmen who could reflect on their experiences at school and model taking a stand. Crucially, George and Nathan emphasised the value of hearing from people they could relate to – in Nathan's case, for example, Pasifika students from South Auckland:

> *Nathan:* Um I think videos would be a good one (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah?) but maybe a video of like not only like famous– but like maybe students (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) who are currently at school (*Facilitator 2:* Mmhm) (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) like if they don't– like have their faces blurred or something (*Facilitator 1 laughs*) and had like– Oh they don't even have to have a video like just their personal experiences (*Facilitator 1:* Mmmm) and the ways that they dealt with these (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) situations. Like a way that which young people can make a connection to.
>
> *Facilitator 1:* Yeah.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Mm. So hearing from people that actually like–
>
> *George:* Who have experienced–

Nathan: Like who's, who has like, like going through what they're going through (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) And not only from men but like women as well. (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah)

Facilitator 2: Would you guys watch something like that? I mean like would you be interested in that or would it just be like...

Nathan: Yeah if there was like students– current students. (*Facilitator 2:* Mhm) (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) Like, for me as an Islander like if I saw more Islanders like student like from south-side schools and stuff like that I would like oh, I wonder what this is, this is really interesting. (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) (*Facilitator 1:* Mm)

George: Yeah then you'd go hey I know that person or, I've talked to that person.

Nathan: Or from– maybe even like um, famous sportsmen who (*Facilitator 2:* Mhm) most um Polynesians look up to. (*Facilitator 2:* Mhm) (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) Just in terms of as, (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) being a Polynesian. (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) But also as like, who other young people look up to.

Facilitator 2: And– what would they?

Nathan: Like rugby players. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) Like Patrick Tuipulotu, like people who have just recently left school and that are like (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) making their way up throughout the ranks.

Facilitator 2: So what would they be saying?

Nathan: Like um... Like 'growing throughout– oh in my experiences through, throughout like high school like I was like really popular but I also um, I knew that there was like all this stuff going on (*Facilitator 2:* Mm) (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) while I was there but I was, I distanced myself from it (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) and just focused on myself, but I wish I could have stepped in (*Facilitator 2:* Right) and maybe changed the outcome.' (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm)

Facilitator 2: So him saying something like that?

Nathan: Yeah. Or even have someone who's actually done it. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) Or, or have been a victim of it like. (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) Someone who has done it is– that's always a good perspective like 'oh this is what I was doing and yeah it has– it's not a positive outcome. (*Facilitator 2:* (*laughs*) Yeah) It it– I regret it' like. (*Facilitator 1:* Mmm) (*Facilitator 2:* Mm)

Facilitator 1: Do you think people would be happy to come and share those kinds of stories?

Nathan: If they really did care about their victims (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) then they would. (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) It would be hard for them but they'd eventually come around like oh 'I don't want this to happen, (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) like, maybe you should (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) think about what you do next time. Like, I'm you if you don't change.' (*Facilitator 1:* Mm) Like those kinds of messages. (*Facilitator 1:* Yeah) (*Group 10*)

Many boys, across different groups, also emphasised the importance of having "relatable" (e.g., *Dion*) figures to inspire change:

"So that you can kind of relate to it, you don't want like a teacher telling you something off you know." (*Kevin*)

This has implications for public messaging as well as for considering which types of people are most likely to be effective workshop facilitators. Boys in Group 2 talked a lot about this, clearly suggesting they'd be less likely to take seriously information and advice from "50 and 60-year-old men all in suits" (Dion):

"a lot of information comes from like the school and like what to do, and like if like someone who's like, say like a teacher who's like a 50-year-old guy and you get that information from him, you kind of like, you're like what does he know about it? (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah (*laughs*)) Like you're kind of like you don't know what's going on. So, I think a way of doing that would be through people your own age so that like more relates. Like if Tim has come in– if this is me in the situation then he come and told me I'd kind of agree more than if like a teacher came and said like don't do it. I'd be like don't have as much respect in terms of that kind of situation." (*Dion*)

"you already know that a teacher's going to tell you not to do that. Like you already know that they're going to think it's a bad idea. But like hearing it from someone your own age is a lot different because you actually like think that, OK, well, he– he's my age, he knows what I'm like. He's– he'll actually know what he's talking about. So, I think that definitely makes a difference." (*Mitchell)*

In these kinds of discussion, "people your own age" (*Dion*) were depicted as more likely to understand boys' cultural context and therefore have views that were more realistic. Within workshop settings, some boys suggested that our younger facilitators helped set a tone that made it "a bit more easier to kind of express your opinion I think": "Like for an example like right now you guys are a bit younger than most teachers so it's kind of a bit more easier" (*Dion*). As well as figures who were relatable (closer to their own age and ideally, in some cases as Nathan described, people they could look up to), boys often referred to the importance of friends as influencers:

"You're more likely to listen from your friends rather than someone you've never met before." (*Henry*)

Boys in Group 3 echoed this point in suggesting that education alone would not be enough to influence boys to change their behaviour. When Facilitator 3 asked whether helping people manage online communication ethically was an "education issue or is it a peer culture issue", they reiterated the importance of peers in effecting change:

Finn: I think it's probably peer culture

Other participant: Yeah.

Riley: Peer culture *and* education I reckon yeah–

Seb: Because the amount of education– it comes down to a point where you can give best advice and give the best examples and you can give all these things and all these things and don't do this, this is why, and they understand it but they– they're still not going to listen.

Other participant: Yeah.

Seb: Mm.

[....]

Riley: Oh. I think it takes a level of maturity to, to take it from a a school environment I mean. Not everyone's going to listen to a school talk and be like, 'oh, yeah, that's changed my life' I mean, it's more of a communication thing between peers that's going to (*Wei:* Ah–) make an effect.

Wei: Yeah, I might agree. (*Group 3*)

Challenges – turning it into a joke

While boys offered constructive suggestions for how to engage boys in the process of thinking and talking about issues like gender, sexism and online ethics, they also highlighted some of the

obstacles. There are several reasons why gender transformative work with boys might be challenging. As we discussed in Chapter 3, dominant norms for men and boys are tightly held in place within boys' peer group culture through the 'positive pull' of loyalty, belonging and fitting in, as well as through the negative flip side of banter, shaming and exclusion. Another challenge, which boys in several groups noted, was the risk they saw for serious messages to be undermined by mocking forms of trivialisation. Under the guise of humour, these kinds of responses can make it difficult for endorsements of equality and social justice to 'stick' and gain traction in boys' peer groups. We have already discussed how some boys expected this would happen in peer to peer attempts to, for example, call out another boy's unethical behaviour. The same risks, several boys told us, would apply to social messaging or organised interventions.

When we asked boys in Group 6 their views on if and how a website about these issues could be designed to carry ideas and resources that were useful to boys, they suggested some practical considerations like getting young people involved in helping design it, having lots of visuals and not too much text. Boys in other groups also emphasised the importance of using language that is casual (*Kevin*) and not formal (*Oscar*). In some groups we described the approach of the Australian website, *The Line*[176], which we described as "integrat[ing] like lots of *gifs*, [using] kind of really casual language, [and] realistic scenarios" (*Facilitator 2*). Rory agreed that would be a constructive approach:

> "I think that kind of rhetoric would, speak to, teenagers, (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) um, much more easily than like if we're sitting in school, in a health presentation or something with some, old teacher telling us not to do it" (*Rory*)

Boys in Group 6, however, also cautioned about how the progressive intent of interventions that on the surface seem simple and straightforward, can be undermined through rebellious/reactionary resignification:

> *Oscar:* Like I feel, maybe, design a website like, with the young people in mind maybe even like *use*, like young people (*Other participant:* Yeah) to help design the website (*Facilitator 2:* Mhmm) yeah I think that could make it you know more relatable. (*Other participant:* Yeah) Yeah.
>
> *Nikau:* I reckon have lots of visuals and little writing. (*several participants agree*)
>
> *Scott:* That first bit I didn't read it all. (*other participants laugh*) (*Nikau:* Yeah) I– I would read four lines in the entire thing, (*Facilitators 1 & 2:* Yep) and you're not going to get anything out of a teenager if you have more than that.
>
> *Facilitator 2:* Yep. (*Other participant:* Yeah) So make it nice and concise.
>
> (*participants all talking at once*)
>
> *Oscar:* Even if you have it, like, almost like a meme format (*several participants agree*) more people will be like inclined to look at it. Yeah. (*Other participant:* Yeah)
>
> *Scott:* Oh and just one thing um there's like– here's an example that I saw the other day, um there's like a filter on Facebook and– that you can put on like your profile picture and it says, um, respect women, (*Other participant:* Or value women.) or something like that, and like at first it was like really, really worked well, but then people just use it as a joke now, (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) and you don't want your page to turn out as a joke. (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah exactly) So you got to be careful with like, what you put on.
>
> *Oscar:* Yeah because you find that like there's all these memes like, 'every day I respect women' but like in a jokingly manner, I feel maybe you know obviously you're wanting to create a website that's inclined f– to you know respect you know people, but not, in a way

that could be you know associated, with like a meme that you know almost like under-mines what you're trying to do, (*Facilitator 2:* Yeah) (*Kevin:* Yeah) yeah.

Kevin: You want it to be serious but not in a sense where it's going to be turned into a joke, you know. (*Group 6*)

Lachlan put more faith in the power of formal education than the boys in Group 6, but also pointed to the way that its messages can be undone through trivialising humour:

"Um... ah, in terms of information, I think that the only way you can really get especially boys into– which is, a lot of the problem– ah especially boys into getting information and thinking about these things ahead before they even do it, is not via any website or– it it's probably education in the schooling system, and we already have that quite a bit, but a lot of people take the piss out of it" (*Lachlan*)

Ari (from the same group) also had more faith in formal education, but argued that to be effective, workshops like the ones we were conducting would need to be "integrated into the education system" so they would reach a wider audience, including those who might need it most: "it can't be like a workshop for people to like join", because:

"it won't be targeting the right audience. (*Facilitator 3:* Mm hm) In in that it would be targeting people who would care or would be interested, but wouldn't target people who would need it." (*Ari*)

In conclusion

In this chapter we have discussed how boys reflected on the workshop process, including their recommendations for how best to engage boys and young men in change-oriented work – that crit-ically interrogates restrictive and inequitable gender norms and wrestles with practical dilemmas related to intervening against sexism or unethical online behaviour. Many described the workshop conversations as a crucial first step towards action, noting that they had had few previous oppor-tunities to discuss these sorts of issues. Our problem-posing approach was well received by the boys, who appreciated being asked for their views and suggestions. Some explicitly recognised that this kind of respectful and non-didactic approach, which creates space for boys to generate their own ideas and problem-solving, was most likely to be effective in bringing boys into these kinds of potentially challenging conversations. Workshop participants also described valuing the relative informality and collaborative, non-hierarchical nature of the groups (relative to the usual student-teacher relationships within school settings), and having "relatable" (relatively young) facilitators. In thinking about how to extend the spirit of this process in wider ways, boys emphasised the importance of some of these key features, and spaces and resources from which young people can hear from each other. They also cautioned, however, about the challenges of such work when brought into more public domains – citing examples of how serious messages can become parodied and trivialised through the banter and humour of masculine peer culture.

Chapter 7
Discussion

Online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse – including the unethical distribution of nudes and other forms of image-based sexual abuse – are arguably new manifestations of the longstanding problem of gendered violence and abuse. Like gendered violence more broadly, they have their origins in the everyday gendered norms, practices, and values that create the 'cultural conditions of possibility' for violence against women, girls, and gender diverse people. In this project we worked with over 50 boys and young men in Auckland to explore some of those everyday norms and practices. We looked at norms of masculinity, norms and ethics associated with onsharing nudes, and the challenges boys face in considering intervening when they observe or are party to peers' sexist, unethical, or abusive behaviour. We also invited boys to critically interrogate the everyday norms and practices they identified.

The boys and young men we worked with in this study had volunteered to take part in workshops on online communication in relation to "wider issues around gender and social responsibility". As we specifically sought to work with boys who were interested in thinking about questions to do with gender, equality, and ethics, they were probably more likely than boys and men in general to be open to critically thinking about gender and sexism. Most boys participated in just one short workshop, with others taking part in two workshops. We were initially struck by how many boys volunteered in the school settings to take part in this research – and pleasantly surprised that it was not difficult to recruit over 50 boys and young men in a short period of time. Although every workshop group had its own dynamics and patterns of participation and interaction, our overwhelming impression was that these teenage boys were ready and keen for the opportunity to talk about gender, sexism, and the norms and ethics of obtaining and onsharing nudes. Many told us that they had never had an opportunity to talk about these issues, and they welcomed being able to do so in a setting where their voices and views were actively encouraged.

In our analysis we have been interested both in the *content* of what the boys told us and also in what we can learn from the *process* of engaging boys and young men in these kinds of critical reflective discussions. Asking boys and young men to think about the ethics associated with gendered digital communication and share their views on how boys might take a stand to intervene against unethical or abusive peer behaviour provides us with direct suggestions that are helpful in informing interventions to bolster the promotion of ethical communities of care and prevent harm. They told us, for example, about the value of small group discussions and the importance of relatable facilitators. Some boys cautioned about the limitations of what is achievable with only opt-in programmes, and recommended mainstreaming such topics within the school curriculum. Some also cautioned about the potential for messages promoting equality and so on to be undermined through trivialising humour.

At the same time, asking boys about what is expected of how boys and men should act, and about how such norms are shaped and policed, provided important insights into the social context in which such interventions would need to be made. It showed us that for both boys themselves and for those working with boys to support and encourage ethical bystander interventions (for example), the challenge is much more complex than it could appear on the surface.

Overall, when boys told us about the norms and constraints they associated with being a man (or a guy) they identified a number of stereotypical features of New Zealand masculinity – including strength, sporting acumen, and particular styles of mundane taste and appearance. What appeared to tie together all of the specific characteristics, however, was what we've dubbed a 'flight from femininity'.[177] Boys appeared to recognise that a dominant prescription for New Zealand masculinity is the avoidance of acting in any way like a girl. The most striking and poignant example of this was what they identified as a cultural prohibition for men and boys against showing vulnerable emotions. Boys from all groups, across a range of ethnicities and social locations, recognised this restricted and restrictive emotional repertoire as an expected norm for men.

Our finding that boys described the norms for masculinity in opposition to what is culturally understood to be feminine should perhaps come as no surprise. It fits with long-standing stereotypical portrayals of New Zealand masculinity, both settler and Māori since colonisation.[178] In 1996, for example, Pākehā New Zealand historian Jock Phillips lamented the ongoing costs for men "thinking it is a weakness to express emotion"[179] – costs that practitioners and social scientists were at the same time linking to men's violence against women.[180] Pākehā men in particular, according to Indigenous masculinities scholar, Brendan Hokowhitu, "have maintained power by defining what they are not (and therefore what they are) through the constructions of 'Others' such as Māori and women".[181]

Hokowhitu's argument clarifies how the compound effect of cultural and gendered stereotypes impacts Māori boys and men in the contemporary context.[182] He details how the weight of dominant prescriptions for masculinity falls more harshly on Māori boys and men, who are more likely to be met with racist limiting expectations about their skills and prospects that narrow the range of possibilities and opportunities open to them. Dominant representations of Māori men as inherently 'physical' – sometimes expressed in 'positive' terms in relation to the "'physical prowess'" and the athleticism of tāne, and sometimes in negative terms in relation to an imagined proclivity for violence, are two sides of the stereotypical racist coin, Hokowhitu argues.

While the dominant contemporary stereotypes for New Zealand masculinit(ies) have arisen through our specific history of colonisation and significant local socio-political events, key elements of these stereotypes and the norms they supply resonate with wider (at least) Western norms for men and boys. Internationally, groups in several countries have used the concept of the "Man Box"[183] to illustrate the restrictive and costly nature of "the set of beliefs within and across society that place pressure on men to be a certain way"[184]; "a narrowly defined set of traditional rules for being a man"[185]. These revolve around attributes such as self-sufficiency, toughness, heterosexuality and conformity to rigid gender roles,[186] and are "enforced through shaming and bullying, as well as promises of rewards"[187]. According to this metaphor, a man who has accepted and internalised these social beliefs is *in* the man box. Recent research conducted in the United States, Mexico, and the United Kingdom shows that not only is adherence to "strict masculine stereotypes" still relatively common in those countries (and in Australia[188]), and associated with personal, interpersonal and social harms, it also carries a significant economic burden.[189]

While this broad sociocultural analysis sets the scene for understanding the dominant portrayals and meanings of gender in our and other societies, qualitative social science research has examined how boys and men respond to these norms, providing insights into where and

how they are observed, navigated, and adopted, or in some cases resisted and rejected, by boys and men in their own lives. While scholars emphasise that there are multiples masculinities, and different, fluid ways of being and acting as men,[190] several studies have shown a remarkable consistency in boys' and men's understanding of what the dominant characteristics they are supposed to embody are – or, more emphatically, the characteristics they are not supposed to embody: those associated with femininity (just as the boys in our study relayed).

As Hugh Campbell found in his ethnographic study of men in rural New Zealand pubs, conducted in 1989 and 1990: "pub(lic) masculinity involved not so much a striving towards some defined ideal of masculinity as a desperate struggle to avoid and negate any accusation or appearance of femininity".[191] This general finding has been echoed in several overseas studies. On the basis of her interviews and observations with men in a United States city, for instance, Sharon Bird suggested: "Being masculine, in other words, means being not-female".[192] United States sociologist C. J. Pascoe, has argued the point more strongly, suggesting that "cultural effemiphobia" "pervades contemporary framings of masculinity".[193] As one boy said, when interviewed by Kiera Duckworth and Mary Nell Trautner in their large interview study of mostly "white, middle class" United States boys and young men: "'All [guys] need to do is not act like a girl or be called, well, a bitch'".[194]

In this more recent (2019) study, however, Duckworth and Trautner found that "while boys and young men recognise dominant notions of hegemonic masculinity, most do not subscribe to those uncritically". Nevertheless, this distance from hegemonic norms did not automatically translate into those boys being able or willing to challenge those norms:

> "Some of our subjects talked about women as objects or tools to achieve masculinity, while a considerable number did not. However, neither do the boys generally question or interrupt the conversations they witness other boys having. They embraced the idea that masculinity should not be so narrowly defined, yet still acquiesced to the benefits of masculinity's social privileges."[195]

Our study also found this pattern. Boys drew a clear picture of a set of dominant norms for men in New Zealand, but they did not explicitly endorse these norms, and many were explicitly critical of at least some elements of them. Yet, as they talked about what they would or could do if other boys were drawing on sexist norms to behave unethically or abusively towards girls, it was very clear that many would feel stuck, and reluctant or unable to challenge such behaviour. What our study therefore reveals are the complex constraints on bystander intervention within peer groups. Boys identified the importance of loyalty to their friends and peer group belonging as critical factors that would shape many boys' ability to act. Where they perceived peer group norms as condoning sexist, unethical or abusive behaviour, or where they could not be sure of other boys' views and support, many boys suggested they would be cautious about intervening. They might pause before acting and not force the issue, or they might just stay silent and avoid getting involved.

This key finding about the importance of friendship norms and values resonates with findings from an earlier New Zealand study looking at how different expressions of masculinity relate to "men's involvement in campaigns designed to prevent men's domestic violence toward women in Aotearoa/New Zealand".[196] In that research with "ordinary" New Zealand men (who were on average considerably older than our participants), Alison Towns and Gareth Terry concluded that traditional masculine values around "mateship" and loyalty to "the 'team' of *all* men" were still influential, and can work to prevent men from intervening should they witness or know about another man's violence against a woman.[197]

Our finding about the influential role of peer groups highlights how important it is to work towards changing narrow sociocultural norms for gendered identities and behaviours. These

findings also show the importance of not under-estimating how complicated this process is likely to be. As boys talked about if and how they could intervene to challenge unethical peer behaviour, they revealed the complex and difficult social interactional dimensions of ethical bystander interventions. It is clear from our research that expecting boys as individuals to stand up and speak out to promote gender equality or question unethical behaviour is unrealistic. It is not that no boys are capable of doing this on their own, but from what our workshop participants indicated, very few boys and young men are likely to have the confidence, skill, and social capital to be able to do this successfully. Our research nevertheless suggests that many more boys would like to be able to do so. It suggests that they are much more likely to act, such as by intervening as change agents or ethical bystanders, when they feel they have the backing of their friendship group. How then do we capitalise on such goodwill and aspirations, to support boys being able to act according to the positive values at least some, and perhaps many, boys endorse, such as equality and respect?

In our workshops, we turned the gaze of Paulo Freire's problem-posing questioning onto dominant sociocultural norms for men. Through this process, key stereotypical notions of what masculinity *is* became a 'social object' to be interrogated by the boys. As they participated in this process of identifying and discussing the norms of how boys and men are supposed to act, and what is stereotypically associated with boys and men, we found the process invited (or, for some, reinforced) a degree of critical separation from these norms. The simple act of asking about these norms and then inviting discussion of them, helped to de-naturalise them. They could be seen more as cultural ideas for how men and boys *should be* rather than essential facts mapping *who they really are*. This is a potentially liberating shift. In making room for questioning and evaluating those rigid cultural ideas for how men and boys should be and act it opens the door to rethinking one's allegiance to them and, if necessary, rejecting them.

The Foucauldian idea of pouvoir-savoir that we introduced in Chapter 2 would suggest that change (personal and social) is made possible through this process of unpacking and de-naturalising dominant sociocultural ways of understanding something ('dominant discourses'). This creates space to think differently about how we understand and relate to our social worlds. But what is also needed to support change are new frameworks of understanding that guide us to navigate the social world differently. Facilitating conscientisation requires providing information and new ideas that offer alternative lenses for seeing the world. As an important part of the workshops, therefore, we introduced resources and tools that juxtaposed facts and questions, and modelled other young people talking about what is expected of boys and men. We also played videos showing examples of older men discussing their own experiences and difficulties challenging sexism. Part of the new information that can arise in these spaces comes from listening to other boys (and men) who are (also) uncomfortable with the dominant norms of masculinity. In Duckworth and Trautner's recent study with United States boys and young men, one of the fascinating results was that a high proportion subscribed to what the authors called "outcast" masculinity. These boys aspired to alternative, "hybrid" understandings of masculinity, which embraced more emotional openness, empathy and so on (at the same time as some also embodied some more traditionally masculine characteristics). Yet these boys thought of themselves as outcasts as they recognised that the more traditionally feminine characteristics they valued did not fit the ideal of how boys are positioned in relation to "commonplace notions of masculinity". That is, it was not how they thought they were supposed to be. Ironically, they lacked "awareness that many peers defined masculinity similarly".[198] Creating opportunities, therefore, for boys to learn that they are not alone in how they feel in relation to dominant norms of masculinity is an important step towards fostering collective change.

