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Abstract

This work examines what rhetorical approaches were used in the devising and delivery of workplace training materials that address intimate partner violence and gender-related power constructs in a predominantly male workplace and why these approaches were chosen. Specifically, this study analyzes the language used throughout the discourse for the purposes of determining how language can shape the perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of the participants. The data was obtained using the qualitative methods of rhetorical analysis and interviewing. The materials were analyzed and this data was synthesized with the results of interviews with the author of the discourse. Supporting research examines existing systems that reinforce power differentials and concludes that these ideologies are so ingrained in our culture that groups often participate in their own marginalization. Studies further demonstrate how these inequities impact organizational dynamics. Select communication theories were applied to the findings, which upheld the hypothesis put forth by rhetorical theorists such as Kramarae (2005) that language frames perceptions, cultural ideologies and ultimately impacts behaviors. Findings can help us to further understand the power of language and the steps that must be taken to reframe perceptions and alter behaviors relative to gender norming and intimate partner violence in a sustainable way.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Study

However imperceptible, every interpersonal and organizational interaction is influenced by power. The United States was built on a foundation of power hierarchies based on race, class and gender. While this power structure has become less obvious in a number of ways, it is still in existence and has far reaching implications for our interactions with one another. Power provides opportunity for some while marginalizing others.

It is not practical to assert that the workplace can be separated from the rest of human experiences. Increasing research shows that the constructs that exist outside organizations also exist within and impact the institution, affecting not just the employee but the business bottom line as well. Studies such as the one commissioned by Liz Claiborne in 2007 in concert with data collected by the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and the Corporate Alliance to End Partner Violence support the hypothesis that power constructs and inequities impact organizational dynamics and employees in a number of ways including promotional opportunities, task assignments, and employee morale, satisfaction and retention. A lesser-known result of gender-related power inequities directly impacting organizations today is intimate partner violence. Intimate partner abuse is an issue that spans all cultures, races, and classes. This abuse is rooted in patterns of power and control and fueled by sexism and the objectification of women. There are distinct negative and widespread consequences of intimate partner violence to organizations. Research shows how existing social systems reinforce gender related power differentials, and contribute to stereotypes and bias regarding intimate partner violence. These ideologies are so ingrained in our culture that gone unexamined, they intersect with workplace norms and further perpetuate gender roles and stereotypes when job-related
consequences of intimate partner violence impact the victim’s job performance, job security, and workplace safety. Additionally, these gender roles and stereotypes contribute to the role of the silent bystander; whereby colleagues or supervisors who may be willing to be supportive are precluded from taking appropriate actions.

This study specifically examines training materials that were designed to address the issues of dominant cultural ideologies relative to gender and intimate partner violence for a male-dominated work environment. The discourse analyzed included the curriculum used to train the participants, the curriculum used to train others to give the workshop, and accompanying trainer’s discussion guides.

Studying the history and formation of these constructs can assist us in seeing the situation from different perspectives and shed light on why their unraveling can be complex but important to understand given the impact of intimate partner violence on the workplace.

To date, few studies have focused on the training and education materials used to deconstruct these systems and generate sustainable change in employee’s attitudes and perceptions. It is important to examine gender-related power constructs in organizations and the training materials used to deconstruct these systems because it has been proven to be cost effective for the organization and in understanding the influence of power on our interpersonal interactions and group dynamics, we are better equipped to communicate with one another and work together effectively and safely in organizational settings.

**Definitions of Terms Used**

**Abuse:** Abuse is defined as a behavioral pattern of coercive control that one person exercises over another in order to get their way. It is behavior that physically harms, arouses fear, prevents a person from doing what she wants, or compels her to behave in ways she does not freely
choose” (Jones & Schechter, 1992, p. 13).

**Ally Behavior:** Ally behavior begins with understanding your own privileges, understanding them relative to those of others and then helping others to acknowledge their privilege. It involves not buying into stereotypes or being a bystander but speaking up for those who for whatever reason are not able to speak up for themselves. For example, not laughing at an offensive joke and/or holding someone accountable for their offensive language or behavior are both examples of ally behavior.

**Dominant cultural ideology:** An ideology is defined as, “the body of doctrine, myth, belief, etc., that guides an individual, social movement, institution, class, or large group” (World English Dictionary, 2011). The term “dominant cultural ideology” is used to refer to the overarching or prevailing ideology of a culture.

**Gender Equality:** Refers to the absence of discrimination, on the basis of a person's sex, in the allocation of resources or benefits or in the access to services. Gender equality entails the concept that all human beings, both men and women, are free to develop their personal abilities and make choices without the limitations set by stereotypes, rigid gender roles, or prejudices. Gender equality means that the different behaviors, aspirations, and needs of women and men are considered, valued, and favored equally. It does not mean that women and men have to become the same, but that their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Inequality, discrimination, and differential treatment on the basis of sex can be structural (i.e., it is practiced by public or social institutions and maintained by administrative rules and laws and involves the distribution of income, access to resources, and participation in decision making) (United States Agency International Development, 2007).

**Gender-related power construct:** A construct is defined as something that is formulated or
built systematically (World English Dictionary, 2011). The term gender-related power construct refers to the constructs involving gender and power dynamics.

**Gender role stereotyping:** The portrayal, in media or books or conversations, of socially assigned gender roles as "normal" and "natural" (United States Agency International Development, 2007). This is also referred to as gender norming.

**Intimate partner violence:** The definition of intimate partner violence is a pervasive pattern of domination and control by one intimate partner over the other. This pattern of behavior can include tactics such as physical, sexual, emotional, psychological, verbal, and financial abuse. Examples of intimate partner violence may include hitting, kicking, punching, shoving, stabbing, shooting, slapping, threatening behavior, name calling, humiliation in front of others, controlling what one wears, says or does, controlling financial decisions, stalking, taunting, destroying or attempting to destroy property with the goal of controlling another person. Intimate partner violence crosses all ethnic, racial and socio-economic lines and occurs in heterosexual, as well as same-sex partnerships (Center for Disease Control, 2003).

**Stereotype:** A stereotype is an inaccurate, simplistic generalization about a group that allows others to categorize them and treat them accordingly (World English Dictionary, 2011).

**Organization of Remaining Chapters**

This work is organized into five chapters. Chapter two is a literature review that provides a foundation for understanding gender-related power constructs, dominant cultural ideologies, and the impact of these constructs and ideologies on organizational dynamics. Chapter two also contains an overview of the communication theory used to discuss the findings of this study. Chapter three includes a description of the scope and methodology of this qualitative study and a rational for the choice of research methods used. Chapter four discusses the results of the study,
and contains a summary of themes that emerged from the data, as well as conclusions that can be drawn from this data. The fifth chapter includes the conclusions of this study and how they relate to current research being done in this field, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following section reviews the literature that provides a foundation for understanding gender-related power constructs, dominant cultural ideologies, and the resulting impacts of these constructs on organizational dynamics. Attention to the history and formation of these constructs can assist us in seeing the situation from different perspectives and shed light on why their unraveling can be complex but important to understand given their influence on organizational environments. Further, the literature discusses the link between gender-related power constructs and intimate partner violence. It explores the impact of intimate partner violence on organizations and defines the theories used to analyze these constructs and the training materials used to deconstruct these systems.

Sources used to illustrate the points outlined above are well-established texts that examine communication theory, interpersonal interactions, and organizational dynamics as well as peer reviewed scholarly journals and studies conducted through the use of interviews, survey data and observations.

**History of Power Constructs**

Johnson, Rush and Feagin (2000) examine the development of white privilege and the formation of the constructs of power that are in place today. The article explains the concept of racism as a complex system of oppression dating back to the formation of North America. The authors focus on racism while acknowledging that racism, sexism, and classism are not separate constructs. Johnson et al. (2000) suggest that power is the ability to control and distribute resources and hierarchies based on race, class, and gender were created to categorize the human race. Throughout history, European Caucasians have been in control of the distribution of resources beginning with the formation of colonies while Americans of color were objectified
and often treated as subhuman. The content of this work explains that the ideology of racial classification in the United States is grounded in a system of hierarchy, privilege, and power that favors the Caucasian race. These ideologies, prejudices, and stereotypes exist today in an institutionalized capacity that perpetuates the oppression of some while elevating others.

**Power Constructs Perpetuated**

Power constructs and dominant cultural ideologies are reinforced in a myriad of ways in our culture. Examples of this include, but are not limited to, messages sent through mass media outlets, language used, and behavior exhibited by society.

