Gandhi Nivas

Serving our families

Developing culturally specific early intervention community collaboration for men bound by Police Safety Orders in Counties Manukau

Technical Report

Residents' stories of violence and early intervention

Tony Mattson, Mandy Morgan, Leigh Coombes, Matthew Kean & Geneva Connor

School of Psychology

Key Contacts

All enquiries about the content of *'Residents' stories of violence and early intervention'* should be directed to the researchers:

Mandy Morgan

Massey University

c.a.morgan@massey.ac.nz

Recommended citation:
Mattson, T., Morgan, M., Coombes, L., Kean, M., & Connor, G. (2020). Residents' stories of violence and early intervention. Palmerston North, Aotearoa New Zealand, Massey University.

© Massey University, 2020
Copyright: Please credit the authors when quoting from this document. Reproductions only with permission from the authors.

Acknowledgements

Our gratitude goes to the men who have shared their stories during times of great uncertainty and stress. Your willingness to talk about your lives, your experiences of violence and intervention as well as your hopes for the future have made this project possible.

Our deep gratitude and thanks go to Ranjna Patel, Sucharita Varma, Rakesh Naidoo and Board Members, key stakeholders and workers at Gandhi Nivas and Sahaayta. We are honoured to collaborate with you. You have unstintingly supported and facilitated this research project, making it all possible.

Our thanks also go to Massey University and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences for scholarship and research funding support.

Ever present in our thoughts and in this project are the families within the communities of Counties Manukau who inspire the vision of living free from violence.

Overview

Family Violence in Aotearoa New Zealand

Community interventions and successive Aotearoa New Zealand governments continue to seek ways to reduce the high rates of family violence across the country. Violence against women has come to be understood through interconnected social issues and compounding entrapments through precarity – systemic discrimination, patriarchal colonialism, poverty, migration, health inequities and so on.

Aotearoa New Zealand has used legislative changes to address family violence, including the Domestic Violence Act (1995) and the Family Violence Act (2018). While legislative changes have engaged better understandings and responses to violence, there remains complexities of the diversity of violences and diversity of understandings of 'family', particularly within indigenous and migrant communities. While some research has been produced with Māori and Pacific communities to better address violence within these communities, there is still little research available. There is very little research about violence intervention into migrant communities in Aotearoa New Zealand. There is a lack of culturally informed support services for migrant and refugee communities. Violence across all communities is underreported to New Zealand Police.

Gandhi Nivas. Community collaboration for early intervention into Family Violence: The Research Programme

The residents' study is part of a programme of research about the development of a community-led violence intervention in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland. Gandhi Nivas provides residences for men bound by Police Safety Order (PSO) or bail conditions to stay for the duration of their Order. Sahaayta Counselling and Social Support provide the services in the homes.

The Gandhi Nivas and Sahaayta intervention service is a 24 hour a day, 7 days a week service, providing social support to the men who enter the homes and their families. Men may return voluntarily or stay longer than the duration of their PSO if they wish. Support might include providing food and clothing, engaging medical or mental health services, legal services or budgeting services.

The Residents' Study

The residents' study presents a thematic analysis of the narratives of Gandhi Nivas residents who shared their stories with the researchers. The study focuses on how marriage, migration, and culturally specific understandings of being men, and men's responsibilities, rights and obligations in families, affects men's experiences of family violence and intervention. We address four specific research questions:

1. How do residents understand their relationship with Gandhi Nivas in the context of their referral?

2. How does the men's residence at Gandhi Nivas motivate their engagement with early intervention services for becoming safe within their families?

3. How has Gandhi Nivas motivated and sustained changes towards safety and non-violence for residents?

4. How do residents' experiences of being migrant men influence their experiences of early intervention for becoming safe within their families?

Methodology

The residents' study sought understanding of men's experiences of residing at the Gandhi Nivas home and engaging with the social supports that Sahaayta offer. Researcher Tony, while immersing himself in the life of the Gandhi Nivas home, gathered participants' stories through interviews and group discussions. He then conducted an analysis of the men's narratives, in collaboration with the co-researchers. Sahaayta staff supported both the participants to share their stories, and the research process.

Participants were both men bound by a PSO, and men bailed to the Gandhi Nivas home. Some participants were living at the home at the time of the interviews or group discussions, and some, having previously met Tony, returned to the home to participate in the research. All participants were under 35 years old, and were migrant men from homelands in South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Pacific nations. All participants had a history of verbal abuse of partners, and most had also engaged in physical violence or threats of violence against their partners.

Through Tony's engagement in the daily activities of the Gandhi Nivas home, he came into contact with 40 men, with 16 men eventually recruited for formal interviews or group discussions. All interviews were conducted in English. Interviews and group discussions were conducted at the Gandhi Nivas home, and were unstructured one-on-one conversations, semi-structured group discussions or casual interactions between the researcher and one or more participants. Participants were able to lead the direction of the stories they told, telling stories about relationships that were meaningful to them.

The research team utilised Braun and Clarke's (2006) semantic thematic analysis to explore patterns of meaning in the men's accounts of their experiences. Tony transcribed the interviews and coded the text, grouping semantic meanings related to our research questions (for example, following how culturally specific constructs of being men were meaningful within the men's narratives), and the wider research team discussed the themes and developed summary

interpretations. Each theme is illustrated with quotes from participants and interpretative analysis of the men's narratives. Pseudonyms have been assigned to participants ensure their privacy.

Participants' understandings of domestic violence

Understandings of domestic/family violence vary across cultural contexts. We aimed to explore men's understandings of their violence within their cultural contexts.

The primacy of physical violence

Men spoke of diverse understandings of what constitutes domestic violence, and what does not, with men suggesting that physicality and intentionality determine if violence has occurred. For example, Madhu told us that "*saying abusive stuff - that's not violence*" and therefore not serious or tangible.

Resisting responsibility, resisting criminality

Men often resisted having their actions categorised as violent or criminal, calling upon their own perceived injustices to justify their conduct or re-direct attention to sources of their frustration. For example, Parmeet, who had slapped his wife repeatedly, was confused as to why he was "*treated as criminal*".

Many of the men have been embedded within socio-cultural contexts in which it is acceptable for men to use physical force to discipline women, and domestic/family violence can only be considered a crime when men have intentionally harmed women and children, not through normative processes of family disciplining where physical violence is accepted.

Arguments, abuse and coercive control

Men told stories of escalating arguments, psychological and emotional abuse of their partners, that brought them into contact with New Zealand Police and subsequently Gandhi Nivas. Men shared stories of property damage, breaches of bail or protection orders, control of their wives' movements and monitoring phone calls. These forms of abuse were minimised, and justified as discipline. In many tellings, men positioned themselves as the oppressed party. For example, Ronit complains that men are too tired after work to accompany wives to the market – women are not allowed to go without being accompanied by a man, which Ronit describes as "*a bigger problem*" for men.

Growing up as a man

Paternal responsibility and discipline

While the backgrounds of the participants were diverse, all of the men described their childhood experiences as tough. Fathers in the men's lives were strict and punishment was severe. Parental expectations were described as high and seldom met. Men highlighted their fathers as

‘responsible’ men who tried their best to provide for their families in the context of socio-economic difficulties. The men we spoke to were in the process of trying to reproduce their own fathers’ commitments to ‘successful’ family – economically and socially – through crushing economic and social pressures.

For the men, their fathers’ patriarchal authority over the family was total. Family members must comply at all times, and any non-compliance was met with discipline understood as justified and moral – childhood beatings were understood not as violence, but as necessary discipline for the functioning of the family. The men told stories that illustrate that within their socio-cultural contexts, men have particular responsibilities to provide for the family, including an obligation to determine the family’s moral direction – and utilising violence was framed as justified and necessary discipline.

Under the fathers’ authority

Men told stories about how their fathers’ authority extended to disciplining their life-course, where fathers would determine career trajectories for sons and use physical punishments if the fathers’ wishes where not adhered to, reinforcing the hegemony of a father’s authority through his family members’ lives. Many of the men talked of being ‘born into’ particular life-courses, like working on the family farm or becoming a doctor.

While the men spoke of their fathers and grandfathers at length, the women in their families were spoken of less frequently, with mothers largely understood through their domestic care of the household – as Ronit put it, the “*indoor work*” of looking after the family. The father determines the responsibilities of the women and the children within the family, producing prescribed gendered roles the father enforces through discipline exercised by threats and violence. The men understood that a fathers’ authority entitled control of his family.

Transformations: Migration and marriage

Becoming migrant

The men were all migrants and told us stories of their experiences of significant social, cultural, and psychological challenges that intertwine in their everyday lives in Aotearoa New Zealand. Men acknowledged language and cultural challenges, and found it hard to learn about their new homeland. Prominent in men’s stories was the experience of poverty – the complexities of navigating a new country with a high cost of living. Some men experience migrant exploitation – paying large sums of money to secure a job in Aotearoa New Zealand, to find that the job is low paying and abusive. Many of the men have large debts due to migration that they cannot pay off easily, or at all, with low paying employment opportunities, compounding the socio-cultural challenges they face as migrants. For some of the men, skills and qualifications they had earned in their country of origin were not recognised in Aotearoa New Zealand, requiring them to becoming

qualified differently or opt for a new, lower paying, more precarious employment. Low wages and precarious employment can become particularly pressurising for men who are expected to send money to family in homelands of origin. These interconnected circumstances can materialise as a loss of hegemonic masculine status for these men as they become migrant in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Men also shared their experiences of a lack of community support in Aotearoa New Zealand, where neighbours and local communities are, as Raghav states, "*all busy with their own schedule*" rather than actively engaged in neighbourhood community that enables men's social and economic opportunities. And Madhu explains that that no one, even within his own migrant community, would provide "*emotional help*" to him and his family.

Parmeet told us of his experience of Aotearoa New Zealand family values: "*no family values*", where you are not allowed to yell at or slap your children even if they are using drugs or alcohol. Legal restrictions, like anti-smacking legislation, configure 'family values' in ways unrecognisable to Parmeet and other men we spoke to. This extends to the 'freedoms' that women in Aotearoa New Zealand can experience, where the potential for women's autonomy from their husbands is too much "*independent positivity*", says Parmeet. Women's independence and self-determination, disturbs the men's dynamic, patriarchal authority over the whole family.

Visa complexities and other issues of immigration can be difficult for men and their families to navigate as well. Cultural differences between what does and does not qualify as a legitimate relationship can ensnare couples in tense immigration bureaucracies that place strain on the process of migration and the family migrating.

Becoming husband

Men's stories of getting married spoke of the significance of marriage as not so much between two people in love by Western norms, but between two families seeking to enhance their reputations socially and economically. Most of the men spoke of limited experience interacting socially with women, noting that parents have the responsibility to match sons and daughters for marriage. Parmeet and Ronit both entered into inter-caste arranged marriages where the families connected and negotiated their marriages via an intermediary, who scrutinised both families intently to determine their social standing. And Raghav shares that there was violence within the "*first 15 days*" of his marriage to a woman he had met once: "*something mismatch*" in the arrangement.

Love can be involved in arranged marriages, but many of the men spoke of heavy family involvement, including prospective in-laws scrutinising family finances and other extensive negotiations to finalise the marriage of the couples' choosing.

These familial pressures can carry forward into the marriage, where many of the men spoke of the pressures to then carry their new family with limited resources. Parmeet shares that the new responsibilities of husband can be exhausting – commuting to work without a car, long hours in precarious work and so on. For Parmeet, his new responsibilities as husband are harder work, and more significant to their building lives, than his wife's new responsibilities: cooking, cleaning and caring for his parents, in support of her husband's life in the community.

Across the men's stories of becoming husbands, marriage was constructed as a relationship between two families as much as it is between a man and a woman. Men also experienced an expectation that their interests were the family interests and were therefore prioritised over the interests of their wife. Men's stories suggested that women should be matched well to them, and become supportive partners, not only of their husbands, but also of their husband's wider family as well. We also learned from the men's stories that ethnic Indian men, in particular, are expected to marry; and, if men do not follow cultural marriage conventions, they risk stigma.

One man, Semisi, details how he met his wife, and how he felt as he fell in love with her. The relationship developed very quickly, with Semisi proud of how his new wife was keen to fit into his family and his family keen to welcome her. A woman's compatibility for her husband is extended into what is felt, experienced, negotiated, and shared amongst the whole family.

The authority of family honour

As scrutinised families become enmeshed through marriage, pressures can build within marriages over respect for the man's family. Raghav describes an incident very early on in his marriage where his new wife resisted paternal authority by questioning her father's assessment of the family he arranged for her to be married into. She believes they are not financially capable of supporting her. Raghav yells at her for questioning his family's standing, and her father slaps her and asserts that she would be staying with Raghav – the decision is final. Both men enact patriarchal authority, through violence.

Many of the men found it intolerable for their wives to criticise her parents-in-law, with Ronit and Raghav specifically categorising their wives' critiques as 'abuse'. Defending a husbands' family's honour is a necessary imperative of patriarchal authority, as a woman's disrespect of a family's honour destabilises the authority of men in a patriarchal social system. Men justify their right to exert authority over their wives in order to protect the honour of their family.

Family disapproval

The men we spoke to told diverse stories of family disapproval of their alcohol and drug use. Afi's mother is "*always angry*" at him for drinking and smoking marijuana. While Afi alerts us to his mother's disappointment, he is dismissive of her criticism. Where a breach of family honour

(through substance abuse) might ordinarily be met with disciplinary action, Afi reduces his mother's concerns to merely an emotional response from a woman. He does not accept that that his actions necessitate discipline through maternal authority.

Similarly, Ajay tells stories of intervention into his substance abuse, disapproved of by his family, and addressed by attendance of drug and alcohol rehabilitation programmes. Stories Ajay tells us suggest that his engagement with addiction services is less about personal change, but more an exercise in compliance to the expectations of patriarchal social norms as a husband and a son, and the maintenance of his family's honour. When he relapses, he does not take seriously his wife's criticisms or attempts to help him regulate his drinking.

In-laws and in-fighting

Men told stories of conflicts that arose between their mothers and their wives. Parmeet feels "*stuck*" when his mother and his wife argue, unwilling to support one or the other so as not to be seen as taking a side. He suggests that mothers and wives fighting is inevitable, and he experiences conflicted familial duty, compounded by the exercise of the masculine moral responsibility of identifying who is right and who is wrong to resolve the conflict. Parmeet decides, seemingly without consultation with his wife, to move the couple to another country to avoid the in-law fighting. Men's strategies for resisting tensions within their families maintain the legitimacy of the man's gendered role as decision maker with patriarchal authority over his family, minimising the seriousness of violence carried out between women, and negating a woman's role in decision making for her and her family, presenting specific vulnerabilities to women when they venture outside moral conduct expected of them.

Marriage migrants

Marriages can be configured in diverse ways, and some of the men married women who were already established in different countries. For example, Raghav was born and raised in India but married a woman who was raised in Aotearoa New Zealand by Indian parents. Raghav met and married his wife in India, and then they both travelled to Aotearoa New Zealand – a country Raghav had never visited – to begin their married life.

Immigration and residency conditions are typically tied to marriages, making marriage migrants particularly vulnerable to compounding pressures of marriage and migration. The resident spouse can hold threats of deportation over the other spouse. Depending on their conditions, marriage migrants might not be able to legally work.

Raghav tells us that his resident wife, and her parents, threatened him with police intervention and deportation. While these threats seemed an effort to discipline his violence against his new wife, Raghav is isolated in a new country and the threat of deportation, and dishonour to his family were

difficult for him. In particular, his circumstances are a shift in the gendered power relationship of patriarchal authority. Raghav has become dependent upon his wife and her family, making him feel vulnerable.

Engaging with change

Changing understandings of domestic violence

The men typically came to Gandhi Nivas understanding 'violence' as physical fights between strangers, or someone intentionally harming a stranger. It was outside their normative understandings for violence against family members to be categorised as violence. Disciplinary violence enacted upon family members has not been understood as 'domestic violence' by the men we spoke to, and we noticed that men were engaging an understanding violence through Aotearoa New Zealand legislation, rather than through socio-cultural understandings of non-violence.

Madhu and Raghav both tell us that they have learned that violence is illegal in Aotearoa New Zealand, and are learning what counts as violence under Aotearoa New Zealand law, becoming concerned with what does and does not count as violence, legally, in their new contexts.

Afi tells stories that show a shift into thinking about how his wife might feel – an effect of stopping violence programmes that ask violence perpetrators to empathise with their victims. Afi has learned that if he thinks about his wife's feelings then apologises, he has followed the correct procedure to resolve the tense circumstances – his following of protocol could in effect enable him to continue to abuse while justifying abuse through his learning about stopping violence. However, her also learns that she may mistrust him because of his previous violence and coercive control, so an apology may not heal the hurt she feels.

Many of the men were resistant to accept that they had perpetrated violence and instead engaged understandings of the law and so were obliged to 'admit guilt' in a legal context – the men may have learned an admission of guilt can have positive consequences for them in legal contexts.

Further resisting change, many of the men continued to tell us that violence, in their cultural contexts, was a private matter for families to sort out. Parmeet tells us: "*they sort it out within the families*". And Ajay shares: "*Police in India would say, 'Families sort this out. This is not court matter. This is family matter.'*" Keeping violence in the family as a family matter maintains family honour, keeping face within the community.

Participants from an Indian cultural context expressed distrust of police, but also told stories that suggest a public patriarchy where police non-intervention into domestic violence serves to maintain and reinforce patriarchal authority. The intersection of domestic violence and men's understandings of non-intervention by Indian police helps us to understand how men often

maintain secrecy about violence in the home, as well as their mistrust of New Zealand Police and violence prevention support services. This highlights the critical importance of the collaborative work of Gandhi Nivas police training to support front line police officers becoming familiar with Gandhi Nivas services and developing engagement practices that encourage and support men to engage with early intervention services.

Resistance to change

Many of the men shared their feelings of disempowerment and resentment about what they regarded as an unfair bias in Aotearoa New Zealand law in favour of women. Ritesh tells us: "*The laws are inclined too much towards the women they're just favouring the women too much*".

In particular, men were concerned by the extent that women's reports of violence were listened to – in a patriarchal family social structure, women's testimony and feelings have no authority, so police and society accepting her perspective nullifies the husband's authority to discipline his family to meet the socio-cultural expectations of their community.

Madhu argues that "*the law is against you*" as a man, conflating domestic violence with anti-racism laws that aim to give equal rights to people of all races and cultures and greater safety from the harms of racism in the lives of colonised peoples.

Parmeet extends other men's arguments by telling us of understands that his wife now has the power to leave him, or ask him to leave. In the context of his violence, Parmeet is primarily concerned with his wife's autonomy. For him, Aotearoa New Zealand law is unjust through granting his wife's testimony of his actions any authority, and as such, in his estimation, removing his authority over her.

Across men's stories, we hear men's various complaints about movements towards equality, and in particular we hear enduring beliefs in men's entitlements, and a sense of victimisation. Men understood their own social conditions well such as how economic constraints and social relationships entrapped, and hurt them within certain social expectations, but they expressed little understanding that their violence and threats of violence created harms for women and children.

Engaging with services

The Gandhi Nivas home, and the staff who provide care in it, had a variety of meanings for the men. For some, the home provided essential shelter and basic necessities such as clothing and food, enabling them to comply with their bail conditions without returning home. Parmeet and Madhu, for example, had nowhere else to go due to their bail conditions – and had no connections in their community to help them. Madhu in particular was desperately in need of clothes after a month in remand; Gandhi Nivas provided him with clothes and facilitated the collection of clothes from his home.

Ronit emphasised the significance of the home for men: "*I think this is a good organisation that will help men, especially someone who doesn't have any family here, no support*". Isolated migrant men with limited community support can gain access to services and social supports they need. Harnif tells us that Gandhi Nivas is "*a steady place*" that helps him calm down, learn, and gain confidence. And for Afi, Gandhi Nivas is somewhere he can learn to take control of himself, as he learns about himself through others, and share his experience with other men.

Sharing space with men where men could talk about their issues was a common factor for men. Raghav, Jeet and Ronit all mentioned that hearing other men's stories helped them understand their own problems and how they might begin to change.

The men became more comfortable sharing feelings and emotions as they felt more assured of the trust and confidentiality within the Gandhi Nivas home. The sharing of similar stories built connections and intimacy, empowering men to share with others through the care Gandhi Nivas takes in its interventions.

We understand the Gandhi Nivas home as a safe environment for bound men where staff can engage with care and dignity, enabling change to be talked about and supported, and challenged supportively as well. Meeting men on their own terms while also holding them accountable for their actions is an open-ended process of becoming safe within families.

Moving on

Men, like Tariq, spoke of the "*magic*" of Gandhi Nivas, where new connections created the capacity to take on and share new ideas and new ways of thinking and feeling, including talking with partners to sort issues out. Staying at Gandhi Nivas can be a catalyst for change for some men, like Semisi and Ronit; although the stories of change that men tell can rely upon mutuality – where wives are positioned as having shared responsibility for violence and preventing future harm.

Some men, like Tariq and Madhu, were considering not entering into relationships with women again, to avoid difficulties in relating to women. Removing themselves from relationships with women completely speaks to problematic gendered social power relations where gendered expectations of men and women are thought of as 'equal' and 'mutual', rendering invisible the specificity of particular relationships where men victimise women and avoid circumstances in which they will need to take responsibility for change.

Conclusion

From ethnographic engagement, formal interviews and group discussions, Tony gathered men's stories of migration, masculinity and violence to understand the context that led to their arrival at Gandhi Nivas. The men spoke of their experiences of living at the home, of the support they

received there and the ways they have been encouraged to understand and change their violence and abuse. Many men struggled to understand the criminality of the violence from socio-cultural contexts that construct violence as justified for the discipline of a successful family run by the father. Some men resisted the equality and safety afforded their wives by the law in Aotearoa New Zealand.

We heard painful stories of how men experienced meeting their obligations and responsibilities as husbands, fathers and sons as they settled into life in diasporic communities in Aotearoa New Zealand. Poverty, language and cultural barriers, un- and under-employment or low wage and exploitative employment where common features of men's lives. Men experienced isolation from communities, as well as being confronted by different family values in a new cultural context, troubled by expectations of women's autonomy that does not conform to their gendered expectations.

We also heard stories of joy in sharing thoughts and feelings with other men and forging new connections that help to learn how to change, even in the tensions where other men also affirm perceived injustices and entitlements to authority.

Through conversations and group activities with both staff and other resident men, the challenges and affirmations men experience as they make their way in the world all entangle in the home's environment, offering possibilities for change that men learn to share with others.

Contents

Family Violence in Aotearoa New Zealand

While the past century has seen a transformation of women's rights and legal entitlements, sexual and gender-based family violence continues to be widely recognised as a significant global social problem that affects people from all demographics, ethnicities, cultural groups, gender and sexual identities (García-Moreno et al., 2015). Prevention and intervention strategies operate globally and locally, from agreements amongst nations to enact policies for eliminating violence against women (UN General Assembly, 1993), to specific community-based intervention programmes, campaigns and frameworks for perpetrators and victims, and for children and specific minority ethnic communities[1,2]. In Aotearoa New Zealand, communities and successive governments have been working to reduce rates of physical and sexual violence against women in their homes since the mid-1970s, with initiatives including policy and legislative change at the national governmental level, community advocacy challenging social norms perpetuating gender-based violence, and the establishment of non-governmental organisations within the family violence sector. Yet, by the mid-2000s the prevalence of violence against women in Aotearoa New Zealand was still the highest amongst OECD countries (UN Women, 2011).