Some boys in our workshops referenced more personal routes that had already guided them towards a critical disposition towards the dominant norms of masculinity and awareness of alternative models for being men. Some boys, for example, mentioned the influence of their fathers or women in their family. For other boys, it seemed, they had not been exposed to ideas that questioned the place of dominant norms for boys and men, or validated their own personal questions and uncertainties about them. Few high profile men publicly model ways of being men that overtly question the dominant norms of masculinity and promote gender egalitarian views. In the preface to this report we quoted from some exceptions – well known men speaking back publicly to these normative prescriptions for men, challenging edicts against showing emotional vulnerability and amplifying feminist-flavoured critiques of 'toxic masculinity', sexism, rape culture and patriarchy. Such voices are not common, especially in New Zealand, although globally we are seeing more men speaking out in these ways, particularly since the MeToo movement took off in late 2017.[199]

In this project, we deliberately set out with a different agenda from the more usual kind of social science research that provides snapshots of the terrain of masculinity: the social norms that define it (or different versions of it), and the ways that boys and men take it up, in a specific time and place. Numerous studies that have interviewed and observed boys and men have found pessimistic demonstrations of (heterosexual) masculinities – that not only conform to dominant norms, but do so in ways that are actively tied to denigrating girls and women, femininity and homosexuality.[200] On the basis of her research with men, Sharon Bird, writing in the United States in the 1990s, for example, suggested that men prove their (heterosexual) masculinity to other men by "being emotionally detached, competitive, and supportive of the sexual objectification of women" – and that those who are unable or unwilling to act according to these norms risk being seen as "not true men".[201] In her classic ethnographic study of high school masculinity in the United States, originally published in 2007, Pascoe observed that boys at the school where she spent a year and a half doing fieldwork "continually repudiated femininity, weakness, and, most importantly, the specter of the 'fag'".[202] Importantly, she noted, this happened in ways that were encouraged, and in some cases, directly rewarded by the school.

We did not want to further document a static picture of the contemporary trouble with masculinity.[203] Instead, using a change-oriented methodology,[204] we wanted to see what is possible when spaces are deliberately created to foster movement beyond dominant norms. As we theorised, when provided with a space and new tools and resources, we found that the boys we worked with came up with observations, insights and critiques that resonated with the critiques of dominant rigid ideas about masculinity that researchers, prevention advocates and educators, and cultural critics have long been making.[205]

A sociocultural model of working with boys as potential change agents: Where to from here?

In this report we have explored a sociocultural model of working with boys as potential change agents. Our approach is not designed as a formal programme, but as a set of ideas and a model for how to engage boys and young men in supporting change towards gender equality and in preventing online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse of girls and women. The approach offers a philosophy and pragmatics of change that can be used and developed – following our *Workshop Guide*[206] or by drawing on and adapting the general philosophy discussed through this report. It also has the potential to be tailored for working with different groups of boys and young men in a variety of situations. While it is flexible enough to be used in small, ad hoc and peer-to-peer ways, its promise also lies in its potential to be scaled up in ways that fit with a more sustainable model of engagement.

In a nutshell, we suggest that by creating spaces for problem-posing discussions with small groups of boys and young men, it might be possible to support and nurture them towards a more critical perspective on gender and on the ethics of online communication.[207] The notion of *space* is a key principle underlying the possibilities for change. We think of space in both literal and meta-phorical terms and advocate providing both *discursive spaces* in which new ideas and questions are introduced in open and non-didactic ways, and *physical spaces* where boys can be brought together to critically reflect collaboratively, on gendered norms and constraints, as well as inequal-ities and privileges. While our focus here is on boys and young men in general, the spirit of this recommendation resonates with Hokowhitu's recommendations for Māori men in particular: "Key, then, to overcoming stereotypical notions of Māori masculinity is the creation of a 'space' where the pluralism of Māori masculine performances can be given room to breathe."[208]

Bringing boys and young men together in groups is also a key element of this approach. Most of the boys in our workshops emphasised how important their friendship groups and wider peer groups were, in shaping their behaviour. For many boys, peer groups appear to be influential in either enabling or constraining proactive bystander behaviour, depending on the norms and values of the group. There is enormous benefit, therefore, in providing an open and non-judgemental space in which boys can listen to each other's uneasy fit with dominant masculine norms and hear how other boys also stay silent because of what they presume boys in their group or other boys in general think. Although our participants were not always in workshops with boys who were in their everyday friendship groups, witnessing other boys in their wider peer group talk in ways that 'externalised' the norms of masculinity and identified the ways that they have been uneasily shaped and policed according to norms for boys and men, would have confirmed to any participant that he was not on his own in navigating difficult decisions and dilemmas related to what it means to be a man and what kind of person a man can be.

Given what we found about the powerful role of peer group culture, and boys' emphasis on the importance of loyalty and belonging, targeting interventions at a peer group rather than an individual level is obviously crucial for the success of any interventions. Without positive change to the way that norms are explicitly regarded and embodied in such local contexts boys will continue to face significant constraints on their ability to act as ethical bystanders and change agents, and their likelihood of overcoming cultural norms against 'getting involved' in issues that don't affect them directly. Correspondingly, a clear message from our research is that when values around equality and respect are endorsed and normative within a peer group, this can enable and support individuals to stand up for those values and potentially intervene in unethical or abusive situations.

 Our work with boys in this project only scratched the surface of what could be possible. We met with boys for only one or two hours. Yet, even in this compressed timeframe many boys indicated that the workshop had planted seeds of ideas and asked questions that had got them thinking and revising some of their previously default responses. If we had the opportunity to do further work in this area, we would aim to work with groups for several sessions over a longer timeframe. Starting out, we were mindful of the principle of whakawhanaungatanga[209], and aimed to recognise what each boy brought to the group and create a sense of belonging within the particular group and the process we were embarking on. However, the practical constraints of one or two-session short workshops meant that the extent to which we could do this was limited.

Besides the obvious point that adding more workshop sessions would allow us to cover more ground, there are important ways that ongoing engagement would enrich the workshop process and potentially expand its impact. Firstly, there would be more chance of exploring points of differ-ence between boys (related to ethnicity, sexuality, ability and so on). In some cases, working with

more homogeneous groups could perhaps fast track a higher level of trust among the boys, and generate observations, resources, and strategies that were more uniquely fitted to their specific cultural context. For groups of Māori boys and young men, for example, it would be possible to design the content and flow of workshops, to be facilitated by Māori, around mātauranga Māori and tikanga, drawing on work by scholars like Hokowhitu, Mataira, and King and Robertson.

As it was, we noticed boys orienting to what they had in common, so that for example in a group that was relatively homogeneous in terms of ethnicity, boys brought up the specificity of their cultural location in a way that was unusual in groups that were more mixed. In those more mixed groups, boys would orient to their school as a site of commonality, especially where boys were not part of a pre-existing friendship group. If they were part of a pre-existing friendship group, the particular dynamics of their group also became a point of reference.

Another advantage of groups meeting for more sessions, over a longer period of time, is that boys would carry their new ideas out into the world, likely seeing through fresh eyes and perhaps testing out some of their shifting perspectives. The benefits of this would be two-fold. The workshop discussions would become layered with the boys' accounts of this new 'data', which would provide rich points for discussion and extension for the workshop participants. At the same time, this testing out of new ideas within their friend groups – which some boys said they would like to do, in low key and careful ways – would put into practice the most ambitious hopes for this kind of prevention model. That is, that boys would carry their questioning of taken-for-granted norms and practices related to gender out into their wider circles, with the potential for them to influence other boys and loosen the hold of dominant norms for boys and men within their local cultural milieu.[210] Additionally, through multiple sessions, boys would hopefully develop friendships and a sense of community within the workshop group, which could ideally provide an ongoing sounding board and support should they feel emboldened to take more active roles as change agents.

Caveats and limitations

> "Without larger-scale cultural and structural change, social norms interventions are unlikely to be effective." (Jocelyn Hollander and C. J. Pascoe)[211]

We are optimistic about the potential for the sociocultural approach we have trialled in this project to help foster positive changes with boys and men addressing sexism, online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse. In closing we want to moderate this optimism by recognising some of the thorny issues that underlie any such project, and draw attention to some of the caveats and limitations related to our particular project.

In the introduction to this report we argued for the importance of working with men and boys to prevent gendered forms of violence, abuse and harassment – both off and online. As many other commentators have said, this is essential if we have any hope of preventing such violence and abuse from happening before it starts. However, as many of these same commentators have also stressed, working with boys and men in this way is a complex, challenging and sensitive task. It is also not the full and only answer.

A key point we have emphasised through this report is the need to conceptualise 'the problem' at the social and cultural level. While it is the behaviours of individual boys and men that directly cause harm and grab media headlines, a sociocultural approach draws attention to the context that enables, minimises and sometimes excuses such behaviour. This context is shaped by cultural norms that are embedded in social hierarchies of gendered (and racialised) power, and without changing this context it is unrealistic to expect large-scale change in individual behaviour. The task of dismantling gendered hierarchies of power is, of course, a mammoth challenge that requires

interventions at all levels, including political and economic, grassroots and governmental. But work towards disrupting and reconfiguring gendered cultural norms can take place in many ways, big and small, and ultimately help to drive and support structural change. While intervening at the level of sociocultural norms alone will never be enough, as Hollander and Pascoe, and other researchers point out, when this work is done alongside critical attention to gender equality and gendered power and privilege, it is a crucial step in the process.

Gender, power and privilege

> "I'm very much the optimistic practitioner, although I don't subscribe to any magic wand theory. I know few, if any, men actually manage to fully uproot themselves from the internal tyrants of our masculinity." (Peter Mataira)[212]

In our short workshops we did not directly explore gendered power and privilege as it related to the boys' own lives, but several scholars and practitioners have pointed to this 'elephant in the room' as an important factor to face when addressing gender norms with boys and men.[213] Feminist scholar Rachel O'Neill has argued more generally that the optimism and hope found in some strands of masculinity studies relies to some extent on a head-in-the-sand approach to gendered *power* relations.[214] In recognising that a patriarchal gender order imposes distinct expectations and obligations on women and men, it is crucial, according to Abhijit Das, that we recognise "the impact of these obligations on women and men can never be equated, or treated with similar concern".[215] That is, 'the gender order' is a hierarchy, so that while both women and men are constrained by it, men systematically receive benefits that women do not. "Most men," according to Das, "even when fretting against so-called burdensome expectations of being a man, are comfortable with their privilege and sense of entitlement".[216]

As we discussed in Chapter 2, we did have to rejig our workshop guide after the first three workshops we conducted, when we found that not all boys understood the concept of sexism and therefore didn't recognise it as a feature of their social worlds. With this information, we were able to design activities that brought sexism and gender inequality into clearer focus. While this doesn't go as far as inviting boys to explore their own privilege – in a personal sense that connects it to 'the political' – it is a step along the way.

Encouraging men to recognise gendered power and their own privilege within a gender hierarchy requires a path that incorporates clear political messaging with a pragmatic theory of change. Michael Flood, Molly Dragiewicz and Bob Pease, for instance, emphasise the importance of framing gender equality within a "robust feminist framework".[217] Citing Australian feminist writer Clementine Ford, Flood also notes the risks of "a 'softly softly' approach", which can be too compromising and ultimately ineffective.[218] Without a robust feminist framework, interventions with boys and men are unlikely to be able to adequately tackle and transform entrenched and sometimes invisible patterns and structures of gendered power and inequality. Instead, they can end up reinforcing the status quo.

At the same time, the risk with any process that seeks to drive change, is that it can cause people to put up walls to defend against changes they perceive as threatening. Rhetoric that is useful or even necessary within the wider political sphere may be counter-productive when seeking to facilitate change directly with individuals and communities. As Das and Singh note, for example, strategies like "'naming and shaming'" which might be valid in responding to human rights breaches, are likely to be inappropriate (and ineffective) when it comes to engaging individual men to support equality.[219] As one young man we interviewed separately from our workshops said, about his experience of preparing for a performing arts production about gender:

"the moment that we felt like they weren't going to judge us is the moment we started letting out the good– you know, the real stuff, the stuff that actually you can do something with" (*Theo* – see Appendix C)

Promoting and facilitating progressive social change is therefore is an inherently delicate task; one that needs to navigate a path towards meaningful and challenging engagement with boys and men, without alienating them to the extent they entrench a position of power and privilege.

A key reason for starting work with boys who were already interested in discussing gender and equality, was that we would expect more openness and readiness to change. If able to work with boys over a longer period of time, we would anticipate that the guiding principle of manaakitanga and efforts to build whakawhanaungatanga within the group would enhance the potential to hold boys' attention and goodwill without shying away from provocative questions. Peter Mataira, in writing specifically about Māori men working with Māori men in relation to masculinity and violence, also highlights the importance of manaakitanga and insists that the work "must be premised on aroha, tika, pono, and on working in the fire".[220] By working in the fire, Mataira means "an active commitment to taking on the challenge and responsibility of eliminating violence, period, while simultaneously challenging embedded patriarchal assumptions and privileges".[221] The Māori approach that Mataira describes, sets out a model of practice that combines directness and truth with empathy and compassion.

For Mataira, and other scholars and practitioners concerned about engaging men in supporting gender equality and eradicating men's violence against women, personal change for men is an important part of the picture.[222] While real change requires large scale structural and sociocultural change (as many authors, agreeing with Hollander and Pascoe, emphasise), the route to such change requires something more of men than simply 'supporting a cause'.[223] Real change requires boys and men being moved to understand how they are situated within a social fabric that contributes to men's violence against women and girls, and encourages them to turn a blind eye to it when they see it. (This is not to be confused with approaches that individualise the problem, without understanding the sociocultural determinants of individual behaviour.)

For Māori scholars and practitioners, their work focuses specifically on how limiting notions of masculinity, and unequal gendered power relations operate for Māori in relation to colonisation and ongoing racism.[224] Within more 'general' – or whole population – approaches, practitioners and scholars have also emphasised the importance of recognising the uneven ways that gendered power and privilege intersect with men's other relative positions of power and privilege. Reflecting on their work with men in India, for example, Das and Singh noted the importance of an intersectional approach that goes beyond a "simple or binary proposition of gender power relationships", which, they say, "can make men feel threatened and resistant".[225] Our Watch, the body responsible for leading work on the prevention of violence against women in Australia, similarly argues for the importance of an intersectional analysis for understanding masculinities in relation to the different 'lived realities' among men, and as important for engaging men in work towards the prevention of violence against women.[226] As well as being unconducive to change, lack of attention to the intersectional dimensions of gender can reinforce racist, and other prejudicial stereotypes, about which groups of men are the problem and which men are (implicitly) the saviours. Writing about a specific case of men's antirape activism in the United States, for example, Pascoe and Hollander showed how men's antirape activism can slide into performances of masculine dominance that are acted out, often in racialised and classed ways, over other men.[227]

The slippery paradox of gender

In the wake of scandals like Roastbusters and the Wellington College case that we opened with, people often ask how we can promote healthy forms of masculinity, to encourage young men to behave respectfully and support gender equality. Our observations lead us to recommend a subtly different approach, which attends to the importance of gender without further fixing in place contemporary gendered norms and stereotypes.

In a world that is still structured according to a gender binary (men–women), it is important for everyone to understand their 'gendered position', even at a time when many people's *identities* are more fluid than this dichotomy requires. To not see gender, risks not seeing disparities in opportunity and reward that still shape most people's intimate, working, and public lives.[228] And not seeing systemic disparities leaves us unable to contribute to the kind of social change that supports individual boys and young men behaving more ethically.

At the same time, however, we would recommend a lighter touch in how we take account of gender. Instead of automatically turning to the task of promoting 'healthy masculinities', for instance, it may be better to pause and question what is gained and what is lost through packaging desirable qualities for boys and young men in specifically gendered terms. Emphasising more flexible, less gender-bound, possibilities for personhood would likely bring many benefits for individual boys and men *and* girls and women.[229] It would also reduce the risks associated with investing in a concept that carries so much unhelpful baggage, including inadvertent associations of masculinity with "the savior of women", as Michael Messner puts it.[230] In our own workshops, we deliberately aimed to frame the work in ways that were as ordinary and un-heroic as possible, mindful of observations by Messner, Greenberg and Peretz, and by Flood, of the problematic "gendered 'economy of gratitude'" that can lead to male allies of progressive change and anti-violence work being showered with disproportionate kudos for minimal effort.[231] While there are many problems with this dynamic, one of these, as Flood notes, is the message it gives to men that measures like supporting gender equality or the prevention of men's violence against women are not *really* their job.

It's not all about boys and men

Finally, while working with boys and men is essential for change, it is not the full and only answer, and it is important that in the process attention and resources are not diverted away from work with girls and women.[232] It is also crucial that women's and girls' perspectives and expertise are acknowledged and drawn upon to inform the direction of work with men. Mataira repeatedly emphasises this point, advocating work in collaboration with Māori women. Similarly, in a 2019 commentary in *The Lancet*, Flood endorses the premise that work to engage men in working towards gender equality and justice should be done "in partnership with, and be accountable to, feminist and women's rights organisations".[233]

Notes

1 For recent New Zealand media commentaries on 'toxic masculinity', see Barker (2018), Johnston (2018), MacDonald (2019), Marvelly (2017), Morris (2017), Tait (2018), M. Thomas (2018). For other related commentary and discussion, see Baker (2018), Flood (2018), Kimmel and Wade (2018), Salter (2019). And for a sample of recent popular cultural examinations, see Farber (2019), Humphris (2017), Stephens (2017); see also Bishop (n.d.), Morris (2018, 2019).

2 See, for example, Successful protest at Parliament against rape culture (2017) and Towle (2017).

3 See, for example, Dooney (2017a), McGauley (2017), Rape comments apology doesn't mention women (2017), and Wellington students encourage taking advantage of 'drunk girls' (2017). While most media reports abbreviated the original text, as we have in the body of this report, according to McGauley (2017), the original wording was "fuck women". Subsequent behaviour by boys at this school included threatening online to "'jokingly' to run over protesters" (Stewart, 2017; see also Wellington College boys now threatening violence against planned 'rape culture' protest, 2017), and posting an anti-feminist meme directed at a local secondary school girls group (Cann, 2017).

4 For example, Dooney (2017c), Rape culture in the spotlight: A week to forget for Wellington schools (2017), Students posted images of female teachers on Instagram (2017); see also Hunt (2018).

   This is not an isolated incident. In March 2018, it was reported that two boys from a Christchurch boys' secondary school had been suspended: "one took a photo up a female teacher's skirt and shared it with his mates, while another took a video of his teacher in the classroom and uploaded it to a porn website" (Video of Teacher on Porn Site, 2018).

5 Jessica Dellabarca, a former Wellington East Girls, College student, quoted in Donovan (2017).

   See also the interview with Mia Faiumu, one of the protest organisers from Wellington East Girls' College (Successful protest at Parliament against rape culture, 2017) and McGauley (2017). These media reports also echo recent New Zealand qualitative research findings that show at least some young people consider sexist and abusive behaviour of this kind as "a normalized backdrop to everyday life" (e.g., Sills, Pickens, Beach, Jones, Calder-Dawe, Benton-Greig, & Gavey, 2016, p. 940; see also Calder-Dawe, 2015; Calder-Dawe & Gavey, 2016).

   For further discussion related to the 2017 cases of online misogyny, sexualised harassment and image-based sexual abuse by New Zealand schoolboys, and wider responses to them, see New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (2017).

6 We use the term 'onshare' to refer to the act of showing or distributing an intimate image beyond its intended recipient.

7 For example, the government's "It's Not OK" campaign (see Family Violence. It's Not OK, n.d. a) has implicitly called upon men to be allies in the movement to prevent "family violence", through recognising it and not tolerating it. Similarly, White Ribbon campaigns have focussed until recently on addressing men directly to not use violence against women, and to "stand up", "speak out" and act as allies (including high profile "ambassadors") in the movement against violence towards women. Until the past couple of years, neither sets of campaigns, however, focussed directly on questioning dominant norms of masculinity and gender (see Note 90).

8 See Farley (2017), Gavey (2013, 2019a), New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (2013, 2014).

9 Gavey (2019a).

10 Biddle (2017). See also Fredricsen (2018).

11 Duff (2018).

12 For example, Rape culture in the spotlight: A week to forget for Wellington schools (2017), Students posted images of female teachers on Instagram (2017), Video of Teacher on Porn Site (2018).

13 For example, the participant on the first New Zealand *Married at First Sight* television show in 2017 was revealed to have initiated Tinder contact with a woman with the message, "Fancy satisfying my Asian fetish?", and responded by calling her "ugly" and "mutant" when she strongly indicated her offence (Auckland woman outs Married at First Sight star for 'misogynistic and disgusting' Tinder messages, 2017). For further discussion of this kind of harassment on Tinder, see Hess and Flores (2018) and Thompson (2018).

14   Borissenko & Reid (2018), Roy (2018); see also Lawton (2018), Livingston & Owen (2018).

15   Casey & Greive (2016).

16   Some discussion of the Roastbusters' actions, for instance, implicitly blamed them on the immaturity of youth. For example, former Prime Minister, John Key's comment that "These young guys should just grow up" (Pair speak to police about Roast Busters, 2013; see also Farley, 2017). For ongoing discussion of sexual harassment, assault and bullying in the workplace, see New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (2019a).

17   Quoted from 3news in Gavey (2014); see also McKay (2014).

18   Malone, Kerr, Hinton, Edens, & Robinson (2016).

19   Paul (2017).

20   Lewis (2018), Redmond (2018).

21   For example, the 2015 I love Ugly campaign (e.g., Moses, 2015; I Love Ugly's ad branded 'sexist and revolting', 2015).

22   See, for example, the Widdex Hearing Aid advertisements (e.g., Julie, 2009a, 2009b).

23   Examples of promotional messaging that is aggressively sexist include graffiti style slogans in an Auckland restaurant's men's toilets (Fagan, 2016) and campervan slogans that have been controversial, and increasingly banned, in New Zealand and Australia (e.g., Wicked Camper vans banned from Aussie music festival, 2019). Misogynist humour still pops up in everyday public settings – such as the promotional message on a chalkboard sign outside an Auckland restaurant that said, "On Valentine's Day open the car door for her. After Valentine's Day open the car boot for her" (Neilson, 2019). For an Australian critical review of problematic gender portrayals in advertising, see McKenzie, Budgen, Webster, and Barr (2018).

24   See, for example, this opinion by Gilbert (2014) and this response by Gavey (2014).

25   See Gavey (2019a).

      While these discourses are influential in our society, it is important to recognise that they don't completely shape our cultural landscape, and that masculine norms are not fixed or universal. They take different forms in different social and cultural contexts, they change over time, and individual men accept and reject conventional masculine norms in diverse ways. Moreover, although elaboration of this point is beyond the scope of this report, dominant norms of masculinity are also relevant in contributing to men's violence and abuse, of all kinds, towards boys and other men (see also Kaufman, 1987).