**Mass Media Influences**

The mass media has demonstrated an ability to influence everything from our purchasing decisions to which political candidate we vote for. It shapes our views and understanding of issues. These views carry over into organizational environments. Television programs, major motion pictures, and print and electronic media perpetuate power constructs and stereotypes in ways that are detrimental to marginalized groups. Iconic television shows such as *The Honeymooners* and *I Love Lucy* routinely communicated that the ambitions and desires of the female characters were secondary to that of the male characters and were only entertained if those ambitions didn’t preclude the females from catering to the needs of the males. More modern television shows send equally damaging messages concerning gender and power. In the drama *Mad Men*, a story unfolds depicting life at an advertising agency in the 1960s. Female characters are portrayed as not having anything to contribute that is of equal value to the professional contributions of their male counterparts. While fictional, these shows reinforce the idea that male gender is the group in power and the female gender is somehow subservient to them. Print media equally participates in reinforcing gender related power constructs in our
society. In July of 2010, the New York Times published an article entitled, “From a Lounge Chair, Marking Their Prey,” in which two male insurance brokers in their thirties were interviewed about picking up women at a rooftop pool in New York City. “We are on a safari, and this is our jungle,” said one. “I’m here to hunt for meat,” commented the other (Raftery, 2010, para. 3). They then went on to critique the physical characteristics of a nearby group of women, concluding with, “There were rumors that there were good-looking girls, but I’m not impressed … It’s nice that the waitresses wear those little black dresses, though.” (Raftery, 2010, para. 20). Comments such as these, which received no public outcry or backlash, published in a major metropolitan newspaper serve to perpetuate and legitimize the objectification of women and their perceived status relative to men in society.

Behaviors that perpetuate stereotypical gender roles, assign gender to characteristics, and uphold myths of masculinity and societal ideas of what it means to “be a man” and “be a woman” all contribute to the existing imbalance of power in society and within organizations. At times, these practices have become so ingrained in our way of life that we are not even conscious of their existence and our role in maintaining them.

The agenda setting theory supports the idea that the mass media shapes our perceptions of what is and isn’t acceptable in society. Maxwell McCombs summarized the idea behind the agenda setting theory by stating, “We judge as important what the media judge as important … the media may not only tell us what to think about, they also may tell us how and what to think about it, and perhaps even what to do about it.” (Griffin, 2009 pp. 359-366). To this end, Ramasubramanian (2005) conducted a study to examine the self-reported prejudicial feelings of one group toward another after exposure to various forms of media, in order to demonstrate the influence of media on the thoughts and beliefs of society. Of the 227 participants, 86.3% were
white and the ratio of males to females was almost even. Participants were asked to first view a film on media literacy that encouraged them to be thoughtful and reflective concerning media messages. After the film, they were asked to answer a series of questions that gauged their understanding of the film. Next, participants were asked to read five news stories. Two of the news segments depicted stereotypical stories, three depicted non-stereotypical stories, and all were uniform in length and format. Findings indicated that the participant’s emotions and attitudes toward the groups in the news stories were influenced by the stories they read. Those participants who viewed the stereotypical news stories expressed a level of contempt and/or pity for the groups portrayed that differed from those participants that read the counter-stereotypical stories. Results demonstrate that media is a powerful agent shaping people’s understanding and views of other groups. One of the potential limitations of the study is that the sample is drawn from one large university in the northeast. It is suggested that results may vary when dealing with non-students or populations of a different age or geographic region. The author acknowledges that it is important to replicate the study with different populations.

Ramasubramanian’s (2005) work identifies a critical way in which groups in power influence the perception of others and lends further support to the power of the agenda setting theory.

Organizational Technology Influences

Much like mass media, corporations also have a profound influence on the perceptions of society. Tools used in business as well as company practices send a strong message that can reinforce stereotypes of gender roles. Examining the content of a widely used business tool, Dyrud (1997) examined 14,000 clip art images across six different Windows-based programs for gender bias. Results of the examination shows that clip art images tend to reinforce stereotypes. Men are typically portrayed as doctors, dentists, managers, construction workers, technicians,
and plumbers while images of women typically portray them as mothers, teachers, or nurses. Generally, women are not shown as doing anything functional in their environment, they appear alone or standing still. Comparatively speaking, men are depicted as interactive, participating in activities such as giving speeches and presentations or talking to co-workers. Further examination indicates that men are portrayed as rescuers, women as victims, men as powerful beings, women as subservient. The review also shows that images of men largely outnumber those of the women in the professional arena. It can be argued that the study is limited in that the observations only encompass six image programs. However, the programs examined are among those most widely used in business organizations. This research demonstrates evidence of how gender stereotypes are perpetuated and how the perception of women in society and in organizations is shaped.

**Language and Behavioral Influences**

Through our language and behavior, we perpetuate stereotypes, reinforce gender hierarchy, and pass on dominant cultural ideology. The study conducted by Haase (1998) explores how male teachers can reinforce gender power differentials through their work practices. The research method consisted of a series of interviews with 11 male teachers, 6 female teachers, 2 male principals, and two female principals within a six-month period. The article asserts that one of the ways in which inequity of power is maintained is through the practice of segregated work roles and assigning unequal value to the work that women and men do. Results of the study indicate that both male and female teachers can pass on their own personal experiences and bias to their students. This generally manifests itself through the way boys and girls are disciplined, the types of things they are disciplined for, and the work they are assigned in the classroom. For example, male teachers interviewed felt that when boys push each other it is a sign of friendship
and not worthy of disciplinary action. They do not view the boys’ physical actions as acts of power. In interviewing so few subjects, the study is somewhat limited in scope. This study explores the hierarchal system of the distribution of power and is an example of gender role segregation, which is one of the practices that keep gendered power differentials in place.

Institutionalized power constructs can appear to be such a normal part of our interactions that the marginalized group participates in furthering its own oppression. In this case, Ashcraft and Pacanowsky (1996) explored the implications of assigning gender to specific traits or management styles within an organization. Furthermore, the study examined how females in actual organizational settings actively contribute to the construction of their workplace communities and how they negotiate organizational norms that could appear to exclude or marginalize female employees.

Ashcraft and Pacanowsky (1996) theorize that female employees participate in their own marginalization by demonstrating behaviors that preserve the institutionalized constructs that oppress them. To explore their theory, Ashcraft and Pacanowsky (1996) conducted a case study of the culture and business practices of Office Inc., a small business with predominantly female employees. Office Inc. is comprised of 32 employees, 9 of which are male. The employees are spread across two geographic locations. Of the nine male employees, six work within the warehouse and three work in management and sales. The scope of analysis encompassed the use of participant-observation methods and open-ended interviews with 21 of the 32 employees over the course of six months. The female employees at Office Inc. are predominantly white and are from middle to upper-middle class communities. The group is diverse in age and comprised of both single and married individuals. The study may be viewed as being limited in scope in that it only examines one organization and utilizes interpretive forms of analysis (interviews and
observation). However, Office Inc. provides a functional cross section of warehouse, management and sales employees with geographic locations in both the mountains and in a downtown metropolitan area. Results of this study support Ashcraft and Pacanowsky’s (1996) hypothesis and indicate that stereotyping and sexism are so pervasive and deep-rooted that they manifest themselves in ways that appear to be normal to those that are being marginalized, that marginalized groups play a role in perpetuating the systems that oppress them and thereby have a role in eliminating them.

Ely (1995) examines the implications of having a disproportionate amount of women in power within an organization and assigning gender to characteristics and gender role stereotyping on employee perceptions. Ely’s (1995) study purports that the proportional representation of women in power positions in organizations affects the gender identity of women in lower positions in the organization. The hypotheses explored in this study are that women in male-dominated firms will exaggerate behavioral and psychological differences between men and women in ways that are consistent with gender-role stereotypes, will evaluate women’s attributes less favorably in relation to firm requirements for success, and will be less likely to identify characteristics that are stereotypic of women as requirements for success as compared to women in sex-integrated firms. Qualitative interviews were conducted and quantitative questionnaires were administered to volunteer participants from four male-dominated law firms and four sex-integrated law firms. Information obtained supports the hypotheses and further demonstrates how an imbalance of gender representation in an organization impacts female employees at all levels of the organization and the organizational dynamics as a whole. The information gleaned from this study is reflective of the social identity theory, studied and eventually named by Tajfel (1971). The social identity theory maintains that
group memberships define the perception that others have of us as well as the way in which we view ourselves. Ultimately, this affects the way individuals behave within these groups and communicate with one another. Ely’s (1995) work viewed through the framework of the social identity theory illustrates the far-reaching implications of power imbalances on individual psyches, perceptions, and behaviors of employees in organizations.

The research of Vescio, Gervais, Snyder and Hoover (2005) proposes that when men in masculine domains apply stereotypes to female subordinates, the resulting patronizing behavior has serious implications for the recipients of these behaviors and often results in poor performance on the part of the female subordinate. A masculine domain is defined as an environment in which attributes necessary for success are typically associated with men. The outcome of the experiments support the hypothesis that men who stereotype their female subordinates are more likely to assign women fewer valued positions than those men or women who do not apply gender stereotypes to their employees. Results also indicate that women’s performance worsens in patronizing situations while men’s performance improves. The outcome of this body of research indicates that the implication of applying stereotypes to female subordinates have largely negative effects on those subordinates and their work product. This work illustrates the tangible negative impacts of acting upon stereotypes and assigning gender to characteristics upon the performance of female employees in the context of power relations within organizations.

Goodwin and Fiske (1998) propose a model for understanding how situational power and dominance works to motivate stereotyping that in turn maintains conflict and hierarchy among social groups. Goodwin and Fiske (1998) developed their model based on a series of studies focusing on cognitive and behavioral bias. Their research indicates that the motives that facilitate
stereotyping result in cognitive and behavioral biases that prompt actions that directly affect the
distribution of resources, thereby stabilizing the existing power structure and keeping it in place.
In each scenario, those with perceived dominance and those with actual power or situational
control were more likely to consider stereotypes when making judgments. This study
demonstrates that stereotyping is a powerful tool that perpetuates the existing cycle of
dominance and power.