Conceptualising the social problem of *violence* against women within families in Aotearoa New Zealand is complex and involves the use of terms that have multiple and contested meanings. Whilst ambiguity in the meaning of violence is a significant issue for researchers establishing evidence for the prevalence of many forms of violence in families, the complexities of conceptualising violence with varied and multiple meanings within different communities also has implications for intervention and prevention policies and strategies. In other words, policy makers, researchers, and support services within the sector often contend with violence against women as a plurality of interconnected social issues. For instance, international prevalence rates, such as those that place Aotearoa New Zealand highest in prevalence amongst the OCED countries, are based on reported incidents of sexual and physical violence against women partners. Yet, the scope of violence in families recognised by international researchers and organisations, such as the United Nations, also includes emotional, psychological and spiritual harm, patterns of coercive control that involve multiple forms of violence, child abuse and neglect, child sexual abuse, forced or early marriage, and "killings in the name of honour" (García-Moreno et al., 2015, p. 1686). Only

[1] In this context, ethnicity references the cultural group(s) with which people identify or affiliate (Stats NZ, 2019a, 2019b). In Aotearoa New Zealand census statistics, ethnicities are broadly categorised. Europeans, including Pākehā and immigrants from other predominantly European nations, are the majority ethnic group in Aotearoa New Zealand (70.2%) with Māori from all iwi groups as the second largest ethnicity (16.5%). Minority ethnicities also comprise heterogeneous peoples, grouped as Asian (15.1%), Pacific Peoples (8.1%) and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African peoples (MELAA) (1.5%). We acknowledge that these broad groups are inclusive of diverse ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic affiliations.

[2] See http://www.pasefikaproud.co.nz, for example.

since the mid-1990s has legislation in Aotearoa New Zealand acknowledged some forms of psychological violence, or that violence might involve a pattern of behaviours “even though some or all of those acts, when viewed in isolation, may appear to be minor or trivial” (Domestic Violence Act, 1995). Coerced marriage has been included as a form of family violence since 2018, when the Crimes Act (1961) was amended in line with new legislation repealing the Domestic Violence Act (1995). This legislation, the Family Violence Act (2018), now includes a broad understanding of violence that encompasses physical, sexual and psychological abuse, patterns of coercive control, and dowry related violence.

While we acknowledge these legislative changes increase recognition of the scope of violence in the home, in Aotearoa New Zealand, violence is still predominantly understood as physical and/or sexual assault. Consequently, some forms of violence, such as financial abuse, remain largely hidden despite recognition in law (Postmus et al., 2020). This is particularly concerning for those communities that might be disproportionately affected by less well-known forms of violence, or communities supported by services that are less familiar with their experiences of violence. For example, while dowry related violence and forced marriage remain concerns for migrant women in Aotearoa New Zealand, we are aware there is little evidence available about prevalence rates to inform interventions supporting these communities and “the scale and scope of ethnic family violence remains unclear” (Simon-Kumar, 2019, p.4).

As with the complexity of the concept of violence, the term *family* also brings layers of meaning to understanding the problem of violence against women within families in Aotearoa New Zealand. In many traditional Asian, South East Asian and Pacific cultures, which represent home countries for a significant proportion of migrants who come to live in Aotearoa New Zealand, families are conceptualised as super-organic kinship networks that exist across both past and future generations, whereas Western cultures often refer to the family in terms of a heterosexual two-parent nuclear kinship unit (for further discussion, see Anyan & Pryor, 2002; Cowley et al., 2004; McCarthy & Edwards, 2010; Yamashiro & Matsuoka, 1997). In Aotearoa New Zealand, the indigenous Māori concept of *whānau* significantly shapes our understandings of family violence, and, in particular, Māori women’s experiences of violence in their homes (Wilson et al., 2019). Whānau members are embedded in extended kinship networks of hapū and iwi established through *whakapapa* and *whanaungatanga*. Whakapapa and whanaungatanga are cultural practices specific to Aotearoa New Zealand, and place Māori identity in a wider context with links the land (whenua), tribal groupings (hapū and iwi), and the mana (authority, status, power) of these connections. Whilst these concepts have differing levels of saliency to non-Māori (tauiwi) within everyday life in Aotearoa New Zealand, whakapapa and whanaungatanga involve culturally specific social relationships, collective values and community responsibilities within Māori communities in particular. As the general public, mainstream service providers, and government

agencies are often unfamiliar with the intricacies of the responsibilities, obligations, and expectations of Māori women (wāhine) within these kinship networks, wāhine Māori can experience both structural and interpersonal violence as a result of perpetrator abuse. In the context of Aotearoa New Zealand's constitutional commitment to biculturalism and an ongoing national commitment to immigration (Spoonley, 2015), we are aware that diverse kinship relationships and responsibilities mean that *family* is understood and practiced *differently* within our *increasingly* diverse ethnic communities, necessitating increasingly diverse and culturally responsive early interventions to meet the needs of our communities.

In the early 2000s, a taskforce formed to develop an indigenous framework, specific to Aotearoa New Zealand, for working with violence amongst whānau. The framework both comprised of and consulted with Māori practitioners already involved in the intervention sector and was supported by a number of iwi (see Kruger et al., 2004). Since then, Ministry of Justice funded intervention programmes that specifically take a whānau-centred approach founded in Māori cultural concepts, have been found to contribute to improved wellbeing for whānau (Paulin et al., 2018). Increasingly, research is also demonstrating how *strengths* of whānau, as a culturally specific arrangement of interconnected social relationships, can be mobilised to address whānau violence (see King & Robertson, 2017; Wilson et al., 2016). Pacific peoples in Aotearoa New Zealand have also developed specific frameworks for seven ethnic groups. Recognising their independent differences from Western models of the nuclear family, the frameworks are strength-based and recognise differences in kinship groups across the seven Pacific ethnic groups (see Peteru et al., 2012). Nonetheless, historically, there has been little research literature available to build Pacific Island practitioner capacity and capability, and concerns have been raised about practices of studying prevalence that do not distinguish amongst the different Pacific ethnic groups (Peteru, 2012). For other immigrant and minority ethnic women, culturally distinctive interventions that respond to violence against women in their homes by mobilising the strengths of their communities are under-researched and remain localised to individual community service providers (Simon-Kumar et al., 2017), and a need remains for improved responsiveness to violence within minority ethnic communities with culturally-sensitive approaches and techniques (Simon-Kumar, 2019).
A lack of culturally informed services for minority ethnic women is also amongst the concerns raised by ethnic *youth* in one of the few studies on family violence in Aotearoa New Zealand's minority immigrant communities. Echoing research internationally, the family violence experiences of young minority ethnic immigrant women in Aotearoa New Zealand intersect with issues of migration and cultural practices, with changes in cultural norms, such as familial responsibilities and understandings of family honour and shame, producing complex spaces that young adolescent immigrant women need to navigate in Aotearoa New Zealand (Mayeda & Vijaykumar, 2015). This is linked with an understanding that one of the predominant forms of intimate partner violence against women is coercive control that involves multiple forms of violence, child abuse

and neglect, child sexual abuse, and forced or early marriage (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Stark, 2007), which is exacerbated when migrant women arrive in Aotearoa New Zealand with limited knowledge and experience of legal processes and social practices.

We are mindful of Mayeda and Vijaykumar's (2015) concern that our understandings and explanations of family violence do not promote a totalising depiction of migrant women's traditional cultures "as violently patriarchal" (p. 217) as compared to accepted/acceptable hegemonic cultural practices in Aotearoa New Zealand. Doing so, we risk perpetuating racist and orientalist discourses that ignore, minimise, or normalise the cultural components of Aotearoa New Zealand society that contribute to family violence. It is appropriate, and important, then, to also acknowledge that legislative efforts, cultural norms and social practices in Aotearoa New Zealand continue to privilege the nuclear family unit, which promotes a specific cultural focus that is unresponsive to and excludes other family structures (Cohen & Gershon, 2015) whilst engendering beliefs that perpetuate, condone and sustain the presence of violence in the home. In this sense, the complexities of victimisation for minority ethnic immigrant women can be seen to include "stigma around disclosing violence and the resulting silencing of victims, the lack of trust in authorities" (Simon-Kumar et al., 2017, p. 1394), creating structural tensions within government responses and community services that are associated with significant underreporting of violence against women from ethnic communities.

Across Aotearoa New Zealand, including within culturally hegemonic communities, family violence is extensively underreported to police. The New Zealand Crime and Victim Survey report (Ministry of Justice, 2018) estimates reporting of intimate partner violence at 25.1%, and reporting of all forms of violence in families at 26.12%. Notably, though, in one particular section the report treats family violence as a form of interpersonal violence, but does not include psychological violence, in terms of number of incidents a victim experiences over a 12 month period of time, whilst, conversely, in a different section, the report includes psychological violence in population-level reporting rates for individuals experiencing intimate partner violence. This conceptual ambiguity, whilst potentially useful for law enforcement purposes, means it is not at all clear whether estimates on reporting rates include psychological violence, and we note not all forms of psychological violence are included in the survey in any case.

Despite such underreporting levels and conceptual challenges of defining violence, police conducted 133,022 family harm investigations in 2018, of which 28.27% involved criminal offences. Nearly one in three family harm investigations were located in the Auckland region (New Zealand Police, 2019) where a third of the Aotearoa New Zealand population resides (Stats NZ, 2019b). Over 60% of the total population for both Pacific and Asian ethnic groups live in Auckland, as do

half the population of MELAA groups[3]. The concentration of ethnic minority groups in Aotearoa New Zealand's largest city deepens the phenomena of superdiversity, highlighting the way in which the majority ethnic group – broadly Pākehā/European – maintains hegemonic status in institutions and governance (Spoonley, 2015). In relation to interventions for family violence, the hegemony of European ethnicity can be recognised in the assumption that coercively controlling intimate partner violence is the predominant form of family violence against women. For minority ethnic women, family violence may be embedded in familial and social relations that mean they "can experience violence from a range of perpetrators, including older women in the family" (Simon-Kumar et al., 2017, p.1389). Improved recognition, understanding and responsiveness to the complexities and differences of family violence for minority ethnic women requires addressing gaps in research and a lack of access to appropriate services for intervention (Simon-Kumar, 2019).

While Police data (New Zealand Police, 2019) fails to identify ethnic differences in reporting family violence investigations or offences, and the New Zealand Crime and Victimisation Survey report (Ministry of Justice, 2018) analysed family violence victimisation only with reference to Pākehā/NZ European and Māori and Pacific ethnicities, earlier studies have shown that migrant women from Asian-Pacific communities in Aotearoa New Zealand are disproportionately killed by their partners and young Asian women are "most susceptible to death by violence" (Simon-Kumar et al., 2017, p. 1389). Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that women are more vulnerable to family violence following their migration to Aotearoa New Zealand than local women in their countries of origin (Somasekhar, 2016). The disproportionate vulnerability of minority ethnic women has inspired the development of Gandhi Nivas, a community-led collaboration with New Zealand Police for early intervention responses to family violence in Counties Manukau. Counties Manukau is one of Aotearoa New Zealand's most ethnically diverse urban districts within Auckland city, encompassing one of the country's largest police districts in terms of population as well. It is important to note that whilst the current study was conducted before the 2020 COVID pandemic began, the police conducted 21,106 family violence investigations in this Auckland district while the research was underway, with 26.65% of these investigations involving charging perpetrators with offences (New Zealand Police, 2019)[4].

[3] The MELAA groups are ethnicities from Middle Eastern, Latin American or African countries. They are often categorised together in Aotearoa New Zealand because they comprise very small percentages of immigrant populations.

[4] At the time this report was completed, New Zealand Police statistics had not been published since 2019. During the 2020 COVID-19 lockdowns, Police indicated concern about family violence in locked-down homes (Kirkness, 2020). From 2020 onwards, global challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic affected all areas of the work undertaken in the Family Violence sector. While research on the impact of COVID-19 on all forms of violence against women and children, locally and globally is currently in progress, various studies and publications show how the pandemic was already impacting women, children and service providers in Aotearoa New Zealand and globally (for further discussion see Every-Palmer et al., 2020; UN Women, 2020).

Gandhi Nivas. Community collaboration for early intervention into Family Violence: The Research Programme

The residents' study is conducted within a programme of research that concerns the development of a community-led early intervention initiative for family violence, Gandhi Nivas. The intervention initiative is a collaboration with New Zealand Police and community stakeholders to respond to men who have been bound by Police Safety Orders (PSOs), providing intervention services for them and their families. First established in Ōtāhuhu, Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland in 2014, Gandhi Nivas now provides residences, *homes of peace*, and support services for men in three local areas of Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland, and engages Sahaayta Counselling and Social Support for service provision and staffing of the homes.

Police Safety Orders were introduced through a 2009 amendment to the Domestic Violence Act (1995)[5] with the intention of providing Police with a means to protect victims, and potential victims, of family violence at the time police attend a family violence incident. Where there is insufficient evidence that an offence has been committed, yet police officers reasonably believe that persons in the household are at risk of violence or that an incident of violence has occurred, issuing a PSO allows for removing the person who is bound by the order from the home for a specific period of time. Bound persons commit an offence if they return to the home they share with protected persons (including children) during the period covered by the PSO. They are also prohibited from assaulting, threatening, intimidating or harassing protected persons, and they may not retain possession of firearms or firearm licenses during the period covered by the order. Orders have the additional intention of enabling protected persons sufficient time to access support agencies for purposes such as developing safety plans or applying for a Protection Order[6]. Prior to the completion of this study, PSOs were usually binding for between one and three days but could be issued for up to five days[7].

In a formative evaluation 12 months after PSOs were introduced, it was already clear that the police appreciated how the orders strengthened the range of responses available for family violence incidents. However, challenges were identified too. There were issues related to training

[5] The Domestic Violence Amendment Act (2013) was repealed, and the Family Violence Act (2018) was introduced while the current study was in progress. The new Act incorporates the provisions of Police Safety Orders in Section 3 and provides for a longer period (up to 10 days) as an enforcement period. The Family Violence Act came into effect on 1st July 2019 at which time the phase of engaging with participants for the current study had concluded.

[6] Protection Orders were introduced through the Domestic Violence Act (1995). They are granted by the Family Court when the order is necessary for the protection of the applicant and/or the applicants' children because domestic violence has been perpetrated against the applicant and/or the applicants' children and there has been a domestic relationship between the applicant and the respondent. When a Protection Order is granted, it is mandatory for respondents to attend a court approved stopping violence programme and it is possible for protected persons to attend approved court-funded programmes.

[7] The maximum duration of Police Safety Orders was legislatively changed from five days to ten days on 1 July 2019.

and risk assessment, protocols and guidelines, and information provided to bound persons and persons at risk. Importantly too, there was a lack of support available for bound persons and concerns about timely access to support for protected persons (Kingi et al., 2012). An evaluation of PSOs released three years later specifically identified a need to improve the provision of emergency housing for bound persons, whilst reiterating the importance of quick referrals to community agencies for both the bound person and the person at risk (Mossman et al., 2014). In December 2014, through formal agreements between NZ Police, Gandhi Nivas and Sahaayta, Gandhi Nivas began providing accommodation and intervention services to meet these needs for communities of Counties Manukau.

Gandhi Nivas provides men who are bound by a PSO, or by bail conditions, with temporary accommodation and the support of in-house trained staff who are affiliated with and employed by Sahaayta. Although the vast majority of men are referred by Police, and subsequently dropped off at one of the three residences by police officers responding to the family harm incident, men who self-refer or are referred through other community agencies are also accommodated and provided services. As a 24 hour, 7 days a week service, we feel it is important to recognise that Sahaayta employs a mix of trained social workers and counsellors, which means that, on intake, men are offered an immediate needs assessment, counselling interventions, and social support. Whilst men continue to be offered these services throughout their stay, as well as longer-term early intervention counselling after their PSO or bail conditions expire, Sahaayta also recognises timely interventions for members of families protected by PSOs, or bail conditions, might deviate from men bound by PSOs. In practice, this means Sahaayta continues offering services to protected people beyond the duration of a PSO or when bound men might otherwise stop using their services. As well as social support, non-violence programmes and culturally sensitive counselling services, Sahaayta staff engage in safety planning and provide referrals to other organisations and support services in the community to meet the needs of both men and their families. Referrals may be made to statutory organisations, including Work and Income New Zealand or Housing New Zealand, to medical and health care providers, such as general practitioners and mental health services, and to other social services including other culturally appropriate violence intervention services, refuge providers and budgeting services. Sahaayta also maintains close relationships with informal migrant support organisations in their communities, often accessed through ethnic community centres and churches, and can assist with access to legal services and translators when needed.

Coordinated community responses such as Gandhi Nivas are recognised as the most effective approaches to interventions for family violence (Murphy & Fanslow, 2012). Ongoing community stakeholder leadership from the Gandhi Nivas Board of Trustees (the Board), along with formal agreements between Sahaayta and New Zealand Police, are in keeping with recommended

practices for effective coordinated community responses. Since Gandhi Nivas has been established through collaboration between police and community-led, culturally sensitive social and health services, they meet some recommended best practice criteria, proposed by Murphy and Fanslow (2012), for achieving better outcomes for victims *and* perpetrators, on the basis of their collaborative co-operation to work towards safer homes in the community. The Board's negotiation of a programme of research, led by Massey University, to include both statistical and interpretive evidence of intervention processes and outcomes from various perspectives, speaks to the key stakeholder's commitment to achieve community-responsive effective interventions for stopping family violence in their communities.

The Residents' Study

Consistent with the collaboration between stakeholders and Police that is central to Gandhi Nivas, our research programme is a collaborative project, grounded in principles of inclusive approaches to investigations (Donaldson & Scriven, 2003). In particular, key stakeholders are involved in collaborating with researchers to ensure that their concerns and understandings of the issues they face are central for the research, contributing to the development of a programme of studies in which community-oriented research provides the opportunity for reviewing praxis and ongoing learning for effective interventions. In our research collaborations with Gandhi Nivas and Sahaayta, we have produced a statistical description of the demographic characteristics and patterns of family violence occurrences and offences recorded by New Zealand Police, for clients referred for intake to Gandhi Nivas between December 2014 and December 2015 (Morgan & Coombes, 2016), as well as an account of stakeholder collaboration establishing Gandhi Nivas, interviewing stakeholders to identify the strengths of the community initiative, as well as barriers and challenges in providing community-led early interventions services (Coombes et al., 2017).

The current study thematically represents the narratives of Gandhi Nivas residents, from their early lives through to their time as clients with Gandhi Nivas. The study is particularly focused on how marriage, migration, and culturally specific understandings of being men, and men's responsibilities, rights and obligations in families, affects men's experiences of family violence and intervention. Stakeholders participating in our second study (Coombes et al., 2017) were clear that migration was a critical process in the lives of many of their clients. Migration challenges the taken for granted social and cultural norms of client's homelands, poses different expectations of them in their family relationships, and presents stressful circumstances, such as unexpected financial, immigration, or employment problems. While our preliminary statistical analysis (Morgan & Coombes, 2016) was able to confirm the ethnic, cultural and religious diversity of Gandhi Nivas clients, and provides evidence that the majority of clients did not have New Zealand Police records of family harm matters after their intake at Gandhi Nivas, the statistics could not answer questions about the ways clients understood and experienced family violence, police intervention, and the

residence and services provided by Gandhi Nivas. These questions are particularly important in providing stakeholders with understandings of how early intervention works to motivate and sustain change, from the perspective of some of the migrant men who have resided at Gandhi Nivas.

The current study addresses four specific research questions, which were developed in collaboration with the Gandhi Nivas Board of Trustees:

1. How do residents understand their relationship with Gandhi Nivas in the context of their referral?
2. How does the men's residence at Gandhi Nivas motivate their engagement with early intervention services for becoming safe within their families?
3. How has Gandhi Nivas motivated and sustained changes towards safety and non-violence for residents?
4. How do residents' experiences of being migrant men influence their experiences of early intervention for becoming safe within their families?

Methodology

Theoretical approach and overview

Our methodology for this project follows the ethical principles of interpretative research to respect and dignify the perspectives of participants. Our methodology assumes people, as self-conscious agents who experience themselves as meaningfully connected within their social context, are able to reflect on the significance of their experiences. People interact with and influence the events they experience, bringing their own perspective to their circumstances and relationships. We make sense of ourselves and our everyday lives through interpretative processes involving meanings we share with others. Our cultural, social, historical, and personal lived experiences provide a background of pre-understandings that we draw on to create intelligible courses of action for ourselves and sensible accounts of others (Martin & Sugarman, 2001).

Interpretive research focuses on how people make sense of their experiences in their present situations. It involves researchers actively engaging in the lifeworld of research participants, to immerse themselves in the everyday experiences that are relevant to the research inquiry. Closely engaging with participants in their everyday lives enables researchers to better understand, and therefore interpret, the meaningfulness of participant's actions and accounts of themselves (Smith & Eatough, 2012). Both participants and researchers are actively involved in interpretation and sense-making throughout the research process, and it is through their interaction that they co-create shared understandings of life experiences (Laverty, 2003). This dual process of interpretation requires researchers to acknowledge that whilst they are actively involved in sense-making with participants, they cannot completely enter the lifeworld of others (Smith & Eatough, 2012). An interpretative approach to the current study aims to provide understandings of participants' experiences by bringing together ongoing interactions and conversations with the researcher, previous research that informs the researchers' pre-understandings, and ideographic analyses of participants' accounts of their experience, to integrate them into new, shared understandings (Laverty, 2003). Interpretation takes place in multiple stages, enabling patterns of meaning to be analysed both within participants' accounts *and* researchers' experiences of making sense of participants' accounts.

The current study seeks to address the research questions with a nuanced understanding of Gandhi Nivas clients' experiences of residing at the home and engaging with services provided by Sahaayta staff. The first author (Tony) undertook a phase of ethnographic research at a Gandhi Nivas residence to enable him to become actively engaged with the service providers and meet with clients to begin the process of interpreting the meaningfulness of their experiences of services while they stayed at the home. He collected participants' stories through formal interviews and group discussions and conducted preliminary analysis of their accounts. Co-researchers Mandy,

Leigh, Matthew, and Geneva, have each engaged with the everyday work of Gandhi Nivas as part of a wider research team conducting the programme of research. Together, we collaboratively worked on the analysis of the participants' accounts to bring different perspectives into the interpretation of the research findings in this technical report, serving as a means of ensuring the sensibleness and credibility of the analysis for both insiders and outsiders of the experience of residing at Gandhi Nivas.