26   Sills et al. (2016); see also Calder-Dawe & Gavey (2016).

27   Following current convention in Aotearoa New Zealand, we use 'gender diverse' as an umbrella term to refer to people who identify as trans, nonbinary, genderqueer, as well as, and including, people with more specific gender identities outside of the conventional man-woman binary. While technically perhaps everyone should be considered to sit within a spectrum of gender diversity, 'gender diverse' is a useful inclusive and non-pathologising descriptor for people who do not conform to this binary.

28   See, for example, Benton-Greig, Gamage, & Gavey (2018).

29   See, for example, Fanslow, Robinson, Crengle, & Perese (2010).

30   Le Grice (2018).

31   Tikanga refers to "Māori protocols and practices" (Pihama, Te Nana, Cameron, Smith, Reid, & Southey, 2016, p. 49); "the customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context" (Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index, n.d.).

32   See, for example, Cavino (2016), Hokowhitu (2004, 2007, 2015), King & Robertson (2017), Mikaere (1994, 1999, 2017), Pihama & McRoberts (2009), Pihama et al. (2016), Pihama, Cameron, & Te Nana (2019), Wilson, Jackson, & Herd (2016). See also E Tū Whānau Mahere Rautaki Framework for Change 2019–2023 (2020), Family Violence Death Review Committee (2017), Robertson & Oulton (2008).

33   Hokowhitu (2004, p. 276).

      Hokowhitu has unpacked in depth the formation of such Indigenous masculinities, explaining "how Māori survival required some complicity with Pākehā systems" (Hokowhitu, 2008, p. 120; see also Hokowhitu 2007, 2015), while urging that "the hybridization of Māori masculinity and British patriarchy must be acknowledged as an out-of-date performance, which resulted from colonial circumstances but no longer serves an integrative function, and should be discontinued" (p. 134).

34   Hokowhitu (2015, p. 83).

35   Hokowhitu (2008).

      See also Mikaere (1999, 2017) regarding similar misattributions of sexism as inherent to Māori culture.

36   Overseas scholars have detailed cases in which racialised depictions of rape and rapists, for example, are deployed in ways that serve to shore up racial and cultural hierarchies and privilege, at the same time as 'othering' the problem as something that does not belong within mainstream 'white culture' (e.g., Grewal, 2017; Nilsson, 2019; see Gavey, 2019b, for reference to other studies).

37   For the newly released prevention framework by and for Māori, see E Tū Whānau Mahere Rautaki Framework for Change 2019–2023 (2020); and for the newly released prevention framework for Pacific peoples, see Pasefika Proud (2020).

38   See, for example, Arotake Tūkino Whānau (2010), King & Robertson (2017), Kruger, Pitman, Grennell, McDonald, Mariu, Pomare, Mita, Maihi, & Lawson-Te Aho (2004), Le Grice (2017–2021), Mataira (2008), Pihama & McRoberts (2009), Pihama et al. (2016), Pihama et al. (2019), Smith & Tinirau (2019).

Mātauranga Māori refers to Māori "knowledge, wisdom, understanding, skill" (Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index, n.d.). For tikanga, see Note 31.

39   Netsafe (2017).

In this survey of 1001 14–17 year old New Zealand teenagers, Netsafe found that 4% had sent "nude or nearly nude content of themselves" in the past 12 months. The figure for 17 year olds was 7%.

All prevalence research on sensitive issues is fraught with challenges, and it is possible that methodological aspects of this study could be related to under-reporting of sexting. For example, the authors note that 30% of the young people completing this survey did so with a parent or caregiver close to them, and that some may have been embarrassed to admit to having sent a nude. In our qualitative research with secondary school girls in New Zealand, we found that when they referred to 'nudes' they did not mean images that were necessarily literally nude, but rather images that portrayed an intimate or sexualised kind of physical depiction that would not normally be shared in public (Thorburn, Gavey, Single, Wech, Calder-Dawe, & Benton-Greig, 2021; Gavey, Wech, Thorburn, Single, Calder-Dawe, Benton-Greig, & Hindley, 2021). Whether or not teenage survey respondents would always match the term "nude or nearly nude images" (as used in the Netsafe, 2017, survey) with their colloquial use of 'nudes' is also an open question. For Australian data that suggest sexting is more common, particularly among sexually active young people, see Mitchell, Patrick, Heywood, Blackman, and Pitts (2014).

40   For example, Burkett (2015).

41   McGlynn & Rackley (2017, p. 3).

McGlynn and Rackley see image-based sexual abuse existing on a continuum of sexual violence. Australian criminologists Nicola Henry and Anastasia Powell (2015a, p. 105) have argued that when such behaviour occurs "in the context of harassment, stalking and family or intimate violence" (their focus is primarily on adults) it is best thought of as a form of gender-based violence – that they call "technology-facilitated sexual violence or harassment".

42   Under the Harmful Digital Communications Act 2015, the crime of "causing harm by posting digital communication" is defined by four criteria: A person (1) posts a digital communication, (2) "with the intention that it cause harm to a victim", (3) and that "posting the communication would cause harm to an ordinary reasonable person in the position of the victim", and that (4) "posting the communication causes harm to the victim" – where harm is defined as "serious emotional distress". (For a critique of this fourth criterion, in relation to image-based sexual abuse in the context of men's violence against women, see Gavey and Farley, 2021.)

43   Bates (2017), McGlynn, Johnson, Rackley, Henry, Gavey, Flynn, & Powell (2020).

Given the gendered and other patterned ways in which intimate images are coercively obtained and unethically distributed, when the practice is normalised it also arguably contributes to social harms through reinforcing social hierarchies of gender, sexuality, ethnicity and ability, and limiting the 'space for action' (Kelly, 2003, drawing on Lundgren's 1998 work) for some groups of people (see McGlynn et al., 2020, for how this is also a way that image-based sexual abuse harms individual victim-survivors).

44   See, for example, Albury, Crawford, Byron, & Mathews (2013), Dobson & Ringrose (2016), Handyside & Ringrose (2017), Johansen, Pedersen, & Tjørnhøj-Thomsen (2019), Lippman & Campbell (2014), Ringrose, Gill, Livingstone, & Harvey (2012), Ringrose, Harvey, Gill, & Livingstone (2013), Ringrose & Harvey (2015), Salter (2016a), Setty (2019), S. E. Thomas (2018), Walker, Sanci, & Temple-Smith (2013).

Note, that just as measuring the prevalence of sending nudes is challenging (see Note 39), so too it is difficult to ascertain with certainty the incidence and prevalence of image-based sexual abuse. It is difficult to know how much of what particular behaviours are being done, to whom, and by whom. All forms of sexual violence are difficult to define in terms that can be operationalised and measured without losing important contextual information that affects the meanings of the acts being measured (e.g., see Gavey, 2019a). Representative samples of the population, furthermore, are difficult and expensive to study. A further complication in measuring image-based sexual abuse in particular, is that it can occur without the target of the abuse always knowing it has occurred. These caveats should be kept in mind when reading research on image-based sexual abuse. For instance, Netsafe's (2019) survey-based finding that the prevalence of image-based sexual abuse is low in New Zealand may have been shaped by having measured only a subset of the wider field of image-based sexual abuse. That is, cases where the target or victim-survivor knows their images have been onshared without their consent. Similarly, while some quantitative studies report a similar prevalence of image-based sexual abuse for women and men, these raw numbers don't tell

the full story. As Netsafe (2019) notes, these findings do not gel with their agency's observations in their role as the "Approved Agency under the Act" (p. 9), providing guidance and support to members of the public. In that role, "the reports we receive about 'revenge porn' are mainly from women", and the nature and degree of distress that women and men report is very different (p. 5).

45 See, for example, Burén & Lunde (2018), Cooper, Quayle, Jonsson, & Svedin (2016), Englander (2012), Kernsmith, Victor, & Smith-Dardon (2018), Klettke, Hallford, & Mellor (2014), Lippman & Campbell (2014), Ringrose et al. (2012), S. E. Thomas (2018), Thorburn et al. (2021), Walker et al. (2013).

46 Netsafe (2017). Twenty-four per cent of the girls surveyed had been asked for an image of themselves over the past 12 months, compared to 14 per cent of boys. See also Thorburn et al. (2021).

47 S. E. Thomas (2018, pp. 195, 192). See also Thorburn et al. (2021).

48 A focus group study of 95 New Zealand teenagers concluded that "boys are more likely to share nude images of girls than girls of boys" (Ministry for Women and Netsafe, 2017, p. 24). Correspondingly, Gordon-Messer, Bauermeister, Grodzinski, and Zimmerman (2013, p. 304) cited studies finding young men were more likely than young women to receive "second-hand sext content".

49 See, for example, Dobson & Ringrose (2016), Handyside & Ringrose (2017), Salter (2016a), S. E. Thomas (2018), Walker et al. (2013).

Note that Netsafe (2018) found that girls were more likely to be more adversely affected than boys by unwanted digital communications in general (more broadly defined).

50 Salter (2016a, p. 2728).

51 See Note 159 in relation to 'sextortion'.

52 Thorburn et al. (2021), Gavey et al. (2021).

53 See, for example, Dobson & Ringrose (2016), S. E. Thomas (2018), Walker et al. (2013); see also Burkitt (2015).

54 Dobson & Ringrose (2016, p.18).

55 Our workshops did not raise the issue of boys and men sending girls and women unsolicited pictures of penises, although this behaviour would be within the scope of our interest in online sexual harassment and sexualised abuse. This practice has routinely been minimised and trivialised as (implicitly humorous and harmless) 'dick pics', but feminist scholars are increasingly recognising the harmful and sexist nature of such gendered intrusions (e.g., McGlynn & Johnson, 2021; Thorburn, 2018). McGlynn and Johnson argue that this behaviour is more appropriately recognised as "cyberflashing".

56 Henry & Powell (2015b).

For a review of empirical research on "digitally-facilitated sexual violence" against adults, see Henry and Powell (2018), and for further discussion of the issues see Powell and Henry (2017).

57 See, for example, Jane (2017), Mantilla (2013), McGlynn & Rackley (2017), McGlynn et al. (2020), Penny (2013), Powell & Henry (2017), Thompson (2018).

58 For recent New Zealand research related to pornography and young people, see Classification Office (2020), Office of Film and Literature Classification (2018), and Pearson, Powell, Denholm, and Robertson (2018). See also In the Know (n.d.) and The Light Project (2018); and for an earlier social action project that aimed to raise conversations about the sexism, racism and misogyny within mainstream pornography, see Sexual Politics Now (2013).

59 Dooney (2017b), Hundreds of Wellington college girls protest at parliament to highlight rape culture (2017).

60 Bevacqua (2000), Gavey (2009).

61 Norma McLean (14 years old), quoted in Dooney (2017b).

62 See Blackett (2016), Jackson (2018), and Sills et al. (2016) for relevant New Zealand research.

63 See Schmidt (2019) for a recent story of high school girls in the United States fighting back against a culture of 'toxic masculinity' in their school, inspired by MeToo.

64 Boys and girls present a united front against rape culture (2017).

65 For example, see Dooney (2017b).

66 Towle (2017).

67 Successful protest at Parliament against rape culture (2017).

68 Kasey McDonnell, speaking in radio interview on RNZ National (Boys join girls protest against rape culture, 2017).

69 Josh Stewart, speaking in radio interview on RNZ National (Boys join girls protest against rape culture, 2017).

70 Thorburn et al. (2021), Gavey et al. (2021); see also Calder-Dawe & Gavey (2016), Sills et al. (2016).

71 See, for example, Netsafe (2015, 2016). See Gavey et al. (2021) for a critique of this approach from the point of view of secondary school girls.

72 Clancy, Klettke, & Hallford (2019, p. 270).

73 Flood (2017); see also Flood (2019a, 2019b).

Elsewhere, Flood (2011, p. 359) argues "we have no choice but to address men and masculinities if we want to stop violence against women".

74 See, for example, Barker, Ricardo, & Nascimento (2007), HeForShe (n.d.).

75 See, for example, Baker (2013), Flood (2019a), Flood & Howson (2015), Jewkes, Flood, & Lang (2015), Katz (2018), Kaufman (2001, 2012), Messner, Greenberg, & Peretz (2015), Messner (2016).

76 See Gavey (2019a).

77 Barker et al. (2007).

78 Jewkes, Flood, & Lang (2015).

79 HeForShe (n.d.).

80 UN Women (2014). Note that later wording calls on "men and people of all genders" (HeForShe, n.d.).

81 See, for example, Gender Equal NZ (n.d.), New Zealand Family Planning (2015), White Ribbon (n.d. b). See also New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (2019b), New Zealand Parliamentarians' Group on Population and Development (2015).

82 Sydney Boys High School Gender Equality Project (2011).

83 Brown (2017).

84 Gillette (2019a); see Gillette (2019b).

85 For example, Flood (2017).

86 For critical discussion of the pitfalls of strategically 'drawing on masculinity' to implicitly or explicitly call upon men to 'man up' to curb their own violent behaviour, or to protect women from other men's violence, see for example, Bridges (2010), McCaughey and Cermele (2017), Messner (2016), Murphy (2009), Pascoe and Hollander (2016), and Salter (2016b, 2016c). Michael Salter (2016c, p. 464) further critiques the tendency for primary prevention campaigns in "high income countries" to focus almost exclusively on gender norms while forgetting how structural forms of gender inequality, manifest in social, political and economic disparities, contribute to violence against women. Targeting these structural inequalities, he argues, is a critical component for any comprehensive strategy.

87 See, for example, Barker et al. (2007), Dworkin, Fleming, & Colvin (2015), Gupta (2001).

88 For an important, recently published, discussion about the challenges and promise of "gender transformative" approaches to preventing men's and boys' violence against women and girls see Brush and Miller (2019a, 2019b), Dworkin and Barker (2019), Hollander and Pascoe (2019), and Orchowski (2019). See also Salter (2016c) and Flood (2019a) for different views related to the gender transformative approach adopted in Australia in particular.

89 Bertelsen, Sørensen, & Jensen (2019), Gavey & Farley (2021), Hearn & McKie (2010).

90 For recent examples: The 2019 "Wellbeing Budget", which allocated unprecedented sums to address social issues including "family and sexual violence", did not use the words gender or women at all in its list of funding initiatives in these areas (Government of New Zealand, 2019). In a report released by the Office of the Chief Science Advisor (Lambie, 2018), on preventing family violence, the umbrella term "family violence" subsumes the specific problem of men's intimate partner violence against women and yet is defined in completely gender neutral terms. While "gender" and "women" are mentioned in the report, there is no sustained gender analysis of violence against women or "family violence".

This mirrors the framing of "family violence" in the government's landmark prevention strategy, released in 2001 (Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy, 2002). Again, while recognising that "perpetrators of the most severe and lethal cases of family violence are predominantly male" and that "victims of the most severe and lethal cases of family violence are predominantly women and children" (p. 8), and mentioning "promot[ing] healthy gender roles and responsibilities, and non-violent concepts of masculinity" (p. 14), these key gendered observations lie buried within a definition and analysis of the problem that is framed in gender neutral terms. Overall, the strategy refrains from offering any sustained gender analysis of the problem. We see this carrying through to practice in the way that the government's "It's Not OK" prevention campaign website, for example, has provided information on "what is family violence?" and "who is impacted?" that is strictly un-gendered (Family Violence. It's Not OK, n.d. b, n.d. c).

At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that in other ways the New Zealand approach to the primary prevention of "family violence" has been sophisticated and thoughtful, and has achieved successes, such as increased awareness of the issue (Point Research, 2010; Roguski, 2015). Despite a largely gender neutral approach to the campaign (note that a 2015 evaluation document [Roguski, 2015] doesn't mention "gender" once), some phases of its national media campaign took an implicitly gendered approach, featuring men who had been violent talking about how they stopped (Point Research, 2010). Also, as the campaign takes a community-based approach that promotes locally led initiatives, other less nationally visible interventions may have taken more gendered approaches.

For earlier critiques of gender neutral discourse about violence against women in New Zealand, see Gavey (2005b) and Towns (2005); see also Gavey and Farley (2021). Based on her qualitative research with young men about their "understandings of control, power and equality in boyfriend/girlfriend relationships", Towns (2009) earlier recommended a gender transformative approach to prevention in New Zealand.

91 There are promising signs this is beginning to change. Within the nongovernmental sector, for example, White Ribbon New Zealand, the high profile organisation that leads campaigns to encourage men "to be part of the solution to ending violence against women" (White Ribbon New Zealand, n.d. a), has in recent years adopted a gender trans-formative approach (Baker, 2018; McCann, 2018). Their most recent 2019 campaign, "Challenge the #unspoken rules", explicitly targets and seeks to undermine the unhelpful "expectations that boys and young men inherit from society, based on outdated ideas of what a man is, how he acts, and how he should express himself" (White Ribbon New Zealand, 2019). This includes masculine norms around emotional stoicism and "toughness", and male dominance, which are framed in terms of "unhealthy masculinity", and linked to men's violence against women, other boys and men, children, and themselves. The messages in this campaign represent a noticeable shift in emphasis compared to earlier campaigns, such as the 2016 (and subsequent) "Respectful relationships" campaign. That campaign called upon men to treat women respectfully, model respectful behaviour and (to a lesser extent) be prepared to "stand up" and "speak out" against violence towards women (White Ribbon New Zealand, n.d. c, 2017). While that campaign was framed with reference to the importance of "flexible gender behaviour for men and women" as a basis for respectful relationships (as well as equality, non-violent communication and "respectful sexual relationships"), it didn't focus on this in depth.

Recent independent grassroots initiatives also represent change in this direction. For example, Matt Brown and Sarah Brown's "She is not your rehab" movement (see Brown, 2019; She is not your rehab, 2019).

In the governmental sector, also, movement towards an explicit and sustained gendered lens is evident for the first time. For example, the most recent report of the Family Violence Death Review Committee is focused on "men who use violence" (Family Violence Death Review Committee, 2020). And in the prevention sphere, developments are underway to launch prevention campaigns framed in response to the problem of *men's* violence, explicitly recog-nising it as a structural issue linked to "gender inequities" (Campaign for Action on Family Violence: Framework for Change 2019–2023, 2020).

92 In New Zealand family violence is the 'polite term' for men's violence against women intimate partners. However, it also refers to other forms of abuse within the family.

93 See, for example, Beres (2018), Gavey (2019a); see also New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (2017).

94 Our Watch, Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS) and VicHealth (2015, p. 19). See also Flood (2019a), Our Watch (2017, 2019a), Pease (2014b), VicHealth (2012).

The notion that sexual violence against women exists on a continuum has been used by several researchers (Kelly, 1988). It was developed in depth by influential U.K. feminist scholar, Liz Kelly (1987, 1988), to draw links between "the more common, everyday abuses women experience with the less common experiences labelled as crimes" (Kelly, 1987, p. 59). Empirical research published in the United States in the 1980s also consolidated a continuum approach to understanding sexual violence in particular (Gavey, 2005a). Note also that influential Australian academics working in the field, such as Michael Flood (2019a) and Bob Pease (2014b) deliberately refer to *men's* violence against women; see also Hearn and McKie (2008).

95 This is not to suggest that other people are not also subject to interpersonal forms of violence, but rather to highlight how women are disproportionately (relative to men) subject to violence because of their gender. LGBTQ+ people are also more likely to be subject to gender violence, and the specific drivers associated with that violence also need to be explored. Gavey (2019a) argues that the underlying causes of men's sexual violence against LGBTQ people may be similar to the causes of men's sexual violence against women.

96 Our Watch, Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS) and VicHealth (2015, p. 5). See also Webster & Flood (2015).

This policy framework is implemented by Our Watch, the organisation established to lead "Australia's work to stop violence against women and their children before it starts". It works to "to drive nationwide change in the structures, norms and practices that lead to violence against women and children" (Our Watch, 2019c). For further discussion of the Australian approach associated with this framework, in relation to critiques of a public health model of violence prevention, see Flood (2019a).

For information and resources showing how such strategic thinking about the connection between gender inequality and violence translates into policy vision, see the Our Watch (2021) website. See also MacNeill, Coles, and Vincent's (2018, p. 1) government-commissioned scoping of projects from around the world that aims to help inform those "who seek to contribute to the goal of achieving gender equality through the arts and creative industries".

97 See Baker (2013) and Towns (2009) for other New Zealand researchers who have previously called for a "gender transformative" approach to violence prevention. See also Robertson & Oulton (2008).

98 Mataira (2008, p. 36).

99 Mataira (2008, p. 38).

100 Mataira (2008, p. 39).

Wairua refers to "soul, spirit" (Mead, 2003, p. 507). For more detail, see Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (n.d.). For tikanga, see Note 31.

101 Mataira (2008, p. 38).

Aroha means "affection, sympathy, charity, compassion, love, empathy" (Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index, n.d.); "love, respect, compassion" (Mead, 2003, p. 495). For an in-depth discussion of aroha, from the perspective of Māori women who have been in relationships with men who were abusive or violent towards them, see Wilson, Mikahere-Hall, Jackson, Cootes, and Sherwood (2019).

Tika means "appropriate behaviour, good grace" (Mead, 2003, p. 506); "truth, correctness, directness, justice, fairness, righteousness, right" (Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index, n.d.).

Pono means "true to the principles of culture" (Mead, 2003, p. 501); "be true, valid, honest, genuine, sincere" (Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index, n.d.).

102 Mataira (2008, p. 39).

103 King & Robertson (2017, p. 211).

While his focus is not on domestic violence, see also Rua (2015).

104 King & Robertson (2017, p. 216).

Mataira (2008, p. 38) similarly speaks of Māori men needing to "work to actively redefine our narrative".

105 King & Robertson (2017, p. 214); see also Hokowhitu (2004).

106 Our sociocultural approach draws from Michel Foucault's theories of discourse and disciplinary power (see Gavey, 2019a), and his concept of pouvoir-savoir (Spivak, 1993; see also Calder-Dawe & Gavey, 2019; Gavey, 2019a). The concept of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1979) helps to explain how human behaviour is regulated through socially dispersed, often subtle, means even in the absence of 'top down' force, authority, and direct instruction. Instead it works through inducing us to comply with social norms (see Bartky, 1988; Gavey, 2005a).