**Impacts of Power Constructs in Organizations**

**Upward Mobility and Access to Informal Power Networks**

Power constructs have a direct impact on organizational dynamics and one’s ability to
successfully move up the organizational ladder. Elliot and Smith (2004) focus on one dimension
of power—control over others in the workplace. Using data from the Multi-City Survey of Urban
Inequality, the authors examine how race, ethnicity, and gender affect the likelihood of attaining
successively higher levels of authority in organizations. Examining race and gender together,
Elliot and Smith’s (2004) work specifically looks to assess how inequality in workplace power
increases among women and minorities relative to white men. Homosocial reproduction is the
phenomenon in which supervisors promote individuals that are most similar to them and one of
the reasons used to explain the relative inequality as one moves higher up the organizational
chart. Statistics show that the majority of the individuals holding positions of power in
organizations are white males, therefore individuals of other genders, races, and ethnicities have
a lower likelihood of moving up the ranks than white males. The study examines a random
sample across several workplaces. It is suggested that a larger sample within organizations may
provide a better analysis of the importance of network assistance in white men’s attainment of
power. The information in this article demonstrates the impact of race and gender on power inequalities in the workplace.

Along the lines of Elliot and Smith’s (2004) work, Ibarra (1992) argues that gender inequalities in the distribution of power within organizations are caused by homophily (the preference for interaction with those having similar attributes such as sex and race), and the ability or inability to leverage personal attributes and resources. To develop a better understanding of the impact of homophily on women’s access to informal workplace networks, Ibarra (1992) conducted an examination of a large advertising and public relations firm in New England. The firm had 94 full-time employees organized into various departments. Data was collected through one-on-one interviews and questionnaires that were used to obtain information on communication, advice, support, influence, and friendship networks. The author explores how formal positions and individual attributes contribute to network access. Results of this qualitative organizational study support the hypothesis that homophily contributes to men’s centrality while it decreases women’s centrality. Centrality is defined as the proximity to an organization’s center of influence. This research is useful because it provides a network analysis, which uncovers systematic differences that reflect a disadvantage to female employees. It further demonstrates that men will hold more central network positions than women in the context of organizational interactions. This analysis provides critical information that can be used to modify existing behaviors and systems, which will in turn provide women with additional support, resources, and access to informal networks.

Orpen (1998) looks specifically at the effects of centrality, also known as radial movement, within an organization on the career success and satisfaction of employees. Radial movement is defined as proximity to the organization’s center of influence. The subjects, 79 employees of a
small manufacturing company, completed a 21 item organizational centrality measurement in which they indicated how much their salary had grown and how many promotions they received during their tenure with their organization as well as their location relative to the influential center of the organization. Results suggest that the career success of employees and employee satisfaction are positively related to their level of radial movement, otherwise referred to as centrality. This study compliments the work previously discussed that purports power imbalances within organizations that lead to decreased centrality for women directly impacts their levels of satisfaction and professional success. Distance from an organization’s center of influence can also mean a lack of access to the formal and informal networks that allow one access to positions of power within an organization.

Using data from the Comparative Leadership Study conducted in 2000 by Vianello and Moore, Moore and Dolan (2004) compare the perceptions of women’s access to elite networks in 24 industrialized nations. It is hypothesized that women’s lack of access to informal power networks is likely to impede their ability to move into high-powered positions. A questionnaire was administered to the highest positions held by women and men in each country that focused on gender and power as well as measures of access to power. Results assert that women in top positions agree that women are isolated when in predominantly male environments and lack powerful informal contacts and access to powerful networks. Men in top positions do not agree, citing lack of experience and skills as reasons for women’s underrepresentation in powerful positions. This work will provide additional evidence to illustrate factors that contribute to the underrepresentation of women in positions of power. The reported discrepancy between male and female perceptions can be explained by the feminist standpoint theory purported by Wood (2005). This theory suggests that our view is shaped by the place from which we view the world
and that the perspective of the marginalized group can provide a more objective and accurate representation of a situation than that of a group or individual in power. The gender-related power constructs that structure society place men in the dominant group and women in the marginalized group. Therefore, the perception of the female employees in this case will be more accurate than that of the male employees.

**Supervision**

In addition to the impact gender related power constructs have on promotional opportunities, task assignments, and employee morale, satisfaction and retention, these constructs also influence the ability of women to supervise and instruct male subordinates. Elias and Cropanzano (2006) analyze data from two different studies to determine how an instructor’s gender may influence his or her ability to gain compliance from students. The authors purport that female instructors are at a disadvantage as compared to their male counterparts, specifically when exerting social power over male students. Using a modified version of the Interpersonal Power Inventory, participants were asked questions relating to their perceptions of power usage by a supervisor in an organizational setting. Respondents consisting of 297 undergraduate students (117 males and 180 females) rated the likelihood for which each item would result in compliance with a particular request. Results of the study support the hypothesis that female instructors have more difficulty attempting to gain compliance from male students as compared to their male counterparts. While this study was conducted in an academic setting, the authors contend that this phenomenon extends into other organizational settings. This study supports the idea that females within organizational settings are at a disadvantage in exerting social power as compared to their male counterparts.

**Health and Safety**
As previously noted in the study conducted by Ashcraft and Pacanowsky (1996), assigning gender to characteristics is a means by which stereotypes are perpetuated, is limiting to the success of both males and females in organizational settings, and ensures that the patriarchal systems within our organizational communities stays in place. Effective leaders are characterized by traits that are typically associated with the male gender roles. If a woman demonstrates confidence, assertiveness, or ambition, she is often told she is acting like a man. If she is sensitive, emotional, catty, or backstabbing, her behavior is described as being typical of a woman. Ashcraft and Pacanowsky (1996) state, “Office Inc. employees speak of cutthroat competition in their workplace as ‘female’, rather than as a darker side of humans striving for individual achievement” (p. 230). Ely and Meyerson (2010) conducted a study on workplace safety that found an unintended link between workplace safety and male employee’s attempts to fulfill the culture’s idea of masculine identity. The study was conducted on two offshore oil platforms, Rex and Comus, that have an employee base that is 90% male ranging in age between 21 and 55 years old with the average age being 38. Data was collected primarily through interviews and observations conducted during site visits over a period of 19 months. Male employees reported that they felt they were not allowed to admit to mistakes or discuss feeling ill or experiencing personal issues that may be affecting their ability to focus on their work. If they violated those norms, other employees would ridicule them. In addition, safety goals tied to monetary compensation resulted in employees covering up minor accidents. At the same time, production goals were set that incentivized employees to work faster which in turn led them to cut corners where safety was concerned. To strengthen their position that there is a correlation between poor workplace safety rates and a culture that emphasizes behaviors linked to masculine identities, Ely and Meyerson (2010) reviewed over 80 studies reporting on men’s workplace
behaviors spanning industries traditionally dominated by males. The review indicated that organizations that were operating in a less safe and efficient manner employed males who seemed concerned with portraying a masculine image, idealizing strength and power, technical prowess, and emotional detachment. Those organizations that were operating more safely and efficiently had male employees that acted in a counter-stereotypical manner. Employees of Rex and Comus received instruction on how to modify their behaviors to create a safer working environment and in turn the corporation developed new goals and standards supportive of these efforts. Goals were re-defined to measure competence using task requirements, employees were encouraged to question when something appeared dangerous, to admit that they did not feel safe and to stop and evaluate the situation. Employees were encouraged to admit to and collectively analyze their mistakes rather than place blame. Changes in corporate culture resulted in an 84% decline in the company’s accident rate and the company’s productivity, efficiency and reliability exceeded the industry benchmark for that time period. The implications of this study indicate that men’s interactions are shaped by beliefs about what it takes to be a man. In order for men to break from these norms, they risk ridicule and ostracism. Therefore, cultures must be created within organizations that give men the permission and the drive to exhibit counter-stereotypical behaviors. This behavioral and cognitive shift gives employees permission to hold one another accountable for creating a safe work environment, which in turn builds cohesiveness and trust within work teams. As intimate partner violence is a bi-product of gender-related power constructs and perpetuated by societal beliefs about what it takes to be a man, this same permission extends to employees talking to one another about issues of intimate partner violence in the workplace.

Intimate partner violence, a bi-product of societal constructs of power and control has very
Institutionalized gender norming, to include perceptions of the characteristics associated with masculinity and how this concept is reinforced and perpetuated within organizations, contributes to the severity of the problem.