The setting

One of the homes in which men are provided temporary residence was the setting for the ethnographic and interviewing phases of the study. Tony began visiting the home regularly, where he cooked meals for, and sometimes with, the men who were there during his visits. A deliberate decision, cooking and eating with the men became Tony's way of immersing himself in activities of the home emphasising a relationship of care involved in feeding others and a sense of community created when people eat together. Through Tony's work in the kitchen and sharing meals in the dining room, he was able to enter the setting of the men's residence in a socially meaningful way. He was always clear with residents that he was a researcher, interested in hearing their stories of coming into the home and how they understood their experiences of being men who had been referred by police for family violence episodes. While at the residence, Tony also joined in group activities, including educational workshops run by staff and other community members. He kept field notes of his observations and reflections as he became increasingly familiar with the daily life at Gandhi Nivas, with formal interviews and group discussions conducted for the research project all taking place in the residential setting as well.

Ethical considerations

Since interpretative research involves engaging with participants to better understand their lived experience, and since the lived experience of the men residing at Gandhi Nivas involves encounters with the police relating to intimate details of their family lives, we are acutely aware that the ethical considerations for the current study include respecting the dignity of all residents and potential research participants. Respect for participants' dignity is evident in the choice of research methodology, which enables participants to story their own experiences in the co-creation of knowledge about their lives, and involved ensuring that everyone at the home, irrespective of their involvement or duration of stay, was informed about the research. Potential participants were provided with detailed information about the purpose of the project, how their accounts would be gathered, stored, and analysed, and informed of their rights should they agree to take part. Resident men were informed they were not expected to interact with Tony if they chose not to, and that engaging in *any* activity with Tony was entirely voluntary. Whereas some men chose not to engage Tony at all, others limited their engagement to casual conversations during everyday

activities. Where men chose to participate in formal interviews or group discussions, Tony discussed the research protocol with them, explaining what was expected and how they could contribute to this research project, as well as how their participation informed a larger study Tony was conducting focusing on men's experiences of migration, masculinity and violence (Mattson, 2020)[8]. They were also given detailed information sheets written in plain English, which outlined that men could ask questions at any time and could decline to answer any specific questions that Tony asked. If they agreed to their interview being recorded, they could ask for the audio recorder to be turned off at any time, and since participation in the research was voluntary, each man was aware that he could withdraw from the research at any time up until the analysis was completed. If men volunteered to take part in a group discussion, they were asked to sign a confidentiality agreement to protect the privacy of other men in the group.

Researchers protected all participants' privacy throughout the research process. This includes removing all identifying information from records of the interactions between participants and Tony, deleting recordings of interviews and interactions after transcriptions were completed, and refraining from disclosing or sharing identifying information of the residents within the research team. To maintain the anonymity of the participants, Sahaayta staff have not had access to interview or discussion transcripts, or other information collected and analysed in the research process. All research material is securely stored in password protected, de-identified files that are only accessible to the research team.

Given the sensitivity around discussions of abuse towards others, the emotional and psychological safety of the participants and their families was paramount. Collaboration with Sahaayta staff enabled participants to be supported throughout the research process and ensured that trained counsellors who already had working relationships with residents were available to support them should the need arise. All interviews and discussions took place with trained counsellors on the premises at the time. The safety of the researcher was also considered, and regular debriefings within the research team enabled emotional responses and concerns arising from talking with the men to be shared and discussed. The research protocol was registered with Massey University Human Ethics Committee.

Participants at Gandhi Nivas

All participants in the research project were either bound to Gandhi Nivas by PSO, or, following a court appearance, had been bailed to the home on condition of residing at Gandhi Nivas.

[8] As well as the current study, Tony was also involved in doctoral research, and he ensured that everyone involved in the home was also aware of his doctoral research. Theoretically and methodologically distinct from the current study, Tony's doctoral thesis focused on "engaging with how [the men] affectively produce and are produced by the world, through their interactions with others, social systems, material objects, and abstractions" (Mattson, 2020, p.15).

Participants were either staying at Gandhi Nivas at the time of their participation in formal interviews or group discussions or had previously met Tony whilst staying at the home and returned to participate in the research. All participants were under 35 years of age, and were migrant men originating from South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Pacific nations. The characteristics of the participant group are particularly relevant, as, in terms of Gandhi Nivas clients between 2014 and 2019, more than 60% were men residing at Gandhi Nivas during this period of time were under 39, and, similarly, for those with recorded ethnicities, 60% of men residing at Gandhi Nivas during this period of time were from the same diverse range of communities the participants self-identified as belonging to (Morgan et al., 2020).

Although each man's story was unique, there were some commonalities in the circumstances of their violence that led to a PSO being issued or to an arrest being made. All of the participants described histories of verbal arguments with their partner, and most described patterns of escalating arguments over the months and weeks leading up to the events Police attended and after which they had been bound or arrested[9]. Most of the participants had also been physically violent, or had made intimidating threats of physical violence, to their partners, and for all except two men, initial contact with the Police had been made by the person at risk[10].

Recruitment

Sahaayta staff working at Gandhi Nivas actively supported the research by directly introducing Tony and the research project to resident men, both at intake as well as throughout their stay at the home, and encouraged men to volunteer for formal interviews or group discussions. Participating in daily activities of the home, such as cooking meals, enabled Tony to speak with men about the project and invite them to take part, whilst others made the first approach to Tony, asking him if they were able to participate. In this way, over 40 men interacted casually with Tony during the course of the research project, with 16 men recruited to take part in formal interviews or group discussions. Although the men had migrated to Aotearoa New Zealand from different regions of the world, and had identified themselves in ethnically diverse ways, all participants spoke a shared language of English in interviews, discussions and casual interactions.

[9] This issue of ongoing patterns of violence is significant insofar as these men encounter the justice system on the basis of specific events rather than because of ongoing patterns of violence. There is concern in the literature that the criminal justice systems faces difficulties criminalising coercive control because of the underlying requirement of our criminal justice system to prosecute an offence as identifiably a specific act of violence (see Morgan et al., 2019, for a more detailed discussion).

[10] Of the two men, one explained that a third party had contacted the police after that person became concerned at the level of abusive behaviour, while a second participant self-reported.

Gathering stories of lived experience

The men's stories were gathered in various face-to-face interactions during everyday activities at the home. These consisted of unstructured one-on-one conversations, semi-structured group discussions, and casual interactions between the researcher and one or more men at a time. Semi-structured group discussions (in which a total of 13 men participated) typically lasted for two hours with breaks. In one series of group discussions, the men talked with Tony about different aspects of their lives, focusing particularly on their early years. In other group discussions, all the men, including Tony, participated in meditative activities, collaborative drawings, and discussions on the characteristics of feelings, such as anger, and how men go about coping with anger. Groups also provided opportunities for men to say how they were feeling at the time, and how their feelings related to events that had occurred in the previous days. This approach opens up spaces between men for discussions facilitating shared understandings of their experiences.

Unstructured one-on-one interviews, typically lasting between one and two hours, were conducted with eight men in total[11]. In these conversations, the men were encouraged to tell their stories from their own points of view, and although the conversations were fluid, they include stories of their early lives, the events that precipitated their residence at Gandhi Nivas, their experiences of Gandhi Nivas, and various institutional responses they encountered following police intervention. Engaging in one-one-one conversations enabled the participants to lead the direction of the stories they told, elaborating on events and relationships that were meaningful to them. Tony was able to follow the men's accounts and check his interpretations as the participants told their stories. The interpretative interactions in one-on-one and group sessions help create possibilities for new meanings to be co-created in shared understandings between Tony and the men, and amongst the men. Casual interactions were commonplace, particularly over food and during shared leisure-time such as watching television together. Whilst these interactions were not recorded, Tony maintained daily field notes and a journal of reflexive observations throughout the research to provide context for preliminary interpretations.

Data analysis

Since our methodology for the residents' study involves an interpretative approach, we chose to use Braun and Clarke's (2006) semantic thematic analysis to generate shared patterns of meaning that were explicit in the men's accounts of their experiences. Thematic analysis is undertaken through "deep and prolonged data immersion" (Braun & Clarke, 2019, p. 591) involving reflexivity, sensitivity to context, flexibility, and active engagement in interpretative processes. Guidelines for thematic analysis do not present rigid procedural steps to follow, but general principles that enable

[11] Five of these men also participated in group discussions.

researchers to perform analytic work that is ideographic, iterative, and contextually bounded. There are six phases recommended for thematic analysis: familiarisation with the data, generating codes for the data, constructing themes, revising themes, conceptually naming themes, and writing an analytic narrative (Braun & Clark, 2006). For the purposes of this study, Tony's ethnographic engagement at the research site began in the familiarisation phase, when he began interacting with men to collect their stories. Tony's field notes, which included his reflections on these interactions as well as his experiences in interviews and group discussions, were a rich source of data for contextualising our analysis, ensuring that in the early stages of analysing the men's stories, their narratives were carefully situated with regard to the men's circumstances at the time.

Tony became more immersed in the men's stories through transcribing the recordings of formal interviews and group discussions. Transcription involved creating written text for more detailed coding, thus shifting recordings of spoken interactions to a textual format. All verbal interactions were transcribed word for word. Some features of the spoken interaction were excluded, including speech disfluencies such as lexical sounds, intakes of breath, stops and restarts to narratives, bodily movements, pitch, and intonation of voices. Other speech disfluencies deemed to have importance to interpreting men's narratives were retained. For instance, short pauses were represented by a dash, and longer pauses by two dashes, enabling Tony to textually code pertinent cues helping situate his understandings of the men's narratives. Where non-verbal gestures or other devices are used, these were presented in brackets, such as [laughs] or [sweeps hand in slapping motion]. Any identifying information, such as the names of people or places, were replaced by pseudonyms or generic terms, and presented in brackets (e.g. [brother]).

Transcripts became the focus of analytic attention during the second phase of generating codes for the data. Initial coding focused on creating domains of semantic meanings that are of particular interest for addressing our research questions, such as how childhood experiences, migration, and culturally specific constructs of being men were meaningful within the men's narratives, and how they are reproduced in the men's actions and explanations. Codes were developed to represent the explicit content of the data (Braun & Clark, 2006), enabling us to carefully attend to the content of stories told by men during interviews and group discussions. In the third phase of analysis, themes were generated by clustering codes according to shared patterns of meaning, and when codes were made meaningful by relationships between clusters. These themes were subsequently used to generate a coherent and concise account of the data within each theme, which served as the preliminary analysis for the fourth and fifth phases of analysis.

In the fourth phase of analysis, themes were reviewed by the research team, paying attention to the relationship between the explicit meanings of the men's stories and the way in which these addressed the research question. The team held discussions about the content of the themes, their internal coherence, and their relationship to our research questions. Some provisional themes

were discarded, whilst other themes were re-organised to strengthen the coherence of the theme. During this phase, implicit meanings within narrative extracts were identified by analysing how the men's understandings of their residence at Gandhi Nivas were related to their stories of being migrant men held accountable for family violence.

For the fifth phase, the team generated names for themes and developed summary interpretations of the core concepts that organise shared meanings. The report of our analyses provided in the following chapters is the outcome of layering our analysis from explicit, semantic meanings to implicit meanings, and collaboratively interpreting the internal coherence of themes. We have organised the thematic analysis so that the themes build on each other, creating an account of the men's shared understanding of their experience. Each theme is illustrated with direct quotes from participant interviews and group discussions, followed by an interpretative analysis of the selected narratives. Pseudonyms have been assigned to participants so that their privacy and confidentiality is protected. The pseudonyms assigned to the men featured in this report are: Parmeet, Ronit, Harnif, Ajay, Afi, Raghav, Tariq, Madhu, Ritesh, Semisi, Jeet, Shiva and Harpreet. Where any phrasing has been left out, typically because it is repetitive or unclear, the exclusions are represented as […]. Team members contributed to writing our analysis, both collectively and through individual contributions to the final document, with the final chapter discussing how the thematic analysis addresses our research questions.

Participants' understandings of domestic violence[12]

Understandings of what constitutes domestic violence, and what does not, vary from one culture to another (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005; Tang et al., 2000; Yoshihama, 1999). Sokoloff and Dupont (2005) make the point that our understandings of domestic violence are incomplete if we do not consider the specific forms of abuse that are particular to the sociocultural backgrounds of the women who are affected, stipulating "women must be able to voice their concerns about how violated they feel within a cultural framework that is meaningful to them" (p. 42). Similarly, in this research we hear men's stories of violence within their families from their own cultural perspectives, because our understandings of domestic violence will be enhanced by taking account of the men's understandings of their actions within cultural frameworks that they are most familiar with. Thus, we have invited stories of the men's earliest experiences of domestic violence, which might involve men's experiences of bearing witness to violence inflicted on others, to help us become more familiar with the sociocultural influences that shape the meaning of the men's contemporary actions and experiences. However, we are clear that the men's perspectives on domestic violence will also be shaped by their position as the aggressors in the context of the Police intervention that brought them to Gandhi Nivas.

When men's stories are heard at Gandhi Nivas, we understand that those who work to support them have insider perspectives on the everyday struggles many families face in their clients' communities, which informs an appreciation for diverse understandings and experiences of family violence within and between different cultures and communities (Coombes et al., 2017). The story of establishing Gandhi Nivas links violence with specific, but widely shared, experiences of migration, un/employment, social isolation, and economic hardships that many migrant communities experience, as well as wider social issues, such as substance misuse, that all communities across Aotearoa New Zealand experience. While stakeholders all appreciated the scope of family violence in its many physical, emotional, sexual, financial, and spiritual forms, their story of collaboration reminds us that there are many ways in which family violence, and addressing men's use of violence, becomes meaningful in the context of people's lived experiences.

The primacy of physical violence

In the current study, men spoke of various understandings of what constitutes domestic violence — and what does not. We bear in mind that in some cases men may have already received counselling intervention for the harm they inflict on others, and we expect that awareness of acts that constitute domestic violence may be changing for them in the process. However, in most

[12] While it has becoming increasing prevalent to use the term 'family violence' in Aotearoa New Zealand, in our report we use the term 'domestic violence' since this is the term most frequently used by the men who participated in the research.

discussions with the participants, they focused, at least initially, on the physicality and intentionality of violence, in the context of the circumstances in which the Police brought them to Gandhi Nivas. Often, they provided accounts of the harms that lead to Police intervention as if violence is not violence when either physical assault or intent to cause harm are absent.

We begin with Madhu, who makes an explicit equivalence between domestic violence and physical violence:

> ***Madhu:*** *"in my case there is no domestic violence - no physical violence, there's nothing, just verbal altercations."*

Madu denies any domestic violence, and minimises the effects of his threats and abuse against his wife as a 'verbal altercation' which, in our experience, is often a formal way to speak of violence as an interpersonal conflict when there is no tangible evidence of physical harm, or where a primary perpetrator of abuse isn't recognised, either by professionals or clients. Madhu's understanding of domestic violence excludes psychological or emotional abuse and the exclusion is significant since Mahdu also told of a four-hour long "fight", during which he threatened to kill his partner. Despite the clear evidence of an offence against his partner, he explains that the incident did not involve violence:

> ***Madhu:*** *"it was just a fight - you know - nothing physical ... I always believe that physical violence is the highest level of violence … it takes a lot to hit someone … then there's things like saying abusive stuff - that's not violence."*

Madhu is explicit that physical violence is the most serious form of violence. His devaluation of less tangible forms of violence, such as emotional, psychological, financial and spiritual abuse is emphatic. While there is a logic to scaling acts of violence from the most lethal to the less discernibly harmful (Stark, 2007; Westmarland & Kelly, 2012), it is an approach that ranks an individual act of physical assault over unremitting and interwoven patterns of psychological, physical, and sexual harms that are often experienced in intimate gendered violence (Morgan et al., 2019). Using a hierarchy of violence to exclude tactics of abuse that enable coercive control of their partners enables men to engage selectively in accountability for their actions.

Psychological and emotional violence appear invisible to Madhu. The tangible is so highly valued that he would seek tangible evidence of abuse through an independent psychological evaluation, before he would consider the possibility that he is abusive:

> ***Madhu:*** *"they say that I'm psychologically abusive, but the thing if I'm psychologically abusive you should have me do an exam like a psychological exam and things like that - let*

me do that and then you come back to me saying OK what are the findings and this is what we decided you do."

Madhu will not accept either his wife or the counsellor's assessment that his actions are abusive. For Madhu, a formal psychological assessment would be needed to find or identify evidence of his culpability, in some way. Although he is insistent that he has not become an abuser, we recognise that he clearly understands that psychological abuse is a form of domestic violence, since his is being taught the legal requirements for keeping his family safe in Aoterora while residing at Gandhi Nivas. His resistance seeing himself as abusive elides the significance of his threat to kill his partner and avoids accountability for a pattern of different tactics enabling men to minimise their responsibility for the harms that brought them to Gandhi Nivas.

Resisting responsibility, resisting criminality

Recognition that harms may be psychological entered into Parmeet's account, in which he resisted responsibility by mobilising the concept of psychological abuse to explain and justify his violence rather than to characterise his own actions:

Parmeet: *"my wife giving me emotional pain, psychological pain."*

In this instance, Parmeet positions himself as the victim of psychological and emotional harm, occasioned, as he told Tony, by his suspicion that his wife is unfaithful to him. He has been brought to Gandhi Nivas after assaulting his wife in their car while at a police station. Parmeet had brought his wife to the police, so that they would help him to prevent her having contact with another man who had befriended her. Yet, things did not go as planned for Parmeet:

Parmeet: *"they put me in cell and like treated as criminal - and bad thing has started - I think what - what should I do - I am wrong because of slap, but actual reason is what? I always trying to sort it out from the conversation, so that's my fault? That's what I'm doing is my fault? I slapped so that's why you're putting me [here]."*

We hear Parmeet's account as a plea for understanding how confused he felt to be taken into police custody when he had been trying to control her interactions with others. In his story, he tells of giving her "three times chance" and yet she still does not stop her contact with the other man. Parmeet tells Tony:

Parmeet: *"and I angry and I slap her in the car, one time."* [13]

[13] Later, he tells of slapping her again because she does not want to come into the police station with him.

Parmeet knows he has been taken into custody for assaulting his wife. Yet, he does not accept that he is at fault, and yet he cannot understand being "treated as criminal". Given social stereotypes and stigma associated with criminality, we appreciate Parmeet's plea for understanding. He was not the only man who resisted being seen or treated as criminal when they could not reconcile the perceptions and assumptions of criminals with their sense of themselves despite encounters with police officers and other people in police custody. While Parmeet may know that he has assaulted his wife, he doubts whether he was committing a crime by harming or putting his family at risk of harm. He questioned the involvement of the police in bringing him to Gandhi Nivas, believing he had done nothing illegal:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"they have said many times that the role of police in the domestic violence case is the same as that of a criminal - - But he's not a criminal in the case because what is the crime? The crime is doing something illegal, right?"*

In Parmeet's account, "they" are the Gandhi Nivas counsellors and social workers who teach the men that domestic violence is against Aotearoa New Zealand law and can involve the police. Parmeet understands that if the police are involved in domestic violence "cases" it should be for the same reasons they are involved in criminal cases, yet he does not see how he has committed a crime and cannot understand why the police are involved in his case. We understand that being seen as a "criminal" for many men is more than the experience of stereotyping since it brings unwanted police attention. Police attention for *violence* also brings undesirable consequences for their family life, employment opportunities, financial circumstances, and immigration prospects. Significantly, because crime is defined by illegality, it follows that he does not recognise domestic violence as being against the law except in the case of physical assault. A complication in Parmeet's situation is that domestic violence is not defined in the Crimes Act (1961). It is defined within Family Law, so that while it is illegal in the sense that there is law that defines and prohibits domestic violence, there is no specific criminal offence of domestic violence for which a person can be charged. Instead, family violence offences include a wide range of criminal charges, from the most serious forms of violence including kidnapping, rape, and homicide to low level traffic offences and breaches of legal orders. While Gandhi Nivas clients are often reminded that family violence is illegal, Parmeet's resistance helps us understand the difficulty for men to conceive of themselves as committing a crime, given their understanding violent crime as assault.

In some cases, the men struggled to recognise violence within their families because of socio-cultural contexts in which it is acceptable for men to use physical force to discipline women and children in their homes. One of the men, Raghav, explained how discipline worked in his family by telling Tony of a time when his new wife was slapped by her father. The incident occurred in front of Raghav when his new wife was complaining about him as her arranged-marriage partner. Far

from describing the slap as domestic violence, he framed the episode as her parents' attempt to correct her complaints about him:

> ***Raghav:*** *"so her parents was trying to make her understand […] He slapped her and said* '*Look you have to be live with these guys - we already told that this is the final decision these guys and this is the place you gonna have to live - so this was your choice - as far as you are concerned you were agreed - you chose [Raghav] to be married.'"*

In Raghav's account of this episode, it is evident that his father-in-law is enacting his authority to discipline with corporal punishment. His right to discipline his daughter is asserted by assaulting her in front of his son-in-law. We notice that by agreeing to the marriage, the daughter has lost any right to complain of her marriage partner. Since her father clearly demonstrates his authority to punish, Raghav does not conceive of the actions as violent.

For most of the men in this study, the term 'domestic violence' primarily describes physically and intentionally injuring another person. From our perspective, the men's accounts of coming to Gandhi Nivas and the context in which Police brought them to the home commonly include the perpetration of physical violence. From some of the men's perspectives, however, the intention to discipline rather than harm their wives or children creates a clear distinction between a criminal act and a morally justified action which is within their authority as men in their households. There were, however, other men who tacitly accepted responsibility for harmful wrongdoing involving physical assault, even though, like Parmeet, they justified their actions as understandable responses to provocation:

> ***Ronit:*** *"I'm angry and my wife don't understand why - so this is all too much and we're fighting - she's swearing my mum and I hit her - I'm immediately saying I'm sorry but - you know - swearing my mum and all that - she [his wife] don't listen and calls the police - and they arrive and separate us - they talk to her - they talk to me - then they are taking me away from there."*

> ***Parmeet:*** *"she wound me up and nagged me and wound me up and threatened me and when I hit her, she called the cops - it's not fair eh?"*

Both Ronit and Parmeet understand the Police have intervened when their partners report an assault. Yet, they detail the ways in which they perceive the women have hurt them. Parmeet explicitly draws attention to the injustice he perceives in the Police intervention, and Ronit tells how his wife does not take account of his apology before calling the police. In neither account do the men speak of the possibility that their partner called the police for help because she became afraid for her safety, with the men holding their partners responsible for not responding appropriately to the perceived moral authority of the man of the house.

Arguments, abuse and coercive control

Participants' stories also often told of increasingly frequent arguments leading to the episodes that brought them to Gandhi Nivas. In accounts where arguments with their wives and partners escalated, men sometimes told of targeting their partners for psychological and emotional abuse, which we understand as strategies for controlling the women in light of Stark's (2007) theories of coercive control. Parmeet, who did not understand how he could have been seen by the Police as a criminal after slapping his wife, explained that he faced four charges, including damaging property and breaching both bail conditions and protection orders against him. Those charges were all indicated as family violence by the police, but Parmeet emphasises that they are not direct physical harm to his partner:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"[I was] charged with hit the door - breached the bail - protection order - trespass."*

In denying that his acts are family violence, Parmeet shows no insight into the fear that he invokes by damaging property in his home. He also does not give Tony an account of how he came to be the respondent to a Protection Order, charges he has previously faced to be in a position to breach a Bail Order, or the reasons that he'd been charged with trespass. Parmeet's account of how he came to be seen as committing acts of family violence only reference slapping his partner, and his reticence to accept responsibility for harming his partner, imply that he feels entitled to control access to, and the use of, the home his partner lives in.