107 The significance of this concept is explicated by Spivak (1993); see also Gavey (2019a).

108 Spivak (1993, p. 34).

109 The notion of what is 'normative' deserves some explanation. Here it refers not to what 'normal' in the sense of a set of behaviours that every man does, or a set of characteristics that every man has, but to a pattern of behaviours, characteristics and expectations that provide an implicit template for being a man (see Gavey, 2019a). In particular, as Raewyn Connell and James Messerschmidt (2005, p. 832) noted with regard to the normative "pattern of practices" associated with "hegemonic masculinity", they constitute "the currently most honored way of being a man". What is important to recognise about normative patterns, scripts and expectations for masculinity (as they take shape, differently, across time, culture and place), is that they help to produce men as socially legible *as men* (see Hollander & Pascoe, 2019; see also Brush & Miller, 2019b). All men are compared and measured against them – by others and themselves. Even if individual men resist, reject or contest normative models of masculinity, there is no way of avoiding being positioned in relation to them.

110 Bodies such as the American Psychological Association (2018) and the World Health Organisation (2018) have recently questioned the limiting and potentially harmful effects of rigid gender norms (and examined the impact of gender equality [WHO, 2018]) on men's health and wellbeing. Within popular culture, we are also witnessing a trend towards questioning traditional stereotypes for men. In U.S. advertising, for example, advertisements for products for men "have lately turned away from old notions of square-jawed masculinity" (Hsu, 2019). Some, explicitly influenced by the MeToo movement, have adopted a position that is even directly critical of 'toxic masculinity', such as the much talked about Gillette advertisement (e.g., Gillette, 2019a, 2019b; not without controversy [e.g., Topping, Lyons, & Weaver, 2019]). Also influenced by MeToo, some men artists are following in the footsteps of longstanding feminist tradition, producing music and comedy tackling the problem of rigid gender norms and, in particular, problematic cultural scripts for masculinity (e.g., see Farber, 2019).

111 Antevska & Gavey (2015).

112 Gavey (2015).

113 Antevska & Gavey (2015, p. 662).

114 See, for example, Aspin & Hutchings (2007), Kerekere (2017), Mikaere (1999, 2017); see also Te Awekotuku (1991).

115 See, for example, Hokowhitu (2007). In some ways this is changing, particularly in relation to sexuality, with growing recognition of takatāpui, for example.

116   Freire (1970, 1972).

For further discussion of our approach in drawing on the work of Foucault and Freire and feminist scholarship to design a change-oriented methodology, see Calder-Dawe and Gavey (2019). Note that other approaches to working with men to prevent gendered violence against women have also drawn on Freire's ideas (see, for example, Katz, 2018; Rich, 2010; Promundo-US and University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, 2018). See also Fenaughty (2019), who advocates a critical pedagogy approach, drawing on Freire and others, for addressing homophobic and transphobic bullying. See also Calder-Dawe (2014), Trewartha (2020).

117   Freire (1970, p. 452).

118   Calder-Dawe & Gavey (2019), Freire (1972).

119   Freire (1972, p. 54).

120   In relation to gender equality in particular, see, for example, Gender Equal NZ (2018), Ministry for Women (2020), World Economic Forum (2019).

121   For example, American Psychological Association (2018), Certified male: Promoting healthier masculinities (2019), World Health Organisation (2018).

See, however, Pease (2014a, p. 550) for an important critique of moves to foreground "men's interests, needs, and concerns in relation to gender equality" in relation to engaging them to promote gender equality and challenge men's violence against women.

122   For a description of our conventions for transcribing and reporting boys' speech, see Appendix B.

123   The model we propose is designed for boys and young men who hold values like equality, justice and inclusion, and who are open to reflection, having challenging conversations, and supporting change. It is important to acknowledge that the 'myth of masculinity' (Bergoffen, 2012, 2014; Gavey, 2019a) has a powerful hold over some men and boys, who are highly invested in embodying traditional models of masculinity which are premised on notions of men's invulnerability, superiority and dominance. Attempting to raise the sorts of issues we did in our workshops with groups of boys and young men in this situation would no doubt require a slower pace and a lot of additional care and scaffolding work to avoid defensiveness, derision and hostility.

124   Although students 16 years and above were invited to participate, at one of the sessions two 15 year old students turned up and were not turned away.

125   We use the term 'dominant discourses' in a way that is associated with the work of Michel Foucault (see Gavey, 2005a). By discourses, we mean the interrelated "system[s] of statements which cohere around common meanings and values" that "are a product of social factors, of powers and practices, rather than an individual's set of ideas" (Hollway, 1983, p. 231).

126   Calder-Dawe, Benton-Greig, Gavey, & Smith (2018).

127   Gavey, Taylor, & Benton-Greig (2018).

128   Gavey, Taylor, & Benton-Greig (2018).

129   Manaakitanga as defined in Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (n.d.).

130   Smith & Cram (2001; cited in Rautaki Ltd and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, n.d.); see also Jones, Crengle, & McCreanor (2006).

131   The Gender Equal NZ survey found that a high percentage of a representative sample of survey respondents agreed with statements like "gender equality in New Zealand is a fundamental right" (79%) and "tackling gender inequality in New Zealand is necessary to establish a fairer society" (78%) (Gender Equal NZ, 2018, p. 25). Although this finding has to be read cautiously, because of people's different understandings of what gender equality means, and what groups of people respondents thought were most affected by inequality, it does at least indicate that most New Zealanders are likely to agree in principle with the value of gender equality.

132   Taylor, Calder-Dawe, Gavey, Le Grice, Thorburn, Manuela, Dudley, & Panditharatne (2021).

133   The Line was a violence against women primary prevention social marketing campaign, addressed to young people, and run by Australia's Our Watch (see Tracking Change: Snapshot evaluation findings for The Line campaign 2015 to 2017, n.d.).

134   Video 1: What's it like for guys? (Calder-Dawe et al., 2017). In this video actors voiced the words of local teenagers who were interviewed about gender as part of Octavia Calder-Dawe's (2017) doctoral research.

135   While talk about the social expectations for boys and men tended to focus on characteristics like strength, and being a provider and protector, some participants referred to expectations that are in some ways the flip side of this more traditional masculinity – "getting" rather than protecting girls. For example, as one boy said: "Um, guys are expected to, do the hard work, get the girls, and, play sports, to impress girls". This was not a strong feature of our workshop discussions about social expectations for men, however.

136 Later in the report we discuss the importance of peer group belonging which boys gave us the impression would constrain many boys' behaviour, encouraging them to fit in with peer group norms. Although on the surface this valuing of 'being your own man' could appear at odds with this 'fitting in with the group', we would suspect that the behaviour of a boy who was seen to be 'being his own man' would likely only be noticed and appreciated by others when it exhibited particular qualities valued by that group. However, we can only speculate on this as our research did not explore this question in any detail.

137 See Edley and Wetherell (1997) for a detailed analysis of the contradictory ways in which some boys in a U.K. secondary school distanced themselves from the kind of masculinity associated with "the rugby lads" (p. 207). In their case, Edley and Wetherell argued that while these boys "built a critique of a form of masculinity" (p. 215) associated with "'sporty or hard lads'" (p. 208), "there was also complicity" in the way that they did this, because they still drew on key characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity such as strength, arguing that their form of it was superior. Our workshops did not generate the kind of discussion that would have elaborated whether or not this kind of dynamic was active among the boys who participated in this study. However, it is the sort of dynamic that workshop facilitators would want to be alert to, and question, if it arose.

138 This echoes findings from overseas research (see Chapter 7). We note that the term the 'flight from femininity' has previously been used by Kimmel (1994, p. 127).

139 See Maglaty (2011), Paoletti (2012).

140 This association of gendered meanings with alcohol is unsurprising. Several New Zealand studies have examined ways in which alcohol marketing explicitly pitches exaggerated models of masculinity, how such associations are woven into masculine identities, and how drinking practices can be associated with the performance of masculinity (e.g., Campbell, 2000; Towns, Parker, & Chase, 2012; Willott & Lyons, 2012; see also McCreanor, Moewaka Barnes, Kaiwai, Borell, & Gregory, 2008).

141 Taika fleshed out what banter meant in his peer group: "Yeah in our group there, isn't a line where it comes to banter, there, there's, it's, we're jumping between insulting offending and joking".

142 Contrary to this, it is interesting to observe the reporting and cautious endorsement, in at least some sectors of the mainstream media, of All Blacks players and coaching staff showing vulnerable emotions after their loss in the 2019 Rugby World Cup semi-final (e.g., Norquay, 2019).

143 See, for example, Bird (1996), Duckworth & Trautner (2019), Oransky & Marecek (2009); see Chapter 7 for further discussion.

144 American Psychological Association (2018).
See also Matt Brown's (2019) powerful talk about the damaging effects on men (and those around them) of their childhood hurt, trauma and misrecognition in a social context that encourages boys and men to suppress their painful emotions.

145 It is also possible that as a Māori young man, Nikau's "two opinions" could be informed through his experience of walking in both te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā; although the workshop format and length did not allow for exploration of this.

146 See also Hyde, Drennan, Howlett, & Brady (2009), Pascoe (2012).

147 As Pascoe also observed, in public settings "boys tended to close off, hide, or otherwise deny emotional attachments to girls" (Pascoe, 2012, p. 159).

148 For example, Pascoe (2012). See also Kehily & Nayak (1997), Kimmel (2008).

149 Pascoe (2005, 2012).
This also likely applies in relation to other social distinctions. For example, Hyde et al. (2009, p. 243) noted that Irish secondary school boys used labels "strongly reinforcing a culture of compulsory heterosexuality, and promoting a clear notion of homosexuality as something abject", and that the strength of this kind of policing talk varied in relation to the socioeconomic location of the schools.

150 Pascoe (2005, 2012).

151 Pascoe (2013, p. 88). See also Hyde et al. (2009).

152 The quote we used was drawn from Ringrose et al.'s (2012, p. 43) qualitative study with U.K. school students.

153 Hollander and Pascoe (2019, p. 1684) make the important point that:
"Often, boys do not even see these discursive practices as problematic because they do not actually match their attitudes or ideologies, thus allowing such homophobia to be relegated to the realm of joking or teasing when really it is conveying serious and perhaps deadly messages about what it means to be a man and what happens if you are not one."
According to masculinities theorist, Michael Kimmel (2008), 'homophobia' is less "the irrational fear of gay men" or "the fear that we [men] might be perceived as gay" (p. 131); rather it is "men's fear of other men" (p. 135), and the fear that they will be judged by other men as weak and unmanly (p. x).

154 Pascoe (2012, 2013).

155 For example, at one point a participant invoked a biologically determinist interpretation of stereotypical gender roles: "I don't know like, I feel like some- a lot of the gender roles that are, we're used to hearing kind of goes back to the hunter-gatherer sort of aspect from, you know ancient times, so".

156 Note the actual name of the school is Nelson College for Girls.

157 The concept of 'externalising the problem' was developed as a therapeutic technique within Michael White and David Epston's (1990) Foucauldian-influenced approach to narrative therapy. It encourages people to objectify problems that they find oppressive, separating the problem from themselves and their relationships, thereby opening up alternative ways of understanding it in the context of their lives. White and Epston argued that this can free people and families from problems that have proved obstinate when they were seen as being located *within* an individual. At the same time, they argued, it can enhance responsibility: "practices associated with externalizing of problems .... foster a new sense of personal agency; with this, persons are able to assume responsibility for the investigation of new choices in their lives and to pursue new possibilities. In the process, they experience a newfound capacity to intervene in their world" (p. 65).

158 These quotes were, respectively: "I guess there is a sort of expectation put on [guys] that they should have sexual desires ... like girls are not expected to be like that but guys kind of are, like it's more acceptable" (girl quoted in Gavey, Benton-Greig, Calder-Dawe, Thorburn, Wech, & Single, 2016; see also Thorburn et al., 2021); "It's usually because they like the boy/girl who asked for the nude pics and they'll do whatever he/she says just to make him/her like them or ask them out. That's what happens with girls at my school, don't know if it's the same elsewhere" (girl quoted in Netsafe, 2017, p. 30).

159 It is possible that Ari was thinking more widely of the potential for different kinds of image-based sexual abuse, as there had been recent concern in his school about 'sextortion' that had targeted boys. This potentially very harmful form of image-based sexual abuse involves a perpetrator obtaining nude or sexually explicit images of someone, and threatening to distribute those images unless further images are provided (see McGlynn, Rackley, & Houghton, 2017; Powell & Henry, 2017). This criminal practice "is essentially a form of blackmail and entrapment" (Powell & Henry, 2017, p. 124) that can be perpetrated by someone completely unknown to the victim; and is in many ways not characteristic of the more usual forms of sexual harassment and sexualised abuse that occur within teenage peer contexts. Netsafe (2019, p. 5) note that men are more likely than women to seek their support in relation to "'sextortion scams'" (while it is mainly women who report experiences of "'revenge porn'").

160 See, for example, Flood (2008), Kimmel (2008); see also Hyde et al. (2009), Duckworth & Trautner (2019).

161 Gavey et al. (2016).

162 Within the literature, some studies have referred to pressures on boys and young men to seek and share girls' nudes, with inconsistent findings. Melissa Burkett (2015, p. 845), for instance, noted: "In contrast to Walker et al.'s (2013) findings, in which it was asserted that young men in their study experienced pressure to 'request and show each other images of girls' (p. 699), and Ringrose et al.'s (2012) observations that males risk peer exclusion if they do not engage in this practice of 'bragging', none of the males in the present study expressed any pressure to engage in this behaviour or risked exclusion if they refrained – either now or when they were younger."

163 For example, Flood (2008); see also Kimmel (2008).

164 See, for example, Bird (1996), Kimmel (2008); see also Flood (2008).

165 See also Albury et al. (2013), Johansen et al. (2019), Salter (2016a).

166 McGlynn & Rackley (2017).

167 Hall & Hearn (2019).

168 Sacha, David and Nathan's references to suicidality and suicide, as a worst case scenario potential consequence of image-based sexual abuse, has in some cases been born out. In relation to the well-publicised stories of North American teenagers, Audrie Pott and Rehtaeh Parsons, see Burleigh (2013) and Segal (2015), respectively; for further discussion of the potential harms of image-based sexual abuse see McGlynn et al. (2020).

169 While these boys are primarily discussing the way that humour can work to minimise serious concerns or to provide a 'cover' for disrespectful and potentially abusive behaviour, other researchers have also discussed the ways in which humour can be used to more directly denigrate and undermine others. For example, in their ethnographic work in two English secondary schools, Kehily and Nayak (1997, p. 84) found that boys' humour operated as "a regulatory technique, structuring the performance of masculine identities". Working in this way, humour can function to bolster male dominance in general, as well as to police hierarchies among boys and men.

170 Some participants remained more ambivalent about the ethics of showing rather than sending a girl's nudes to other boys.

171 In his research with Australian young men, Flood (2008) refers to "codes of mateship" to describe this dynamic. As one of his participants said, "You never jack [tell] on your mates, you will always be there for your mates, you'll always look after your mates, and as far as a mate is concerned, they always come first" (p. 344). Flood describes how this extreme privileging of homosocial bonds among young heterosexual men can shape and police their social and sexual behaviour in ways that can be very problematic within some groups of men.

172 Conversation analysis is an approach to studying the patterns and structures of everyday 'talk-in-interaction'. It highlights the implicit rules that people follow in producing and understanding talk within ordinary conversations. As a methodology for studying interaction, it seeks "to uncover the often tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction" (Hutchby & Woffitt, 2008, p. 12). Assumptions about how this works are shared among people who speak the same language in the same cultural context. According to Weatherall (2002, p. 99), they are what "people use to structure the ongoing business of everyday life" and "promote common understandings and help co-ordinate social action".

173 This is not to say that boys did not have physical safety concerns related to 'snitching', but if they did, they may not have felt it was appropriate to articulate those in the research context.

174 Wei is referring to the New Zealand political party, ACT.

175 While this sentiment was shared by boys from different social and cultural contexts, it is important to recognise that there may be additional cultural constraints on talking about sexuality in general for Pasifika young people, as Veukiso-Ulugia (2017) discusses in relation to Samoan young people in Aotearoa New Zealand.

176 See Note 133.

177 See also Kimmel (1994).

178 See, for example, Bannister (2005, 2006), Hokowhitu (2004), Phillips (1996).

179 Phillips (1996, p. 289). Bannister (2006, p. 21) also noted: "Many of the customary forms of homosocial interaction within New Zealand society – work, sport – do not allow participants to express feelings or be responsible for them".

180 For example, in a large 1995 Department of Justice research project examining men's "abuse of women partners" and their views on the issue, the authors concluded: "If there is any one message from this research, it is that we, individually and as a society, have to be responsible for changing our expectations of 'what it is to be a man' in order to reduce the abuse of women" (Leibrich, Paulin, & Ransom, 1995, p. 151).

In reviewing this report, Ken McMaster (1995, p. 2), the National Convenor for Men for Non-Violence, noted: "Practitioners will welcome the findings of this report in that it confirms what clinicians have known for a long time. It supports the notion of masculinity being culturally determined and at the root of physical and psychological abuse. When men are thwarted in their search for a traditional masculine identity, when they find, for example, that they are unable to measure up to the image they may hold of the strong, silent, successful breadwinner, it is then that they are more likely to be abusive towards their female partners."

(For a related argument, see Gavey [2019a] for a discussion of the role of the 'myth of masculinity' in relation to sexual violence.)

181 Hokowhitu (2007, p. 64).

182 Hokowhitu (2004).

183 For example, Heilman, Barker, & Harrison (2017), Heilman, Guerrero-López, Ragonese, Kelberg, & Barker (2019), The Men's Project and Flood (2018). The concept of the 'the man box' was originally developed in the 1980s by Paul Kivel and the Oakland Men's Project (and originally referred to as "the Act Like a Man Box", see Kivel, 1992). In the 1990s, the term itself was refined by Tony Porter, who further developed the concept and brought it to a wider audience (see Greene, 2019).

184 The Men's Project & Flood (2018).

185 Greene (2019).

186 Heilman et al. (2017).

187 Greene (2019).

188 The Men's Project & Flood (2018).

189 Heilman et al. (2019).

190 See, for example, Connell & Messerschmidt (2005), Edley & Wetherell (1997), Hokowhitu (2004), Jewkes, Morrell, Hearn, Lundqvist, Blackbeard, Lindegger, Quayle, Sikweyiya, & Gottzén (2015), King & Robertson (2017), Oransky & Marceck (2009), Rua (2015) – who all make this point in different ways. At the same time, scholars have highlighted how plural, and even "hybrid", forms of masculinity do not necessarily challenge – and may even obscure – gendered power relations and gendered inequalities (see, for example, Bridges, 2014; Bridges & Pascoe, 2014).

191 Campbell (2000, p. 576).

192 Bird (1996, p. 125).

See also Kimmel (1994), and Oransky and Marecek (2009, p. 234), who noted from their interviews with U.S. high school student boys that:

"A central finding was that the boys organized their self-presentations, friendships, and many of their emotion practices in light of peer group expectations and assumptions about masculinity and what they identified as its antitheses, girlishness and homosexuality."

193 Pascoe (2012, p. xv); see also Pascoe (2005). Pascoe argues that we must address the critical role of masculinity in "homophobic harassment and heteronormative behaviour" (p. xiv), pointing to "the way in which gay but normatively masculine men are somewhat acceptable, but a gay or straight boy who fails at contemporary enactments of masculinity is vilified" (p. xv).

194 Duckworth & Trautner (2019, p. 803).

195 Duckworth & Trautner (2019, p. 814).

It is interesting to note here the findings from a large early New Zealand survey study of men's perceptions of "domestic abuse" of women partners (Leibrich et al., 1995, p. 141), in which the authors found that despite most men knowing that the physical abuse of women was a "major problem" and a crime, and many not condoning it, "a substantial proportion of men did report abusive behaviour towards their women partners and show an underlying acceptance of domestic abuse" (see also McMaster, 1995). Although there are important differences between this study and Duckworth and Trautner's (2019, p. 814) (specifically, the reference point of abuse perpetration versus bystander intervention – "speaking and standing up to others"), both highlight how a gulf can exist between ostensibly progressive shifts in relation to gender and masculinity and the behaviour of men that is necessary to instantiate these.

196 Towns & Terry (2014).

197 Towns & Terry (2014, p. 1024, emphasis in original).

Loyalty to mates was also identified as important to the young men (18–35 years) who participated in Town's (2009, p. 7) study of "young men's ideas about control, power and equality in boyfriend/girlfriend relationships and the social and cultural values and beliefs that contribute to these ideas". These sets of findings resonate with Michael Messner's (2016, p. 63) point, drawing on feminist work, that "'overconformity with masculinity' is not just an individual problem or an unhealthy lifestyle choice. It also is a group process that too often over-rides the inclinations of otherwise 'good' individual men, whose desperate need to feel accepted (or at least safe) within a male group keeps them silent and thus complicit in the sexual assaults of women by their brothers".

198 Duckworth & Trautner (2019, p. 803 – both quotes). Although rooted in a different research paradigm, these findings resonate with some of the underlying premises of a "social norms approach" to prevention (e.g., Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003; Orchowski, 2019), and in particular the point that men's willingness to act on values promoting sexual consent, for example, or to act as "social justice allies" (Fabiano et al., 2003, p. 105), is influenced by their perception of others' views and values (see also Gavey & Senn, 2014).

199 This trend must be seen alongside a counter trend, however, epitomised by figures like Jordan Peterson, the Canadian psychologist, advocating a return to old notions of essential sex differences, which are mobilised in hostile and aggressive ways by anti-feminist 'men's rights' and 'incel' groups.

200 For just a few examples, see studies that show some men normalising men's sexual exploitation and violence against women (e.g., Jeffrey & Barata, 2019; Marston & Lewis, 2014) and male sexual domination within pornography (e.g., Antevska & Gavey, 2015; Sun, Ezzell, & Kendall, 2017), as well as more generally disparaging femininity and gay masculinity (Bridges, 2010).

201 Bird (1996, p. 131).

202 Pascoe (2012, p. 157).

203 Māori scholars such as Hokowhitu (2004), King and Robertson (2017), Mataira (2008), and Rua (2015) have expressed similar sentiments, specifically in relation to Māori men. Our approach shares much in common with the theory of change articulated by these authors. However, their deliberate effort to move beyond limiting stereotypical representations of Māori men carries the additional, and pressing, concern for the ways that such representations are not just 'limiting' for men (and dangerous for women), but carry pejorative racist freight when applied to Māori men (as is likely the case for some other groups of men in New Zealand). Furthermore, these authors' work explicitly highlights the value of rich alternative ways of being men that are steeped in Māori values and tikanga.

204 See Calder-Dawe & Gavey (2019).

205 Consistent with our underlying logic, that the ways boys can act and the ways they can understand themselves and their place in the world are shaped by the cultural resources that are available to them, Abbey Hyde and colleagues (2009) also found in their study with Irish schoolboys that "masculinities were shaped through the cultural resources available to the young men and, out of fear of group sanction, their positioning of themselves within prevailing discourses promoted by the peer group" (p. 248).