In 2007, Liz Claiborne, Inc., commissioned a study entitled, “Corporate Leaders on Domestic Violence,” to gauge corporate leaders’ view of intimate partner violence and its impact on the workplace. A random sample of 200 Chief Executive Officers was selected from Fortune 1,500 companies. Data was collected through telephone interviews and online questionnaires. Simultaneous to the Liz Claiborne study, Safe Horizon and the Corporate Alliance to End Partner Violence commissioned a study entitled, “America’s Workforce on Domestic Violence,” in order to study employee perception of intimate partner violence in the workplace. A random sample of 503 employees was selected from Fortune 1500 companies to participate in phone interviews and questionnaires administered online. Combined results of these studies indicate that 63% of CEOs and 81% of employees believe that intimate partner violence is a major problem in our society. Among CEOs, 58% are aware of employees affected by intimate partner violence and 41% of all employees are aware of a co-worker affected by intimate partner violence. When it comes to impacting the bottom line 43% of CEOs and 91% of employees say intimate partner violence has harmful effects in the areas of employee attendance, productivity, employee safety, insurance and medical costs, and turnover. Employees are more likely than CEOs to say that companies should play a major role in addressing intimate partner violence while only 13% of CEOs say companies should play a major role.

Data cited by the AFL-CIO (2001) indicates that abusers commit 13,000 violent acts against their partners in the workplace each year and research shows that 74% of employed abused
women were harassed by their husbands or boyfriends at work (AFL-CIO, 2001). A Center for Disease Control (2003) study on the financial impacts of intimate partner violence on an organizations showed that the annual cost of lost productivity due to intimate partner violence is estimated as $727.8 million. That figure is not inclusive of the cost of medical insurance claims. In addition, over 7.9 million paid workdays are lost each year due to intimate partner violence situations. This information coupled with the aforementioned studies on intimate partner violence in the workplace serves to make the case that intimate partner violence is an issue that is a consequence of imbalances in power and control structures that has serious implications for organizations.

A critical component to addressing intimate partner violence in the workplace is training and education. Traditionally, intimate partner violence has been seen as women’s issue and training and education on the subject has been focused on women. Recently, there has been an increased acknowledgement that women alone will not eliminate intimate partner violence. It will take women and men working together to deconstruct the systems currently in place that allow violence against women to continue. Environments need to be crafted in which men feel that they have permission to hold other men accountable for their behavior. One of the tools used to generate that culture change is training and education geared toward men that actively engages them as allies and outlines how they are a necessary part of the solution. Crooks, Goodall, Hughes, Jaffe and Baker (2007) propose a cognitive-behavioral paradigm geared toward men who do not abuse their intimate partner which teaches them to play more active roles in eliminating violence against women. Crooks et al. (2007) maintain that the path to violence prevention is not linear and must take into account social norms, worldviews, and theories of adult learning. It is easy for one to say that they do not condone violence against women, it is
much more difficult to contradict deeply embedded social norms to confront someone who may be abusing their intimate partner. Berkowitz (2004) states, “Men who work to end violence against women are challenging the dominant culture and the understandings of masculinity that maintain it. Thus, male activists are often met with suspicion, homophobia, and other questions about their masculinity” (p. 4). It is also difficult for men and boys to know where to begin. For this reason Crooks et al. (2007) emphasize that any program that seeks to engage men on this subject must be purposeful and incorporate action items and goals. In addition, individuals are not always aware of their core beliefs and so in order for a training program to be successful, work must be done to bring these beliefs out into the open. Lastly, in order for the learned cognitive-behavioral shift to be sustained, participants will need positive reinforcement and opportunities to build their skills so that they achieve a feeling of competence and success. In this respect, corporations are in a unique position to address this issue, as they are excellent venues to create such an environment through the use of corporate training and education.

**Theory**

Communication theory provides a framework with which to view organizational and societal constructs and lends an additional perspective through which we interpret our interpersonal interactions. The following are theories that will be used to understand the origins and perceptions of gender-related power constructs and their effects on organizational environments.

Julia Wood’s feminist standpoint theory suggests that our view is shaped by the place from which we view the world and that the perspective of a marginalized group or individual can provide a more objective and accurate representation of a situation than that of a group or individual in power. (Wood, 2005). This is because the marginalized group does not have a vested interested in keeping inequities in place that result from gender-related power constructs.
Therefore, their interpretation of a situation may be more complete (Wood, 2005). According to Wood (2005), “The feminist standpoint theory focuses on the ways that social location shapes knowledge. In doing so, feminist standpoint theory offers a critique of existing power relations and the inequality they produce in the lives of women and men” (Wood, 2005, p. 64). This theory is particularly useful when looking to understand the discrepancies in perception of corporate culture between male and female employees. Males are generally the group in power within organizations and therefore will not have the same perception of their corporate culture as female employees.

The study of rhetoric helps us to understand the language and symbols used to construct societal realities and develop and perpetuate dominant cultural ideologies. Feminist rhetorical theories in particular look to analyze constructs of oppression and domination as they relate to gender. Feminist theorist Cherise Kramarae (1999) examines the structural use of language as a factor that establishes the societal norms and systems that position men as the gender in power. In Foss, Foss & Griffin (1999), Kramarae explains, “The labels and descriptions we use help determine what we experience. They constrain how individuals within a particular linguistic structure think about the world and construct the meanings of that world in particular ways” (p. 39). To that end, Kramarae purports that our current system of language predominantly features the perspectives of white men, which establishes them as the norm. Further, she asserts that violence against women has at some level been established as a norm and is an underlying aspect of communication between males and females. Kramarae’s work is important to this study as it will help us to understand how gender related power constructs are perpetuated in society and will be used to shed light on how the language and descriptions used in developing content for workplace trainings relating to intimate partner violence and gender role ideologies impacts the
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way employees process and react to the information. For example, the language used when discussing the prevention of violence against women has traditionally framed the issue as a woman’s issue. This has led men to feel that they have no role in prevention. Theoretically then, in order to be successful in engaging men on this subject, we must change our language.

The social identity theory maintains that group memberships define the perception that others have of us and the way in which we view ourselves, and that individual’s activities and behaviors will be in line with that of the group they identify themselves with (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Further, as discussed by Ashforth and Mael (1989), the social identity of the group can conflict with that of the individual identity and yet the individual will not speak or act out against the group. This theory can be used to help us understand how gender-related power constructs within organizations remain in place. If the dominant culture ideology is one that reinforces the stereotypes of masculine characteristics, social pressure will result in male employees perpetuating those characteristics for fear of ostracism. This can result in outcomes previously defined such as an increase in risk-taking behavior in the workplace and a resistance or inability to participate in ally behavior. The same social pressures to conform to female stereotypes in organizations holds true for women. Women can often internalize negative societal norms and unwittingly participate in their own marginalization or perpetuate the marginalization of women.

Building on the premise of the social identity theory, the spiral of silence theory by Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann (1974) helps to further explain why individuals may remain silent even when their individual identities are contradictory to that of the group. The spiral of silence is the increasing pressure people feel to conceal their views when they think they are in the minority (Noelle-Neumann, 1974). Noelle Neumann’s (1974) theory purports that the threat or fear of isolation will keep people from verbalizing their thoughts and opinions if those thoughts and
opinions go against the group’s norm or identity. The more an individual determines that the group may not be in agreement with their opinions, the less likely it is that an individual will voice their opinions. Eventually one opinion is verbalized continually over the other and that is how the spiral of silence builds on itself and keeps the lesser-voiced opinion from being heard and becoming the dominant ideology within a group or organization. This theory provides additional explanation as to why members of an organization will continue to perpetuate stereotypes and not speak out against dominant cultural ideologies within an organization.

**Summary of Literature and Research Question**

The literature reviewed in this work provides a deeper understanding of the relational dynamics within organizations. In understanding the influence of power on our interpersonal interactions and group dynamics, we are better equipped to communicate with one another and work together effectively in organizational settings.

Previous research supports the hypothesis that power constructs are perpetuated by society and keep systems of inequity in place within organizations. It appears that these ideologies have been in existence for so long, that for many they have become as natural as breathing. It is only through acknowledging that power differentials exist and examining our own role in the system that we can begin to learn from and modify our own culture and behaviors.

To date, few studies have focused on the training and education materials used to deconstruct these systems and the organizational support to generate sustainable change in employee’s attitudes and perceptions. It is important to examine the training materials used to deconstruct the systems of intimate partner violence and gender-related power constructs in organizations because it has been proven to be beneficial for the organization and its employees. Further, in understanding the influence of power on our interpersonal interactions and group dynamics, we
are better equipped to communicate with one another and work together effectively and safely in organizational settings. This study will specifically look to examine the following questions:

RQ1: What rhetorical and content approaches are used in the devising and delivery of workplace training materials that address intimate partner violence and gender-related power constructs in a predominantly male workplace?