Some men talked more explicitly of exercising control over aspects of their partner's lives. Raghav spoke of prohibiting his wife's medication after making his own inquiries into the drug and the possible side-effects:

> ***Raghav:*** *"we were told that here's the medication - it is for her skin allergy ... I thought it was all skin allergy medication but when I Google it - it was I think - citalopram ... I checked the side effect - it's got heaps of side effects were there - to take that medication ... I said, 'Don't take that medication again.'"*

In the broader context of his account, Raghav explains that both he and his wife were deceived about her medication (Citalopram[14]) by her parents, when their marriage was arranged. In Raghav's account, his partner came into the marriage with no control over her own medication, which is not, to our understanding, problematic for Raghav. As an unwed woman, she is expected to be the subject of her parents' authority. Raghav's account is premised on an assumption that

[14] Citalopram is a selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitor. Whilst most frequently used to treat depression, Citalopram also has a long list of 'off-label' indications for prescription.

the authority to control his partner's medication has been passed from her parents to him, as her husband, after their marriage. Raghav's instruction for his wife to stop her medication is not related to the presence of deceptive coercive control that her parents enact through their authority, but, rather, Raghav is frustrated that they maintained control over aspects of her daily life where he, as her husband, is both entitled, and duty bound to take responsibility for controlling her.

Ronit also spoke of women's lack of autonomy, necessitating a man's control over a wife's daily life. He provides us with an account of his socio-cultural context, where women's freedom to move outside the home is constrained:

> ***Ronit:*** *"women cannot even go to the market to buy something without their husbands so see - OK that is a problem for the woman but that is a bigger problem for the man as he's working all day as he does the household outdoor works and when he comes back he needs to go to the market with his wife again."*

While briefly acknowledging that the prohibition of women's freedom of movement is "a problem" for her, Ronit tells how the more significant issue is the considerable inconvenience imposed on him by his partner's dependence. In his words, needing to control his partner's movements outside their home is the more significant burden and his wife's social entrapment in their home is minimised. The burden of controlling his wife's movements becomes an appeal for empathy for the man's plight in conditions of social entrapment that hold his privilege to dominate the household in place.

Afi told of control that he exercised by monitoring his wife's phone calls, and the emotional challenges of exercising this control:

> ***Afi:*** *"I was outside [in] the lounge and I heard her phone's - you know message is going off and I open the message - it's one of her best friends - a man - it's an old man - [they] work together - he text her 'How you now?' … All those things in my head I just want to kick the wall, yeah, big consequences that's why ...* '*cos if I give it to her the only thing she says I'm going to beat her again."*

While Afi connects his thoughts, anger and suspicion with his decision not to return his wife's phone to her, he elides responsibility for controlling surveillance of his wife's contacts with others. Control over Afi's wife's autonomy is to the extent that her agency and autonomy is both determined and therefore limited by Afi. We notice, in this particular narrative, Afi constructs violence, which he premises on his wife breaching a moral code of acceptable behaviour, as both predictable and inevitable, with Afi's control over his wife such that she cannot message her concerned friend to say whether she is safe, or not.

We offer these examples of abuse as all are forms of violence within the Family Violence Act (2018) that we recognise as contributing to patterns of intimate violence through which coercive control is exercised. They are forms of abuse often characterised by participants as low on a conceptual scale of the seriousness of violence - it's "nothing", it's not a "crime", "saying abusive stuff" is not violence. In some cases of physical violence, the concept of discipline justifies the moral necessity of physical violence as a duty of a man married to a woman. By minimising or justifying forms of violence, the men question whether there was good reason for them to be brought to Gandhi Nivas for the sake of protecting their families from harm. Also, by drawing on narratives that ground their actions and beliefs on cultural norms and social expectations, and, in some cases, tying violence to the "bigger problem[s]" men face in relation to women's (lack of) autonomy, we understand these narratives offer opportunities for men to allege that the legal conceptualisation of abuse and police involvement cause harm to their families instead. In this sense we understand that the men's commitment to their gendered authority in the family interconnects with both the minimisation of harm and mistrust, if not rejection, of police intervention.

There were instances where participants questioned the Police intervention in their case by making comparisons with other men, or groups of men, who were more likely to be violent against women. For example, Madhu located violence towards women as a "Third World" problem – but not an issue in Aotearoa New Zealand:

> ***Madhu:*** *"probably a third world country like Kenya or Tanzania or all those countries - yes I think women suffer a lot but I don't really think in this country or UK or America that's the case."*

Madhu draws on a division of the world into developed and underdeveloped nations, with the association that more developed nations do not have the same kinds of social issues with gendered violence against women in the home. We recognise that he is evoking a stereotype of people in developed nations living "the good life", and therefore women in those nations suffer less from victimisation. We interpret a connection between this stereotyping and the notion that women in developed nations have more autonomy, and are therefore more empowered, which mitigates their suffering. Locating himself in Aotearoa New Zealand enables Madhu to locate himself somewhere different from the places where women suffer most from victimisation – and from men who perpetrate women's victimisation. The following narrative from Madhu is an example of establishing a kind of hierarchy of men who are dangerous to others, which enables him to distinguish himself from other men at Gandhi Nivas whose differences from him are faith-based:

> ***Madhu:*** *"I think mostly people are here are Punjabis - Sikh religion, which is different. They still have a very backward way of thinking - probably. I don't know. I can't judge them. I'm a Hindu. My religion is basically a very nonviolent religion."*

Madhu's account of the people who perpetrate violence distinguishes religiously characterised acceptance of violence from the nonviolence with which Madhu identifies his religious commitments. The establishment of hierarchy of masculinity in which some men are stereotypically more violent than others, provides Madhu with a pathway to deny that he has engaged with violence, since he is not 'that kind' of man. The differences in social conditions require different levels of empathy, as their use of violence is embedded in social conditions where violence is authorised and normalised. Madhu relies heavily on images of more dangerous men to minimise the threatening control that he exercises as a responsibility for disciplining his family.

As an outcome of their time in counselling, anger management courses, and other pro-social activities and interventions at Gandhi Nivas, we recognise participants become aware that their abusive behaviours are complex, and that abuse takes many different forms, often as a pattern of interlinked behaviours. Nevertheless, many men still tended to describe domestic violence in very stereotypical ways, that violence is primarily, if not exclusively, physical. The men who remained convinced of the primacy of physical violence often described how domestic violence takes place in someone else's back yard (whether another country, another Indian state, or another faith), yet they were at Gandhi Nivas because of their own violence, which some had perpetrated literally in their own back yards. Rather than putting forth men's narratives as representative sites of *cognitive distortions,* though, that violence prevention interventions can target, we offer these narratives as examples of men 'layering' their stories of violence with social complexities that belie simple, singular understandings of social conditions giving rise to violence against women. When men are given an opportunity to story the social complexities of their lives, new possibilities emerge in terms of therapeutic spaces created with community engagement practices made available to men.

Growing up as a man

During the research project, the many narratives participants told about their childhoods and upbringings clustered around two broad themes: stories about paternal responsibility and discipline, and about living under a father's authority. The men talked explicitly about patriarchal systems and their fathers' responsibilities, particularly in relation to providing for their families. A man's responsibility to provide evoked many discussions about patriarchal authority, which participants often directed towards men's responsibility for keeping the family together, and the patriarchal discipline that ensured compliance with that authority. In these discussions was a position that a father's responsibilities are not abusive if he is meeting his responsibilities, a position that is reinforced, according to the men, by social, cultural, and familial norms and expectations. Most of the men expressed aspirations to follow examples set by their fathers; however, the precarious social and economic conditions of their daily lives meant that they struggled to achieve their ambitions. In their conversations with Tony, participants acknowledged the pressures of these struggles, and whilst they speak to the consequences of those pressures, we notice men were less concerned that their ambitions were often incongruent with their social, cultural, and economic conditions. We examine these themes in the following sections.

Paternal responsibility and discipline

While all participants in this study were under the age of 35 years old, the men grew up in different family situations, across diverse locations, cultures, and relationships with community. However, we noticed commonalities in their narratives that relate violence to families and social norms. One such commonality is that of a challenging childhood. Without exception, the men described their childhood experiences as tough; fathers in particular were strict and punishments were severe; parental expectations were described as high and seldom met, sometimes with dire consequences.

As one participant explained:

> ***Madhu:*** *"my father was very strict growing up - his main aim was always to provide for his family - you know there were times when we were on the edge - based on the social economic pressures or you know things like that […] yeah there's a lot of pressure and people crumble - it's very unwise to say people don't crumble, because everyone has a heart … but he always worked towards us you know like how I always work towards my son … yeah I may have my up and downs you know but so I think does everyone else I always work for my son's good."*

Here, describing his father as a responsible man whose aim was to provide for his family whilst experiencing "social economic pressures", Madhu appreciates that the means to provide for the

family are scarce - “we were on the edge” - but there is also a social expectation that his father will find a way, since this is what is expected of a father in a family. Providing for a family is a responsibility that our participants understood as being a difficult commitment to meet, with Madhu’s comment - “it’s unwise to say people don’t crumble” - suggesting men’s social obligations require empathy and compassion. The phrase both signals that Madhu understands ‘success’ is not always achievable within precarious social and economic conditions, but rather than indicating failure there is an empathy for the burden of responsibility in his father’s life that formed the conditions for his violence.

Acknowledging his own strict, severe, and punishment-oriented upbringing, Madhu reproduces his father’s responsibility in his own parenting - “he always worked towards us you know like how I always work towards my son” - and recognises that he faces his own pressures - his own “ups and downs” - as a father supporting his family. We understand Madhu’s narrative crafts his own fathering as similar to that of his father:

> ***Madhu:*** *“I am like my father in a way - I am not abusive - not - not abusive - but I lose my temper, but I always believe in keeping my family together.”*

In explaining how he is like his father, Madhu distinguishes between losing his temper and being abusive, a distinction made possible by eliciting the social, cultural, and economic pressures that Madhu situates as grounding the justification of violence. In his telling, Madhu’s priority is on his duty to keep the family together, which means that he is not abusive: a father’s actions to meet his responsibilities are not a form of abuse from Madhu’s perspective. Furthermore, Madhu’s narrative suggests how he is different to his father as well. Losing one’s temper does not contradict his responsibilities to provide for his family but evidences his capacity as a father to withstand social economic pressures and how he continues to “work towards my son” and meet his obligations as a father.

Another participant, Raghav, uses the term ‘tough’ in relation to his experience of his father’s discipline. Raghav describes his father in connection with the presence of patriarchal discipline in the home, specifically sharing with Tony that:

> ***Raghav:*** *“there’s a kind of strict environment at my house […] my father was really tough man and really strict on everyone.”*

Raghav’s description of the whole environment of the household in which he grew up as “strict” implies a totalising approach to both his father’s patriarchal authority as well as the necessity to comply with his authority. Describing his father as a “really tough man” who “was strict on everyone”, we interpret Raghav’s narrative as characterising his father’s style of parenting as a morally justifiably approach to directing his family. By stressing how everyone is subjected to the

same expectation of unwavering compliance to his authority, Raghav stories an interpretation of fairness that relates less to any justification of discipline or the impact or consequences on individual family members, and more on how his father maintained a home environment that everyone was subjected to the same expectations of paternal authority. In this sense, the family's compliance justifies the father's efforts as a legitimate means to meet his responsibilities, demonstrating Raghav's commitment to keeping the family together.

Another participant drew comparisons between his understanding of the role of the man in a family with his own experiences of beatings while growing up:

> ***Ritesh:*** *"so that is the main responsibility of the father of the man to carry the family in a better way and a right way - but sometimes they get a little bit angry - I have got beatings with belt and everything […] until ten [years old] he was always doing that."*

Ritesh accounts for the responsibilities of the father for the family, but in this case his responsibilities are for the 'betterment' of their moral upbringing - "a right way" - in addition to providing for them economically. A father's anger is neither threatening nor abusive since it demonstrates emotional investment in family members' compliance with men's control over family. Anger, to our understanding, is permissible and understandable as Ritesh's father's emotional response is committed to meeting his responsibilities as the head of the family. We understand that his further account of receiving "beatings with belt and everything" explicitly means that the consequence of angering *his* father is discipline exercised through physical violence. Still, he reconciles the tension between his lived childhood experience of violent control and his father's obligations to the family through empathy for men who are upholding their social responsibilities. With Raghav, Ritesh's narrative speaks to the social responsibilities that entrap the men in expectations in tension with the lessons on coercive control and abuse they are learning though psycho-social education at Gandhi Nivas.

Similarly, Madhu observed that:

> ***Madhu:*** *"I didn't see any domestic violence problems, but my dad was very strict with me, you know sometimes he can be very angry and things like that…I don't mind dad's being tough because as long as he's going to be there and I think discipline is required you know when you're growing up."*

Madhu explains that his father, like other participants' fathers, was "very strict" and "angry", mentioning "and things like that" which could evoke any, or all, of the other ways in which fathers exercise discipline or punish violations of their authority. His father's authority and control is justified, since from his perspective "dads being tough" is not only acceptable but expected of men.

While Madhu claimed that he did not see any domestic violence problems, he had previously limited the scope and extent of domestic violence by describing abuse as an exclusively physical form of violence, minimising emotional and psychological violence as forms of necessary discipline. His narratives construct a disciplinary regime with his father at the centre, and in doing so hints at the reproduction of a similar disciplinary regime predicated on his rights and obligations as a man. This regime includes intimidation, threats and outbursts of violence that are legitimated as responsibility to discipline, yet reproduce patterns of coercive control of the minutiae of women's and children's lives.

Another participant shared a similar understanding of parenting as a disciplinary regime:

> ***Ritesh:*** *"you have to take care of your family - that's the main thing - you have to drive it - and discipline is a part of everything - in modern life, jobs or whatever it is - even in love also there is a discipline which you have to maintain."*

We understand that the kind of care Ritesh evokes is entangled with paternal responsibilities to exercise authority and discipline within the family. Caring through drive and discipline, like keeping the family together, help to legitimise a regime of controlling family violence, because when a disciplinary regime is legitimised as necessary for the good of others, violence is minimised and the experiences of victims elided in favour of meeting social expectations. Ritesh emphasises that discipline is needed in modern life, so the regime of control he is justifying is not something only of relevance in the past, or somewhere else, it is a living patriarchal family structure within the context of his everyday conditions.

Stories of patriarchal family structures and responsibilities were not only told by participants of Indian ethnicities. One Samoan participant commented that:

> ***Semisi:*** *"it's a Samoan thing - man is the head of the family - and the mum is the maker of the family - and in Samoa - the Samoa thing - it's a way that their culture - man is the head."*

As with other participants in this study, the structures and responsibilities Semisi evokes entangles paternal responsibilities with a duty to exercise authority and discipline over the family. In his story, Semisi understood the practice that men have particular rights to make decisions for the family, responsibilities to provide for the family, and an obligation to determine the family's moral direction. As the head of the family, a man also determines everyone else's rights and responsibilities, and in his telling, we found there was a connection to understandings of "women as makers of the family" and men's authority to determine women's responsibilities.

Under the fathers' authority

In the stories we have told for the previous sub-theme, the participants talk about a father's responsibilities and authority to control their family. Within their family, the father's responsibilities and authority also determine how the men understand roles and responsibilities for other family members. Under the father's authority there is an expectation that young men, in particular, comply with the normalising structures and hegemonic codes of the patriarchy, to identify with their fathers, model their behaviours, and internalise their paternal laws (Puri, 1999; Segal, 1999; Sharma, 1990). One of the participants brought this expectation to life in his own narrative:

> ***Raghav:*** *"from my starting my father wants me and my siblings to be involved in the farming work - my father was the one who would make the decision we used to for me have to follow him actually if you don't follow him you really got it."*

Raghav explicitly addresses the expectation that he will "follow" his father into working their farm. In his story, Raghav makes sense of his life trajectory in farming as his responsibility to follow the authority of his father. To resist his father's authority was met with punishment, regulating his compliance to authority.

Ronit too, talked of the structural conditions of his family where the life trajectory for sons is decided at birth, and the expectations that follow become extensively disciplined:

> ***Ronit:*** *"in India at that time there was a scenario that when a child was born a lot of pressure was put on him because elders already decide that OK a boy is born he will be a doctor, this boy is born he will be an engineer, and so that was the case."*

In the men's accounts we bear witness to their acceptance of the disciplinary regimes of fathers and sons and their responsibilities to intergenerational expectations to become providers:

> ***Raghav:*** *"[I was] born in a farming family - with the crops and my father and my grandfather they raised all our family - my father's grandfathers and generations of their fathers and grandfathers all were farmers so - there's a kind of strict environment at my house."*

Raghav locates himself entirely through the men in his family, tracing himself through his "father and grandfather" and on through his "father's grandfathers and generations of their fathers and grandfathers" reproducing a genealogical account of the success of patriarchal authority and responsibility in meeting the needs of the men's families. To resist the trajectory would risk the family's survival. While Raghav talked at length about his relationships with his father and grandfather, there was also a noticeable absence in his story of his mother or grandmothers.

Another participant who also elaborated on his father's roles, responsibilities, and control of resources, did elaborate on his mother's domestic responsibilities:

> ***Ronit:*** *"he used to bring all the household items from the market and he used to take us to the school and bring us back from the school every day - he took responsibility for that - and again all the bills and all - he used to deposit in the particular office - the electricity bill and all - he used to do all the outdoor work and my mother used to do all the indoor work - wake us - groom us - help us in our studies."*

Ronit understands his father's responsibilities that included the movements outside of the house, and his mother remained at home. The responsibilities that Ronit describes lay out the conditions of his father's patriarchal status bestowed with the obligation to acquire, accrue, and act on the requisite knowledge to look after his family, while his mother's role of domesticity and childcare does not come into view as work. Like Semisi, Ronit understands that it is fathers, and sons, who determine the responsibilities of women within the family, and it is the men who are responsible for enforcing them through discipline that is controlling and violent.

The authority of the father Ronit describes is not simply a product of his family. It also emerges in the influences of peer groups, social media, and, on occasions, even in school textbooks from the periods in which his parents were raised. Kalia (1980) describes how textbooks used in high schools and higher secondary schools around India "fortify a sex-based division of labor...men venture into a bustling world of excitement and decision while women remain in the background providing service and support…[and] condone the use of physical and verbal abuse against women who fail to comply" (p. 223). As we have seen, Kalia's observations in 1980 are reproduced in the present day by Ronit, such as when he describes his father as navigating the world of officialdom while his mother remained in the background doing "all the indoor work". What emerges here then is a lack of accountability for the enforcement of 'indoor' work, and the coercive control that restricts women's movement in public life.

Returning to the division of labour within Ronit's narratives, we recognise that indoor/domestic work involves skills that are intrinsically less portable than the skills of more public participation in everyday life. Domestic skills also form the basis for women's employment in early childcare in the West. These are low-paid roles restricting women to a 'job ghetto' that constrains their economic independence (Byrne, 2002). The division of public and domestic labour according to sex roles is implicated in ongoing differentials in gender earning power in India as well (Agarwal, 1990; Borooah, 2000; Gupta et al., 2017; Jensen, 2010)[15]. Segal (1999) notes that in Indian

[15] A comparable public/private split in Eurocentric societies has similar implications for a gender gap in paid employment for women (see for example: Berns, 2002; Cohn, 2000, Périvier, 2018; Sullivan, 2018).

communities, women were often socialised as caretakers, even as the people they look after changes. Duty-bound, women's caretaking role is premised "first on the father, then on the husband and, finally, on the eldest son" (p. 215). Her role and responsibilities in the background, doing the "indoor work", is to ensure the patriarchal succession of "the eldest male, [who] grows with the knowledge that, upon the death of his father, he will become the head of the household, and will also be responsible for his mother, female relatives, and younger siblings" (p. 216). This is not a strict hierarchy of social power between a father, husband, and son, ordering who a woman cares for first, or cares for the most, but acknowledges a woman's lived reality within a system of patriarchal authority.

Participant narratives also evidenced how women's caretaking work includes responsibilities in the absence of the father. In Jeet's account, his mother exercised her responsibility to discipline her son's compliance with the conduct expected in the hierarchical and patriarchal structure of the family:

> ***Jeet:*** *"it was hard eh because we did get hidings - you know the rice? the massive bags? well mum used to put me inside them and beat the bags [with a long cane] - yeah* 'cos *I used to swear to her yeah just me - and then she'd put some salt on me and make me sit for like an hour."*

Amongst the participants' stories, this was a rare account of a mother's discipline. The account acknowledges that women are brought into the disciplinary regime of physical violence within the home when the head of the household is absent. In Jeet's story, he experiences his mother's positioning in a patriarchal household as a proxy for the absent father, requiring her to administer discipline accordingly. We do notice, though, that when she places her son inside a rice sack then beats the sack, she performs that violent act of disciplining her son while placing a covering to protect him. In her maternal responsibilities, under a patriarchal regime of control, she is expected to care for both her son's moral and physical wellbeing, creating a tension in 'care practices' that she resolves with a covering and salt to help with purifying and healing the body that suffers for sake of moral imperatives.

Another participant who described being raised in a patriarchal family structure immediately established men's responsibilities in the opening words of his conversation with Tony, as if it were an integral part of his identity and necessary to his introduction:

> ***Ronit:*** *"I am from Punjab - in our early days - in our culture the men are the head of the family - the man - and he earns for the family and he's the bread-earner for the family - nowadays the time has changed - but when we were growing up that was the scenario."*

However, in this account, Ronit reflects on how social expectations in his community for “the man” to provide for and lead the family are changing. And in this story, we recognise that some of the men have experienced changes in their social locations, including challenges to their authority and to their roles as sole providers who can rightfully expect to control the domestic world of women and children.

Transformations: Migration and marriage

Having identified several different early-life experiences that are common to many of the participants, the focus of this report now moves to two significant life-course changes in the men's stories: marriage and migration. Migration, although experienced in multiple ways by the men, is a life-course event that all the participants in this study have undertaken. We want to highlight that all of the men participating in this study have migrated from situations where they were part of the hegemon, where men occupy dominant and privileged roles in their societies, to situations where the men are now often marginalised in terms of race, ethnicity, social class, language, immigration requirements and employment prospects. Whilst marriage is differently understood among many cultures, we note in Aotearoa New Zealand, as a *Western* institution, marriage is commonly regarded as a matter of individual choice. We contrast this with participants in this study, who primarily come from communities that place greater importance on the family, in that marriage is often regarded as combining two bloodlines, particularly when systems of arranged marriages are involved (Seth & Patnayakuni, 2009). Although not all the participants in this study are, or have been, married, this distinction between individual choice and family-oriented marriage practices is relevant to all of the men's life experiences and migration experiences.