206 Taylor et al. (2021).

207 See also Katz (2018) about the value of spaces for men to talk openly with each other about such issues.

208 Hokowhitu (2007, p. 64; see also Hokowhitu, 2004).

In writing for a counselling audience, Hokowhitu (2007) emphasises that in working with Māori men it is important to understand "the notion of 'space' in relation to *tikanga Māori*" (p. 75). He advocates for deconstructing "the limitations of the singular Māori masculine stereotypes" (p. 73), suggesting that working effectively with Māori men "is to allow them to broaden the limits imposed on them, to have them recognise that the limits are imaginary and that they can be transcended" (p. 75). See also King and Robertson's (2017) research that deliberately examines "the plurality of Māori masculinities" (p. 213), sharing the stories of men who "discuss how they have attempted to widen the available space in which they can be Māori men" (p. 214); and Rua (2015). See also Mataira (2008, p. 38) who advocates for a "Māori men's practice theory", that "facilitates us to speak out, speak up, and speak to issues".

Vā – a concept across many Pacific cultures – may also be relevant here. Albert Wendt (1996) notes that in the Samoan worldview, for instance, vā is "the space between", the "space that relates" (quoted in Anae, 2019). As vā articulates relationality and holding connections, it may be a useful guide for creating workshop spaces that work in the ways that Hokowhitu and Mataira write about, for Pasifika boys and young men in particular. As Jacoba Matapo describes it, vā evokes similar possibilities for supporting the transcendence of imposed limits: "The vā, as a relational sphere when applied to the teaching and learning environment, becomes a conduit for story creation, storytelling and *story reimagining*" (Matapo, 2020; our emphasis).

209 Whakawhanaungatanga is "the process of establishing relationships, relating well to others" (Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index, n.d.).

210 See Appendix C for a brief report on our interviews with young men who had participated in a performing arts production about gender, and in particular, their experiences of related conversations with other men.

211 Hollander & Pascoe (2019, p. 1686). See also Dworkin et al. (2015), Flood (2017, 2019a, 2019b), Messner (2016), Messner et al. (2015), Pease (2014b), Salter (2016a, 2016c).

212 Mataira (2008, p. 40).

213 Das (2018), Pease (2014a, 2014b). See also Brush & Miller (2019b), Duckworth & Trautner (2019), Hollander & Pascoe (2019), Messner et al. (2015).

214 O'Neill (2015).

215 Das (2018). See also Das & Singh (2014), Pease (2014b).

216 Das (2018). See also Duckworth & Trautner (2019), Flood, Dragiewicz, & Pease (2018), Hollander & Pascoe (2019), Mataira (2008), Pease (2014a, 2014b).

217 Flood et al. (2018, p. 21). See also Katz (2018), Pease (2014b).

For further discussion unpacking the relationship between feminism(s) and the prevention of men's violence against women, see Burrell and Flood (2019) and Messner et al. (2015).

218 Flood (2017, p. 53).

219 Das & Singh (2014, p. 75).

220 Mataira (2008, p. 38). See Note 101 for the meanings of aroha, tika and pono.

221 Mataira (2008, p. 38–39).

222 Mataira (2008); and see, for example, Brown (2019), Flood (2019b), and indirectly Kaufman (1987), Pease (2014a) and Salter (2016b).

223 Such as "committing" online to support HeForShe or wearing a white ribbon or taking "the pledge" to "act to prevent men's violence towards women" (White Ribbon New Zealand, n.d. d).

224 See, for example, Hokowhitu (2004, 2007), King & Robertson (2017), Mataira (2008).

225 Das & Singh (2014, p. 75).

226 Our Watch (2019b). See also Dworkin et al. (2015), Flood (2019a), Messner et al. (2015).

227 Pascoe & Hollander (2016).

228 Relatedly, Hearn and McKie (2008) critique how "'domestic violence'" policy and practice often fails to recognise men's behaviour as "gendered", noting how even in gendered approaches, gender is often equated with women or "limited aspects of gender relations" (p. 78). Instead, they note: "Men's practices (re)producing gender inequality are heavily embedded in social, economic and cultural relations, so that men's dominant or complicit practices may often easily be equated with what is considered as the normal, usual, or even the official way of doing things" (pp. 78–79).

229 This resonates in some ways with Jewkes, Morrell et al.'s (2015, p. S120) discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of the Swedish educational initiative, the Macho Factory (Machofabriken), designed to promote "gender equity" and prevent violence: "it is not enough to create more 'gender equal men' ... gender binaries and power hierarchies have to be deconstructed".

230 Messner (2016, p. 64).

   Several scholars have made similar points; see, for example, Bridges & Pascoe (2014), McCaughey & Cermele (2017); and see Gavey (2019a) for a brief review.

231 Flood (2017, p. 53), Messner et al. (2015, p. 141).

   Note that the concept of the "gendered 'economy of gratitude'" is Arlie Hochschild's (Messner et al. 2015, p. 141). (Gendered economies of gratitude can work in other domains relevant to gender relations – as Terry and Braun [2011] show in relation to men's contraceptive practices.)

232 Das (2018), for example, has noted that some women's rights activists have been concerned "that 'working with men and boys' has emerged as the 'flavor of the month' and may draw both attention – and resources – away from the important task of advancing women's empowerment".

233 Flood (2019b, p. 2). See also Kaufman (2001).

References

Albury, K., Crawford, K., Byron, P., & Mathews, B. (2013). *Young people and sexting in Australia: Ethics, representation and the law.* Sydney, Australia: ARC Centre for Creative Industries and Innovation / Journalism and Media Research Centre, The University of New South Wales. Retrieved January 26, 2021, from https://eprints.qut.edu.au/109550/1/Young_People_And_Sexting_Final.pdf

American Psychological Association (APA), Boys and Men Guidelines Group. (2018, August). *APA guidelines for psychological practice with boys and men.* Retrieved January 10, 2019, from http://www.apa.org/about/policy/psychological-practice-boys-men-guidelines.pdf

Anae, M. (2019). Pacific research methodologies and relational ethics. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education.* Retrieved February 18, 2021, from https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-529

Antevska, A., & Gavey, N. (2015). "Out of sight and out of mind": Detachment and men's consumption of male sexual dominance and female submission in pornography. *Men and Masculinities, 18*(5), 605–629.

Arotake Tūkino Whānau: Literature review on family violence. (2010). Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri. Retrieved May 27, 2020, from https://www.tpk.govt.nz/documents/download/262/tpk-family-violence-literature-review.pdf

Aspin, C., & Hutchings, J. (2007). Reclaiming the past to inform the future: Contemporary views of Māori sexuality. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 9*(4), 415–427.

Auckland woman outs Married at First Sight star for 'misogynistic and disgusting' Tinder messages. (2017, November 6). *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11940980

Baker, G. (2013). *Effectively involving men in preventing violence against women.* Auckland, New Zealand: New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse, The University of Auckland. Retrieved January 10, 2019, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/default/files/issues-paper-5-2013.pdf

Baker, G. (2018). *Report on how White Ribbon New Zealand can align with the #MeToo movement.* White Ribbon Trust. Retrieved October 18, 2019, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Report-on-White-Ribbon-aligning-with-Me-Too-Movement-24072018.pdf

Bannister, M. (2005). Kiwi blokes: Recontextualising white New Zealand masculinities in a global setting. *Genders, 42.* Retrieved November 15, 2019, from http://researcharchive.wintec.ac.nz/217/1/kiwi_blokes.pdf

Bannister, M. (2006). *White boys, white noise: Masculinities and 1980s indie guitar rock.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Barker, G., Ricardo, C., & Nascimento, M. (2007). *Engaging men and boys in changing gender-based inequity in health: Evidence from programme interventions.* Geneva: World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/gender/documents/Engaging_men_boys.pdf

Barker, P. (2018, February 27). How 'toxic masculinity' doesn't even scratch the surface of the issue. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/life-style/life/101814935/how-toxic-masculinity-doesnt-even-scratch-the-surface-of-the-issue

Bartky, S. L. (1988). Foucault, femininity, and the modernization of patriarchal power. In I. Diamond & L. Quinby (Eds.), *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on resistance* (pp. 61–86). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Bates, S. (2017). Revenge porn and mental health: A qualitative analysis of the mental health effects of revenge porn on female survivors. *Feminist Criminology, 12*(1), 22–42.

Benton-Greig, P., Gamage, D., & Gavey, N. (2018). Doing and denying sexism: Online responses to a New Zealand feminist campaign against sexist advertising. *Feminist Media Studies, 18*(3), 349–365.

Beres, M. A. (2018). The proliferation of consent-focused rape prevention social marketing materials. In C. Dale & R. Overell (Eds.), *Orienting feminism: Media, activism and cultural representation* (pp. 181–196). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bergoffen, D. B. (2012). *Contesting the politics of genocidal rape: Affirming the dignity of the vulnerable body.* New York: Routledge.

Bergoffen, D. (2014). (Un)Gendering vulnerability: Rescripting the meaning of male-male rape. *Symposium: Canadian Journal of Continental Philosophy / Revue Canadienne de Philosophie Continentale, 18*(1), 164–175.

Bertelsen, E., Sørensen, W. Ø., & Jensen, M. W. (2019). Intimate partner (sexual) violence: Danish research and policy. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 28*(1), 25–46.

Bevacqua, M. (2000). *Rape on the public agenda: Feminism and the politics of sexual assault.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Biddle, D. (2017, February 24). Issue of consent highlighted by Kuggeleijn rape case. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/89788616/what-is-consent

Bird, S. R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society, 10*(2), 120–132.

Bishop, E. (n.d.). *Boys.* http://www.eleanorbishop.org/boys

Blackett, E. (2016). 'I'm allowed to be angry': Students resist postfeminist education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Women's Studies Journal, 30*(2), 38–52.

Borissenko, S., & Reid, M. (2018, February 14). The summer interns and the law firm. *Newsroom* https://www.newsroom.co.nz/2018/02/14/88663/the-summer-interns-and-the-law-firm#

Boys and girls present a united front against rape culture [Audio podcast]. (2017, March 14). *Radio New Zealand.* Retrieved February 15, 2019, from https://www.radionz.co.nz/audio/player?audio_id=201836483

Boys join girls protest against rape culture [Audio podcast]. (2017, March 13). *Radio New Zealand.* Retrieved February 15, 2019, from https://www.radionz.co.nz/national/programmes/morningreport/audio/201836369/boys-join-girls-protest-against-rape-culture

Bridges, T. S. (2010). Men just weren't made to do this: Performances of drag at "Walk a Mile in Her Shoes" marches. *Gender & Society, 24*(1), 5–30.

Bridges, T. (2014). A very "gay" straight? Hybrid masculinities, sexual aesthetics, and the changing relationship between masculinity and homophobia. *Gender & Society, 28*(1), 58–82.

Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2014). Hybrid masculinities: New directions in the sociology of men and masculinities. *Sociology Compass, 8*(3), 246–258.

Brown, A. (2017, March 8). Sydney Boys High releases video about why feminism is important. *The Sydney Morning Herald.* https://www.smh.com.au/lifestyle/sydney-boys-high-releases-video-about-why-feminism-is-important-20170308-gut1zg.html

Brown, M. (2019, September 23). *The barbershop where men go to heal* [Video]. TEDxChristchurch. YouTube. Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4UhP3OZ9ZCE

Brush, L. D., & Miller, E. (2019a). Authors' response to commentaries on "Trouble in Paradigm". *Violence Against Women, 25*(14), 1689–1695.

Brush, L. D., & Miller, E. (2019b). Trouble in paradigm: "Gender transformative" programming in violence prevention. *Violence Against Women, 25*(14), 1635–1656.

Burén, J., & Lunde, C. (2018). Sexting among adolescents: A nuanced and gendered online challenge for young people. *Computers in Human Behavior, 85*, 210–217.

Burkett, M. (2015). Sex(t) talk: A qualitative analysis of young adults' negotiations of the pleasures and perils of sexting. *Sexuality and Culture, 19*(4), 835–863.

Burleigh, N. (2013, September 17). Sexting, shame and suicide. *Rolling Stone*. https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-news/sexting-shame-and-suicide-72148/

Burrell, S. R., & Flood, M. (2019). Which feminism? Dilemmas in profeminist men's praxis to end violence against women. *Global Social Welfare, 6*(4), 231–244.

Burrows, B. (2018, December 4). Ada Hegerberg: Andy Murray hits out at 'unreal' sexism after Martin Solveig asks Ballon d'Or winner 'do you twerk?' *The Independent*. https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/womens_football/ada-hegerberg-martin-solveig-twerk-ballon-dor-2018-andy-murray-instagram-story-a8666031.html

Calder-Dawe, O. (2014). *Gender, sexism and social activism: A youth workshop resource*. Auckland, New Zealand: Sexual Politics Now, School of Psychology, The University of Auckland. Retrieved March 24, 2017, from http://www.sexualpoliticsnow.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Resource_ONLINE3.pdf

Calder-Dawe, O. (2015). The choreography of everyday sexism: Reworking sexism in interaction. *New Formations, 86*, 89–105.

Calder-Dawe, O. (2017). *"Should I have to learn to live with that?" Dynamic research into gender, sexism and feminism with teenagers* [Doctoral thesis, The University of Auckland]. ResearchSpace. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/34556

Calder-Dawe, O., Benton-Greig, P., Gavey, N., & Smith, R. (2017). *What's it like for guys?* [Video]. Auckland, New Zealand: Sexual Politics Now.

Calder-Dawe, O., & Gavey, N. (2016). Making sense of everyday sexism: Young people and the gendered contours of sexism. *Women's Studies International Forum, 55*, 1–9.

Calder-Dawe, O., & Gavey, N. (2019). Feminism, Foucault, and Freire: A dynamic approach to sociocultural research. *Qualitative Psychology, 6*(3), 216–231.

Campaign for action on family violence: Framework for change 2019–2023. (2020). Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from, https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/initiatives/family-and-sexual-violence/campaign-for-action-on-family-violence-framework-for-change.pdf

Campbell, H. (2000). The glass phallus: Pub(lic) masculinity and drinking in rural New Zealand. *Rural Sociology, 65*(4), 562–581.

Cann, G. (2017, October 19). Facebook page linked to Wellington College students posts meme comparing feminist radio show to cancer. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/98014143/facebook-page-linked-to-wellington-college-students-posts-meme-comparing-feminist-radio-show-to-cancer

Casey, A., & Greive, D. (2016, April 11). 'I will come forward'. *The Spinoff*. https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/11-04-2016/i-will-come-forward/

Cavino, H. M. (2016). Intergenerational sexual violence and whānau in Aotearoa/New Zealand – Pedagogies of contextualisation and transformation. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand, 7*(1), 4–17.

Certified male: Promoting healthier masculinities. (2019, March 7). *VicHealth Letter*, Issue 49. Retrieved April 9, 2019, from https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/letter/articles/issue-49-certified-male

Christensen, M. (2018, December 4). David Pocock on homophobia in sport and marriage equality. *GQ*. https://www.gq.com.au/fitness/sport/david-pocock-on-homophobia-in-sport-and-marriage-equality/news-story/5c60150c2d89c5d36e328d9d42de6618

Clancy, E. M., Klettke, B., & Hallford, D. J. (2019). The dark side of sexting – Factors predicting the dissemination of sexts. *Computers in Human Behavior, 92*, 266–272.

Classification Office. (2020). *Growing up with porn: Insights from young New Zealanders*. Wellington, New Zealand: Classification Office. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from https://www.classificationoffice.govt.nz/assets/PDFs/Growing-up-with-Porn-Web.pdf

Community action toolkit to prevent family violence. (2007). Wellington, New Zealand: Family and Community Services of the Ministry of Social Development. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from http://www.areyouok.org.nz/assets/AreyouOK/Resources/Toolkit-book.pdf

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829–859.

Cooper, K., Quayle, E., Jonsson, L., & Svedin, C. G. (2016). Adolescents and self-taken sexual images: A review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior, 55*, 706–716.

Das, A. (2018, October 10). Men: Recognize your privilege, not just your vulnerability. *Voice Male*. https://voicemalemagazine.org/men-recognize-your-privilege-not-just-your-vulnerability/

Das, A., & Singh, S. K. (2014). Changing men: Challenging stereotypes. Reflections on working with men on gender issues in India. *IDS Bulletin, 45*(1), 69–79.

Dobson, A. S., & Ringrose, J. (2016). Sext education: Pedagogies of sex, gender and shame in the schoolyards of Tagged and Exposed. *Sex Education, 16*(1), 8–21.

Donovan, E. (2017, March 8). Rape comments happen 'every single day' – student. *Radio New Zealand*. https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/national/326088/rape-comments-happen-'every-single-day'-student

Dooney, L. (2017a, March 7). Investigation launched over rape comments made by Wellington College students. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/90165634/investigation-launched-over-rape-comments-made-on-facebook-by-wellington-college-students

Dooney, L. (2017b, March 13). Protest at Parliament against rape culture in schools. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/90374283/protest-at-parliament-against-rape-culture-in-schools

Dooney, L. (2017c, March 8). Year 9s at St Patrick's Silverstream suspended over sexual harassment of staff. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/90179350/cultural-shift-needed-to-put-an-end-to-attitudes-toward-sexual-violence-experts-say

Duckworth, K. D., & Trautner, M. N. (2019). Gender goals: Defining masculinity and navigating peer pressure to engage in sexual activity. *Gender & Society, 33*(5), 795–817.

Duff, M. (2018, May 25). Is rough sex the new rape defence? *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/life-style/104216482/is-rough-sex-the-new-rape-defence

Dworkin, S. L., & Barker, G. (2019). Gender-transformative approaches to engaging men in reducing gender-based violence: A response to Brush & Miller's "Trouble in paradigm". *Violence Against Women, 25*(14), 1657–1671.

Dworkin, S. L., Fleming, P. J., & Colvin, C. J. (2015). The promises and limitations of gender-transformative health programming with men: Critical reflections from the field. Culture, *Health & Sexuality, 17*(sup2), 128–143.

Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 203–217.

Englander, E. (2012, July). Low risk associated with most teenage sexting: A study of 617 18-year-olds. *MARC Research Reports*. Paper 6. Retrieved February 14, 2019, from https://vc.bridgew.edu/marc_reports/6/

E Tū Whānau Mahere Rautaki Framework for Change 2019–2023. (2020, July). Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/initiatives/family-and-sexual-violence/e-tu-whanau-mahere-rautaki.pdf

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health, 52*(3), 105–112.

Fagan, J. (2016, March 28). Auckland restaurant's toilet slogans slammed as 'misogynistic' and 'degrading'. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/better-business/78318278/auckland-restaurants-toilet-slogans-slammed-as-misogynistic-and-degrading

Family Violence Death Review Committee. (2017). *Fifth report data: January 2009 to December 2015*. Wellington, New Zealand: Health Quality & Safety Commission. Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://www.hqsc.govt.nz/assets/FVDRC/Publications/FVDRC_2017_10_final_web.pdf

Family Violence Death Review Committee. (2020). *Sixth report | Te Pūrongo tuaono: Men who use violence | Ngā tāne ka whakamahi i te whakarekereke*. Wellington, New Zealand: Health Quality & Safety Commission. Retrieved May 30, 2020, from https://www.hqsc.govt.nz/assets/FVDRC/Publications/FVDRC6thReport_FINAL.pdf

Family Violence. It's Not OK. (n.d. a). [Website]. New Zealand Government. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from http://www.areyouok.org.nz/

Family Violence. It's Not OK. (n.d. b). *What is family violence?* New Zealand Government. Retrieved January 22, 2021, from https://web.archive.org/web/20200330111202/http://areyouok.org.nz/family-violence/family-violence-2/

Family Violence. It's Not OK. (n.d. c). *Who is impacted?* New Zealand Government. Retrieved January 22, 2021, from https://web.archive.org/web/20200330111217/http://areyouok.org.nz/family-violence/who-is-impacted-by-family-violence/

Fanslow, J., Robinson, E., Crengle, S., & Perese, L. (2010). Juxtaposing beliefs and reality: Prevalence rates of intimate partner violence and attitudes to violence and gender roles reported by New Zealand women. *Violence Against Women, 16*(7), 812–831.

Farber, J. (2019, January 11). The new angry young men: Rockers who rail against 'toxic masculinity'. The *New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/11/style/rock-masculinity-men-emotions.html

Farley, J. (2017). *Discursive analysis of media representations of rape culture in Aotearoa New Zealand: Roast busters and the Wellington College case* [Unpublished honours dissertation]. School of Psychology, The University of Auckland.

Fenaughty, J. (2019). Developing resources to address homophobic and transphobic bullying: A framework incorporating co-design, critical pedagogies, and bullying research. *Sex Education, 19*(6), 627–643.

Flood, M. (2008). Men, sex, and homosociality: How bonds between men shape their sexual relations with women. *Men and Masculinities, 10*(3), 339–359.

Flood, M. (2011). Involving men in efforts to end violence against women. *Men and Masculinities, 14*(3), 358–377.

Flood, M. (2017). The turn to men in gender politics. *Women's Studies Journal, 31*(1), 48–58.

Flood, M. (2018, July 7). *Toxic masculinity: A primer and commentary.* XY. Retrieved November 26, 2019, from https://xyonline.net/content/toxic-masculinity-primer-and-commentary

Flood, M. (2019a). *Engaging men and boys in violence prevention.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Flood, M. (2019b). Gender equality: Engaging men in change. *The Lancet, 393*(10189), 2386–2387.

Flood, M., Dragiewicz, M., & Pease, B. (2018). *Resistance and backlash to gender equality: An evidence review.* Brisbane: Crime and Justice Research Centre, Queensland University of Technology (QUT). Retrieved May 4, 2020, from https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/-/media/ResourceCentre/PublicationsandResources/PVAW/Backlash/Resistance-and-Backlash-to-Gender-Equality---Evidence-Review.pdf

Flood, M., & Howson, R. (Eds.). (2015). *Engaging men in building gender equality.* Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Penguin. (Original work published 1975)

Fredricsen, J. (2018). *"He thought he could still win it, you know": Young men's talk around consent and sexual violence* [Unpublished masters thesis]. The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Freire, P. (1970). Cultural action and conscientization. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*(3), 452–477.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Gavey, N. (2005a). *Just sex? The cultural scaffolding of rape.* London and New York: Routledge.

Gavey, N. (2005b). *Violence against women: Beyond gender neutrality.* Invited paper presented at The Women's Convention, 3–6 June, Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved April 7, 2018, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/nzfvc.org.nz/files/Violenceagainstwomen-neutrality05.doc

Gavey, N. (2009). Fighting rape. In R. J. Heberle & V. Grace (Eds.), *Theorizing sexual violence* (pp. 96–124). New York: Routledge.