RQ2: Why are these approaches chosen?
CHAPTER 3: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope of the Study

Prior research conducted on gender-related power constructs within organizations has been focused predominately on the impacts on organizational dynamics as they pertain to promotional opportunities, task assignments, and employee morale, satisfaction and retention. For example, studies previously mentioned such as those conducted by Elliot and Smith (2004) and Vescio, Gervais, Snyder and Hanover (2005), examined the negative effect of these constructs on the likelihood of a women being selected for valued positions within organizations. Results of the study conducted by Ely (1995) reflected a negative effect on the performance of female employees and Orpen (1998) looked at the adverse impact of gender-related power constructs on centrality, otherwise known as access to an organization’s center of influence. To date, few studies have focused on the rhetorical styles and content of the training materials and tools used to deconstruct these systems and generate sustainable change in employee’s attitudes and perceptions. Even fewer studies have been published examining this type of curriculum as it pertains to intimate partner violence, particularly when administered to a predominantly male population in a corporate setting containing both union and management employees. A predominantly male setting is a particularly complex setting in which to do this type of training. One must be careful to use language and techniques that do not generalize that all men are villains, or abusers, but rather engage them as allies who can use their male privilege in constructive ways to challenge the “stereotypical norms of masculinity” that contribute to male violence against women. Secondly, there are a number of dynamics that also must be taken into consideration when dealing with an employee base comprised of union and management employees. Generally, union and management employees spend a great deal of the year divided
on issues such as scheduling, compensation and other work-related matters. It is essential to get the employees to see past these day-to-day conflicts in order to develop an increased level of trust and transition them toward working together as a cohesive workforce so that they may act as allies toward one another. At the same time, it is essential to equip management employees and supervisors with the information they need to deal with human resources issues that may arise and these subjects cannot always be discussed in front of union employees for contractual reasons. Therefore, union and management employees participate in training separate from one another.

The purpose of this study is to examine the training and education curriculum used to teach employees about intimate partner violence, gender norming, and ally behavior from a rhetorical point-of-view. The rhetorical analysis will focus specifically on the language used in these materials, the context in which the training is given, and the techniques and theories of adult learning that are employed in the presentation of the information.

**Methodology**

The data obtained in this qualitative study was ascertained through rhetorical analysis of the training curriculum and interviews conducted in-person and over the phone with the author and facilitator of the training. The study detailed in the following pages will begin with a brief discussion of the demographics of the target audience that the training program was designed for. The discussion of the target audience is followed by an analysis of the training materials. Rhetorical analysis, specifically ideological criticism, was used to explore the relationship between the terminology used throughout the materials and how that terminology would be used in a persuasive manner to influence the group’s worldview with respect to gender roles and intimate partner violence. Ideological criticism explores the relationship between language,
rhetoric, and the power that rhetoric has over a particular social group (McGee, 1980). McGee (1980) states, “human beings in collectivity behave and think differently than human beings in isolation … human beings are conditioned, not directly to belief and behavior but to a vocabulary of concepts that function as guides, warrants, reasons or excuses for behavior and belief” (p. 2, 6). The language used in the training materials was examined specifically to determine how gender is framed and how dominant cultural ideologies can be reinforced or reframed by language. The qualitative methods chosen for this study were decided upon based on the volume and complexity of the curriculum. The methods of discourse analysis and interviewing complemented one another as results of each activity enhanced and brought additional perspective to the other. Using an interview process as opposed to a survey process created openness, encouraged depth and detail of responses, and allowed the researcher the flexibility to ask the interviewee to elaborate further when necessary.

Rhetorical Analysis of the Training Curriculum

It is particularly important to study the language used in this curriculum, as language helps to shape our ideas and experiences and is a factor that establishes dominant cultural ideologies and systems. Language, coupled with the context in which the curriculum is administered, and the techniques used to implement the training, affects the way the message or core points are delivered. For example, when dealing with issues surrounding stereotypes, gender-related power constructs, or intimate partner violence, it is important to use language that does not persecute men or they won’t hear what is said. Therefore, when speaking to men about their role in these matters, using a term such as “allies” suggests a partnership between men and women and removes connotations that demonize men. Further, the setting and context in which the training takes place is important due to the sensitive nature of the issues addressed and the fact that
intimate partner violence has historically been laden with stigma and viewed as separate from life at work.

For the purposes of this study, the discourse analyzed included the curriculum used to train participants, the curriculum used to train others to give the workshop, and the accompanying trainer’s discussion guides. These materials were originally developed in 2006 by the Family Violence Prevention Fund and revised in 2009 by Wagner and Walcott (2009). The discourse was examined for underlying gender ideologies and how certain language or role-playing scenarios within the curriculum highlight gender norms and perceptions of intimate partner violence. These instances were noted and further explained by applying communication theory and theories of adult learning that result in cognitive behavioral change. The materials were also examined for any common themes in messaging.

**Interview with the Author and Facilitator of the Training Program**

The individual responsible for creating and facilitating the program was interviewed in order to gain a better understanding of the significance of the language chosen for the content and the theories of adult learning that are incorporated into the development of the curriculum. At the commencement of the interview, the purpose of this study was made known to the interviewee. A clear explanation of purpose was provided to the interview subject. The subject’s time was freely given. Confidentiality was not an issue as the author of these materials is public knowledge.

Open-ended questions were used to allow for long, detailed answers. The following open-ended interview questions were asked:

1. How has the language used when discussing intimate partner violence historically framed this issue as a “woman’s issue”?
2. What language techniques do you use to engage men and help them to understand the dynamics of intimate partner violence?

3. What terms have been incorporated into the curriculum to re-frame intimate partner violence as one in which men can be instrumental in eradicating?

4. How do you convey to the audience that intimate partner violence is an issue that needs to be addressed in an organizational setting?

5. Are participants split along gender lines in workshops? Why?

6. Are union and management employees separated when they take the training? Why?

7. Does the gender of the instructor for this curriculum matter? Why?

8. What theories of adult learning are incorporated into the curriculum design and why?

9. Why are case studies used in this curriculum?

10. How are these case studies chosen?

These questions were chosen as they speak directly to determining what rhetorical and content approaches are used in the devising and delivery of workplace training materials that address intimate partner violence and gender-related power constructs in a predominantly male workplace and why these approaches are chosen. Information gathered from the interview and discourse analysis was then synthesized. Findings from the study are presented in the following pages.
CHAPTER 4: THE STUDY

Data Analysis

The data analysis began by compiling a descriptive summary of the target audience and the training curriculum. After the training materials were collected and the interviews had been conducted, the discourse was reviewed in order to identify significant terms that were used. Next, a rationale for using these terms was explored and several themes and strategies were identified that support the goals of the discourse.

Target Audience for the Curriculum

The discourse analyzed in this study was developed for a utility company in the northeast serving a population of approximately 750,000 people in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The employee population ranges in age from the mid-twenties to late sixties with the majority of the employees being in their mid-forties to mid-fifties. Employees are a fairly traditional, lower-middle class to upper-middle class group comprised of union and management employees who are 74% male.

Curriculum Characteristics

The training curriculum is comprised of two modules. There are typically 25 to 30 participants in each module. In order to maximize feelings of psychological safety and promote candid dialogue, participants are divided by their employment classification – union or management. As previously explained in chapter three, this is done because management employees may have work management/human resource related questions that they do not feel comfortable asking in front of their union employees. A low trust factor or fears of retaliation may also contribute to a union employee’s reluctance to participate in a training with management staff.
Module A Materials Description

Module A consists of a formal training session on intimate partner violence and explores how this issue impacts the workplace and why it needs to be addressed. Prior to receiving training, participants complete a survey gauging their baseline knowledge of gender-related power constructs and the relationship of these constructs to intimate partner violence. Following the training, participants complete a survey to gauge the impact of the training itself. The survey instruments used to capture this information can be found in Appendices A and B. Module A begins by first defining abuse, setting ground rules for the discussion, and addressing the question of why employees should be concerned about intimate partner violence as a workplace issue. To begin, abuse is defined as, “a behavioral pattern of coercive control that one person exercises over another in order to get their way. It is behavior that physically harms, arouses fear, prevents a person from doing what she wants, or compels her to behave in ways she does not freely choose” (Jones & Schechter, 1992, p. 13). Ground rules are set in order to create a feeling of psychological safety so that people can share their thoughts freely. For example, participants are told that as the discussion unfolds, they must respect one another’s feelings, even if they have strong feelings of disagreement. It is also stated that confidentiality is essential. Next, the trainer asks the participants to complete a handout gauging their personal understanding of intimate partner violence. Participants are told that the questionnaire will not be collected so that there is a greater chance that they will answer honestly. The goal is that by the end of the training, any misperception will be corrected and the participant will be free to come to these conclusions on his or her own without embarrassment or fear of being incorrect or in the minority with his or her answer. An example of a question asked is, “The person being abused can make the abuse stop –
true or false” (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 2006). The group is then asked to identify possible signs of abuse.

A central tenant of the curriculum for Module A is the power and control wheel (see Appendix C). The tool was developed in 2008 by the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project in Duluth, Minnesota and has been integrated into the curriculum by Wager and Walcott (2009). The wheel was designed with input from women who had been abused and were asked to relay the most common tactics used by their abuser. This clearly defines for the participants what is considered to be abuse. In the center of the Power and Control Wheel is a hub with the words “power and control” inside it. This is done to reinforce that power and control is the intent behind the tactics listed in the wheel and the root of intimate partner violence (Wagner & Walcott, 2009). The outer rim of the wheel prompts the group to define, discuss and explore what is referred to as “Abuser Privilege.” Abuser privilege refers to the societal constructs that reinforce gender inequality and allow the objectification of women and intimate partner violence to be perpetuated. Examples of these constructs are the objectification of women, societal support for the use of force to influence situations, and in some cases, the minimization of abuse which is done through blaming or focusing on the behavior of the person who is abused rather than focusing on the behavior of the perpetrator (Wagner & Walcott, 2009).