Whereas migration for women partners of resident men and men partners of resident women involve similar bureaucratic requirements in terms of residency and citizenship, in other words, although Aotearoa New Zealand migration processes are not necessarily gendered, men and women can experience significantly different movement in social power relations and legal status in terms of their migration experiences, and the implications are often immeasurable.

Most of the men in this study shared with Tony that with marriage comes relatives, and issues of fighting between marriage partners and in-laws. For some participants, the in-fighting was a catalyst for the decision to migrate, for others the in-fighting occurred following migration to Aotearoa New Zealand. Whereas for some participants, marriage and migration occurred as two distinct events; for others, whom we refer to as 'marriage migrants' to better illustrate and emphasise changes to the social, economic, and legal conditions they experience, marriage took place to facilitate their migration. For men and women whose marriage facilitated their migration, the intersection of the two events creates particular vulnerabilities because the residency status of the marriage migrant is typically probationary and subject to the conditions of marriage. For the following sections, we turn to men's experiences of arranged marriages and marriage migration vulnerabilities.

Becoming migrant

Since the early 1980s, we have arguably seen the greatest migratory patterns ever recorded in history. Journeys that were once unimaginable have become everyday events. But while the act of

travel has become easier, other challenges that are associated with changing the country we live in have not (Kim, 2019; Kim & Sung, 2016; Murshid & Bowen, 2018). Migrants experience profound social, cultural, and psychological challenges that do not occur in isolation, but, instead, combine in a *totality* of differences. They feel the challenges of new lifestyles and practices they do not understand, and what they have brought with them (their previous ways of knowing and doing) no longer sustains them.

One participant observed that:

> ***Raghav:*** *"everything was different […] I didn't know anything in this country - no language or anything."*

Understanding Raghav's experiences as a totality of differences created through his migration, means that he experiences himself as not knowing "anything". We notice, too, that the only particularity that he mentions is language. For us, this is strongly connected with his experiences of a totality of differences, since nothing new can be negotiated without language. Similarly, we understand through the men's stories that in the absence of a shared language, it is difficult for men to make sense of that which they do not know.

Another participant, who originally came to Aotearoa New Zealand to study, also emphasised the differences he understood between his homeland and the social world in which he settled:

> ***Madhu:*** *"the society that I saw as a student was very different to the society that I was from […] I think there are lots of problems in New Zealand, starting from poverty - I think it's too expensive way too expensive for anyone to survive - one of the other problems I did see with this change of my life is that there are families in New Zealand that are broken."*

Madhu's experience of Aotearoa New Zealand is that it is an expensive country to live, and poverty is relevant to the totality of differences, where his assumption that men are responsible for providing for their families, and responsible too for holding a family together, was challenged by what he saw. In terms of the providing for oneself and dependent family members in a country with a high cost of living, the men related to Tony that employment is critically important in Aotearoa New Zealand. Shiva was concerned about the difficulties he had in being self-sufficient, specifically in contrast to how self-sufficiency can be managed in his homeland:

> ***Shiva:*** *"in India if you can't work you can stay home […] if I go and work my land and like - in the field - we can earn like a chapati and all that - we can make our home - we have firewood - we have milk at home - just stay home - do your home work if you can't get any job - but here you have to pay rent, electricity. water bill. internet."*

For Shiva, compared to his place of origin, “staying home” does not have the same opportunities of self-sufficiency within the socio-economic reality of Aotearoa New Zealand, without family. The burden of responsibility to earn an income that barely covers the cost of living limits his potential to gain the authority to provide for a family, and this is a source of tension, and vulnerability. Ajay too invokes a layer of differences through his story of financial precarity and vulnerability to exploitation, telling Tony:

> ***Ajay:*** *“it cost me like $10,000 to get a job here - but when I came here he paid me like around three months then he start cutting from my pay - cut like $800 this month, next month a $1000 - he was paying me $600 then he stop my pay - I already gave him my passport […] then he said, ‘Go and take out the money from the ATM. Give it to us for this week’. […] then they were pushing me swearing me tell me, ‘you cannot call the police - they will arrest you - put you in the jail for life.’”*

Through his account it becomes possible to understand the vulnerability to employment that some migrants experience in the community. In this account what becomes visible is how Ajay experiences coercion from his migrant-employment location[16,17], challenging his sense of masculinity, success and authority. Ajay also further explained how his socioeconomic circumstances empowered his employer to force non-work related duties upon him, for which he was not compensated, as well:

> ***Ajay:*** *“I had to clean all the house all the garage all the garden all toilet cleaning all the restaurant cleaning all the vacuum then work.”*

In Ajay’s account, we hear the distress as his work becomes increasingly precarious, and we also understand the challenges to his expectations of migration and work and the feminisation of the work he was required to do. And in this telling, we understand the complexities of ‘doing’ domestic tasks, those tasks that would have been under his patriarchal authority were now being imposed on him. And the imposition here matters in terms of his vulnerability to the social, economic and legal conditions of his migration. Exploitation of migrant workers coerce them into silence, as the threat of being replaced has real material effects:

[16] These are key elements that satisfy the Palermo Protocol on Human Trafficking. The Palermo protocols are three protocols that were adopted by the United Nations (UN) to supplement the *UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (UN General Assembly, 2000a). The first Palermo Protocol is the *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children* (UN General Assembly, 2000b). See also the *Trafficking in Persons Report, 2019* (US Department of State, 2019).

[17] The protection of temporary migrant workers from exploitation in the workforce is currently the subject of review by the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment (2019).

> ***Ajay:*** *"I realise they got another man whose bought my job - he's coming in - starting at $200 paid for the week."*

The financial burden of migration for Parmeet was also evident. In his story, given the context of coming into Gandhi Nivas, he attributed the cost of migration to his responsibilities to emigrate with his wife:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"it's horrible for me - I take a loan for almost [NZ] $40,000 so it's pretty big big decision to take that […] I wind up my business and I take too much loan and I think about her - that's why I am coming here."*

Here, Parmeet's distress is evidently connected with the financial difficulties his faces. His need for intervention connects with the extremity of his situation. In effect, he is indebted more than 75% of the annual median earnings from wages and salaries in Aotearoa New Zealand (Stats NZ, 2019c), compromising his capacity to meet his patriarchal responsibilities to provide. It is on her behalf that he incurred his debt, making his wife responsible for his troubles.

Once in Aotearoa New Zealand, migrants are confronted with other challenges that lead to their distress. Raghav described how the education and skills that he had gained in India were not acknowledged in his host country:

> ***Raghav:*** *"I studied electronics and communications back in India - so here I have to register first ... but they need further more study and they need registration - registration period - and they wanted to have some experience - but how can I have some experience if I've just completed my study? ... so I started looking for other jobs and I found a job [harvesting at] a sweetcorn farm."*

Raghav describes a paradoxical situation that many new arrivals face: needing local experience in order to gain trade registration, but needing to have trade registration in order to gain that local experience. His only option has become agricultural harvesting on a local farm, where his efforts to study are not recognised and his employment in manual labour does not provide him with the ability to pay his debts nor provide for his family. The distress of underemployment as a social and economic burden challenges Raghav's understanding of himself as responsible.

Another kind of financial pressure is experienced by participants whose responsibilities to provide for their families include sending money back to family members in their homelands. Although only a few participants spoke of expectations of remittances being returned to their family because of their migration to a wealthier country, Semisi explained that his mother's expectations of financial support was a problem for him and how he understood his responsibilities:

> ***Semisi:*** *"my mum always asks me why aren't you sending money and I say 'Mum I'm getting only hand-to-mouth' [and she says] 'What are you doing?' It's really difficult - very difficult to send."*

It is Semisi's responsibility to work hard and provide for his family back home through the imagined opportunities of his migration. The distress he feels at his socioeconomic instability and precarious living conditions is understood for Semisi as a tension between his accountability to his family and his failure to provide.

Madhu also talked of his imagined opportunities of migration, and the ongoing financial struggles he faces needing to stay afloat, attributing his current situation to the resulting pressures of following his dream in an expensive country:

> ***Madhu:*** *"this country I know is such an expensive country - it's extremely expensive this country - ah - and very difficult to follow your dream - and sometimes you know you can slip and fights can happen - arguments can happen - and things like that."*

Through his migration narrative, we understand the social expectations and his family obligations travel from his home country and therefore understanding 'fights' not as violence, but as an outcome of his responsibilities 'slipping' out of his control.

While some men talked of precarious employment circumstances, debt, and failure to provide for family in the home country as tangible risks and costs of becoming a migrant, an intangible and less-expected cost is a downward socio-economic mobility that many men experience in becoming migrant. As is well documented, in Aotearoa New Zealand migrants home country qualifications and educational experience are often not recognised by host country institutions, with business needs and immigration policies often privileging migrants originating from particular (i.e. Western, educated, English-speaking) countries. Some members of the research team, as migrants, have first-hand knowledge of how poor our understandings of Aotearoa New Zealand's social systems, in particular the informal social systems in which employment opportunities are often generated, can diminish the likelihood of employment and erode a migrant's social status. In many respects, our experiences reflect that migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand often start from behind in work and social life contexts that are already well below their status in their home country (Charsley, 2005). In other words, in combination with limited language skills to ameliorate changing social and economic circumstances, for many migrants, resettlement is often experienced through a loss of hegemonic status as they settle in Aotearoa New Zealand.

We acknowledge that all of the participants in the present study expressed to Tony difficulties in negotiating the socio-economic conditions they find themselves in. The men's changing socio-economic conditions were made more difficult, according to some participants, with changes in

community relationships, even when settling within communities inhabited by people from cultures the men were familiar with in their home countries. We are aware many participants shared with Tony that they come from communities where everyone knows each other, and where members of a community rely on each other for support. Raghav, in particular, explicitly spoke of his experiences with neighbours in his new community:

> ***Raghav:*** *"after coming here, I found the communication here - like people in your neighbourhood - like they're all busy in their own schedule or they don't want to catch up don't want to talk […] people try not to involve in your matter - try not to be in front or help someone - they afraid to get involved."*

Here we recognise that Raghav's experience of a lack of community coherence in urban Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland is articulated in terms of the busy-ness of city life. Further, he specifies that his neighbours are actively disinterested in being involved with each other, to the extent that they "don't want to talk". He interprets their disinterest as a fear of being involved with each other. What we hear in Raghav's sense making is a story of isolation, where Raghav's movement through the social engagements and administration of everyday life lacks connection and makes it difficult to meet his responsibilities.

Another participant who had initially come to Aotearoa New Zealand as a student commented on the difficulties he experienced in developing relationships with his community, specifically with members of the Indian community in Auckland:

> ***Madhu:*** *"one thing I noticed when I came here there's no-one to help here for us - and even our own community - when you go to them and tell them you're a student - they try to distance us […] it's not that we need some financial help from them - it's the emotional help - but still they try to distance us."*

Isolation from community also featured in Madhu's story, where he understood his position as a student meant he did not meet the criteria for inclusion into his identified community. He understood his lack of support as based on the fear of students needing financial support. Madhu's need for emotional support becomes a complexity of intangible connections where he is able to share struggles, identities and cultural values as he finds new strategies and knowledge to a successful migration.

While Madhu and Raghav spoke of their experiences of differences in *community* values between Aotearoa New Zealand and their homelands, Parmeet told of his concerns about the differences that he experiences in making sense of *family* values locally:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"here is that no family, no family values. People are grown up and after 18 they are finding their own place to live. They're not living with family. If you are giving too much independence, what's going? If your child is taking drugs or alcohol you don't stop it. Why? Why? Here is law that if your child is taking alcohol or drugs, then you're not shouting on him. You're not slapping your child. So, if your child is going to bad habits you just can't do anything."*

Parmeet finds the Western structure of family and notions of parental responsibility difficult to understand, and he makes sense of the difference as unrecognisable from his own location. His understanding of adult children at 18 years of age is a challenge to his parental authority, and he struggles with the idea of their independence. In this context, Parmeet cites how parents cannot exercise discipline over their adult children in challenging circumstances, such as when an adult child is engaging in inappropriate behaviour. Many of the men in this study were educated about their legal obligations in Aotearoa New Zealand through their time at Gandhi Nivas, and while he is cognisant of the 'anti-smacking' bill introduced in 2007[18] that prohibits 'slapping' as a form of discipline, and control, it doesn't make sense to him. He is confronted by the differences he experiences whereby he understands holding the authority to use force as a form of punishment as being connected to family values and not violence[19].

Parmeet's narrative helps us understand how, for some participants, the changes in family values that they experience in Aotearoa New Zealand includes different power relationships between husbands and wives as well. Although women in Aotearoa New Zealand have achieved equality with men in law, there remains evidence of their historical subordination as a consequence of the colonial patriarchal systems that established Aotearoa New Zealand in its contemporary form. In principle, women in Aotearoa New Zealand can participate more in public life, may be expected to make decisions for themselves, earn a living and contribute to the financial support of their families, and manage their own finances[20]. For many women migrating to Aotearoa New Zealand, the move might be assumed to be liberating because they are more able to take on aspects of men's traditional responsibilities for the family. They may also be in social environments where it is more normalised for women to move independently of their husbands, to think independently, and

[18] Crimes (Substituted Section 59) Amendment Act 2007, colloquially referred to as the *Anti-smacking Bill*.

[19] The legislation explicitly permits police discretion in decisions to prosecute parents when force is used in 'normal daily tasks that are incidental to good care and parenting', whilst also explicitly prohibiting 'force for the purpose of *correction*' (Crimes (Substituted Section 59) Amendment Act, 2007 - our stress). We interpret Parmeet's account as connecting the absence of family values with the legislative prohibition of force and punishment as a form of correction, inhibiting his traditional and familiar authority over his children, even as they become adults. We notice the physicality of "bad habits", "not living with family", and "not shouting" when Parmeet describes both permitted and prohibited interaction between parents and children, with affective modes of connecting with and relating to children absent in his account of family values.

[20] We note that women born in Aotearoa New Zealand, including wāhine Māori, are more frequently subjected to coercive control of their financial and social independence by their partners (Elizabeth, 2015).

to make decisions for themselves. Parmeet's account of changes in his partner's sense of autonomy gives testimony to the influence of others on migrant women's social expectations, as he understands them:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"my wife feeling independent - and that person putting positivity so much - like independent positivity - like your life your decision - all these things."*

Parmeet experiences challenges to his authority as his wife takes up more independence as she becomes immersed in her new social relationships. He finds her increasing independence testing, acknowledging the influences of women's legal status in Aotearoa New Zealand, but finding the influence of others as undermining his family values.

For Ronit, the experience of his wife's changing sense of independence became apparent to him after he arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand. The circumstances of the couple's migration were such that her visa was approved before his and she arrived two months ahead of him. A sense of tension becomes apparent when considering that, for Ronit, his wife's new sense of independence emerged in his absence:

> ***Ronit:*** *"she got the freedom when she came here - she was all free - she could move around eat sleep all she wanted - but when I arrived here then she was also finding it a little bit difficult to adjust, because every now and then if she's going out, I am going with her. Now I am here too, she needs to prepare food for me and she needs to take care of me."*

In his account, Ronit attributes his wife's arrival in Aotearoa New Zealand ahead of him as allowing her the freedoms to become independent and make her own decisions about her daily life. These freedoms of movement challenge Ronit's understanding of his authority in the relationship, and he feels that he is not being given the care and attention that he expects from his position as head of family.

For some of the men participating in our study, becoming migrant followed becoming husband, and they migrated with their wives and children. For others, becoming migrant preceded becoming a husband. For Ajay, the complexity of finding a wife negotiated with his family in India after his migration to Aotearoa New Zealand emerged in his struggles to obtain a visa for his new wife:

> ***Ajay:*** *"they said you wasn't living like two years together - I said that's - there was engagement - I gave them proof like phone calls letters text messages and all that - but they said 'no this is not good - not allowed - no.'"*

Ajay explains that the New Zealand embassy in India required evidence that he and his wife had lived together for a minimum of two years as grounds for granting the visa application. The cultural

prohibition on co-habitation before marriage for Ajay and his new wife meant they did not meet immigration criteria. As Ajay explained to Tony, he shared the circumstances of his marriage arrangements to the Punjabi Immigration assistant at the embassy:

> ***Ajay:*** *"you are in our culture - you can't meet - if we are getting married you can't meet before our parent's permission."*

Despite a shared understanding of his cultural practice that prohibits meeting his wife prior to parental consent, Ajay experiences the legal differences between his family in India and the laws of Aotearoa New Zealand that challenge his understanding of the authority of parents over their children's marriages.

The men in this study acknowledged that institutions in their new environment were often not compatible with the institutions of their homeland and spoke of struggling with these incompatibilities. They shared their feelings, expressing to Tony anxieties about isolation, exploitation, and impoverishment, because their previous ways of knowing and being no longer sustained them. Their anxieties were also heightened by marriage, and the challenges of becoming husbands. In the following section we elaborate on the ways that the men described the issues they faced as men entering relationships.

Becoming husband

We begin this section by situating our understandings of men's experiences of marriage with Seth and Patnayakuni (2009), who posits "[i]n India, marriage is viewed not so much as a union between two individuals as the beginning of an enduring relationship between two families. Weddings are usually protracted events that mark the end of lengthy negotiations between two extended families" (p. 330). The act of marriage moves the young couple from the personal domain to the public, creating a spectacle and opportunity to reify hierarchies, and cement and enhance family reputations[21]. Agarwal (1991) points out that "the popular definition of a 'good Indian girl' is one who does not date, is shy and delicate, and marries an Indian man of her parents' choosing" (p. 52). This is reflected when Parmeet contrasted Aotearoa New Zealand with his home country:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"like here it's totally different - never at that time almost in 2006 in India it's hard to talk to girl."*

[21] This is not limited to India. Marriage more broadly involves a public declaration of the way in which two families come together. While responsibilities to the family may differ, the marriage act brings the couple's relationship from a private domain to a public domain where the relationship is solemnised.

Parmeet is not just talking about the awkwardness of adolescence, he is talking about a familial system in which you are not expected to become a couple, when acts of couple-ing are in fact explicitly prohibited. Parmeet's comment affirms the taboo nature of establishing relationships, independently of your family. We see that he implicitly references the practices at play that discourage interaction between young single men and women:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"in India - most of the father and mother have the responsibility to find girl for husband - and also feeling like that it is ok for you find for me a girl from the respected family and particularly cultural fit with me - so it is easy going later in life."*

We interpret Parmeet's account as implying that it is not only primarily his parents' responsibility to find him a wife, but that it is *any* parent's responsibility to do so. In Parmeet's telling, it is his responsibility to both accept that his parents will find him a wife – and to accept *that* wife. His acceptance is premised on his faith in his parents' authority and capacity to identify the right wife for his future as a husband.

The system of arranged marriages that Parmeet refers to helps to operationalise caste and family honour (Chakravarti, 2018a, 2018b; Gupte, 2012; Kukreja, 2018). The mutual respectability of two families, brought together through a marriage relationship, demonstrates to their community the competence of their parents in determining the right way forward for their children. The sensitivity of the issue of caste was particularly evident in the stories of Parmeet and Ronit, men who were in inter-caste relationships: both were higher caste men who married lower down the caste hierarchy. The two participants explicitly evidence how cultural fit in an inter-caste marriage is particularly important to demonstrate parental judgement. In both cases the participants described protracted negotiations between families via intermediaries:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"we directly not interact with both families, somebody need to - middleperson - both families the middleman know but we are like different caste people so it's hard to manage these discussions - so we are facing three months in that conversation."*

Neither of the families directly interact with each other. There is a match-maker who liaises between the families in a negotiation that is complicated by the difference in castes, a "middleperson" who is knowledgeable in traversing such complicated discussions. As well as negotiations through intermediaries, Ronit described how both families were scrutinised at length to determine standing in their communities:

> ***Ronit:*** *"my parents said these things but we are not sure about what the girl's parents think - they [her parents] believe in the caste system […] so there were problems - all these issues that we need to address but slow and steady."*

Ronit explains the complexity of negotiations involving mixed caste marriage matches. The differences families' commitments to the caste system create problems for Ronit's family, which had to be addressed "slowly and steadily". Although it is unclear if Ronit's family involved a middle person to do so, when intermediaries manage the marital arrangements, to the exclusion of the couple who are to be married, as Raghav explains, there remains a potential for mismatches:

> ***Raghav:*** *"I got married - that was an arranged marriage - one intermediate person arranged the meeting in India and then [my fiancée and I] started talking - we were in touch on Skype because she was here [in New Zealand] … I just met her once before we were married, just 15 days before, even though we were engaged for a year … so there was something mismatch like that one and the family when she came amongst us and there was domestic violence in first 15 days."*

Raghav's explanation of a mismatch becomes an introduction to his violence in the home, which happens within days of the couple's marriage. He affirms quite dramatically the consequences for women when parents or intermediaries insist on their marriage to men who do not find them suitable wives.

Other participants describe their marriages as 'love marriages', but even with love marriages the influence of parental authority is evident in their stories:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"we are in mind that both family agree then we marry. We are not going outside the family to marry, like that type of thing. We need to take both families together happily. After this thing happened her mother and father agreed to marry, and her family's going to see me."*

The meeting between Parmeet and his future in-laws is more than a request or a requirement once the marriage has been "agreed", it becomes an obligation that speaks to parental authority. He specified what her mother and father were looking for in a partner for their daughter:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"girl's mother father always thinking about marriage, how much they earning monthly… they measure before marriage our wealth, how wealthy family."*

In effect, 'love' marriages such as the one Parmeet describes are an amalgam of love and arranged marriage: although courtship is initiated by the couple, family status and parental authority both continue to play a powerful role in the decision to marry and the process of marriage. The validity of the marriage is steeped in ensuring not only Parmeet's capacity to provide, but his family's capacity to provide as well. This is a reminder of how filial duty to both families can take priority over a love relationship, even in relationships described by the men as love marriages. We are mindful that the men's accounts draw attention to 'conflicts' and 'tensions'

with Western hegemonic norms, and arranged marriages appear, on the surface, incompatible with Western notions of marriages premised on autonomy, romance and love. Yet within the complexity of the tensions the men are experiencing, romance, love, marriage, parental approval, and patriarchal authority are intertwined in specific ways for each of the men.

Ronit's story presents a specific amalgam of love and arranged marriage. He and his prospective wife met while studying for their exams in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), and:

> ***Ronit:*** *"slowly we started getting mixed up - we shared our family backgrounds and all that - we shared our dreams about - with each other and what we want to be - why are we here what we want to do - and after all this we thought that our dreams are quite similar we want to be - we are - you know - on the same base we have the same target and we are going at - serious ... She was also a pretty good looking girl and I felt in love with her and after two months two and a half months I told her that I love you and I want to marry you I feel if you can - I waited for a response for two or three days and she also agreed and then we told our parents the love was there."*

In Ronit's story, romance involves an entanglement of the couple's dreams and stories. Given the context of the IETLS examinations it seems they perceived that they were compatible: they were both motivated to migrate and her attractiveness - "she was also a pretty good-looking girl" - was a bonus. Ronit is sharing with Tony a love that is growing.