Gavey, N. (2013, November 5). *Roast busting and the revival of misogynist sexual culture.* Sexual Politics Now. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from http://www.sexualpoliticsnow.org.nz/roast-busting-and-the-revival-of-misogynist-sexual-culture/

Gavey, N. (2014, October 14). *This is what we mean by rape culture*. Sexual Politics Now. Retrieved February 14, 2019, from http://www.sexualpoliticsnow.org.nz/this-is-what-we-mean-by-rape-culture/

Gavey, N. (2015, January 28). *Gender, power and porn: A New Zealand perspective*. Talk presented to the Gender & Sexual Politics Symposium, The University of Auckland [Video]. Sexual Politics Now. Retrieved January 27, 2020, from http://www.sexualpoliticsnow.org.nz/projects/symposium-2015/

Gavey, N. (2019a). *Just sex? The cultural scaffolding of rape* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Gavey, N. (2019b). The persistence of a masculine point of view in public narratives about rape. In U. Andersson, M. Edgren, L. Karlsson, & G. Nilsson (Eds.), *Rape narratives in motion* (pp. 247–255). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gavey, N., Benton-Greig, P., Calder-Dawe, O., Thorburn, B., Wech, A., & Single, G. (2016). *"Sending nudes": Girls' and the gendered context of digital communication with boys* [Unpublished raw data]. School of Psychology, The University of Auckland.

Gavey, N., & Farley, N. (2021). Reframing sexual violence as "sexual harm" in New Zealand policy: A critique. In G. Torres & K. Yllö (Eds.), *Sexual violence in intimacy: Implications for research and policy in global health* (pp. 229–248). London and New York: Routledge.

Gavey, N., & Senn, C. Y. (2014). Sexuality and sexual violence. In D. L. Tolman & L. M. Diamond (Eds.), *APA Handbook on Sexuality and Psychology: Vol. 1. Person-based approaches* (pp. 339–382). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gavey, N., Taylor, K., & Benton-Greig, P. (with Terry, G. & Braun, V.) (2018). *The Men and Gender Video Project*. Auckland, New Zealand: Sexual Politics Now.

Gavey, N., Wech, A., Thorburn, B., Single, G., Calder-Dawe, O., Benton-Greig, P., & Hindley, P. (2021). *Preventing image-based sexual harassment and abuse among teenagers: Girls deconstruct the gender and sexual politics of intervention messages*. [Manuscript in preparation]. School of Psychology, The University of Auckland.

Gender Equal NZ. (n.d.). *Good guys infographic*. Retrieved May 28, 2020, from https://genderequal.nz/good-guys-infographic/

Gender Equal NZ. (2018). *Gender attitudes survey: Full results 2017*. Wellington: National Council for Women of New Zealand. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://genderequal.nz/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Gender-Attitudes-Survey-FINAL.pdf

Gilbert, J. (2014, July 23). New Zealand's rape culture myth. *The National Business Review*. https://www.nbr.co.nz/article/new-zealands-rape-culture-myth-ck-159587

Gillette. (2019a, January 14). *"Boys will be boys"? Isn't it time we stopped excusing bad behavior?* [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/Gillette/status/1084850521196900352

Gillette. (2019b, January 13). *We believe: The best men can be | Gillette* (Short Film) [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koPmuEyP3a0

Gordon-Messer, D., Bauermeister, J. A., Grodzinski, A., & Zimmerman, M. (2013). Sexting among young adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 52*(3), 301–306.

Government of New Zealand. (2019). *The wellbeing budget*. Wellington, New Zealand: Treasury. https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2019-05/b19-wellbeing-budget.pdf

Greene, M. (2019, January 15). The history of "The man box". *Medium*. https://medium.com/@remakingmanhood/the-history-of-the-man-box-e6eed6d895c4

Grewal, K.K. (2017). *Racialised gang rape and the reinforcement of dominant order: Discourses of gender, race and nation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gupta, G. R. (2001). Gender, sexuality, and HIV/AIDS: The what, the why, and the how. *Siecus Report, 29*(5), 6–12.

Hall, M., & Hearn, J. (2019). Revenge pornography and manhood acts: A discourse analysis of perpetrators' accounts. *Journal of Gender Studies, 28*(2), 158–170.

Handyside, S., & Ringrose, J. (2017). Snapchat memory and youth digital sexual cultures: Mediated temporality, duration and affect. *Journal of Gender Studies, 26*(3), 347–360.

Harmful Digital Communications Act 2015 (New Zealand). http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2015/0063/latest/whole.html

Hearn, J., & McKie, L. (2008). Gendered policy and policy on gender: The case of 'domestic violence'. *Policy & Politics, 36*(1), 75–91.

Hearn, J., & McKie, L. (2010). Gendered and social hierarchies in problem representation and policy processes: "Domestic violence" in Finland and Scotland. *Violence Against Women, 16*(2), 136–158.

HeForShe. (n.d.). *HeForShe* [Website]. Retrieved January 11, 2019, from https://www.heforshe.org/en

Heilman, B., Barker, G., & Harrison, A. (2017). *The Man Box: A study on being a young man in the US, UK, and Mexico.* Washington, DC, & London, United Kingdom: Promundo-US & Unilever. Retrieved November 10, 2019, from https://promundoglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/TheManBox-Full-EN-Final-29.03.2017-POSTPRINT.v3-web.pdf

Heilman, B., Guerrero-López, C. M., Ragonese, C., Kelberg, M., & Barker, G. (2019). *The cost of the Man Box: A study on the economic impacts of harmful masculine stereotypes in the US, UK, and Mexico - Executive summary.* Washington, DC & London: Promundo-US and Unilever. Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://promundoglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Cost-of-the-Man-Box-Summary-Web.pdf

Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015a). Beyond the 'sext': Technology-facilitated sexual violence and harassment against adult women. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 48*(1), 104–118.

Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015b). Embodied harms: Gender, shame, and technology-facilitated sexual violence. *Violence Against Women, 21*(6), 758–779.

Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2018). Technology-facilitated sexual violence: A literature review of empirical research. Trauma, *Violence, & Abuse, 19*(2), 195–208.

Hess, A., and Flores, C. (2018). Simply more than swiping left: A critical analysis of toxic masculine performances on Tinder Nightmares. *New Media & Society, 20*(3), 1085–1102.

Hokowhitu, B. (2004). Tackling Māori masculinity: A colonial genealogy of savagery and sport. *The Contemporary Pacific, 16*(2), 259–284.

Hokowhitu, B. (2007). The silencing of Māori men. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling, 27*(2), 63–76.

Hokowhitu, B. (2008). The death of Koro Paka: "Traditional" Māori patriarchy. *The Contemporary Pacific, 20*(1), 115–141.

Hokowhitu, B. (2015). Taxonomies of indigeneity: Indigenous heterosexual patriarchal masculinity. In R. A. Innes & K. Anderson (Eds.), *Indigenous men and masculinities: Legacies, identities, regeneration* (pp. 81–95). Winnepeg, Manitoba, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

Hollander, J. A., & Pascoe, C. J. (2019). Comment on Brush and Miller's "Trouble in paradigm: 'Gender transformative programming' in violence prevention". *Violence Against Women, 25*(14), 1682–1688.

Hollway, W. (1983). Heterosexual sex: Power and desire for the other. In S. Cartledge & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Sex and love: New thoughts on old contradictions* (pp. 124–40). London: The Women's Press.

Hsu, T. (2019, September 8). Underwear ads lose the macho: How marketing has embraced real men. The *New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/08/business/media/underwear-ads-men-marketing.html?smid=nytcore-ios-share

Humphris, L. (2017, September 1). What do we mean when we say 'toxic masculinity?' *The Nib.* https://thenib.com/toxic-masculinity

Hundreds of Wellington college girls protest at parliament to highlight rape culture (2017, March 13). *One News,* TVNZ. https://www.tvnz.co.nz/one-news/new-zealand/hundreds-wellington-college-girls-protest-parliament-highlight-rape-culture

Hunt, T. (2018, August 21). Teacher sexually harassed by Upper Hutt students speaks out about upskirt incident. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/106404388/teacher-sexually-harassed-by-upper-hutt-students-speaks-out-about-upskirt-incident

Hutchby, I., & Woffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hyde, A., Drennan, J., Howlett, E., & Brady, D. (2009). Young men's vulnerability in constituting hegemonic masculinity in sexual relations. *American Journal of Men's Health, 3*(3), 238–251.

I Love Ugly's ad branded 'sexist and revolting'. (2015, December 3). *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/news/article.cfm?c_id=3&objectid=11555093

In the Know. [Website]. Retrieved January 22, 2020, from https://www.intheknow.co.nz/about-us/

Jackson, S. (2018). Young feminists, feminism and digital media. *Feminism & Psychology, 28*(1), 32–49.

Jane, E. A. (2017). *Misogyny online: A short (and brutish) history.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Jeffrey, N. K., & Barata, P. C. (2019). "She didn't want to... and I'd obviously insist": Canadian university men's normalization of their sexual violence against intimate partners. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 28*(1), 85–105.

Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: A conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet, 385*(9977), 1580–1589.

Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., Quayle, M., Sikweyiya, Y., & Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: Combining theory and practice in gender interventions. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 17*(sup2), 112–127.

Johansen, K. B. H., Pedersen, B. M., & Tjørnhøj-Thomsen, T. (2019). Visual gossiping: Non-consensual 'nude' sharing among young people in Denmark. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 21*(9), 1029–1044.

Johnston, K. (2018, May 17). Kirsty Johnston: A message to toxic men – please just stop. Women are tired of having to have this fight. *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12053187

Jones, R. [@rg_jones]. (2019, January 27). *100% justified criticism. Men with privilege - our silence speaks volumes. It perpetuates systems of violence and upholds #rapeculture. We've gotta use our privilege to be part of the solution* [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/rg_jones/status/1089626838979080193?s=21

Jones, R., Crengle, S., & McCreanor, T. (2006). How tikanga guides and protects the research process: Insights from the Hauora Tāne project. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 29,* 60–77.

Julie. (2009a, August 13). And in breaking news.... *The Hand Mirror.* Retrieved June 11, 2019, from http://thehandmirror.blogspot.com/2009/08/and-in-breaking-news.html?m=1

Julie. (2009b, August 7). Sex sells hearing aids? *The Hand Mirror.* Retrieved January 20, 2021, from http://thehandmirror.blogspot.com/2009/08/sex-sells-hearing-aids.html

Katz, J. (2018). Bystander training as leadership training: Notes on the origins, philosophy, and pedagogy of the mentors in violence prevention model. *Violence Against Women, 24*(15), 1755–1776.

Kaufman, M. (1987). The construction of masculinity and the triad of men's violence. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), *Beyond patriarchy: Essays by men on pleasure, power, and change* (pp. 1–29). Toronto and New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaufman, M. (2001). Building a movement of men working to end violence against women. *Development, 44*(3), 9–14.

Kaufman, M. (2012). The day the White Ribbon Campaign changed the game. In C. J. Greig & W. J. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 139–158). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.

Kehily, M. J., & Nayak, A. (1997). 'Lads and laughter': Humour and the production of heterosexual hierarchies. *Gender and Education, 9*(1), 69–88.

Kelly, L. (1987). The continuum of sexual violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 46–60). Houndsmills and London: The Palgrave Press.

Kelly, L. (1988). *Surviving sexual violence.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kelly, L. (2003). The wrong debate: Reflections on why force is not the key issue with respect to trafficking in women for sexual exploitation. *Feminist Review, 73*(1), 139–144.

Kerekere, E. (2017). *Part of the whānau: The emergence of takatāpui identity – He Whāriki Takatāpui* [Doctoral thesis, Victoria University of Wellington]. ResearchArchive – Te Puna Rangahau. http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/handle/10063/6369

Kernsmith, P. D., Victor, B. G., & Smith-Darden, J. P. (2018). Online, offline, and over the line: Coercive sexting among adolescent dating partners. *Youth & Society, 50*(7), 891–904.

Kimmel, M. S. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119–141). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men.* New York: HarperCollins.

Kimmel, M., & Wade, L. (2018). Ask a feminist: Michael Kimmel and Lisa Wade discuss toxic masculinity. Signs: *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 44*(1), 233–254.

King, P., & Robertson, N. (2017). Māori men, relationships, and everyday practices: Towards broadening domestic violence research. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 13*(4), 210–217.

Kivel, P. (1992). *Men's work: How to stop the violence that tears our lives apart.* Center City, MN, USA: Hazelden.

Klettke, B., Hallford, D. J., & Mellor, D. J. (2014). Sexting prevalence and correlates: A systematic literature review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 34*(1), 44–53.

Kruger, T., Pitman, M., Grennell, D., McDonald, T., Mariu, D., Pomare, A., Mita, T., Maihi, M., & Lawson-Te Aho, K. (2004). *Transforming whānau violence: A Conceptual Framework* (2nd ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri. March 30, 2020, https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/default/files/transforming_whanau_violence.pdf

Lambie, I. (2018, November 6). *Every 4 minutes: A discussion paper on preventing family violence in New Zealand.* Auckland, New Zealand: Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor | Kaitohutohu Mātanga Pūtaiao Matua ki te Pirimia. Retrieved March 15, 2020, from https://cpb-ap-se2.wpmucdn.com/blogs.auckland.ac.nz/dist/f/688/files/2020/02/Every-4-minutes-A-discussion-paper-on-preventing-family-violence-in-New-Zealand.-Lambie-report-8.11.18-x43nf4.pdf

Lawton, Z. (2018). *#Metoo Blog.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://www.zoelawton.com/metoo-blog

Le Grice, J. (2018). Exotic dancing and relationship violence: Exploring Indigeneity, gender and agency. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 20*(4), 367–380.

Le Grice, J. (2017–2021). Becoming sexual beings: Māori recommendations for sexual violence prevention. Health Research Council of New Zealand Erihapeti Rehu Murchie Fellowship project [Work in progress].

Leibrich, J., Paulin, J., & Ransom, R. (1995). *Hitting home: Men speak about abuse of women partners.* Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Justice & AGB McNair.

Lewis, O. (2018, May 17). 'Stripping was all I had': Former dancer exposes Calendar Girls' rules and fines. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/news/103840709/stripping-was-all-i-had-former-dancer-exposes-calendar-girls-rules-and-fines

Lippman, J. R., & Campbell, S. W. (2014). Damned if you do, damned if you don't…if you're a girl: Relational and normative contexts of adolescent sexting in the United States. *Journal of Children and Media, 8*(4), 371–386.

Livingston, T., & Owen, C. (2018, May 30). Widespread harassment, bullying and racism identified within the law profession. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/104316785/widespread-harassment-bullying-and-racism-identified-within-the-law-profession?rm=m

MacDonald, K. (2019, January 17). Kyle MacDonald: Why 'toxic masculinity' and gender roles harm everyone. *Stuff.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/lifestyle/news/article.cfm?c_id=6&objectid=12191256

MacNeill, K., Coles, A., & Vincent, J., with Kokkinos, A., & Robertson, M. (2018). *Promoting gender equality through the arts and creative industries: A review of case studies and evidence.* Melbourne, Australia: VicHealth. Retrieved January 14, 2020, from https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/-/media/ResourceCentre/PublicationsandResources/GenderEqualityArts/Promoting-gender-equality-through-the-arts-and-creative-industries-report.pdf

Maglaty, J. (2011, April 7). When did girls start wearing pink? *Smithsonian Magazine.* https://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/when-did-girls-start-wearing-pink-1370097/

Malone, A., Kerr, F., Hinton, M., Edens, J., & Robinson, G. (2016, August 4). Stripper speaks out, alleges Chiefs players inappropriately touched her. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/sport/rugby/super-rugby/82789997/chiefs-in-hot-water-over-stripper-fracas

Mantilla, K. (2013). Gendertrolling: Misogyny adapts to new media. *Feminist Studies, 39*(2), 563–570.

Marston, C., & Lewis, R. (2014). Anal heterosex among young people and implications for health promotion: A qualitative study in the UK. BMJ Open, *4*(8), e004996.

Marvelly, L. (2017, April 21). BOYS: The play inspired by our Kiwi toxic masculinity problem. *Villainesse.* Retrieved February 14, 2019, from https://www.villainesse.com/think/boys-play-inspired-our-kiwi-toxic-masculinity-problem

Mataira, P. (2008). 'Sitting in the fire', an indigenous approach to masculinity and male violence: Māori men working with Māori men. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work, 20*(4), 35–40.

Matapo, J. (2020, May 3). The vā that binds: A Pasifika education story during Covid-19. *Newsroom.* Retrieved June 2, 2020, from https://www.newsroom.co.nz/ideasroom/2020/05/03/1155074/the-v-that-binds-a-pasifika-education-story-during-covid-19

McCann, R. (2018, August 9). *2018 White Ribbon Campaign.* White Ribbon.org.nz. Retrieved June 1, 2020, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/2018/08/09/2018-white-ribbon-campaign/

McCaughey, M., & Cermele, J. (2017). Changing the hidden curriculum of campus rape prevention and education: Women's self-defense as a key protective factor for a public health model of prevention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18*(3), 287–302.

McCreanor, T., Moewaka Barnes, H., Kaiwai, H., Borell, S., & Gregory, A. (2008). Creating intoxigenic environments: Marketing alcohol to young people in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Social Science & Medicine, 67*(6), 938–946.

McGauley, E. (2017, March 10). 'This is what it's like for us' – a teenager on Wellington College Facebook comments and rape culture. *The Spinoff.* https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/10-03-2017/this-is-what-its-like-for-us-a-teenager-on-wellington-college-facebook-comments-and-rape-culture/

McGlynn, C., & Johnson, K. (2021). *Cyberflashing: Recognising harms, reforming laws.* Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press.

McGlynn, C., Johnson, K., Rackely, E., Henry, N., Gavey, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2020). 'It's torture for the soul': The harms of image-based sexual abuse. *Social & Legal Studies.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663920947791

McGlynn, C., & Rackley, E. (2017). Image-based sexual abuse. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 37*(3), 534–561.

McGlynn, C., Rackley, E., & Houghton, R. (2017). Beyond 'revenge porn': The continuum of image-based sexual abuse. *Feminist Legal Studies, 25*(1), 25–46.

McKay, W. (2014, October 9). University takes action over 'degrading' page. *Stuff.* http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/10598057/University-takes-action-over-degrading-page

McKenzie, M., Bugden, M., Webster, A., & Barr, M. (2018). Advertising (In)equality: The impacts of sexist advertising on women's health and wellbeing. *Women's Health Victoria Issues Paper, Issue 14.* Melbourne: Women's Health Victoria, Australia. Retrieved April 24, 2019, from https://women-shealthvic.com.au/resources/WHV_Publications/Issues-Paper_2018.12.06_Advertising-inequality-the-impacts-of-sexist-advertising_Dec-2018_(Fulltext-PDF).pdf

McMaster, K. (1995). Hitting home: Men speak about abuse of women. [Review]. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (5).

Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values.* Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Messner, M. A. (2016). Bad men, good men, bystanders: Who is the rapist? *Gender & Society, 30*(1), 57–66.

Messner, M. A., Greenberg, M. A., & Peretz, T. (2015). *Some men: Feminist allies in the movement to end violence against women.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mikaere, A. (1994). Māori women: Caught in the contradictions of a colonised reality. *Waikato Law Review, 2,* 125–149.

Mikaere, A. (1999). Colonisation and the imposition of patriarchy: A Ngati Raukawa woman's perspective. *Te Ukaipo, 1,* 34–49.

Mikaere, A. (2017). *The balance destroyed.* Otaki, New Zealand: Te Tākupu, Te Wānanga o Raukawa.

Ministry for Women. (2020). *International.* Retrieved May 27, 2020, from https://women.govt.nz/about/international

Ministry for Women and Netsafe. (2017, November). *Insights into digital harm: The online lives of New Zealand girls and boys.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry for Women. Retrieved May 31, 2020, from https://women.govt.nz/sites/public_files/Insights%20Into%20Digital%20Harm%20-%20Ministry%20for%20Women%20%20Netsafe_R3_v6b-Web.pdf

Mitchell, A., Patrick, K., Heywood, W., Blackman, P., & Pitts, M. (2014). *National survey of Australian secondary students and sexual health* 2013. (ARCSHS Monograph Series No. 97). Melbourne, Australia: Australian Research Centre in Sex Health and Society, La Trobe University. Retrieved May 30, 2017, from https://www.latrobe.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/576661/ARCSHS-SSASH-2013.pdf

Morris, T. (2017, March 24). The pencilsword: No 'I' in sex. *The Spinoff.* https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/the-wireless/374526/the-pencilsword-no-i-in-sex

Morris, T. (2018, April 3). The side eye: The 'war on men'. *The Spinoff.* https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/the-side-eye/03-04-2018/the-side-eye-the-war-on-men/

Morris, T. (2019, September 1). The side eye: Who's the man? *The Spinoff.* https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/the-side-eye/01-09-2019/the-side-eye-whos-the-man/

Moses, H. (2015, December 11). I Love Ugly pull sexist ad campaign. *Radio New Zealand.* https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/the-wireless/373632/i-love-ugly-pull-sexist-ad-campaign

Murphy, M. J. (2009). Can "men" stop rape?: Visualizing gender in the "My strength is not for hurting" rape prevention campaign. *Men and Masculinities, 12*(1), 113–130.