The training then details techniques participants can use when they approach someone that they suspect may be experiencing abuse or if they suspect that someone’s behavior is abusive. This is done through role-playing so that participants are able to practice these discussions in a safe environment before using them in the workplace.

To conclude the module, participants are asked to compare the answers they gave when they filled out the questionnaire in the beginning of the training with the correct answers listed in the
back of their books. Answers are reviewed as a group after the facilitator emphasizes that the purpose of training is to learn and that there is no judgment concerning incorrect answers.

**Module B Materials Description**

Module B builds on the information learned in Module A and focuses on gender-related power constructs and men and women working together as allies. This module specifically focuses on the link between gender stereotyping, power constructs, and intimate partner violence and also touches on the employee’s feelings of trust and psychological safety at work. The module is facilitated by a male instructor and a female instructor who work as a team to model the main premise of the module – men and women working together as allies – which allows the group to witness the beginning of a new cultural norm.

The facilitators begin by engaging participants in a dialogue that explores their attitudes toward gender stereotypes and gender norming, the likelihood of participating in gender norming activities that perpetuate gender-related stereotypes, and the likelihood of responding with ally behavior when witnessing gender norming behaviors or discussions that reflect stereotyping or instances of intimate partner violence. Further, the module addresses the issue of assigning gender to characteristics and directly explores how the language we use shapes our worldview. For example, the foundation of Module B is an activity in which the facilitators ask participants to identify words that they think defines a man. They are then asked what roles they associate with men. Lastly, they are asked who defines these roles. Facilitators then repeat the exercise by asking what words are often used to describe women, what roles are associated with women and who defines these roles. Answers collected typically illustrate that words used to describe men focus on what they provide, words used to describe women focus on what they do, and men define both their own roles and that of the women (K. Wagner, personal communication,
October 21, 2011). An example of this exercise can be found in Appendix C. This exercise illustrates how our language shapes our expectations of how men and women will behave as well as the role they will play in society. Further, it emphasizes how assigning gender to characteristics is limiting for both genders. This point is reinforced by the results of the study detailed in chapter two conducted by Ashcraft and Pacanowsky (1996) in which the authors explored the implications of labeling specific traits as “male” or “female.” Results of their study supports the idea that when we assign gender to characteristics, it is limiting to both genders and holds existing gender-related power constructs and patriarchal systems in place. The objectification of women and the institutionalized perception that women are subservient to men and are not given the same level of worth in society is one of the perceptions that allow intimate partner violence to continue. Lastly, it is noted that men who defy these perceptions and behave in ways that contradict society’s definition of masculinity are often called anti-woman or homophobic names such as “sissy” or “gay” (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011). Likewise, if a woman behaves in ways that contradicts society’s view of how a woman should behave, they are often referred to as “bitchy” or “aggressive.” The facilitator then guides the discussion into how stepping outside of these narrowly defined roles can result in being ostracized or ridiculed by the group that the individual identifies with, in this case their workgroup. The fear of being isolated or excommunicated from the group prevents the individual from verbalizing an alternate ideology. This allows the existing cultural ideology to remain dominant, a phenomenon previously identified as Noelle-Neumann’s (1974) spiral of silence. Noelle-Neumann (1974) states, “to the individual, not isolating himself is more important than his own judgment” (p. 43).
The second part of Module B involves discussing and acting out different case study scenarios developed from separate gender focus group sessions and customized by Wagner and the labor/management team from the specific worksite. Utilizing case studies creates a situation in which participants can address concerns they may be having without feeling as if they are being personally scrutinized. It also gives them an opportunity to put the ally behavior techniques covered in both modules into practice. The opportunity to practice these behaviors in a safe environment where participants can receive positive reinforcement and feel that their behavior will be well received will increase the likelihood that these behaviors will be repeated in other settings (Crooks et al., 2007).

**Results**

The analysis of the discourse coupled with interview results showed that language is a starting point toward behavior modification and development of societal norms. The language throughout the discourse was chosen to combat current dominant cultural ideologies and encourage the development of new ones (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011).

The author of the discourse identified the following goals for those who participate in the training modules (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011):

1. Participants will be able to identify language and situations that reflect gender inequalities.
2. Participants will be able to recognize signs of intimate partner violence.
3. Participants will develop a vocabulary with which to discuss intimate partner violence and gender inequalities.
4. Participants will speak out as allies and not collude with others when witnessing activities or speech that support gender inequalities or intimate partner violence, thus demonstrating peer accountability.

Examination of the discourse revealed the following strategies used to achieve these goals:

1. Explore the language traditionally used to describe the traits and roles of men and women.

2. Provide participants with language that can be used to discuss intimate partner violence and gender inequalities.

3. Make the connection between intimate partner violence and issues men have experienced so that they take an interest, see how this affects them and engage in breaking down gender-related power constructs and the ideologies that allow intimate partner violence to continue.

4. Model ally behavior and create an environment in which the participants can practice these behaviors successfully.

The dominant theme that came to light as a result of the discourse analysis and the interviews with the author of the discourse is that historically, men have not felt that they have a role in eliminating gender-related power constructs and intimate partner violence, thereby psychologically absolving them of any responsibility. This is due in part to a lack of awareness and in part because the language used to describe these phenomena has typically framed them as women’s issues. The discourse analyzed for the purposes of this study looks to engage men as allies and broaden the lens of who is responsible for the problem and the solution by changing the language used when discussing these issues in concert with modeling behavior in order to
demonstrate what a new societal norm would look and sound like. This focus is discussed in
detail in the following pages.

Language

In compiling the data resulting from the interviews with the author of the discourse, a number
of examples surfaced in which language has been modified over time to shape the perception of
the issues of gender inequalities and intimate partner violence and those affected by it. For
example, experts in the field of intimate partner violence have begun to avoid using the word
“victim.” The word “victim” intonates helplessness and conjures an image of someone who is
weak and not able to take care of oneself or control one’s situation. Alternatively, using the word
“survivor” conjures an image of someone who is strong, resilient, and able to persevere. Experts
also believe that using the words “person/partner with controlling behavior,” “person/partner
whose behavior is abusive,” or “person/partner whose behavior perpetrates violence” as opposed
to the word “batterer” more accurately reflects the set of behaviors that make up intimate partner
violence. The word “batterer” is typically associated with a physical act of abuse whereas
intimate partner violence can occur absent physical abuse. The word “batterer” is limiting and
hinders society’s view of what intimate partner violence is. The term “intimate partner violence”
is now being used as opposed to the term “domestic violence” as the word “domestic” is
typically associated with what society has viewed as a traditional family – a heterosexual married
couple. The term “intimate partner violence” is more inclusive of couples in our society who
aren’t married or are in same sex or transgender relationships (K. Wagner, personal
communication, October 21, 2011). Currently, the training materials are being modified to reflect
these shifts in terminology.
Framing

Historically, language used in conjunction with intimate partner violence has framed this as a woman’s issue. This is due in part to the fact that the mass media, society, and even education and awareness programs have traditionally focused on the behavior and/or mindset of the person who is being abused and not on the behavior and/or mindset of the perpetrator of the abuse. The term for this focus is known as “victim blaming” (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011). Our focus is directed by way of the language we use when discussing these issues, language that reinforces the existing dominant cultural ideologies. Focusing on the behavior and mindset of victim instead of the perpetrator of the abuse is marginalizing and keeps the existing power structure in place (Westlund, 1999). Further, legal, medical and academic systems keep the existing power constructs in place by perpetuating the view of the victim as the one to be studied (Westlund, 1999). For example, when a woman divulges that she is experiencing intimate partner violence, the response often focuses on what she has done or hasn’t done. Responses such as, “What did you do to make him so angry?” “Why did you yell back at him?” or “Why are you staying, what is wrong with you that you stay?” are all responses that focus on the victim. The terms used lead society to believe that there is something that the person who is being abused has done to insight the abuse and imply that there is something she can do to stop it. Wagner (2011) states, “Using language that focuses on the person who is being abused is triple jeopardy. Using this type of language intimates that the woman is expected to recognize what is happening to her, speak out against it and change it” (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011). Using language that focuses on the behavior and/or mindset of the person experiencing the abuse psychologically absolves the perpetrator of the abuse of responsibility and shapes the perceptions of society along these lines as well. In order for those
perceptions to shift so that the focus is on the perpetrator of the abuse, and for men to feel as if they have a role in solving the problem, the language we use must change.

**Solutions for Changing Existing Ideology**

Modeling behaviors that reflect ally behavior and gender equality coupled with creating an environment in which individuals are given permission to experience success in emulating these behaviors is a strategy that according to Crooks et al. (2007) increases the likelihood of the new behaviors being replicated in day-to-day life. This in turn leads to the development of new cultural ideologies. “Adults are incentivized to learn or change behavior when they feel a need to know something or can relate what you are trying to teach them to something they have experienced” (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011). The primary way this is accomplished is through language that links to real life needs or aspirations. The training materials for Module B exemplify this point. The exercises first ask participants to articulate their views of men and women in society based on their experiences and perceptions. The facilitators then continue on to make the connection between intimate partner violence, bullying behavior and workplace violence in order to demonstrate that these phenomena have a common foundation – power and control. Men, particularly those that are part of any workplace culture where the norms of hyper-masculinity exist, often appearing, but not exclusively seen in unionized, para-military or military work settings, have either experienced or witness bullying or what they refer to as horseplay. Horseplay is an unofficial part of male work groups, recognized in arbitral law as it relates to union cultures, in which members may go through some type of initial hazing ritual or initiation pranks or be ostracized and ridiculed if they don’t exemplify the characteristics society associates with masculinity. Therefore, making the connection between those behaviors and intimate partner violence allows them to gain a better understanding of the
issue and engages them on a deeper level. In essence, it demonstrates how men have a stake in eradicating this behavior, not just because it is the right thing to do for society and human kind but because it directly impacts their environments and experiences as well.