While Ronit dwelt on the compatibility between himself and his wife, others found that the compatibility they perceived early on in their relationship did not withstand the relationship. They described how their roles changed once they were married, sometimes with problematic outcomes for their relationships. Parmeet elaborated at length on this, with his comments serving as an example of the experiences many other men shared during their conversations:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"you need to focus to find out jobs and all things and so often this job is not particularly near you - five kilometres - and 10 kilometres - you need to go one place to another place and almost cycle 25 kilometres - and some sites is almost 40 kilometres - one site 40 and come back 40 - so almost my toiling is 80 to 120 kilometres on the bike - not a car.*
>
> *And after marriage she is changed - my wife has also some responsibility - to make food - to clean house - my mother - father - all these responsibilities - but not hard not too much hard.*

So, I go through that, and I take responsibility so much in business - and so much responsibility - and my wife she thinking I totally changed - I tell lots of time I am not changed - I have some responsibility, to earn money to save for future.

Even our sex life is totally different - I almost working going early and coming home at 9 and no holidays nothing - no Sundays - nothing - I'm just a little bit started my business and I need to give five years - four to five years and my business is all set and you take the time - so my wife thinks that he is not loving me and he's not focused on whatever I need but what do I do - because I'm so much tired - she is also human - she also has feelings and all that."

To our understanding, Parmeet is working hard to be a good husband – but he also understands there are compromises and competing demands that challenge his relationship with his wife, particularly in their sexual relationship. He is persevering with the hard demands of precarious conditions though he does not see the struggles his wife faces as she takes up her new responsibilities as being quite so difficult as his own. Parmeet is making good on what is expected of him and the circumstances he is presented with and he understands that his wife thinks he is changed under the weight of the demands he must meet. Ronit's accounts resonate with the gendering of labour, where women's work is family-specific, domestic work inside the home, whilst men's work involves acquiring and acting on knowledge in the community to look after his family. Parmeet portrays himself as not only driven by but also suffering from his responsibilities, whilst giving no indication that he is aware of how his wife is feeling about her new role. Whereas Parmeet's life involves travelling in the community for the purposes of business, with little or no time off, his wife is constrained to providing services and support in the background, also with little or no time off and with few opportunities to do otherwise.

What Parmeet's toiling and extreme tiredness meant to his wife is almost an afterthought, but nonetheless an important afterthought. We appreciate Parmeet cares for his wife's wellbeing, with his consideration of her humanity and feelings. Still, we notice that, in his telling, he is driven by *his* understandings of social obligations in a patriarchal system. Rather than a reflection of the health of the relationship or a consideration he takes into account when making decisions about how to meet his obligations, his wife's affective experience is a troubling challenge and obstacle Parmeet must navigate.

Although each participant's experience of marriage was different, we interpret some commonalities amongst their stories about arranged marriages: marriage is a relationship between two families as much as it is between a man and a woman; men experienced an expectation that family interests, which are the interests of the man, are placed before the interests of the wife and couple; ethnic Indian men, in particular, are expected to marry; women ought to be suitable and supportive

partners, not only of their husbands, but also of their husband's wider family as well; and, if men don't follow cultural marriage conventions, they risk the stigma of separation from their family.

The accounts men gave about their marriages suggest they were very responsive to the various ways in which their immediate communities expected them to adhere to the norms of their responsibilities as husbands. Whilst the men clearly experience consequences for breaching the social norms of their communities, the men's stories also highlight how women do not need to 'misbehave' nor breach social norms to experience serious consequences within a patriarchal social structure. For some women, the men's stories tell us social norms are a matter of how women measure up, how 'compatible' they are in relation to expectations imposed by their families, their prospective husbands' families, and the wider community. Failing to measure up, of being incompatible or a 'mismatch' for their husbands, becomes a condition giving rise to domestic violence.

Almost all of the men who spoke at length about their marriages, were in marriages that they described as arranged, since parental authority had been exercised in at least some aspect of the marriage. Stories of love marriages that involved no parental authority in the decision to marry were not as common, however, one participant went into great detail to describe the occasion when he first met his prospective wife. In Semisi's story, she was a tourist at the hotel where he worked. Their relationship was established in the space of a few days, and it was a story that he did not want taken for granted:

> ***Semisi:*** *"she's ask me: 'You want to come dinner with us tonight?'*
>
> *I say: 'Yeah, but - I have no money.'*
>
> *She say: 'Don't worry. I pay.' And we go together with other guests - and we dinner - then we go back to hotel gates to drop her - and because we walk to the restaurant and we walk back to the hotel - and she have - a request to me: 'Where you go? ... can you come and sleep with me?'*
>
> *I say 'Sure you mind?'*
>
> *'No, come and sleep with me.'*
>
> *And that's the time we start - first night - and in the morning - I feel - huh? What I'm doing? What I'm doing? And that's the night she know - this is the man I chose and this is the man I was fall in love with.*
>
> *The next day she say 'Go home and come. We go out dinner just you and me.' Then go - come back and I sleep again with her - and the next day she say she go to the other island*

for couple three days - say OK cool - and I'm working and I get her request - can she come to my house for a New Year lunch - I say 'that would be lovely.'

I feel my heart boom-boomp - boom-boomp - boom - boom - boom is like that - like a sub-speaker - boom boom boom - I told my parents - my mum I bring someone at home at New Year - my mum is open her eyes 'Who?'

Oh my family!

'Ah, my friend. I bring her for the lunch. She want to see the Samoan life.'

I bring her early in the - I tell her this is when I coming to pick you up - then I go there - pick her up - come home - introduce my family - have a to'ana'i? To'ana'i is THE lunch - we have lunch and she sleep - in my bed at home - my family tidy up my bed - is a mattress for her - and she have a rest - she left my house - at - seven o'clock of the night-time after lunch and dinner catch up with me - still talking with me.

Then the next day when I come to work and she say to me 'Can I come to live at your house before I go to New Zealand?'

She live with me for four days - my house - and that's the time she say: 'I will coming back to you.' That's the time I know she love me - that's the time - she come my home - she enjoy the life - my nephew - my niece - join - play - talk - a normal life - she think she's member of the family and that's the time we partner - we more than friendship what we doing - what we doing before at the hotel - you know?"

Semisi's love relationship is unusual to us in his telling of it. His racing heart as he tells his mother she will visit, speaks to the excitement he feels and perhaps some trepidation in case his parents do not find her acceptable. He is aware he is telling a story about a woman who pursued him with some persistence, a woman who was 'inappropriately' forward with him – and he was not reluctant to engage with her. A dawning love and parental approval are interconnected here too.

Semisi's story also shares that he is proud of how his family makes space to make her feel welcome. This is important to him. As he tells it, she easily took up a place with him and at that point they become partners. They feel that they belong together, and as soon as she fits with his family, their relationship is sealed. Family remains critically important as Semisi and his partner's relationship quickly becomes a marriage. A woman's compatibility again becomes paramount in Semisi's story of a love match. In the familial structures that many of the men feel responsible to maintain, it is the woman's place to fit in with her husband and his family.

The authority of family honour

In another expression of their adherence to community expectations, the men also speak of the respect that they have for their parents. In their telling, men's respect for their parents adds complexity to their stories through the pressures men experience in married life. In particular, Raghav described an argument between his wife of two weeks and her parents, about him and his family. It is an argument that took place in front of him, and it has an ending that we have already discussed:

> ***Raghav:*** *"Her parents was trying to make her understand that 'you shouldn't do these kind of things - and you should be nice here' and so she was saying to her parents that 'what these guys have? They have no money. They have nothing. They don't even have good character.'*
>
> *I said,* '*What? Shut up! Shut up your mouth now!*'
>
> *And her father asked her,* '*Do we have money?*'
>
> *She said,* '*Money is in my face. Money is everywhere. I have money.*'
>
> *He slapped her and said,* '*Look you have to be live with these guys. We already told that this is the final decision - these guys and this is the place you gonna have to live.'"*

Raghav bears witness and particates in the coercion and violence his new wife's father perpetuates. Raghav's wife resists her father's assessment of her in-law family's ability to provide for her. By Raghav's account she is not resisting the possibility of an arranged marriage but questioning whether this arrangement will meet her needs for financial security. She will be dependent and her resistance to the notion of arranged marriage is based on what an arranged marriage ought to deliver to her – financial security and social respect. Questioning Raghav's families' character is too much for him to bear and her doubts justify his angry, authoritative response. When Raghav's father-in-law slaps her, the hierarchy within the family structure is made evident, and Raghav respects the enactment of his patriarchal authority and his exercise of control over his daughter.

Another participant claimed that he was fine with his wife's criticism of himself, but when she criticised his parents, that was too much:

> ***Ronit:*** *"I controlled myself but once she started to abusing my parents then I - that was something I couldn't take any longer - so I got I got angry I hit her - that was the main thing… our parents went through all their sacrifices to raise us and to teach us to be great -*

I don't think so that they should be involved in any of our argument or anybody should say anything about them."

Ronit makes clear he cannot *tolerate* his parents' worthiness and respectability to be brought into an argument. In justifying his violent response, he draws our attention to a distinction between violence as a reactive disciplinary response and violence as realising an intention to harm. Ronit's story situates disciplinary violence in reaction to perceived offence as a culturally acceptable, and potentially socially expected response. The apparent normality of Ronit's violence is similar to Madhu's account of violence as a natural result of when a man "crumbles" under the strain financial pressures. What Ronit also makes clear is violence is *necessary* to reify the subjective primacy of patriarchal social obligations and expectations.

As with Ronit and Madhu, Raghav places great importance on respect for his family[22]:

Raghav: "*that was the respect that I - the people I respect so much, she was abusing them. That was the - that was the respect I have for my parents and any other person in my family that I was unable to bear it."*

Our interest in these discussions is that the men making these comments are not claiming that they are defending their own honour, yet their own reputation is so intimately connected with their families' that they are bound together. These stories help us make sense of patriarchal authority, as authority to coercively control and justifiably assault women and children who do not honour their family without criticism or complaint.

To our understanding, honour-based cultures place high value on respect and the social image of the family (Brown et al., 2009; Gupte, 2012; Lowe et al., 2018). Das (1993) writes that concepts like honour, reputation, or prestige, are highly valued ideals amongst Punjabis. Qureshi (2004) describes "family honour and respect" (p. 2), conceptualised as 'izzat', as a "manifestly influential dynamic" (p. 6) in the lives of young Pakistanis and Punjabis. A core expectation in honour cultures is that men and women adhere to strict gender role expectations (Aslani et al., 2016; Lowe et al., 2018), with men becoming the head of the household whilst women becoming homemakers and caretakers who offer loyalty, humility, compliance and submissiveness through their dependence on and dereference to others (Lowe et al., 2018; Segal, 1999). As the head of the household within a patriarchal system, Lowe et al. (2018) tell us men "acquire honor if they act tough and, if deemed necessary, use aggressive force to protect or restore their own, and by association, their family's honorable reputation" (p. 284). The honour system, then, extends privileges to men that enable them to enforce the maintenance of family honour, such as when a family experiences a perceived

[22] While we acknowledge that family respect is a cultural value with many positive aspects, we also observe that the value of family respect can be distorted through overly defensive responses to perceived criticisms of the family.

loss of honour through breaches of normative gender roles and social expectations, by women. The expressions *honour-based violence* and *honour killing* are often used in discussions when these perceived breaches trigger violent responses by men. The effect of prescribed gender-based roles, according to Gupte (2012), means "patriarchal controls over women are normalised through the concept of honour and therefore honour can be considered as structural violence" (p. 10-11) maintaining women's adherence to the social expectations of patriarchal social structures.

Family disapproval

While family honour was sometimes evoked to justify violence, it was noticeably absent from stories men told Tony of how their families disapproved of their drug and alcohol use. Substance use was implicated in the events that brought the men to Gandhi Nivas and had become such a significant issue for some men, their wives had separated from them. For Afi, it was his mother's disapproval he remembers:

> ***Afi:*** *"I'm the one - know what, my mum always angry at me: 'Shame on you. Naughty man. Drinking. Smoking marijuana. Drinking. Smoking marijuana.' Yep […] But I always - I always drink - but it's me - I tell you my mum say: 'Why are you naughty? Very bad. Too much beer, too much marijuana.'"*

Afi's story is of a man who does not need to measure up to a *woman's* perspective of how he should behave, but he *does* need to measure up to his *mother's* understanding of how her *son* should behave. Although Afi's status and position in his family is unclear to us, we understand this complexity through his account of her questioning of him in affective terms that are characteristically maternal. In other words, Afi's account of his mother's concern for him is a narrative strategy of transposing a potential breach of family honour within a patriarchal system of authority – in which he becomes a shameful son and which could be met with reactive disciplinary violence action, to an *affective* response from *a woman*. As we discussed with Jeet's account, discipline at the hands of his mother affirms an understanding of obedience to authority, given her role as a proxy to his father, that is neither predicated on compliance to rules nor the individual whims of the father (let alone the mother), but instead, is a necessary condition to maintaining the patriarchal system of authority. To our understanding, Afi's story also affirms that obedience and discipline are not predicated on compliance to his mother. Although he recognises shame, Afi's mother's efforts at disciplining him affectively are unsuccessful.

Ajay told of drinking up to two bottles of wine each night, and shared how he reclaimed respectability and honour, or at least mitigated the dishonour of his actions:

> ***Ajay:*** *"I was drinking when we came back from India - I went to India I was drinking every day - they don't like - even my family as well - I do that - that's true yeah - but I don't know*

> *why I couldn't stop myself - every day I was drinking - hiding - drinking ... then I proved I'm like I'm OK I went through CADS and detox - and all that I've done all the counselling - CADS - AA - NA - yeah, then she came back to me and we were all good."* [23]

Ajay is embedded in a family where his daily drinking is unacceptable. He seeks help, ineffectually. We notice his emphasis on going through various interventions without any reference to changes in his lifestyle or changes to patterns of alcohol consumption. Nor does Ajay's account mention changes to the views and experiences of others who otherwise disproved of his drinking. We interpret his help-seeking, then, as a form of compliance to the expectations of patriarchal social norms; that his involvement with treatment providers is predicated on doing 'what it takes' to maintain the honour of his family. As head of his household, that Ajay "went through" counselling interventions is all is expected of him – so he and his wife are "all good".

But life was not all good. He relapsed and his relationship with his wife deteriorated:

> ***Ajay:*** *"sometime work is not good - like stressful - and all those things come in my mind and sometimes start drink again - yeah - that's like our differences - like going more far more far - sometimes work isn't good so if it's not good then stay home - then some time start drink - like early some time like three or four o'clock - it was - I know - like bad but I wasn't that much drunk […] I always make curry before she comes home but she comes - like - like ladies: 'No, no, no why you drinking? You can drink? No - I can work I earn money you just sit and drink.'"*

Ajay's talk of work as a stressor references the precarity of his employment, where workplaces and lack of work can be troubling and troubles can lead to drinking that draws disapproval from his wife. This brings to the fore a criticism of his wife which is embedded in his story, a criticism which relates to his responsibilities as the man in the relationship. Ajay's concern is not his employment or his drinking, nor is he concerned about the consequences of his drinking. Instead, Ajay shares with us a concern that *his wife* has raised the issue, that she works and earns money while he drinks. Ajay has lost moral authority in that he is no longer, as man of the house, the arbiter determining acceptable behaviours for his family; his wife speaks out and he response to assert his control.

Although both Afi and Ajay, as young men well aware of their misuse of drugs and alcohol, had made attempts to bring misuse under control, their substance abuse persisted. Afi's drinking, in particular, continued after marrying an Aotearoa New Zealand citizen and migrating:

[23] CADS = Community Alcohol and Drug Services; AA = Alcoholics Anonymous; NA = Narcotics Anonymous.

> ***Afi:*** *"I'm still working you know - too much beer too much - you know I think that's the problem: beer - beer - oh beer is good but the person that drink the beer - can't control beer - beer not control you. Lesson? control the beer, not the beer control you."*

Afi's comments tell us the problem is not his marriage, employment situation, migration challenges, lifestyle choices, or levels of stress in his life. Concerns about how much he drinks, when he drinks, or the circumstances of his drinking are irrelevant at best. At worst, raising these concerns can be an outright challenge to his honour as a man by insinuating he is not successful in meeting social expectations and familial obligations. Afi shares with Tony that he knows the solution, though: aware the beer controls him, *he* must control his drinking, because the discipline to do so is expected of him. Discipline and control are priorities for him, which raises questions of safety for those who challenge his capacity, ability, and success in doing so.

In-laws and in-fighting

Other conflicts that emerge in the marriages of the participants involve the relationships among women, within the patriarchal social responsibilities of their relationships as in-laws. In particular, Gangoli and Rew (2011) elaborate violent behaviour in the home space, perpetrated by mothers-in-law against young women married to their sons, in dowry-related cases. The regulation of power and discipline by an older woman, as a process of regulating a younger woman through social customs dividing the women, illustrates the diverse spaces occupied by women in the various social hierarchies of a household, and the changes expected of them as the spaces they occupy change over time. Thus, the profile of the mother-in-law, similar to Jeet's story which positions his mother as a proxy 'man of the house' for the absent father, enables an understanding of the abusive behaviour of older women that is directed towards the younger new-comer as replicating patriarchal gendered power relations (Anitha et al., 2018; Fernandez, 1997; Gangoli & Rew, 2011).

In his telling, Parmeet identified conflict between his mother and his wife as a central issue in his arranged marriage, and recognised a quandary: two women love the same man, and he loves them both – but if he overtly supports either one, he risks the wrath of the other:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"and you know that mother-in-law and fighting and that small sort of things that always happen - how? why they happen I don't know - I think I not support totally her because I don't know who is wrong and who is right - if I take my mother's side then she thinks I'm going to my mother's right hand - if I go to my wife's side then my mother thinks - so I'm stuck on that - I'm not going to choose - not going there - not going to happen."*

Parmeet normalises the conflict between his mother and wife, minimising it's significance in the lives of the women because he feels unable to choose between them. We appreciate Parmeet's struggle with familial duties to his wife and his mother, and his sense of diminished capacity to

become the moral guide for the women in his family since their conflict compromises him. We notice, though, that Parmeet does not question the efficacy of the conflict resolution approach he takes for granted as his moral obligation as man. Though compromised, his position of authority is asserted in his agency to not choose who is right and wrong because he is stuck on how to make a different decision.

Harpreet described similar ongoing conflict in his marriage as a tension that he eventually could no longer tolerate or endure:

> ***Harpreet:*** *"one day fighting is too much in my family and my wife between - too much fighting - my wife is insulting my mother and my father, and my mother is insulting my wife - it was this type of culture."*

Like Parmeet, Harpreet normalises the conflict between his wife and mother as a cultural type, recognising the localised character of the clashes the women experience in their relationships with each other. Still, it becomes too much for him to bear, and he needs to exercise control to bring the conflict to resolution. Resolution of conflict also becomes Parmeet's responsibility because he cannot bear the fighting between his wife and mother either. Neither of the men recognises the possibility that the women are socially entrapped in duties for his care that could be differently negotiated with support and understanding. In his conversation with Tony, Parmeet takes up his responsibilities man of the house to reprise his duty to uphold his family structure:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"finally I think that if I need to hold my marriage - I need to take some decisions otherwise this is going in the down side - so I think and I just do it - like we are going to out from country - because what happen if I say that we are going to new city in India then society is telling like that for mother and father you left for her … so it's quite big issue, and they are like* '*shame on you.'"*

In Parmeet's narrative the potential failure of his marriage means that he must act to hold his new family together while also respecting his parents. Moving away from his homeland becomes the resolution, since it ends the everyday fighting while still maintaining the face of respect for his family. Internal relocation, seen through the eyes of his community, would be interpreted as a rejection of his parents and bring social shame to his family. Migration carries different social meanings. The family will be separated, yet for new opportunities and a chance to improve rather than diminish his family's social standing:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"my mother and father is angry to my decision - so start to - like - going another country - but eventually my father and mother is giving me lots of support, 'If you are happy to separate from us then you go - we are always blessing you that you live happily - you and your wife' - so they never hold up - they always thoughtful like that."*

Consultations about either resolving the conflict or migrating with his wife do not enter his story. As decision-maker of the family, Parmeet understands these decisions are his alone. In doing so, he exerts control over his marriage partner, with decisions impacting his family a privileged responsibility that he understands as his obligation, social right and duty. Despite his parents' initial anger, they are supportive of his ambitions. The shame Parmeet anticipated if he moved away to another region is mitigated, so the decision he makes resolves the issues from his position, and imposes migration on his wife as a consequence.

Parmeet and Harpreet's stories of fighting within their families draw out their patriarchal obligations and responsibilities as heads of households where women's relationships are conflictual. Their agency is fraught with impossible or shameful outcomes from their decisions. This becomes important when men's strategies for resisting tensions within their families maintain the legitimacy of his gendered role as decision maker with patriarchal authority over his family. As we see with both Harpreet's and Parmeet's stories, privileging the socially sanctioned moral authority of the man of the house enables the men to minimise the seriousness of violence enacted by and carried out between women and invalidates a woman's role in decision making for her and her family, presenting women who may resist violence or venture outside moral conduct expected of them with risks of disciplinary violence.

Marriage migrants

In the context of this report, we characterise marriage migrants as 'home country' people who marry a 'host country' partner in their home country, then migrate to the host country. Our understanding of marriage migrants also includes people who migrate to marry a host country partner in their host country. For example, whilst Raghav was born and raised in India, his wife was raised in Aotearoa New Zealand by her Indian parents. Raghav shared with Tony that he met his wife in India, was married to her in an arranged marriage in India, then, never having visited his host country, followed her back to Aotearoa New Zealand to live with her. Marriage migrants such as Raghav are precariously positioned because their residency status is typically probationary and subject to specific conditions of marriage. Residency depends on making their marriage work.