Neilson, M. (2019, February 14). Auckland restaurant's Valentine's Day sign seen to promote violence against women. *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12203682

Netsafe. (2015, September 14). *Sexting.* Retrieved October 29, 2019, from https://web.archive.org/web/20160419231740/https://www.netsafe.org.nz/sexting/

Netsafe. (2016, February 9). *So you got naked online: A resource for children, young people, their families & whānau.* Retrieved October 29, 2019, from https://web.archive.org/web/20160419231740/https://www.netsafe.org.nz/so-you-got-naked-online/

Netsafe. (2017, December). *Teens and "sexting" in New Zealand: Prevalence and attitudes.* Wellington, New Zealand: Netsafe. Retrieved May 31, 2020, from https://www.netsafe.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/SEXTING-NZ-Report-Dec-7-2017.pdf

Netsafe. (2018). *New Zealand teens and digital harm: Statistical insights into experiences, impact and response.* Wellington, New Zealand: Netsafe. Retrieved January 21, 2021, from https://women.govt.nz/sites/public_files/NZ-teens-and-digital-harm_statistical-insights_2018.pdf

Netsafe. (2019, January). *Image-based sexual abuse: A snapshot of New Zealand adults' experiences.* Retrieved May 31, 2020, from https://www.netsafe.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/IBSA-report-2019_Final.pdf

New Zealand Family Planning. (2015). *It's about Mana. Key messages and discussion prompts.* Retrieved January 20, 2021, from https://web.archive.org/web/20160124043122/http://www.familyplanning.org.nz/media/216883/its-about-mana-key-messages-mar-2015.pdf

New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. (2013, November 4). *Responses to the 'Roast Busters'.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/news/responses-roast-busters

New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. (2014, November 11). *No charges laid: Responses to the 'Roast Busters' decision.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/news/no-charges-laid-responses-roast-busters-decision

New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. (2017, April 11). *Calls for compulsory consent education in all schools continue.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/news/calls-compulsory-consent-education-all-schools-continue

New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. (2019a, August 7). *Continued reports of sexual harassment, assault and bullying at work; steps towards change.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/news/continued-reports-sexual-harassment-assault-and-bullying-work-steps-towards-change

New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. (2019b, November 25). *White Ribbon Day 2019 and 16 days of activism against gender based violence.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/news/white-ribbon-day-2019-and-16-days-activism-against-gender-based-violence

New Zealand Parliamentarians' Group on Population and Development. (2015, June 29). *Engaging boys and men in sexual and reproductive health.* Retrieved January 27, 2020, from https://www.familyplanning.org.nz/media/291278/engaging-boys-and-men.pdf

Nilsson, G. (2019). Narrating the moral geography of rape in Swedish newspapers. In U. Andersson, M. Edgren, L. Karlsson, & G. Nilsson (Eds.), *Rape narratives in motion* (pp. 119–146). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Norquay, K. (2019, November 3). All Blacks in defeat prove that showing emotion is a winning move. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/sport/rugby/rugby-world-cup/117097355/all-blacks-in-defeat-prove-that-showing-emotion-is-a-winning-move

Office of Film and Literature Classification. (2018). *NZ Youth and Porn: Research findings of a survey on how and why young New Zealanders view online pornography.* Wellington, New Zealand: Office of Film and Literature Classification. Retrieved September 30, 2019, from https://www.classificationoffice.govt.nz/assets/PDFs/NZYouthPorn-OFLC-December2018-PrintVersion.pdf

O'Neill, R. (2015). Whither critical masculinity studies? Notes on inclusive masculinity theory, postfeminism, and sexual politics. *Men and Masculinities, 18*(1), 100–120.

Oransky, M., & Marecek, J. (2009). "I'm not going to be a girl": Masculinity and emotions in boys' friendships and peer groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 24*(2), 218–241.

Orchowski, L. M. (2019). "Trouble in paradigm" and the social norms approach to violence prevention. *Violence Against Women, 25*(14), 1672–1681.

Our Watch, Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS), & VicHealth. (2015). *Change the story: A shared framework for the primary prevention of violence against women and their children in Australia.* Melbourne, Australia: Our Watch. Retrieved January 26, 2021, from https://media-cdn.ourwatch.org.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/05/21025429/Change-the-story-framework-prevent-violence-women-children-AA-new.pdf

Our Watch. (2017). *Putting the prevention of violence against women into practice: How to change the story.* Melbourne, Australia: Our Watch. Retrieved January 26, 2021, from https://media-cdn.ourwatch.org.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/11/07042017/Putting-prevention-into-practice-AA-web.pdf

Our Watch. (2019a). *Change the story three years on: Reflections on uptake and impact, lessons learned and Our Watch's ongoing work to embed and expand the evidence on prevention.* Melbourne, Australia: Our Watch. Retrieved January 21, 2020, from https://media-cdn.ourwatch.org.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/11/05224133/OW005-Change-they-Story-Three-Years-On-WEB-AA-2.pdf

Our Watch. (2019b). *Men in focus: Unpacking masculinities and engaging men in the prevention of violence against women.* Melbourne, Australia: Our Watch. Retrieved January 9, 2020, from https://www.ourwatch.org.au/getmedia/47bd1d32-4099-4bbf-85d1-c09e5d982877/Men-in-focus-web.pdf.aspx

Our Watch. (2019c, August 10). *Our Watch welcomes Fourth Action Plan to Reduce Violence Against Women and their Children.* [Media release]. Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved March 17, 2020, https://www.ourwatch.org.au/resource/our-watch-welcomes-fourth-action-plan-to-reduce-violence-against-women-and-their-children/

Our Watch. (2021). [Website]. Retrieved January 27, 2021, from https://www.ourwatch.org.au/

Pair speak to police about Roast Busters. (2013, November 4). *Stuff.* http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/crime/9358977/Pair-speak-to-police-about-Roast-Busters

Paoletti, J. B. (2012). *Pink and blue: Telling the boys from the girls in America.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Pascoe, C. J. (2005). 'Dude, you're a fag': Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities, 8*(3), 329–346.

Pascoe, C. J. (2012). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school* (With a new preface.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pascoe, C. J. (2013). Notes on a sociology of bullying: Young men's homophobia as gender socialization. *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking*, 87–104.

Pascoe, C. J., & Hollander, J. A. (2016). Good guys don't rape: Gender, domination, and mobilizing rape. *Gender & Society, 30*(1), 67–79.

Pasefika Proud. (2020, June). *Pathways for change 2019–2023*. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/initiatives/family-and-sexual-violence/pasefika-proud-pathways-for-change.pdf

Paul, G. (2017, March 25). Gregor Paul: Rugby is dancing around women. *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/sport/news/article.cfm?c_id=4&objectid=11825107

Pearson, L., Powell, M., Denholm, N., & Robertson, J. (2018). *Porn and young people – what do we know? NZ Youth Stakeholder Survey.* Auckland, New Zealand: The Light Project. Retrieved February 15, 2019, from http://www.youthalivetrust.org.nz/assets/Porn-and-Young-People-%E2%80%93-what-do-we-know-2018-Aotearoa-Report-.pdf

Pease, B. (2014a). "New wine in old bottles?" A commentary on "What's in it for men?": Old question, new data. *Men and Masculinities, 17*(5), 549–551.

Pease, B. (2014b). Theorising men's violence prevention policies: Limitations and possibilities of interventions in a patriarchal state. In N. Henry & A. Powell (Eds.), *Preventing sexual violence: Interdisciplinary approaches to overcoming a rape culture* (pp. 1–21). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Penny, L. (2013). *Cybersexism: Sex, gender and power on the internet.* London: Bloomsbury.

Phillips, J. (1996). *A man's country? The image of the Pakeha male: A history* (Revised ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

Pihama, L., Cameron, N., & Te Nana, R. (2019, October). *Historical trauma and whānau violence.* (Issues Paper 15). Auckland: New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse, The University of Auckland. Retrieved March 30, 2020, from https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/default/files/NZFVC-Issues-Paper-15-historical-trauma_0.pdf

Pihama, L., & McRoberts, H. (2009). *Te Puāwaitanga o te Kākano: A background paper report.* Retrieved March 30, 2020, from http://toah-nnest.org.nz/images/Releasing_Te_Puawaitanga_o_te_K%C4%81kano__FIXED.pdf

Pihama, L., Te Nana, R., Cameron, N., Smith, C., Reid, J., & Southey, K. (2016). Māori cultural definitions of sexual violence. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand, 7*(1), 43–51.

Point Research. (2010). *An innovative approach to changing social attitudes around family violence in New Zealand.* Key ideas, insights and lessons learnt. The Campaign for Action on Family Violence. Wellington: Centre for Social Research and Evaluation | Te Pokapū Rangahau Arotake Hapori, Ministry of Social Development. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from http://areyouok.org.nz/assets/Document-files/research/An-innovative-approach-to-changing-social-attitudes.pdf

Powell, A., & Henry, N. (2017). *Sexual violence in a digital age.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Promundo-US & University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. (2018). *Manhood 2.0: A curriculum promoting a gender-equitable future of manhood.* Washington, DC and Pittsburgh, PA: Promundo and University of Pittsburgh. Retrieved May 20, 2020, from https://promundoglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/PM-Manhood-2-0-curriculum-v12-2-E.pdf

Rape comments apology doesn't mention women. (2017, March 16). *Radio New Zealand.* https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/326729/rape-comments-apology-doesn't-mention-women

Rape culture in the spotlight: A week to forget for Wellington schools. (2017, March 10). *Radio New Zealand.* https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/the-wireless/374504/rape-culture-in-the-spotlight-a-week-to-forget-for-wellington-schools

Rautaki Ltd and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga. (n.d.). *Māori ethical frameworks. Rangahau.* Retrieved November 10, 2019, from http://www.rangahau.co.nz/ethics/166/

Redmond, A. (2018, September 26). Ex-Calendar Girls dancers to appeal after ERA finds they were contractors, not employees. *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/107377148/calendar-girls-strippers-were-independent-contractors-not-employees-era-finds

Rich, M. D. (2010). The interACT model: Considering rape prevention from a performance activism and social justice perspective. *Feminism & Psychology, 20*(4), 511–528.

Ringrose, J., Gill, R., Livingstone, S., & Harvey, L. (2012). *A qualitative study of children, young people and 'sexting': A report prepared for the NSPCC.* London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Retrieved October 18, 2019, from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/44216/

Ringrose, J., Harvey, L., Gill, R., & Livingstone, S. (2013). Teen girls, sexual double standards and 'sexting': Gendered value in digital image exchange. *Feminist theory, 14*(3), 305–323.

Ringrose, J., & Harvey, L. (2015). Boobs, back-off, six packs and bits: Mediated body parts, gendered reward, and sexual shame in teens' sexting images. Continuum: *Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 29*(2), 205–217.

Robertson, N., & Oulton, H. (2008). *Sexual violence: Raising the conversations, a literature review.* Report prepared for Te Puni Kokiri and The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs. Hamilton, New Zealand: Māori and Psychology Research Unit, Department of Psychology, University of Waikato. Retrieved May 31, 2020, from https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/995/Robertson%20raising%20conversations.pdf?sequence=1

Roguski, M. (2015). *'It's not OK' campaign community evaluation project.* Wellington: Ministry of Social Development. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from http://areyouok.org.nz/assets/RUOK-Uploads/f-MDS17572-Evaluation-Doc-1a.pdf

Roy, E. A. (2018, February 16). New Zealand legal profession shocked by sexual harassment scandal. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/feb/16/new-zealand-legal-profession-russell-mcveagh-sexual-harassment-scandal

Rua, M. R. (2015). *Māori men's positive and interconnected sense of self, being and place* [Doctoral thesis, The University of Waikato]. Research Commons. https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/9440

Salter, M. (2016a). Privates in the online public: Sex(ting) and reputation on social media. *New Media & Society, 18*(11), 2723–2739.

Salter, M. (2016b). Real men do hit women: The violence at the heart of masculinity. *Meanjin, 75*(1), 97–104.

Salter, M. (2016c). 'Real men don't hit women': Constructing masculinity in the prevention of violence against women. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 49*(4), 463–479.

Salter, M. (2019, February 27). The problem with a fight against toxic masculinity. *The Atlantic.* https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2019/02/toxic-masculinity-history/583411/

Schmidt, S. (2019, March 27). Teen boys rated their female classmates based on looks; the girls fought back. *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/lifestyle/news/article.cfm?c_id=6&objectid=12216812

Segal, M. D. (2015). *Independent review of the police and prosecution response to the Rehtaeh Parsons case.* Retrieved April 1, 2018, from https://novascotia.ca/segalreport/Parsons-Independent-Review.pdf

Setty, E. (2019). Meanings of bodily and sexual expression in youth sexting culture: Young women's negotiation of gendered risks and harms. *Sex Roles, 80*(9–10), 586–606.

Sexual Politics Now. (2013). [Website]. Retrieved March 20, 2017, from http://www.sexualpoliticsnow.org.nz/

She Is Not Your Rehab. (2019). *Home* [Facebook page]. Facebook. Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://www.facebook.com/sheisnotyourrehab/

Shifting The Line. (2021). [Website in preparation – shiftingtheline.ac.nz]

Sills, S., Pickens, C., Beach, K., Jones, L., Calder-Dawe, O., Benton-Greig, P., & Gavey, N. (2016). Rape culture and social media: Young critics and a feminist counterpublic. *Feminist Media Studies, 16*(6), 935–951.

Smith, C., & Tinirau, R. (Eds.). (2019). *He rau murimuri aroha: Wāhine Māori insights into historical trauma and healing*. Whanganui, New Zealand: Te Atawhai o Te Ao.

Spivak, G. C. (1993). *Outside in the teaching machine*. New York and London: Routledge.

Stephens, J. (2017, October 23). Toxic masculinity is everywhere. It's up to us men to fix this. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/oct/23/toxic-masculinity-men-privilege-emotions-rizzle-kicks

Stewart, M. (2017, March 10). Rape culture action moved after Wellington College boys threaten protesters. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/90272223/rape-culture-action-moved-after-wellington-college-boys-threaten-protesters

Students posted images of female teachers on Instagram. (2017, March 10). *Radio New Zealand*. https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/national/326304/students-posted-images-of-female-teachers-on-instagram

Successful protest at Parliament against rape culture [Audio podcast]. (2017, March 14). *Radio New Zealand*. https://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/morningreport/audio/201836494/successful-protest-at-parliament-against-rape-culture

Sun, C., Ezzell, M. B., & Kendall, O. (2017). Naked aggression: The meaning and practice of ejaculation on a woman's face. *Violence Against Women*, *23*(14), 1710–1729.

Sydney Boys High School Gender Equality Project [Video]. (2011, February 2). highresolves. YouTube. Retrieved October 21, 2019, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JgIg6z5nXGI

Tait, M. (2018, May 18). Confirmed: There is no toxic masculinity in New Zealand. *The Spinoff*. https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/18-05-2018/confirmed-there-is-no-toxic-masculinity-in-new-zealand/

Taylor, K., Calder-Dawe, O., Gavey, N., Le Grice, J., Thorburn, B., Manuela, S., Dudley, M., & Panditharatne, S. (2021). *Boys Talk: Workshop guide*. Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland: Te Kura Mātai Hinengaro | School of Psychology, Te Whare Wānanga o Tāmaki Makaurau | The University of Auckland. Manuscript in preparation.

Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index [Online dictionary]. (n.d.). https://maoridictionary.co.nz/

Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *Mana Wāhine Māori: Selected writings in Māori women's art, culture and politics*. Auckland: New Women's Press.

Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy. (2002). Wellington: The Ministry of Social Development | Te Manatū Whakahiato Ora. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/planning-strategy/te-rito/te-rito.pdf

Terry, G., & Braun, V. (2011). 'It's kind of me taking responsibility for these things': Men, vasectomy and 'contraceptive economies'. *Feminism & Psychology*, *21*(4), 477–495.

The Light Project. (2018). [Website]. Retrieved January 9, 2019, from https://thelightproject.co.nz/

The Men's Project & Flood, M. (2018). *The Man Box: A study on being a young man in Australia*. Jesuit Social Services: Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved April 18, 2019, from https://jss.org.au/what-we-do/the-mens-project/the-man-box/

Thomas, M. (2018, June 18). BANG! Season 2 Episode 4: Man O' Man [Audio podcast]. *Radio New Zealand*. Retrieved January 13, 2020, from https://www.rnz.co.nz/programmes/bang/story/2018649770/bang-season-2-episode-4-man-o-man

Thomas, S. E. (2018). "What should I do?": Young women's reported dilemmas with nude photographs. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *15*(2), 192–207.

Thompson, L. (2018). "I can be your Tinder nightmare": Harassment and misogyny in the online sexual marketplace. *Feminism & Psychology*, *28*(1), 69–89.

Thorburn, B. (2018). *"It's just a penis": Examining men's talk about dick pics in Aotearoa New Zealand* [Unpublished masters thesis]. The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Thorburn, B., Gavey, N., Single, G., Wech, A., Calder-Dawe, O., & Benton-Greig, P. (2021). To send or not to send nudes: New Zealand girls critically discuss the contradictory gendered pressures of teenage sexting. *Women's Studies International Forum*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2021.102448.

Topping, A., Lyons, K., & Weaver, M. (2019, January 15). Gillette #MeToo razors ad on 'toxic masculinity' gets praise – and abuse. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jan/15/gillette-metoo-ad-on-toxic-masculinity-cuts-deep-with-mens-rights-activists

Towle, M. (2017, March 13). Photos: Protest against rape culture at Parliament. *Radio New Zealand.* https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/the-wireless/374510/photos-protest-against-rape-culture-at-parliament?utm_source=redirect&utm_medium=wireless.co.nz

Towns, A. J. (2005). *Violence against women: Beyond silence.* Invited paper presented at The Women's Convention, 3–6 June, Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved September 5, 2018, from https://library.nzfvc.org.nz/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=2799

Towns, A. (2009). *The cultures of cool and being a man: Getting in early to prevent domestic violence.* Retrieved March 9, 2020, from https://www.nzfvc.org.nz/sites/default/files/TheCultureofCoolandBeingaMan.pdf

Towns, A. J., Parker, C., & Chase, P. (2012). Constructions of masculinity in alcohol advertising: Implications for the prevention of domestic violence. *Addiction Research & Theory, 20*(5), 389–401.

Towns, A. J., & Terry, G. (2014). "You're in that realm of unpredictability": Mateship, loyalty, and men challenging men who use domestic violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 20*(8), 1012–1036.

Tracking Change: Snapshot evaluation findings for The Line campaign 2015 to 2017. (n.d.). Retrieved November 5, 2020, from https://d2bb010tdzqaq7.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/11/07013310/Tracking-Change-Full-Snapshot-Report-AA.pdf

Trewartha, C. J. (2020). *Measuring community mobilisation* [Doctoral thesis, The University of Auckland]. ResearchSpace. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/50130

UN Women. (2014, September 20). *Emma Watson: Gender equality is your issue too.* Retrieved January 11, 2019, from http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2014/9/emma-watson-gender-equality-is-your-issue-too

Veukiso-Ulugia, A. (2017). *Sexual health knowledge, attitudes and behaviour among Sāmoan youth in Aotearoa* New Zealand [Doctoral thesis, Massey University]. Massey Research Online. https://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/12338

VicHealth. (2012). *More than ready: Bystander action to prevent violence against women in the Victorian community.* Carlton, Australia: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth). Retrieved February 23, 2021, from https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2012-09/apo-nid31013.pdf

Video of teacher on porn site. (2018, March 13). *Otago Daily Times.* https://www.odt.co.nz/news/national/video-teacher-porn-site

Walker, S., Sanci, L., & Temple-Smith, M. (2013). Sexting: Young women's and men's views on its nature and origins. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 52*(6), 697–701.

Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language, and discourse.* Hove and New York: Routledge.

Webster, K., & Flood, M. (2015). *Framework foundations 1: A review of the evidence on correlates of violence against women and what works to prevent it.* [Companion document to Our Watch, Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS) and VicHealth, Change the Story: A shared framework for the primary prevention of violence against women and their children in Australia]. Melbourne, Australia: Our Watch. Retrieved May 27, 2020, from https://www.ourwatch.org.au/resource/framework-foundations-1/

Wellington College boys now threatening violence against planned 'rape culture' protest. (2017, March 10). *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11815597

Wellington students encourage taking advantage of 'drunk girls'. (2017, March 17). *Radio New Zealand* https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/326072/wellington-students-encourage-taking-advantage-of-'drunk-girls'

Wendt, A. (1996). Tatauing the post-colonial body. *Span, 42–43*, (April–October), 15–29.

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends.* New York and London: W. W. Norton.

White Ribbon New Zealand. (n.d. a). *About* [Facebook page]. Facebook. Retrieved April 16, 2020, from https://www.facebook.com/pg/whiteribbonnz/about/?ref=page_internal

White Ribbon New Zealand. (n.d. b). [Website]. Retrieved May 25, 2020, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/

White Ribbon New Zealand. (n.d. c). *Respectful relationships.* Retrieved May 25, 2020, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/home/campaigns/respectful-relationships/

White Ribbon New Zealand. (n.d. d). *The Pledge.* Retrieved May 25, 2020, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/act/the-pledge/

White Ribbon New Zealand. (2017). *Briefing about White Ribbon's 2017 Respectful Relationships campaign.* Retrieved May 28, 2020, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/2017-respectful-relationships-campaign-raise-our-boys.pdf

White Ribbon New Zealand. (2019). *2019 Campaign. Challenge the #unspoken rules.* Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://whiteribbon.org.nz/home/campaigns/

Wicked Camper vans banned from Aussie music festival. (2019, January 25). *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/news/article.cfm?c_id=3&objectid=12196097

Williams, S. B. [@SonnyBWilliams]. (2018a, July 25). *I'm sorry *sarcasm* if my tweets yesterday were a bit too much for some of you. Don't mind me- I'm just doing my part to try break down barriers of unhealthy thinking men have around masculinity* ❤ [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/SonnyBWilliams/status/1022199357490118656

Williams, S. B. [@SonnyBWilliams]. (2018b, July 24). *Real men cry and im learning to feel that joy you really have to sit with that pain or whatever unwanted emotion you have. Always grateful #alhumdulliah* [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/SonnyBWilliams/status/1021882716206190592

Willott, S., & Lyons, A. C. (2012). Consuming male identities: Masculinities, gender relations and alcohol consumption in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 22*(4), 330–345.

Wilson, D., Jackson, D., & Herd, R. (2016). Confidence and connectedness: Indigenous Māori women's views on personal safety in the context of intimate partner violence. *Health Care for Women International, 37*(7), 707–720.

Wilson, D., Mikahere-Hall, A., Jackson, D., Cootes, K., & Sherwood, J. (2019). Aroha and manaakitanga – that's what it is about: Indigenous women, "love," and interpersonal violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519872298

World Economic Forum. (2019). *Global gender gap report 2020.* Geneva: World Economic Forum. Retrieved May 27, 2020, from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2020.pdf

World Health Organisation. (2018). *A fact sheet based on the WHO Europe report. The health and well-being of men in the WHO European Region: Better health through a gender approach.* Copenhagen: World Health Organisation Regional Office for Europe. Retrieved January 27, 2020, from http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/381403/who-mhr-fs-eng.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A:
Supplementary participant and workshop details

Participant demographics

Ethnicity		Total (n=54)	%
Asian (Other)		**3**	5.6%
('Asian')	(1)		
(Filipino)	(1)		
(Sri Lankan)	(1)		
Chinese		**4**	7.4%
European (Other)		**2**	3.7%
(British)	(1)		
(Scottish)	(1)		
Indian		**4**	7.4%
Māori		**1**	1.9%
Māori & Pākehā/NZ European		**4**	7.4%
Māori & Pasifika		**3**	5.6%
(Māori & Pasifika)	(1)		
(Māori & Samoan)	(2)		
Pākehā/NZ European		**19**	35.2%
Pasifika		**10**	18.5%
(Cook Islands Māori)	(1)		
(Fijian)	(1)		
(Samoan)	(6)		
(Tuvaluan)	(2)		
Pasifika & Other ethnicity		**3**	5.6%
(Pasifika & Indian)	(1)		
(Samoan & Chinese)	(1)		
(Samoan & Pākehā/NZ European)	(1)		
Unknown		**1**	1.9%

Note, participants are only counted in one category. As many participants identified more than one ethnic identity, readers interested in the number of participants belonging in any particular ethnicity category can calculate those numbers using the raw data provided under the category headings. As noted in the body of the report, for confidentiality reasons, some participants' ethnicities have been presented in ways that omit specific detail.