Findings of the study are discussed further in the following pages along with limitations, opportunities for future research, and conclusions.
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

The discourse analyzed in this study specifically addresses the issue of intimate partner violence, a lesser-known result of gender-related power constructs, and works to reframe how men and women are perceived in society, the way they are expected to behave, and the roles they are expected to play. The methods chosen probe existing ideologies of the participants, teach them the power of language, and provide them with a different vocabulary with which they can describe their experiences. Lastly, a safe and accepting environment is created in which participants are able to practice these behaviors. The results of the study are supported by relevant theories of communication.

In the work of Foss et al. (1999), Kramarae discusses how language provides a lens that shapes how people feel and behave relative to an issue. That in turns shapes our reality and our worldviews. Organizations are microcosms of society with cultural norms that typically reflect those of society and in industries traditionally dominated by males, it is not uncommon to find a culture of hyper-masculinity (Ely, 2010). Communication theory, in particular Noelle-Neumann’s (1974) spiral of silence theory, has demonstrated that individuals are afraid to speak out against the cultural norms for fear of isolation and ridicule. This ensures that existing dominant cultural ideologies remain in place and other views stay silent (Noelle-Neumann, 1974). In order to change these ideologies, specific techniques must be employed to engage the population so that they are able to hear the message and carry it over into their everyday lives, thereby effecting sustainable behavioral change.

Previously mentioned theories such as the feminist standpoint theory and supporting studies such as the work of Vianello, Moore, Moore and Dolan (2004) demonstrate that our views are
shaped by the position from which we view the world and that it is fairly common that the group
in power is not aware of the privilege they are experiencing relative to the group that is
marginalized (Wood, 2005). In this instance, men are the group in power relative to women.
Therefore, in many cases, men may not accurately perceive the inequalities women are
experiencing. That is why it is important to engage men and educate them regarding those
inequalities and the role that men are able to play in mitigating the affects of gender-related
power constructs and eliminating intimate partner violence. The discourse examined in this study
engages men by making them aware of these constructs, showing them how assigning gender to
characteristics is limiting to men as well as women and illustrating how intimate partner violence
has affected their lives negatively as well. If men feel as if they are being persecuted, they will
not engage. Creating a cooperative and successful environment for this discussion is done by
way of the terminology chosen to describe their experiences.

While there is some literature to suggest that this is slowly changing, results of this study
revealed that the current dominant cultural ideology does not fully support men stepping outside
of the roles and the definition of masculinity that society has determined for them. There is little
acceptance of this by other men. Through language we can create a new cultural ideology that is
respectful to women and men, where men hold one another accountable and don’t participate in
high-risk behaviors or dehumanizing activities.

Kramarae (2005) states, “Knowledge remains language-based. But lately there isn't as much
interest in what social injustices are reflected by language, what is missing in language, and how
it can be reworked” (p. 57). The exercises in this curriculum reflect how language helps to
determine the way gender is framed and how dominant cultural ideologies can be reinforced or
reconstructed by language.
The results of this study offer important insights for organizations with implications that carry over into other areas such as productivity, efficiency, morale, employee retention, psychological safety at work, and employee trust. The results of this study are supported by studies such as the one conducted by Ely and Meyerson (2010), which demonstrated that there is a correlation between workplace safety rates and a culture that supports male employee’s attempts to fulfill society’s definition of masculinity. Ely and Meyerson’s (2010) study also established a link between creating a culture in which men had permission to behave contrary to those masculine identities and an increase in productivity, reliability, and employee trust and cohesiveness.

Limitations and Opportunity for Further Study

The qualitative methods of rhetorical analysis and interviewing are subjective which may result in some bias affecting overall inferences. A large amount of the data collected stems from interviews conducted with the author of the discourse. One could argue that the interpretation of the materials provided by this subject is skewed and potentially bias as she is the author of the discourse. That said, the study gains strength when results are examined in relation to the supporting literature and theories of communication discussed in chapter two.

The process of conducting this study has also revealed that it can be difficult for individuals to discuss emotional topics such as power, privilege, or intimate partner violence in a non-defensive manner. This indicates that these are not subjects that will be naturally brought up in organizations and emphasizes the need for training programs that purposefully address these issues. This also presents a challenge that must be taken into consideration when looking to study these issues further.

To date, few studies have focused on the language and methods in the training and education materials used to deconstruct the systems of inequality in place within organizations and the
organizational support needed to generate sustainable change in employee attitudes and perceptions. Even fewer have focused on the influence of the language used in these materials. A future direction for research would be to conduct a study that measures whether participating in trainings such as the one described in the discourse results in long-term sustainable organizational culture change relative to employee’s attitudes and behaviors toward gender norming and intimate partner violence.

**Conclusions**

An imbalance of power between genders in the workplace negatively affects promotional opportunities, task assignments, access to informal power networks, and morale, satisfaction and retention for female employees. Studies such as the one conducted by Elias and Cropanzano (2006) support the notion that these constructs can also influence the ability of women to supervise and instruct male subordinates. Intimate partner violence, a by-product of this imbalance of power, negatively affects the workplace by increasing healthcare costs and diminishing employee productivity through absenteeism, presenteeism and tardiness (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003). It is a complex issue routinely laden with stigma, rooted in power and control and perpetuated by stereotyping, the objectification of women, dominant cultural ideologies and societal beliefs about masculinity and what it means to be a man. It will take men and women working together to correct these imbalances and deconstruct the systems that allow intimate partner violence to continue. Further, if men are to realize they have a role in working with women toward that end, the language we use must change in order to reframe this issue to be viewed not as a woman’s issue but as a public health issue, a community issue, and a business issue. Language constructs societal realities, perpetuates existing dominant cultural ideologies, and sets the foundation for building new ones.
Through language, modeling ally behavior, and giving men permission to act in ways contrary to the way society has dictated they act, the spiral of silence will be broken and a new cultural norm can be created – one that is respectful toward women and does not encourage high-risk behaviors from men (K. Wagner, personal communication, October 21, 2011). The popular proverb, “sticks and stones may break my bones but words will never hurt me,” (Titleman, 2000) couldn’t be less accurate. Language shapes our worldview and dictates how we view people and issues. Our behavior follows. In altering our language we are able to alter the future direction of our society. In order for this to happen environments must be created in which people feel comfortable speaking out, acting as allies, and holding one another accountable for using words and exhibiting behaviors that perpetuate gender inequality and intimate partner violence.
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APPENDIX A

Domestic Violence Workshop Pre – Training Questionnaire (Wagner & Roberson, 2006)

The statements below describe specific attitudes and beliefs related to domestic violence and this training. Please circle the number that best represents the extent to which you agree or disagree that each statement. Please note that your participation is voluntary and confidential. This questionnaire will take approximately five to six minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If you don’t show who’s the boss in the beginning of a relationship you will be taken advantage of later.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In dating relationships people are mostly out to take advantage of each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most people are pretty devious and manipulative when they are trying to attract someone of the opposite sex.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Men and women are generally out to use each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It’s impossible for men and women to truly understand each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the work force any gain by one sex necessitates a loss for the other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When women enter the work force they are taking jobs away from men.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Men and women cannot really be friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sex is like a game where one person “wins” and the other “loses”.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In all societies it is inevitable that one sex is dominant.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is natural for one spouse to be in control of the other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When it comes to sex, most people are just trying to use the other person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is possible for the sexes to be equal in society.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Men and women share more similarities than differences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is possible for a man and a woman to be “just friends”.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn’t working, I can readily change it to something that does.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation in which I find myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Once I know what a situation calls for, it’s easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly (through their eyes).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person with whom I am conversing.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding the emotions and motives of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I can usually tell when I’ve said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener’s eyes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person’s manner of expression.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I am motivated to learn the information and skills emphasized in this workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I will try to learn as much as I can from this workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I want to increase my knowledge through this workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>The reason I decided to attend this workshop was to learn more about how I can prevent domestic violence.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the “other guy’s” point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Sometimes I don’t feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Other people’s misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. If I’m sure I’m right about something, I don’t waste much time listening to other people’s arguments.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don’t feel very much pity for them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I tend to lose control during emergencies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. When I’m upset at someone, I usually try to “put myself in his shoes” for a while.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
The questions below are intended to assess your current knowledge of domestic violence concepts. For each question, please circle the letter for the one answer that represents what you believe is the best answer.