Probationary conditions apply to both men and women marriage partners of spouses who have a right to reside in Aotearoa New Zealand, producing conditions where the rights of the couple to remain in Aotearoa New Zealand are often dependent on the resident spouse. For migrant men on visitor's visas in Aotearoa New Zealand, reliant on their wives' status as students, permanent residents, or as citizens to remain in the country, we appreciate their arrivals are sometimes "incomplete". Sharing his experiences of migration and resettlement, Raghav described police attending other incidents, separate to the incident resulting in him residing at Gandhi Nivas, but did not disclose who called the police in his story. It is evident from the totality of Raghav's narratives,

though, that on previous occasions his wife did not provide the police with any evidence of violence, and Raghav continued asserting his privileged right to control and discipline his wife violently. The violence that brought him to Gandhi Nivas, is Raghav's response to his wife and her parents threats:

> ***Raghav:*** *"'I escaped you from the ah - the police because I - I - didn't - blame you under - I could charge you under the violence - domestic violence charges - I will complain you - I will complain police about everything you did with me - I escaped you from that - I rescued you from - the things - and ah - I am gonna inform the police - I'm gonna do this - I'm gonna deport you - I'm gonna do that - you're here for residency.' "we gonna deport you - you just are a dog - you are a bastard - you this and you that - your dad is this and that - your mum is this and that.'"*

We understand Raghav finds these comments extremely threatening. Raghav is out of place. He is isolated from his family and dependent on his wife and her family. As a migrant, he is not entitled to remain in Aotearoa New Zealand in his own right. He has lost his position of authority over his own household, and whatever roles and responsibilities he thinks he ought to have as a husband are complicated and compromised by having to live with his wife's parents. He described his feelings at having to do what many migrant women from his home country do when they marry:

> ***Raghav:*** *"you know it's the worst thing when you live in someone - some other's place - it's the most worstest thing - ever - it's really hard."*

This is confronting for him. In Raghav's story we read a substantial shift in the gendered power relationship, and it is a shift that is alien to Raghav's normative upbringing. The dependency he has on his wife's family is a dependency that a woman would experience in her reliance on her husband's family. Moreover, he is also dependent on his wife and her family for social access to the local community and social relations within the community. When Raghav left India as a marriage migrant he lost his social connections and the daily face-to-face contact he had with his family. New connections for him, at least initially, come through the family and friends of his new wife, and he becomes a stranger entering the existing social networks of other people. His story tells us he is scared and vulnerable; he is not compatible with their expectations of a man and husband, and now they are criticising his parents and threatening to deport him because he has become violent towards his wife. His violence against her is entangled in the social entrapment he experiences as a man who is both the head of the household and dependent on his wife.

Engaging with change

The participants in this research have all come to Gandhi Nivas where they have been offered opportunities to engage with changing their controlling violence towards their families. But the situations that the participants have come from are complex and unique to each man, and those complexities make engaging with change more problematic. The various themes that have been discussed so far affect the extent to which the men and their families are willing to discuss and address violence, and this applies particularly to the men who have been brought up in honour-based cultures that place high value on respect and the social image of the family. Complexities of patriarchal social relationships affect the extent to which the men and their families engage with counselling and other support programmes operated through Gandhi Nivas. Moreover, they operate as barriers that compromise how each man internalises accountability in his journey of change. In the following section, we examine in more detail how the participants in this study have internalised accountability, beginning by revisiting the men's understandings of domestic violence.

Changing understandings of domestic violence

The men who spoke with Tony all located domestic violence in different spaces, but there were commonalities in their interpretations. Perhaps the most notable was their understanding that 'domestic violence' described non-disciplinary physical assault, reproducing intention to physical harm as a key characteristic of violence. Put differently, the men construed violence stereotypically as physical fights between strangers, or where a perpetrator of violence intentionally harms an unknown victim. Violence, then, could not occur between members of the same family, and, hence, 'domestic violence' as a concept of thought was very difficult for the men to consider in relation to themselves. The exception to this was the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary regime – as this particular use of violence was not unreasonable nor unexpected in men's experiences of growing up. Violence was often an obligation men said they felt compelled to perform as a disciplinary act, particularly to control the actions of children and women. Disciplinary violence, according to their understandings, was initially not considered to be 'domestic violence' nor 'wrong' by the men. Whilst participants expressed awareness that their understandings were narrow, and that they had become more aware of different forms of abuse that are considered to be violence in Aotearoa New Zealand law, we notice men's understanding of violence seems more concerned with what is legally prohibited and less concerned with what might be socio-culturally acceptable. This differentiates men's interest in change as what not to do as regards legal prohibitions to how to become socially responsible and accountable for their families' safety and security. One man commented that:

> ***Madhu:*** *"[we] immigrant people don't know the laws here, domestic violence and all that. I learned that here [at Gandhi Nivas]."*

Madhu's learning is critical and the first thing he has learned is that domestic violence is against the law. Another participant explained:

> ***Raghav:*** *"I didn't understand that domestic violence is a criminal thing. A crime is doing something illegal, right? But what is the crime in domestic violence? Physical harm was the violence. But not psychological talk, emotional talk. So now I learned what abuse is."*

In his opening position, Raghav pushes back on understandings of domestic violence as a crime. If crimes are crimes because they are illegal, he understands physical harm is violence and therefore illegal, but verbal abuse is not illegal, and psychological talk is not illegal, so in the absence of violence, he asks "what is the crime?". In effect, Raghav is analysing the information he has been provided to be able to separate physical violence and non-physical violence. We notice here, though, his analysis of one form of (physical) violence, which he acknowledges as abuse, creates a permission structure for other forms of (non-physical) violence. He has acquired, in effect, a new vocabulary through his interactions with the home and has learned to differentiate between abuse and violence, and thus 'decriminalise' his conduct because it does not involve physical assault[24].

Raghav's recognition of *psychological and emotional talk* as abuse was consistent amongst other participants in the research too, suggesting that they had learned *together* during their interactions at Gandhi Nivas. Whilst men's changing views about and understandings of domestic violence are encouraging, Raghav's story also opens up how change creates new challenges in terms of supporting men learning to engage in supportive, caring, respectful and dignifying relationships with others.

Afi explains that his learning involves questioning how his wife may be responding to his actions towards her:

> ***Afi:*** *"And here's me - push my wife - hit my wife - I'm angry, jealous, yelling, stare at her, mean when I speak to her - and when I apologise to her, what does she think? How does she feel when he says that? 'He's mean to me. He doesn't really love me. He's just saying that.'"*

Afi is learning to think about what his victim might be thinking and feeling, even if he apologises for assault, jealousy and emotional abuse. Teaching empathy in the context of a violence intervention related to criminal justice processes enables Afi to reflect on the actions expected of him as a partner in his relationship. Afi's apology is contextualised as another possible way for him to exercise his authority by restoring the trust he expects his wife to have in him. He is learning that

[24] There are many criminal activities which men coming to Gandhi Nivas are charged with that do not involve assault, including trespass and threatening to kill.

apologies cannot restore trust broken by violence. There can be no return to an earlier time after the harms of violence are recognised. An apology accepted works to hold the woman under his control just a bit longer, whilst presenting new challenges to her safety.

While the participants all talked about new understandings of domestic violence, we do not suggest that the men universally accepted and agreed with their newly found knowledge, nor did they dismiss taken-for-granted knowledge of intrafamilial relationships. Instead, many of the men were reluctant to accept that they had behaved violently, but understood that the law said differently, and so were obliged to 'admit guilt'. We have seen evidence of this earlier in this report, in the ways in which the men attempt to justify non-physical domestic violence by admitting to physical violence. We also want to acknowledge that whilst Gandhi Nivas does not require men to admit guilt nor take responsibility for their actions in order to obtain support, our experience working within statutory government agencies and the justice system suggests admitting guilt is often encouraged if not required in terms of men's interactions with the police and the court systems. Hence, we acknowledge the participants may have learned an admission of guilt often will have positive consequences for them, legally.

Within the rigidly hierarchical and patriarchal society that Segal (1999) describes and the honour-based cultures that place such high value on the social image of the family that Brown et al. (2009) and Lowe et al. (2018) describe, violence against women is pervasive but not acknowledged, and not discussed outside the family. Taking issues outside of the family is *be-izzat*: shameful and disrespectful. Chakravarti (2018a) makes this clear in relation to upper caste women in particular:

> Upper caste women's own respect is derived from the respectability of their men…codes of *izzat* - honour, respect, and shame - imply further that upper caste women cannot really reveal the existences of oppression that they may have to live with. (p. 87)

We might characterise this as a sense of 'cultural privacy', through which one looks after one's own affairs and keeps issues within the family. It is a notion that emerged in some of the narratives as a rationale the men mobilised to resist change. Parmeet put it this way:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"if you are doing this [in India] then families together and sort it out […] a family matter - they sort it out within the families. Most of the cases are sorted out in family. Family violence - never people going to court for that domestic violence."*

And Ajay told us that:

> ***Ajay:*** *"if this happen in India my family members come together and think about that. This is right or wrong, good if there is right, but then going to divorce if is wrong. So, we are not*

going to police station. There is no counsellor there you know […] Police in India would say, 'Families sort this out. This is not court matter. This is family matter.'"

We read in both narratives that the issue is not about whether there was violence perpetrated against a wife, but how it is managed, and by whom, within the family. The family that comes together to "sort it out" does not come together in the men's accounts to condemn violence, but instead to decide what is to be done to keep face in the community. Maintaining social respect requires keeping violence a secret within the family; family honour, and therefore men's reputations, must be protected.

Historically, domestic violence was dealt with by New Zealand Police as if it were a private dispute within a family. The introduction of the Domestic Violence Act (1995) marked a significant movement away from previous legislation with substantial changes in policing policy. The Act more broadly defined domestic relationships, recognised the potential for psychological abuse of children who witnessed violence, and extended the coverage of protection orders. The legislation also marked a movement to recognise that a domestic dispute is no longer a family matter[25]. However, we caution that, socially and culturally, we have not moved far from domestic violence continuing to be understood as a private matter. In this regard, most of the men participating in this research have migrated from a country where domestic violence is a family matter to a country where, until recently, it has been a family matter, and in many social settings police intervention in response to violence in the home remains unreported, unwelcome and shameful.

Whilst the men's stories illustrate a sense of mistrust in dealings with police in India, we also read in their accounts that Indian police can be perceived to operate as a public patriarchy by imposing a private family perspective that preserves the men's moral authority. Insisting that domestic violence is a matter of family privacy reasserts that the moral direction of the family is to be managed by the family. The intersection of domestic violence and men's understandings of the resistance of the Indian police to becoming involved in family matters both helps us understand the reasons men often maintain silence and secrecy about violence in the home, as well as their mistrust of New Zealand Police and violence prevention support services.

From our research with stakeholders, we are aware of the collaborative work undertaken by Gandhi Nivas and New Zealand Police to build trust in community policing within the districts

[25] Prior to 2005, protections against dowry and domestic violence were present in India under Section 498A (Anti-Cruelty Act) and Section 304B (Dowry Death Act) of the Indian Penal Code (1860), the official criminal code of India. In 2005, the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA) (2005) was enacted. Much like Aotearoa New Zealand's Domestic Violence Act (1995) India's PWDVA established new definitions of domestic violence (as physical, sexual, verbal & emotional, and economic violence), and sought to extend protections to women (see also Ghosh & Choudhuri, 2011).

served by Gandhi Nivas (Coombes et al., 2017). Mistrust of policing institutions within migrants' home countries may work to inhibit reporting violence within the men's families after migration, especially where there is evidence of corruption, brutality or incompetence within home country policing institutions[26]. Furthermore, we are aware through previous studies that resident men at Gandhi Nivas often first encounter the New Zealand Police through issues of family violence (Morgan et al., 2020). This helps situate the importance of the collaborative work Gandhi Nivas undertakes through police training, which is premised on supporting front line police officers not only becoming familiar with Gandhi Nivas services but also helping them develop engagement practices which encourage and support men to engage, voluntarily, with early intervention services.

Resistance to change

During the course of the conversations, the participants related their feelings of disempowerment and resentment about what they regarded as an unfair bias in the law in favour of women. Even though participants had openly talked about the ways in which they had abused their partners and about their new-found awareness of what domestic violence involves, they also criticised efforts in Aotearoa New Zealand to protect women from violence.

Three different participants told the researcher about their understandings of the ways in which the law empowers women:

> ***Ritesh:*** *"if your partner is doing anything wrong and you call the police, I don't think the police will offer any help at all. The laws are inclined too much towards the women they're just favouring the women too much."*
>
> ***Ronit:*** *"we are on our wife's mercy, according to what women say is right and what women say is wrong - where is the proof?"*
>
> ***Madhu:*** *"it's not good for men - it's not good for you - the law is against you - it's like living in a - in a - living in times you know when every law is for white people - and black people were this? [waves his hand low and close to the floor] - it's like that - so women are the new whites."*

An understanding of what constitutes wrong-doing is important here, because in the sense of a criminal justice system, wrong-doing is defined in legislation and refined in case law, and whilst Ritesh recognises a movement towards protecting women, in his narrative, it is a movement that has gone *too far*. We understand that, for Ritesh, a woman who brings shame on the family, such

[26] For further discussions on corruption amongst Indian police, see for example Lamani (2013), Singh (2019), and Verma (1999).

as disrespecting or disobeying the head of the household, or by wanting more freedom or independence, needs moral correction. Ritesh emphasises his conviction that the rights that woman are conferred through legislation are unfair when considered in relation to rights and privileges men are no longer afforded. For Ritesh, the law shifts social power dynamics *too far*, making a man's responsibility to maintain the good standing of his family more difficult.

Ronit's response questions whether woman's words could be accepted as evidence, which is not proof in his view. Ronit questions not only the validity of his *wife's* testimony, but also a *woman's* moral capacity to decide between right and wrong; in a patriarchal family social structure, her word has no authority. If the police and society accept her views, his authority, which is premised on his privileged status as head of the household, is nullified. In a patriarchal family social structure, a family that is undisciplined will fail to meet social expectations, and a family where the man cannot discipline his family members will fail to meet familial obligations. It is his word against his wife's, which leaves the entire family's well-being at her mercy from his position, where the law is constraining his social obligations.

In Madhu's comments, it is immediately clear that concerns about the inequality of domestic violence law are raised in conversations going on between men, and that women are not having these conversations with him. Madhu's narrative evokes, for some of us, a familiar social interaction that occurs in the homes when men attempt to evince support from other men through shared tales of gendered persecution in support of their logic. Madhu draws a parallel between domestic violence laws and racist laws marginalising and denigrating people of colour. During our analysis we were puzzled and challenged by his argument. To our understanding, Madhu's vague reference to "the law" is not limited to specific or general legislation, but also includes legal definitions and social customs that inform sector-wide understanding of domestic violence, and the totality of the criminal justice system, including the police and the courts. Madhu's argument conflates domestic violence laws that give equal rights to people of all races and cultures, which were sought to establish more inclusivity in society and greater safety from the harms of racism in the lives of colonised peoples, and laws from indeterminate locations that sought to subjugate and deprive people of civil liberties and rights that were otherwise extended to other races. We can see no parallel between laws protecting family members from harm perpetrated in their most intimate relationships and laws that legitimate slavery and genocide.

Parmeet shared with Tony his learnings at Gandhi Nivas, that there had been a shift in power:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"she has the power, she has the power to come at home or not 'my husband can come or not' - she has the power […] so something is missing there - they giving so much power to women - just one statement you separated - why you think that woman is always*

right? - if she doesn't want to live with you just make a threat and put you as angry man and just call the police and then separated from that - so actually power is given to women."

Here, we understand Parmeet is explaining a shift in power in two ways: she now asserts her freedom of movement and her agency in deciding where she will go, and she also has the legal protection that enables her to decide whether or not she wants her husband at home. In effect, she has become entitled to choose to leave him and entitled to ask him to leave. For Parmeet, not only is this clearly *too much* power for women in general and his wife in particular but, to our understanding, these are not rights and privileges women should be afforded at all. For Parmeet, something is missing, and it is his authority over his wife to determine who comes and goes in the family household that is not acknowledged.

When Parmeet questions why a woman is always right, he does not say this in the context of her *claiming* that *he* has done *something* to her. Nor does he mention that he may now be *bound* by a Protection Order, which *does* explicitly give the protected person – his wife – *the right* to ask him to leave when she is at risk of harm. Rather than concerning his wrongdoing or her safety, Parmeet's focus becomes his wife's *autonomy*. We understand a woman's autonomy to mean that if a woman does not want him to be there, she should be able to say so. For Parmeet, her fearfulness or mistrust of him is not taken into account. The possibility of his wife deciding she does not want him home, that being her own decision on her own future, does not seem to enter Parmeet's narrative. From his perspective, the law becomes unjust by giving his wife's testimony authority since this must necessarily remove his authority over her. Parmeet uses this shift in power to position himself as a victim of disempowerment, and when he does this, he demonstrates a further problematic response to how we understand domestic violence:

Parmeet: *"they turn me into a criminal, give a criminal record, that stay with me for life because I hit my wife… but my wife giving me emotional pain, psychological pain, mental pain ... the women has so much power eh - so much power over all things - they do whatever they want to and put the advantage on you ... it's 21st century and women are now empowerment - and women also equality - but not like that - not for your benefit."*

Parmeet shared with Tony that his wife arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand several weeks before he did, and her early arrival enabled her to find a sense of autonomy that Parmeet did not want her to have. In that time, she established a friendship with another man. Whilst we acknowledge the possibility that his partner will leave him for someone else could be hurtful for Parmeet, in Parmeet's telling, rather than a matter of fidelity, his hurt is a pain emerged through her disobedience to his authority. Hence, he has felt it was his wife's fault that he hit her in the first place. We interpret Parmeet's story as a lament, that his wife can give him pain through disobedience, but he cannot hit her in response, and for Parmeet, this is fundamentally unfair.

It concerns us that Parmeet is reluctant to distinguish between the two hurts, and that he is unaware of the consequences of his abuse. It also concerns us that Parmeet acknowledges movements towards empowerment and equality of women but resists equality for the benefit of women. For Parmeet, equality and empowerment for women enables women to not only escape the authority of the man of the family but also flips the power relations of a patriarchal social structure. Parmeet's narrative also demonstrates to us an acute sense of being aggrieved with the current state women's legal rights, which raises questions for the safety of his wife, and those that may support her through these experiences. Women's autonomy, empowerment, and equality pose specific risks to not only Parmeet's authority but also his ways of being, as he cannot see how these social changes are for his own individual benefit or the benefit of men.

In the men's stories, we hear the problems that they have perceived in their relationship with the world, and we hear echoes of what the men have been taught in response to their problems. In the men's various complaints about movements towards equality, though, we recognise two particular sentiments: an enduring belief in entitlement, and a sense of victimisation. We understand this idea as an individualised social response judging efforts at gender equality as manifestly unfair, which Kimmel (2017) elaborates as a "sense that those benefits to which you believed yourself entitled have been snatched away from you by unseen forces larger and more powerful" (p. 18). The men understood their own social conditions well enough to appreciate how economic constraints and social relationships entrapped them within expectations of marriage and family that frustrated and hurt them. Yet, in relation to their status as men within their families they showed little understanding that their violence and threats of violence induced fear and created harms for women and children.

Engaging with services

Taking account of diversity within communities, interventions to enhance safety for families are unlikely to address the many different determinants and forms of family violence if they are narrowly focused on specific acts of violence carried out by individuals, as is often the case with programmes offered to perpetrators (Carney & Buttell, 2003; Southern, 2013). Instead, Gandhi Nivas stakeholders, who are all too well aware of the scope of family violence and its consequences, have created a service that bears witness to and engages with the social conditions that support family violence, including family, faith, ethnic, and economic systems that constitute the social determinants of health for their clients (Coombes et al., 2017). The services Gandhi Nivas offers, either directly (to the men) or through its strategic partnerships with other organisations (which support men and their families), are inclusive and wide-ranging. Gandhi Nivas offers not only care *and* interventions, but also offers care *in* its interventions, in its work with bound men and their families. For this section, we want to acknowledge participants went to some lengths to explain the value of the services provided for them.

The home in which they stayed, and were introduced to Sahaayta staff, provided essential shelter and basic necessities such as clothing and food, and this cannot be underestimated. Parmeet and Madhu were bailed to Gandhi Nivas, and the resources that the home provided enabled them to comply with their bail conditions without returning home:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"this house is really nice because otherwise where [would] I go?"*
>
> ***Madhu:*** *"I have no other place to go ... and I don't have my clothes."*

After the police intervention, both Parmeet and Madhu needed Gandhi Nivas. Neither man had a network of friends that they could turn to for support in their community. In similar circumstances, men like Parmeet and Madhu are often remanded in prison, due to the 'risk of harm' they present to others and the absence of a suitable residential address. Remand in custody would mean, as no interventions would be offered, no counselling would be available, and neither man would likely learn about domestic violence and the harm their actions cause. Staying at Gandhi Nivas is challenging and complicated, though; neither man has access to their own clothes or other material possessions other than what was in their pockets on their arrival. Both men related to Tony that they relied on Gandhi Nivas to supply a basic wardrobe. This is a particular concern for Madhu, who was seeking work after he had lost his job while remanded in custody in prison for a month. He had nothing to wear but borrowed t-shirts and track pants, until Gandhi Nivas staff were able to collect a suitcase of clothes from Madhu's home for him:

> ***Madhu:*** *"I have none of my belongings with me. How can I go for a job wearing trackpants and t-shirt that GN has lent me?"*

Ronit stayed at Gandhi Nivas for two nights under a PSO, and like Parmeet and Madhu he had no-one else to turn to. He felt that the home filled an important role for men, particularly those in similar situations as himself:

> ***Ronit:*** *"I think this is a good organisation that will help men, especially someone who doesn't have any family here, no support."*

Here we note that Ronit refers specifically to benefits for men: his comments are focused towards helping the men, while the families of the men are not mentioned. We also note, again, his reference to the isolation of the migrant: there is no family to turn to and no systems of support. The research team is aware that in supporting men in precarious material circumstances, Gandhi Nivas are often encountering men who experience a PSO as loss, a loss of access to material possessions, a loss of contact with their family, and a loss of employment or other social supports. This means that whilst Gandhi Nivas staff frequently contend with men who are hostile, angry, and embarrassed, for some men, though, the home provides respite. Men reported that crucial to the

sense of peace enabled in the home, is the welcoming, dignifying responses of Gandhi Nivas staff. The following stories told by Harnif and Afi speak to the ways in which staff at Gandhi Nivas treat them with respect and dignity:

> ***Harnif:*** *"coming here made a real difference to me. It calmed me down. I don't have the words to say. The counsellors: they're good. The social workers: they're good. They help so much. It's a steady place this place."*

His stay at the home gives him time to cool down, while counselling sessions with staff give him tools with which he can work on his anger. He finds stability in the home and is deeply appreciative of the efforts of the staff. He expresses a sense of belonging, as if he has become part of a community that welcomes his contributions and that persists in helping him despite his anger:

> ***Harnif:*** *"these guys are trying to help me, calm me down, turn my life around. I'll never turn back. I respect the way they've shown generosity to me."*

Here, Harnif draws hope and inspiration from sharing, and finds enough confidence to share his own stories with others. For him, his time at Gandhi Nivas represented a productive learning experience:

> ***Harnif:*** *"it was really great to hear everyone's feelings - it gave me more confidence to speak up […] it heals […] it gives me a chance to learn more, to learn and hopefully it will help me as I grow up hopefully become a better person […] hopefully it will help everyone will stabilise our life."*

While the stability of the home and his life were critical for Harnif, for Afi, the home was a space in which he could focus on rebuilding himself, so that he could contribute more positively to the relationship between himself and his wife:

> ***Afi:*** *"you remake yourself. That's what this house for. And the people too. And that's what the message inside is like. About talking and understanding and remaking yourself. And I know, because here I am: a problem person, a failure."*

Afi contrasts the negative view he has of himself and his sense of failure, with a productive and positive interpretation of the presence of the home in his life. For him, the home is a place where people begin remaking themselves as they learn more about themselves, and others. It is also a place that he associates with sharing with other men, and with the reflections and understandings that sharing with other men might evoke. Afi's focus is on remaking himself as an ongoing iterative process of change. This is a task of rebuilding that he has chosen to take on with the support of the staff and other men.