Age (years)	Total (n=54)	%
15	2	3.7%
16	29	53.7%
17	13	24.1%
18	9	16.7%
19	1	1.9%

Year Level	Total (n=54)	%
Year 11	14	25.9%
Year 12	30	55.6%
School leaver	10	18.5%

Workshop groups

Group 1: 3 participants, 1 workshop session

Group 2: 5 participants, 1 workshop session

Group 3: 6 participants, 1 workshop session

Group 4: 6 participants, 1 workshop session

Group 5: 6 participants, 1 workshop session

Group 6: 6 participants, 1 workshop session

Group 7: 6 participants, 2 workshop sessions

Group 8: 6 participants, 2 workshop sessions

Group 9: 5 participants, 2 workshop sessions

Group 10: 5 participants, 2 workshop sessions

Appendix B:
Transcript style, notation and formatting conventions

All the workshop sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed in full. Transcripts were then checked by a workshop facilitator to aid in identifying participants accurately. Extracts used in this report were checked against the original audio by one or more of the research team, to ensure they accurately recorded all details of speech and nonverbal sounds that we could hear and decipher. Where we have integrated participants' phrases and words into the main body of our analysis, we use double quotation marks to indicate that it is a quote. For larger extracts we have also indented them.

Transcript style

In the extracts presented in the report, we have usually retained the raw transcript record. This registers hesitations, false starts, fillers, interruptions and so on. We have done this deliberately to convey more sense of the tenor of the talk – such as its fluency and clarity. We also deliberately retained detail that shows participants and facilitators commenting and interrupting during and around a main speaker's turn, and referring to each other's previous comments. This helps to convey the joint production of the boys' talk, showing agreement and disagreement.

Below are some key notes regarding the transcript extracts:

- Transcript extracts have occasionally been edited in minor ways to enhance clarity, where hesitations, repetition, and false starts make them difficult to read and understand.
- Participants' and facilitators' natural speech has not otherwise been edited or 'tidied up'.
- Words were transcribed using regular spellings, and we did not use casual phonetic contractions that are sometimes used in transcriptions for certain kinds of words (such as 'coz' for 'because' or 'dunno' for 'don't know').
- On occasions where we have not been able to identify a speaker (usually related to very short utterances while someone else was speaking), we have labelled the speaker as "Other participant" or "Participant" (where it wasn't clear if an utterance was from the original or another speaker). Where more than one speaker was commenting to signal agreement (but in ways that were difficult to tease out), we have referred to "Several participants", for example.
- On occasions where we found it difficult to decipher what a participant had said, we have noted that the audio was unclear. In one or two instances, however, we interpreted ambiguous sounds using contextual information to make a best guess at what had been said. For example, in this phrase "a girl sent a full body nude to a boy she trusted", the second to last word, *she*, sounded like *he*, but relying on meaning derived from context and the relative similarity of the main sound when spoken conversationally at speed we have transcribed it as *she*. There were very few cases where we have done this.
- In a few cases where a participant mentioned details that we thought might potentially identify them to someone who knew them (e.g., a very specific activity, location, characteristic, or a specific relationship or description of another person), we slightly altered or removed those details.
- In a few cases, a boy described a personal characteristic or experience that was potentially identifying. Where we judged it would not affect the meaning, in a couple of cases we have slightly altered the potentially identifying detail. In six cases where altering the detail could change the meaning or significance of the characteristic, experience, or story, we have replaced the boy's pseudonym with an alternate pseudonym to further protect their confidentiality.

Transcript notation

We used the following forms of notation and formatting conventions to convey other information about conversational exchanges:

- Quotation marks are placed within a speaker's turn when they are directly reporting another person's speech (e.g., "he said 'I told you so'"), but not usually when they are indirectly reporting another person's speech (e.g., "he was like I told you so"), or reporting their own internal dialogue (e.g., "I was like I told you so"). We have erred on the side of minimising the use of quotation marks within extracts, but sometimes we have included them in these circumstances if it seems to aid in conveying clear and accurate meaning.
- Forward slashes (/) indicate simultaneous speech from two or more speakers, placed at the points where the overlap starts and finishes. We sometimes present short overlapping or adjacent turns in brackets within a longer extract of the main speaker's talk.
- Square brackets indicate that some transcript material has been deliberately omitted and/ or clarified. We use four dots like this [....] to show where we have omitted any part of a speaker's turn that is tangential to the main point.
- In some cases we place text in square brackets to clarify what the speaker has said, or to replace identifying material. For example, where a boy said the name of his school, we replaced it with "[our School]".
- Parentheses contain our descriptions of non-speech sounds, such as (laughs), our occasional interpretation of the tone of an utterance or sound, or our note that that part of the transcript was unclear.
- Italics indicate a speaker's emphasis on particular words.

Transcript punctuation

We used the following punctuation marks to convey nonverbal elements of speech:

- Commas indicate a short pause within a train of speech, or a pause that ends a train of speech without completing a sentence. However, if a sentence ends on a short pause we have omitted the comma.
- Three dots (like this...) indicate a longer pause.
- Short dashes attached to the end of a word (like this–) indicate that the person has stopped talking or stopped one train of speech abruptly seemingly mid-sentence.
- Full-stops indicate when a train of speech is completed by the speaker in a way that indicates a 'finished' sentence.

Other punctuation

- We use double quotation marks when quoting from the literature (as well as for quoting from participants). We use single quotation marks for scare quote punctuation.

Appendix C:
Supplementary interviews and analysis

Brief report: Young men involved in a performing arts production about gender

Background

This brief report summarises findings from four key informant interviews with young men working in the performing arts, conducted at the same time as our Boys Talk workshops were underway. These young men had been involved in devising and performing a production exploring gender and power in contemporary Aotearoa. Our interviews canvassed their experiences and reflections approximately one year after the production took place. These conversations focussed on questions of rape culture, masculinity and how to create change; onsharing of nudes was not a central focus.

Interview participants were young cis (3) and trans (1) men, heterosexual (3) and asexual (1), aged between 18 and 24, from "other Asian" (1), "other European"/Middle Eastern (1), Pākehā/Hispanic (1), and Pākehā/New Zealand European (1) cultural backgrounds, all living in Auckland. Participants did not come from the same social circles and were not friends before their work together. Three interviews were conducted individually (Theo, Jamie and Jason) and one interview was conducted in a pair (Liam and Theo, subsequent to Theo's individual interview) (all names are pseudonyms). Interviews were conducted by Facilitator 2 and Facilitator 3. In the quoted extracts presented below, some details have been altered or omitted to protect the participants' confidentiality in line with the principles outlined in Chapter 3.

Of the four young men interviewed, only one (Jamie) was explicitly interested in joining the performing arts production because of its critical focus on gender. The other three (Theo, Liam, Jason) became involved for the career opportunity, and the subject matter was incidental. Once committed to the production, the interviewees spent several months devising and rehearsing the production. While young women were involved, a considerable amount of the creative work took place in separate men's and women's groups. As part of this process, the performers were encouraged to speak about and reflect on their own gendered experiences to inform the production:

> "they wanted to find the people and then use our stories to sort of see what was, um, see what was like a common thread amongst our age group I guess" (*Theo*)

Although few in number, these four interviews sit productively alongside the main body of our analysis. Interviewees' discussions of masculine norms and the repudiation of femininity in their peer circles aligns with what we heard from the younger men and boys, and with the analysis presented in the main report. These interviews also lend support to the sociocultural approach we have developed. The four performers' reflections on their experiences of conscientisation through the production suggests the transformative potential of exploratory, consciousness-raising work on gender inequality with groups of young men. Perhaps most significantly, interviews hint at the downstream potential of this kind of approach. Timed as they were roughly one year after the production had taken place, these interviews offer a longer view of how conscientisation processes can play out over time for some young men.

In this brief report, we begin by highlighting what these four young men had to say about masculine norms and their production. From here, our attention turns to their experiences attempting to resist, challenge and shift the practices of other men around them.

Masculine norms and their production

As with the boys and young men who joined our workshops, the four performers we interviewed described intensive policing of normative masculinities as an ingrained, mundane feature of their peer contexts and their relationships with other men. Among friends and acquaintances, masculine status was derived from displaying dominance over other young men and young women, proving heterosexual prowess and eschewing emotionality, vulnerability and femininity. While these dynamics could be a feature of one-to-one conversations, they were especially pronounced in all-male group settings, as Jason observed: "once you're all together it's like a fucking whirlpool of insults, beer, sport". The four interviewees agreed that policing banter tended to focus group chat onto normative interests ("insults, beer, sport"; *Jason*) and away from talk that might be read as "weak" or "gay" (*Jamie*). As Jamie's account below suggests, young men who find themselves teetering on the edge of normative expectations would be likely to pull back, distancing themselves from accusations of "being a pussy" and triggering a kind of domino effect among others:

> "all it takes is one person to feel like, 'I'm not being man enough' or 'they're going to see me like with what I'm doing or what I'm talking about they're going to see that as me being vulnerable' or 'as they would probably put it [on] me being a pussy' and and that's all it takes is one person to set that off and then as soon as another one sees someone doing that they're like 'oh yeah can't be taking this seriously'" (*Jamie*)

This account is clearly resonant with what boys and young men in our workshops told us. While a sensitive conversation might be possible between two close friends, airing a difficult issue, taking a stand against a friend's behaviour or disclosing sensitive information in a group setting was much harder to imagine.

Rethinking masculinity

Through his experiences as a trans guy, Jamie joined the performing arts production with a highly developed pool of observations and critical reflections on gender, gendered bodies and young men's peer cultures. For Jason, Theo and Liam, a critical perspective on gender and power was a new and challenging development. In this section, we draw on Jason, Theo and Liam's recollections and reflections to loosely map out their trajectories of conscientisation. One year on, all three described the critical analysis of dominant 'masculinity rules' developed through the production as profoundly personally resonant and valuable.

Like many of the young men in our own workshops, Jason, Theo and Liam hadn't had cause to reflect on prevailing 'masculinity rules' and explore the imprint of these rules on their own lives prior to the production. All three remarked on the absence of critical conversations around these issues in their schools, peer groups and families. As part of devising the performance, these young men participated in workshops with other young men cast members, working collectively to discuss peer norms and, if and as they felt comfortable, talk about their own experiences. In particular, the young men were encouraged to talk about times when they had acted unethically, or might have wished they had done something differently. Sharing their own stories in a non-judge-mental context, and hearing from other young men who chose to talk about their experiences, actions and regrets was a powerful and transformative experience, as Theo explained when asked what it was like to be involved:

> "Um... Oh... I started to, I started to realise that I'd done more crap than I'd thought than I'd been happy to admit... [....] you just listened you know, nothing happened. You threw your crap into the world and maybe there was a tiny splish on a pond but nothing happened but now it doesn't exist within you it exists outside of you. And what did happen is that slowly afterwards the education came in, the support came in, the um, the challenge. I

think I think we everyone likes to be challenged. To be challenged to be better. And um, certainly feeling empowered and capable of doing that you know" (*Theo*)

These young men also had the opportunity to listen (without challenge or comment) as young women discussed their experiences of mundane sexual harassment, coercion and assault. For Theo, hearing the volume of stories and noticing the patterning across different women's experiences was a lightbulb moment, prompting him to re-evaluate gender inequalities, gendered violence and sexism as more than an "every now and then" problem:

"I thought we were here to fix like, you know every now and then problems that occur, and how fucking naive do you have to be– I reckon you have to make a conscious effort to miss out on this stuff eh" (*Theo*)

All interviewees were clear that the production had been a valuable opportunity to learn about masculinity, about the peer cultures they were part of, and to reflect on gendered dynamics with new eyes. Notably, Liam, Theo and Jason all wished they had explored this territory and had been "challenged to be better" earlier in their lives. Jason described with regret that he was only now learning what he "should have learned years ago" (*Jason*). For these three young men, reflecting on their lives and realising they had "done more crap" (*Theo*) than they had realised and acted in ways they weren't proud of was an uncomfortable but valuable experience. According to Jason, acquiring a critical lens on masculinity was vital because it allowed men to step back from sexism and make emotional connections with others in ways that released "bottled up" pressure and distress:

"when you're born with a penis [the stereotype is] given to you by birth [....] beer pussy beer pussy, you know. But you've got to understand that like, we've got to release this, I don't know, this noose, around our necks as boys and understand that as men, like, one of the strongest things that you can do is just have a yarn, like have a cry you know let our tears be heard" (*Jason*)

Speaking from a slightly different perspective, Liam suggested they were "lucky" to be aware now, as relatively young men. For older men, the process of conscientisation would be harder, he suggested, as they would have more challenging masculinity 'baggage' to confront and more time to do "fucked up things":

"we probably got lucky doing it while we're, I don't know still quite young and that, maybe we've had less time to do some fucked up things whereas someone older getting confronted with it has had [more time]" (*Liam*)

In sum, these interviews affirm our overarching observation that boys and young men have much to gain from the opportunities to talk about and 'problem-pose' masculinity rules, so long as this occurs in a supportive context. Even young men like Liam, Theo and Jason who do not come to a consciousness-raising encounter with an explicit interest in gender equality may find immense value in this process. More broadly, the experiences these three performers described highlight how a carefully designed opportunity to critically reflect on gender norms can catalyse young men's skills and readiness to contribute to positive personal and social change.

Intervention in practice

The consciousness-raising experience provided through their participation in the production left Theo, Jason and Liam feeling "challenged to be better" and "feeling empowered and capable of doing that" (*Theo*), while it worked to further affirm Jamie's commitment to equality for all genders. In the time since the production, these young performers had, in different ways, taken steps to resist, challenge and shift the practices of other young men around them. For example, Liam

increasingly found himself choosing not to spend time with people who were "constantly going to be questioning" his beliefs. Jason, on the other hand, felt an "obligation" to inform his friends and "keep the bros in check". Whether remaining with existing friends or finding new ones, Theo, Jason and Liam all talked about their attempts to start conversations about masculinity with other men in their lives.

Unsurprisingly, given the peer contexts the performers had described, challenging entrenched masculinity rules and supporting more ethical engagements with young women proved a difficult undertaking. However, the production itself created some opportunities for conversation. In order to gather material for the performance, some of the young cast members were invited to interview their friends about gender, power, masculinity and sexuality. Theo explained that this gave him "an excuse" to start a conversation that would have been hard to initiate otherwise:

> "the play was definitely the catalyst that opened it all up to my friend group because it gave me an excuse because I didn't want to be like the [higher pitch] 'hey guys can we talk about this?' I was like [deeper pitch] 'hey guys I've got this project like I don't want to talk about this'" (*Theo*)

As Theo explains it, his request for help with a work-related "project" was received as sufficiently masculine to license his friends (who wouldn't usually "talk like that") to speak about struggles, distress and what was playing on their minds. While such disclosures might more usually be seen as risky and unpalatable, Theo suggests that in this context, several friends "jumped at the chance" to talk:

> "it turns out a couple of them are on antidepressants something that none of us really knew and so I think they jumped at the chance to share and bleed together for a bit. [....] I just think people like talking you know. People like having a chat. And when you give them, when you say it's an interview it's sort of an excuse so sort of [taking off] a mask they wear and they go 'I don't really talk like that but it's for an interview' you know it's a good excuse you know. In the same way that a costume party is a good excuse to dress how you've sort of always kind of wanted to dress. [....] they're only saying things for the interview but you could really see it was things that were bothering them for a long time and um, they brought up things that I thought they'd forgotten about almost which was I found amazing because I was like I'm glad that plays on your mind I'm glad that you remember that girl or that incident" (*Theo*)

While useful, the need for this kind of prompt or "excuse" points to the power of masculinity norms in these peer settings. Only in exceptional circumstances could such matters be broached. According to Theo, Liam and Jason, drinking or drug-taking operated similarly. Being in an altered state of consciousness was understood to give young men a "pass to just talk" (*Jason*) – a temporary release from the strict confines of acceptably masculine conversation.

More usually, spaces for conversation were hard to find. Liam, for example, was disappointed with his father's and friends' unwillingness to broach the content of the production when he met them afterwards. His father's engagement with the content was limited to wondering aloud why there was "no such thing as meninism", and friends showed little interest in discussing some of the challenging ideas the production presented:

> "they just refused to talk about the content of the show like it was just like block it out, 'hey how are you haven't seen you for a while' I was 'like what did you think of the show?', 'oh yeah it was good, what have you been up to?' like and it was- it's interesting... how defensive we get as men to it eh like we don't want to talk about it because that's scary and unknown and, oh no yeah don't yeah, yeah that was real interesting those were the only two that came and so that was the only reaction I got from high school friends was sort of like, push it aside don't actually talk about it." (*Liam*)

Liam did observe that the father of another performer seemed "shook" and thoughtful after the show:

> "he's, so set in his ways and stuff and I remember he came up to me after the show, and he was like oh, he was real quiet he was real shook I remember him just looking real shook and he's like 'oh it was, it was really good you've um given me a lot to think about'" (*Liam*)

This seemed to be the exception rather than the rule, however, and suggests that one-off experiences (such as attending a performance) may have limited potential to trigger engagement, especially from men who do not have an existing personal interest in or affinity for critical approaches to gender.

Jason described mixed experiences trying to start conversations with his friend group. He recalled sharing a feminist video he liked to his group chat. Despite his careful, "picky" framing of the video, it was quickly dismissed by his friends as "bullshit":

> "when I posted that video up in the chat it was like oh here's Jason with his feminist bullshit again, like, um fuck I wrote like a whole like, thingy above it [....] I was really picky with the way I worded it, so, they can, they can stop categorising me as this fairy fucking princess, and just listen, like this is a problem we can do something about it." (*Jason*)

On another occasion, when his group of friends were discussing the "slutty" behaviour of a girl they all knew in an online chat, his intervention was more successful:

> "the comments [about her] on the thing in our group chat just kept on riling up riling up riling up, like it took me all the way back to [the production] like 'alright man this is your moment bro this is what you fucking like this is what you try to prevent', [....] I'm trying to remember what I said like, there's obviously a reason as to why she did it but, ah something along the lines of like, 'we don't get to dictate how she's supposed to feel about it you know what I mean so, [....] don't shit on her like a decision that she made, just be a good person' you know what I mean and, yeah then they started replying back like 'oh yeah da da da da da da, true bro', shit like that." (*Jason*)

Jason's inclusive challenge to his friends – "we" should do things differently – landed well in this context. Theo also reflected on the importance of this inclusive style of engagement, giving his friends respect and breathing space to think and puzzle out collective conclusions, rather than telling them what to think:

> "it's kind of that where you sit next to them and then shit because you're both in this rather than sitting opposite them [....] it's it's ten times better than coming across like a lecture" (*Theo*)

Notably, this 'calling in' style of address echoes both the 'problem-posing' ethos of the Boys Talk workshops and the recommendations offered by participants themselves.

Risks and complexities of intervention

All four of the young men we interviewed affirmed the difficulties of presenting a challenge to another man's behaviour, and the delicate work involved. As with our workshop participants, the four performers described the dilemma of wanting to offer a critique while also wishing to avoid angering others or causing damage to valued relationships. As Jamie explained, critiques and challenges had to be both sensitively and humorously delivered to have a chance of landing well, especially with "traditional males" who might be most heavily invested in dominant masculinities:

> "it always has to be something that's kind of like, almost in a jokey way but with the undertone of 'I'm serious, stop' which I definitely understand because like, it's almost like, something about interacting with more traditional males is like walking on eggshells because you kind of have to say everything in a jokey way so if they don't take it right you can be like 'oh I was just joking'" (*Jamie*)

These reflections align closely with what we heard from workshop participants regarding the intricacies and risks of this work. As discussed in Chapter 5, a great deal of skill is required to navigate these kinds of interactions. In some cases, interviewees worried about inciting an aggressive, violent response, as Liam said of his "angry" and physically imposing flatmate's persistent sexism:

> "I find it rough with him definitely because he's quite a, angry guy when things don't go his way but- and he's very big as well so I'm always quite cautious [....] I'll sort of, I'll give him a look and he'll sort of realise what I'm giving him the look about and he'll just sort of be like 'mm whatever bro' or I'll be like bro, I'll say like 'bro' to him and he just sort of goes 'it doesn't matter it's not important', it's like well, it simply is, like it's not, I could definitely be doing more, I'm very aware of that every time it happens" (*Liam*)

In Liam's account, his personal sense of obligation to be "doing more" sits uncomfortably alongside his concern about personal safety and the desire for things to run smoothly with a flatmate.

While physical violence was occasionally mentioned, the risks of challenging other men were more commonly couched in relational terms. While none of the performers described lasting harm to friendships arising as a result of a challenging conversation, several described receiving hostile and defensive responses. Relational damage was also paramount for Jamie, who expressed worry about damaging his relationship with his father by challenging his banter about women passers-by:

> "when I do see [my father] I'm almost in the mindset of OK don't do anything that'll make him not want to [spend time with me] again kind of thing" (*Jamie*)

Discussion

The four young men we interviewed about their experiences of participating in a performing arts production exploring masculinity and gendered power relations described strikingly similar peer contexts, desires and concerns to those raised by the Boys Talk workshop participants. The workshopping process the four performers went through began with a similar problem-posing approach as used in our workshops. Timed one year after the production, the interviews described here offer a different, longer view of how conscientisation processes might play out over time. Reflecting on their experience a year later, these young men indicated that such opportunities can seed the potential for meaningful shifts over time, and that they can have a lasting impact. Overall, their experiences further highlight the value of opening spaces for men to have challenging conversations with other men, in contexts that also integrate insights from women. The non-judgemental tone of their workshopping was key to allowing young men to re-evaluate received ideas and past conduct:

> "the moment that we felt like they weren't going to judge us is the moment we started letting out the good- you know, the real stuff, the stuff that actually you can do something with and present and um... yeah I feel like a lot of men are... scared that as soon as they admit to having done something irredeemable um... uh, yeah." (*Theo*)

These young men also described how their experience rippled out into other areas of their social worlds. Like those in the Boys Talk workshops, these four performers referred to a wider cultural context that was not always receptive to challenging ideas about gender and masculinity. They reported mixed success in their efforts to intervene, challenge and transform the practices and attitudes of men around them. For some, it seemed that presenting a rationale (their work in the production) for bringing up such points with other men gave them a kind of 'pass' that made some conversations more possible than they might otherwise have been.

In summary, insights from these four interviews support key elements of the workshop model we have presented in the main body of the report, hinting at the potential of this approach to spark change for young men directly involved in ways that can ripple out into friendships, family and the wider cultural landscape.

Acknowledgements