1. Domestic violence is:
   a. any type of physically violent behavior, including hitting, choking, pushing, and kicking.
   b. any hostile or destructive behaviors that cause injury to the aggressor and to others.
   c. A pattern of coercive behavior in which one person attempts to control another through the threats or actual use of physical, sexual assault, verbal or psychological violence.
   d. the abuse of power by repeatedly and intentionally causing pain or distress to others without first being provoked.

2. Male violence against other men typically take the form of:
   a. bullying behavior.
   b. sexual assault.
   c. financial abuse.
   d. stalking and phone harassment.

3. _____ are the main perpetrators of domestic violence:
   a. Women
   b. Men
   c. People of color
   d. People with a lot of money

4. Which one of the following statements is true about socialization and social norms about the roles of men and women?
   a. Men are often defined as facilitators and women are doers.
   b. Men are often defined as nurturant and women are leaders.
   c. Men are often defined as leaders and women are supporters.
   d. Men are often defined as providers and women are leaders.

5. Society’s narrow definitions of masculinity are perpetuated by:
   a. sexist and homophobic attitudes.
   b. a lack of positive male role models.
   c. a lack of government funding for education.
   d. the absence of male support groups and/or organizations.

6. Domestic violence can include:
   a. preventing someone from socializing, going to a meeting, or going to a place of worship.
   b. lying to, gossiping about, or blaming co-workers.
   c. blackmail, bribery, espionage, extortion, or fraud.
   d. all of the above.

7. Domestic violence statistics show that:
   a. domestic violence happens across gender, race, sexual orientation and economic status.
   b. men cannot be abused.
c. men are the primary targets of domestic violence.
d. abuse only occurs in working class families.

8. Male privilege is defined as:
   a. unearned benefits by virtue of being a man in society.
   b. a learned behavior in which males play a dominant role over females.
   c. the pattern of traits and behaviors which involve ruthless pursuit of one's gratification, dominance and ambition.
   d. abundant wealth stemming from gender inequality.

9. _____ are at the core of domestic violence, bullying behaviors and workplace violence.
   a. A lack of money and education
   b. Low self-esteem and frustration
   c. Power and control
   d. Substance abuse and addiction

10. If you hear or witness threatening or harassing behavior at the workplace, you should:
    a. say nothing.
    b. confront the person or be a counselor.
    c. be an ally.
    d. threaten the person to stop them.

11. In talking with a co-worker who could be a victim of abuse, you should:
    a. say nothing about his or her abusive situation.
    b. say what you see, express concern, show support and refer him or her to a help source.
    c. give your co-worker personal advice or tell him or her what to do.
    d. convince your co-worker to stop talking to his or her friends or relatives.

12. In preventing domestic violence, an ally is someone who is willing to:
    a. be silent.
    b. confront people.
    c. threaten people to stop them.
    d. model appropriate behavior.

13. Which of the following contribute to why people who are abused stay in an abusive relationship?
    a. fear and trauma
    b. mental illness
    c. substance abuse
    d. all of the above

14. In the workplace, the signs of violence may include:
    a. being overly calm, social or happy.
    b. lateness, absence, isolation from others and an inability to concentrate.
    c. sabotaging work, name calling, physical altercations and threats.
    d. all of the above.
In the workplace, the signs of an abused person may include:
   a. being overly calm, social or happy.
   b. lateness, absence, isolation from others and an inability to concentrate.
   c. sabotaging work, name calling, physical altercations and threats.
   d. all of the above.
APPENDIX B

Domestic Violence Workshop Post – Training Questionnaire (Wagner & Roberson, 2006)

The statements below describe specific attitudes and beliefs related to domestic violence and this workshop. Please circle the number that best represents the extent to which you agree or disagree that each statement. Please note that your participation is voluntary and confidential. This questionnaire will take approximately five minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I see a link between the training programs that I participate in and my performance at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My supervisor expects me to apply the knowledge and skills I gain in training.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor typically shows interest in what I learn in training programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor has a positive attitude toward training.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am encouraged to try using new skills and knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would recommend this workshop to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This workshop was a good use of my time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, I learned a great deal from this workshop.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This workshop was a waste of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The instructor was knowledgeable about the material and subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of instruction for this workshop.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The workshop emphasized important information.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Overall, the quality of the workshop was high.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I intend to apply what I learned in this workshop.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I understand about the different ways in which I can be an ally.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am willing to be an ally in some way.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am willing to talk with others about domestic violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am willing to ask for help if I was abused.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I will use what I learned in this workshop to help prevent domestic violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questions below are intended to assess your current knowledge of domestic violence concepts. For each question, please circle the letter for the one answer that represents what you believe is the best answer.

1. Domestic violence is:
   a. any type of physically violent behavior, including hitting, choking, pushing, and kicking.
   b. any hostile or destructive behaviors that cause injury to the aggressor and to others.
   c. A pattern of coercive behavior in which one person attempts to control another through the threats or actual use of physical, sexual assault, verbal or psychological violence.
   d. the abuse of power by repeatedly and intentionally causing pain or distress to others without first being provoked.

2. Male violence against other men typically take the form of:
   a. bullying behavior.
   b. sexual assault.
   c. financial abuse.
   d. stalking and phone harassment.

3. _____ are the main perpetrators of domestic violence:
   a. Women
   b. Men
   c. People of color
   d. People with a lot of money

4. Which one of the following statements is true about socialization and social norms about the roles of men and women?
   a. Men are often defined as facilitators and women are doers.
   b. Men are often defined as nurturant and women are leaders.
   c. Men are often defined as leaders and women are supporters.
   d. Men are often defined as providers and women are leaders.

5. Society’s narrow definitions of masculinity are perpetuated by:
   a. sexist and homophobic attitudes.
   b. a lack of positive male role models.
   c. a lack of government funding for education.
   d. the absence of male support groups and/or organizations.

6. Domestic violence can include:
   a. preventing someone from socializing, going to a meeting, or going to a place of worship.
   b. lying to, gossiping about, or blaming co-workers.
   c. blackmail, bribery, espionage, extortion, or fraud.
   d. all of the above.

7. Domestic violence statistics show that:
   a. domestic violence happens across gender, race, sexual orientation and economic status.
   b. men cannot be abused.
c. men are the primary targets of domestic violence.
d. abuse only occurs in working class families.

8. Male privilege is defined as:
   a. unearned benefits by virtue of being a man in society.
   b. a learned behavior in which males play a dominant role over females.
   c. the pattern of traits and behaviors which involve ruthless pursuit of one's gratification, dominance and ambition.
   d. abundant wealth stemming from gender inequality.

9. _____ are at the core of domestic violence, bullying behaviors and workplace violence.
   a. A lack of money and education
   b. Low self-esteem and frustration
   c. Power and control
   d. Substance abuse and addiction

10. If you hear or witness threatening or harassing behavior at the workplace, you should:
    a. say nothing.
    b. confront the person or be a counselor.
    c. be an ally.
    d. threaten the person to stop them.

11. In talking with a co-worker who could be a victim of abuse, you should:
    a. say nothing about his or her abusive situation.
    b. say what you see, express concern, show support and refer him or her to a help source.
    c. give your co-worker personal advice or tell him or her what to do.
    d. convince your co-worker to stop talking to his or her friends or relatives.

12. In preventing domestic violence, an ally is someone who is willing to:
    a. be silent.
    b. confront people.
    c. threaten people to stop them.
    d. model appropriate behavior.

13. Which of the following contribute to why people who are abused stay in an abusive relationship?
    a. fear and trauma
    b. mental illness
    c. substance abuse
    d. all of the above

14. In the workplace, the signs of violence may include:
    a. being overly calm, social or happy.
    b. lateness, absence, isolation from others and an inability to concentrate.
    c. sabotaging work, name calling, physical altercations and threats.
    d. all of the above.
15. In the workplace, the signs of an abused person may include:
   a. being overly calm, social or happy.
   b. lateness, absence, isolation from others and an inability to concentrate.
   c. sabotaging work, name calling, physical altercations and threats.
   d. all of the above.
A CASE STUDY OF THE RHETORICAL

APPENDIX C

Power and Control Wheel – Exercise from Module A – The Workplace Responds to Domestic Violence (Wagner and Walcott, 2009)

Power and Control Wheel

This is called the Power and Control Wheel. It was developed after interviews with many women who were abused and were asked to identify the most common tactics their abusers used to control them. At the hub of the wheel, the center, is the intention of all the tactics – to establish power and control. Each spoke of the wheel represents a particular tactic (economic abuse, emotional abuse, isolation, and so forth). The rim of the wheel, which gives it strength and holds it together, is physical abuse.
## APPENDIX D

**Men and Women Defined – Exercise from Module B – Men and Women as Allies Training**  
(Wagner & Walcott, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is a man?</th>
<th>What is a woman?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Bitchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTOR</td>
<td>Boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Bossy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposite sex</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETIC</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Sexy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARD</td>
<td>Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>MOOD SWINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t show emotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles of a man</th>
<th>Roles of a woman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>Nurturing leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholic</td>
<td>Motherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking tough</td>
<td>Showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled</td>
<td>Caretaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking always right</td>
<td>Spends money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always there</td>
<td>Subservient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can withhold good stuff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men Defined</th>
<th>Women Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>Doers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who defines that?</td>
<td>Who defines that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>