For some men, the Gandhi Nivas home provides generous support. For others it is a space where change comes from within. The association that Afi makes between the home and the opportunity to talk with (and learn from) other men, was shared by other participants as well, who commonly told us that Gandhi Nivas was a space for sharing, where men could talk about their issues:

> ***Raghav:*** *"what I really liked about coming here was hearing other men's stories. And feeling how other men have gone through same sorts of issues that I've had, and they've had same sorts of experiences and feelings. And that's helped me understand I'm not alone and it's helped me understand what I need to change."*
>
> ***Jeet:*** *"I've learned from the counsellors and the other men. We talk about our problems. I've learnt other men's perspectives, how they came here, their life problems - it's all confidential, eh - but I've learned from them. It's up to us to make the change eh. I've learned to control my emotion, eh. Lots more self-control."*
>
> ***Ronit:*** *"I asked [him] about his experiences and he told me he didn't talk [about things that troubled him] . . . so that was the thing. I told my wife that one of my friends told me 'talk early and often'. That we need not bind it up in us, and burst it in harm."*

We notice that these men talk freely about their feelings and emotions. At one point, Parmeet told Tony that he did not talk about his feelings until his time at Gandhi Nivas "because it's personal and you always try to never share with anybody". For him, the opportunity to talk about how he felt was transformative: "it's good to come out - it's like a pressure cooker - all of the energy and if it's not come out then blast".

Both Jeet and Ronit recognise that the men's stories are valuable sources of learning for others as well. Jeet explicitly references confidentiality, seemingly reassured by the intimacy and trust involved in sharing personal experiences in confidence with other men. In the home, conversations with other men become an invitation and an opportunity to speak more openly about feelings and problems. We sense that both men were surprised and, perhaps, reassured to find other men with similar experiences to their own: "that's helped me understand I'm not alone" and "we all have some sort of connection". We are conscious that many of the participants highly valued a sense of personal community and social support, and that some of them would find comfort in each other's support. When they let others in on their fears and feelings, they found men in similar situations - "we all searching for the same things, sharing same sort of difficulties also" - and we appreciate the value that openly sharing their stories may bring for them. This, in our view, is a gift that Gandhi Nivas provides to men, that Gandhi Nivas not only offers care and interventions, but empowering men to share with others occurs because Gandhi Nivas offers care *in* its interventions. In its work

with bound men who are learning new possibilities of living by sharing with others, Gandhi Nivas helps create a sense of community that resident men take with them back into the community.

In the men's explanations, we hear repeatedly that the home takes on the functions of a teaching space that has helped educate them, particularly to learn and to understand through hearing other men's stories, seeing other men's perspectives, and connecting with other men. Ronit spoke of how he had gone home and consciously engaged with his partner about improving their relationship, using skills he had learned from his experience with Gandhi Nivas:

> ***Ronit:*** *"there are so many other cases so many other things that are there, that we don't even know about so that when I shared my experiences with them and I heard their experiences that I came to know about that, oh so that could also happen. After listening to them and understanding from the counsellors then I went back home and looking at all aspects we decided what we can do, so that helped me a lot in making the decision about what now we need to do from there."*

We notice that Ronit embraces the potentials for change that sharing experiences and counselling provide him as a way of helping him decide the direction for his family. While he is learning the value of communicating with his partner, his entitlement to controlling the family's direction is unmoved. Learning is not a process completed during residence at Gandhi Nivas; yet it begins a journey of change for men who continue engaging for the benefits they gather.

In one workshop attended by Tony, the convener included a meditative exercise in which participants imagined themselves as mountains (Kabat-Zinn, 1994): solid, centred, rooted, unmoving, and unaffected by wind, rain, burning sun, or heavy snow. Light and shadow, wind, rain, and snow change the appearance of the mountain moment by moment, but not its substance or presence – constantly changing but always remaining itself.

In later conversations, the metaphor of the mountain was raised by three participants who had attended the workshop, to describe how they needed to be strong and steady in the face of personal stressors. They explained that by recalling their mountain meditation they were able to draw on its strength and stability to improve their capacity to weather emotional storms and crises in their lives with mindfulness and clarity:

> ***Parmeet:*** *"I remember the mountain - I try to see it in my mind-eye - like the mountain - I try to be centre and don't lose control."*

> ***Raghav:*** *"the mountain is a good lesson - I picked up with it - doesn't matter what all happens around us I learn because change is always around me - but what happens*

around me don't change me - definitely, if we want peaceful and happy in our married life the mountain is there."

Tariq: *"when I think about the mountain, I go to my inner [being] - I can deal with the distraction and things that get in the way my focus - I'm secure - how calm is the mountain."*

The mountain meditation enables peacefulness and drawing on the mountain's strength and stability, is productively memorable for the men. However, a tension arises with affirming the strength of their stability when it rests on their authority to control others within their families. For instance, we notice that while the men appreciated both the mountain meditation and other opportunities for learning and sharing made available while they were in residence with Gandhi Nivas, they seemed less concerned about the various services and counselling support for their families and focused more on pragmatic support that changed their situations. Our concern here is, in part, that interventions such as the mountain meditation can become counterproductive by strengthening men's taken for granted understandings of control and patriarchal authority since it focuses the men's attention on themselves rather than their relationships. There is a sense, for us, that a 'centering' meditation exercise might be not be effectively teaching the men empathy for their family members.

That being said, we appreciate that the pragmatic support offered to men when they stay at Gandhi Nivas often begins by addressing the social conditions of men's lives. Whether helping with a basic wardrobe and personal care items, collecting clothing from home environments, or transporting and supporting men in meetings where child custody arrangements are being discussed with government agencies, activities such as the mountain meditation become important activities for men who are experiencing high levels of material precarity, social upheaval, and economic disruption. Offering practical assistance is not only about finding alternative accommodation for men who have never lived alone or supporting families obtain more secure housing, nor is early intervention simply about building men's motivation to engage with alcohol and drug interventions or community mental health supports. Supporting men with an ethics of care is also about enabling men with new ways of living.

Gandhi Nivas' care for men, in our view, does not avoid tensions, but becomes inclusive of challenges as opportunities to work with men learning to improve not only their own safety and security – but also the safety and security of their families. Working with men requires care and consideration of men's social constraints and commitments. The support offered by Gandhi Nivas to bound men is made available in a safe environment where staff can engage men in a dignified and caring manner, where their focus on changing their own circumstances can both be talked about and supported, whilst also being challenged in a supportive manner. Whilst a mountain meditation exercise remains uncomfortable for us as a research team, we recognise that Gandhi

Nivas, as an organisation, also continues teaching us that caring for others sometimes challenges our conceptions of violence prevention early interventions. By doing so, we can begin to reframe our work to meet men on their own terms, both holding them to account whilst also supporting them in open-ended processes of becoming safe within their families.

Moving on

As the men left the residence to begin again in their everyday lives, some of them spoke of the significance of realising they were not alone in the issues they faced with their lives. They recalled sessions where they had creatively worked together to find connections with each other:

> ***Tariq:*** *"magic things come out - even though we all different we all thinking about stuff and with the drawing we're adding to each other's stories."*

New connections enabled through Gandhi Nivas fostered an environment in which learning together became central to the men's experience and understanding of support for change being offered to them at the home. When the men talk about acts of social magic in this way, they engage with strategies that help them to consider different futures and different ways of becoming men. We read in their explanations the capacity to absorb, and give out, new ideas and new ways of thinking and feeling, brought forth through their interactions with other men. For some men, the lifting of the PSO enabled them to resume their relationship with their partner, while other men became single again. Participants, returning home to their partners, spoke of how early intervention through a PSO and the Gandhi Nivas programme had helped them to take stock of issues that lead to them "losing control". Ronit wanted us to pass on his advice other men:

> ***Ronit:*** *"you need to be in touch with your partner, sort out the issues as soon as possible, and ask her if she has any problems with you or anything. Ask her to convey to you as soon as possible. Don't stockpile issues to a level that can't be controlled. Don't pile it up, talk about things early and often."*

In Ronit's advice we recognise an emerging awareness of techniques to engage pro-socially with others – to talk together and share with his wife too. We also notice that mutuality is important in talking through issues, with wives being invited, and welcomed, to raise "any problems" they may have too. Yet, we are left wondering if Ronit has considered the fear his wife has previously experienced in their relationship, and how it may impact on her willingness to disclose problems to him.

Another participant explained how he had spent his time at Gandhi Nivas, developing and applying skills he had learnt from counsellors:

Semisi: *"this week I try so hard relax my mind, relax, just check it out relax - make sure I'm going home ready as a new chapter - what I start doing with all my heart - and I need to know myself first - yeah I need to fix myself first - and love me, love myself […] if I love myself - if I love myself I love my wife and my children. If I fix myself, I fix [my relationship with] them."*

Whilst for Semisi residing at Gandhi Nivas has acted as a catalyst for reflection and hope for change, for some, police intervention bringing them to Gandhi Nivas has been shocking. For men working through a longer journey of change, residing at the home has provided the necessities of life as well access to important social services. In particular, Ronit talked about how his experience of Gandhi Nivas had a transformative effect on him when he returned to his wife:

Ronit: *"I reached home at 11pm and we had a long discussion and it went up to 3:30 in the morning, and then we both agreed to the terms and conditions that we kept for each other: first of all, when sometimes one is angry the other will be calm, and afterwards we can explain it to each other that we don't like that thing about what you said ... we could see with each other's eyes that we had behaved so badly."*

For Ronit, the notion of setting boundaries is a revelation. However, his story maintains a mutuality of responsibility that is not a shared opportunity to raise issues but a shared responsibility for harm that he perpetrated to be referred to Gandhi Nivas. This presents new, troubling issues to the safety of women and children, as men learn about self-accountability and the safety of others.

For some men, partnership relationships were at an end, and they spoke of how reluctant they were to enter into relationships again. Tariq explained:

Tariq: *"I decided I will not get into a relationship ever in my life because it's very one-sided - for women will say 'hey he did this and I didn't do it.'"*

In sharing their experiences, sometimes the men also warn each other of the difficulties they face relating with women. One of the men, who had been placed at Gandhi Nivas as a condition of bail, recounted such a story from his time in remand:

Madhu: *"in prison there was this violent guy, a Russian guy - you know I think they tell the truth - they say things very bluntly - he said in his Russian accent like 'I tell you guys like you going to get into a relationship with a woman. Instead of that in this country I say you stay with a man. You don't have to be gay, but you stay with a man. You do as a friend. You guys do everything together. You buy a house together. You guys can go watch a movie together. Do anything you want. That way, you never risk yourself to be in this situation.'"*

By warning each other of relationship dangers with *any* woman, the message Madhu repeats is a *totalising* approach to *all* women in which men speak to problematics of gender in social relations where there are problems between men *and* women, rather than within the specificity of patriarchal relationships where men victimise women. This, for us, resonates with Parmeet's story of avoiding conflict between his wife and mother from the previous section; choosing to remain alone enables men to maintain specific patriarchal moral understandings of responsibility. In this respect, when men speak about and share with others the wisdom of avoiding relationships in their futures, they are also avoiding situations in which they need to take responsibility for change.

Conclusion

We set out on this research project to address questions relating to men's understandings of their experiences of residing at Gandhi Nivas, the opportunities they were provided for changing threatening and harmful patterns of relating to their partners, children or other family members, and the conditions that enable them to become safer in their communities. From ethnographic engagement and formal interviews and discussions, Tony gathered men's stories of migration, masculinity and violence as they spoke of the context that led to their referral to Gandhi Nivas. Entering into the spirit of the *home of peace*, Tony cooked for and ate with the men, providing care as well as opportunities for reflection if they chose to speak with him or join one of the group discussions held around dinner time. As clients of Gandhi Nivas, the men spoke of their experience of residing at the home, of the support they received and the way they were encouraged to understand and change harmful patterns of relating to others at home, if they chose to do so. Many of the men struggled to understand how their usual ways of disciplining their families could be regarded as criminal, and warrant police intervention. In the context of complex familial relationships that differed significantly between them, the men felt themselves responsible to provide for their families and to ensure their moral standing within their communities. Many men recounted stories of violence in their childhood homes, and normalised practices of violence in their experiences of growing up and becoming men. Some saw themselves as inheriting their father's familial responsibilities, and his authority, and the problems, challenges, and conflicts this presented in their host country.

Appreciating the many people of diverse communities who do not normalise violence, we heard the men's stories not as enculturating violence but as journeys the men were undertaking, from childhood to manhood. All of them were younger men, and their journeys were closely intertwined with their migration and marriages. Complexities of family relationships, involving new wives and in-laws as well as their own parents, and decisions to permanently move overseas, involved challenges that included the financial cost and the implications of social and cultural differences in expectations around marriage, especially where they involve marriages arranged by negotiation to bring together two families.

We heard of the nuanced troubles men experienced in meeting their obligations and responsibilities as they settled into life in diasporic communities. Few of the men who come to Gandhi Nivas have the material resources to fund alternative accommodation, and poverty is frequently mentioned in their stories. Their migration journeys and marriages are beset with challenges for their roles as providers to their families. Language barriers and qualifications that are not recognised coalesce in under-employment or unemployment. Becoming employed may be precarious, exploitative or illegal. Confronting the cost of living in Aotearoa New Zealand's largest city, men told us of their struggles to provide, their feelings of discomfort if their wives were

working, and the challenges to their masculinity posed by expectations that they do domestic chores such as cleaning and cooking. Financial difficulties also posed limitations on the men's opportunities to return to their homeland, or step migrate to another country. We are aware, too, that this is not always the case, with some women who have engaged with Gandhi Nivas (Coombes, et al., 2020) speaking to researchers of their partner's return home or the men's disappearance from their families' life.

Settling into their South Auckland communities, in particular, also challenged the men in various ways. Neighbours and even other members of their ethnic communities did not act towards them in familiar ways. Some felt isolated, confronted by different family values, or troubled by expectations of women's independence that did not conform to their gendered expectations. We notice how the complexity of the men's family context, of settling into diasporic communities in Aotearoa New Zealand, links with marriage situations and the expectations that come with manhood and the role of provider.

We listened and heard painful recognitions that the men were perpetrating harms, not perpetuating moral conduct. We also heard joyful stories of discovering how much difference it makes to love when you listen and talk with each other or engage with your children more playfully. We heard of the magic that emerges from men sharing their stories and recognising that they are not alone with the struggles they face or the conditions that frustrate and anger them. They have told us of learning from each other, and from social workers, the skills needed to help them become more peaceful within themselves, communicate with others, and bring safety to their families. Sometimes they also affirm a sense of injustice from the expectations of their communities or families, and sometimes they affirm each other's entitlement to masculine authority in their homes, resisting possibilities for change that they cannot yet imagine. They may accept that it is against the law to physically assault their wives or children, yet they do not move so far as to acknowledge women's rights to freely move or make decisions for themselves. They do not necessarily move away from the coercive and threatening tactics they've used to control their families.

From our analysis of the stories that men told Tony, and our previous studies with Gandhi Nivas, we understand that residence at Gandhi Nivas offers an ecosystem of support in a peaceful home where men's basic material and social needs are met first. Men mostly encounter Gandhi Nivas at a time of crisis, when police have become involved in their family relationships, and many of their taken for granted liberties, obligations, and privileges are under threat by unfamiliar cultural, legal and social systems. For many men, the long days of isolation and even longer nights alone are shared with other men experiencing similar circumstances. Men who are traveling on journeys from normalising violence in their own homes to living in safe and peaceful co-habitation with others are welcomed, though, into a home of peace in which seeds of change are sown. The men's voluntary engagement with facilities, staff, and other residents might involve cooking for

each other, eating together, doing laundry or gardening together. Through formal and informal conversations and group activities with both staff and other men, the challenges and affirmations men experience as they make their way in the world all entangle in the home's environment, offering possibilities for change that men learn to share with others.

All of the men who participated in this study were re-storying their experiences within a context where respect through caring support and dignifying interventions enabled them to re-consider the conditions of their lives and their harmful treatment of their families. This is not the end of the men's stories, though. We want to acknowledge that although we were unable to follow up with the particular men who participated in this project, we believe it is also through the support provided to women and families in their own homes that opportunities to re-story processes of change continue to emerge for their families as well. Through women's stories of becoming safe we can bear witness to how the seeds for change become fruitful in the men's homes and communities, as, at Gandhi Nivas, men are welcomed not only on arrival but also welcomed on their return. The doors of the home remain open, whatever their circumstances, and self-referrals are welcomed.

References

Agarwal, B. (1990). Social security and the family: Coping with seasonality and calamity in rural India. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 17*(3), 341-412.

Agarwal, P. (1991). *Passage from India: Post 1965 Indian immigrants and their children; Conflicts, concerns, and solutions.* Yuvati Publications.

Anitha, S., Yalamarty, H., & Roy, A. (2018). Changing nature and emerging patterns of domestic violence in global contexts. *Women's Studies International Forum, 69*, 67-75.

Anyan, S., & Pryor, J. (2002). What is in a family? Adolescent perceptions. *Children & Society, 16*(5), 306-317.

Aslani, S., Ramirez-Martin, J., Brett, J., Yao, J., Semnani-Azad, Z., Zhang, Z. X., Tinsley, C., Weingart, L., & Adair, W. (2016). Dignity, face, and honor cultures: A study of negotiation strategy and outcomes in three cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, 1178-1201.

Berns, S. (2002). *Women going backwards: Law and change in a family unfriendly society.* Ashgate.

Borooah, R. (2000). Transformations in the trade and the constitution of gender and rank in northeast India. *American Ethnologist, 27*(2), 371-399.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589-597.

Brown, R. P., Osterman, L. L., & Barnes, C. D. (2009). School violence and culture of honor. *Psychological Science, 20*(11), 1400-1405.

Byrne, L. (2002). *Women combining paid work and parenting* (Working Paper No. 8). https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv%3A3591

Carney, M. M., & Buttell, F. (2003). Reducing juvenile recidivism: Evaluating the wraparound services model. *Research on Social Work Practice, 13*(5), 551-568.

Chakravarti, U. (2018a). *Gendering caste: Through a feminist lens* (Revised Edition). Sage Publications India.

Chakravarti, U. (2018b). Thinking about caste: An autobiographical journey. In S. Bannerjee & N. Ghosh (Eds.), *Caste and gender in contemporary India: Power, privilege and politics* (pp. 23-42). Routledge India.

Charsley, K. (2005). Unhappy husbands: Masculinity and migration in transnational Pakistani marriages. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 11*(1), 85-105.

Cohen, A. J., & Gershon, I. (2015). When the state tries to see like a family: Cultural pluralism and the family group conference in New Zealand. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review, 38*(1), 9-29.

Cohn, S. (2000). *Race, gender, and discrimination at work.* Westview Press.

Coombes, L., Morgan, M., Mattson, T., & Connor, G. (2017). *Establishing Gandhi Nivas: A process narrative of stakeholder's experiences.* Massey University.

Coombes, L., Rogerson, A., Connor, G., Morgan, M., & Venkateswar, S. (2020). *"It always helps to be able to ring someone": Women's Narratives of Sahaayta's Support from Strength and dignity: Women's stories of their hopes and aspirations after their family members' residence at Gandhi Nivas.* Massey University.

Cowley, E. T., Paterson, J., & Williams, M. (2004). Traditional gift giving among Pacific families in New Zealand. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 25*(3), 431-444.

Crimes Act 1961. http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1961/0043/latest/DLM327382.html

Crimes (Substituted Section 59) Amendment Act 2007. http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2007/0018/latest/whole.html

Das, V. (1993). Masks and faces: An essay on Punjabi kinship. In P. Uberoi (Ed.), *Family, kinship and marriage in India* (pp. 198-224). Oxford University Press.

Domestic Violence Act 1995. http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1995/0086/latest/whole.html#DLM372117.

Domestic Violence Amendment Act 2013. https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2013/0077/latest/DLM5615637.html

Donaldson, S. I., & Scriven, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Evaluating social programs and problems: Visions for the new millennium.* Routledge.

Elizabeth, V. (2015). From domestic violence to coercive control: Towards the recognition of oppressive intimacy in the Family Court. *New Zealand Sociology, 30*(2), 26-43.

Every-Palmer, S., Jenkins, M., Gendall, P., Hoek, J., Beaglehole, B., Bell, C., Williman, J., Rapsey, C., & Stanley, J. (2020). Psychological distress, anxiety, family violence, suicidality, and wellbeing in New Zealand during the COVID-19 lockdown: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS One, 15*(11), e0241658. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241658

Family Violence (Amendments) Act 2018. http://legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2018/0047/latest/whole.html#LMS113487.

Fernandez, M. (1997). Domestic violence by extended family members in India: Interplay of gender and generation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(3), 433-455.

Gangoli, G., & Rew, M. (2011). Mothers-in-law against daughters-in-law: Domestic violence and legal discourses around mother-in-law violence against daughters-in-law in India. *Women's Studies International Forum, 34*(5), 420-429.

García-Moreno, C., Zimmerman, C., Morris-Gehring, A., Heise, L., Amin, A., Abrahams, N., Montoya, O., Bhate-Deosthali, P., Kilonzo, N., & Watts, C. (2015). Addressing violence against women: A call to action. *The Lancet, 385*(9978), 1685-1695.

Ghosh, B., & Choudhuri, T. (2011). Legal protection against domestic violence in India: Scope and limitations. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*, 319-330.

Gupta, S. S., Maliye, C. H., Deshmukh, P. R., Raut, A. V., Dongre, A. R., & Garg, B. S. (2017). Gender power dynamics in rural area of India. *International Journal of Medical Science and Public Health, 6*(10), 1473-1481.

Gupte, M. (2012). *Walking the tightrope of honour and power: Women and the politics of patriarchy* [Doctoral dissertation, Savitribai Phule Pune University]. http://hdl.handle.net/10603/150933

Indian Penal Code 1860. https://www.iitk.ac.in/wc/data/IPC_186045.pdf

Jensen, R. (2010). *Economic opportunities and gender differences in human capital: Experimental evidence for India*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1994). *Wherever you go, there you are: Mindfulness meditation in everyday life.* Hyperion Press.

Kalia, N. N. (1980). Images of men and women in Indian textbooks. *Comparative Education Review, 24*(2), S209-S223.

Kim, C. (2019). Social isolation, acculturative stress and intimate partner violence (IPV) victimization among Korean immigrant women. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 72*, 82-95.

Kim, C., & Sung, H. E. (2016). The effects of acculturation on intimate partner violence among Chinese immigrants in New York City. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*, 325-336.

Kimmel, M. (2017). *Angry white men: American masculinity at the end of an era* (Revised Edition). Nation Books.

King, P., & Robertson, N. (2017). Māori men, relationships, and everyday practices: Towards broadening domestic violence research. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 13*(4), 210-217.

Kingi, V., Roguski, M. & Mossman, E. (2012). *Police Safety Orders formative evaluation. Summary report*. New Zealand Police. https://www.police.govt.nz/sites/default/files/publications/police-safety-orders-formative-evaluation-2011.pdf

Kirkness, L. (2020, April 10). Covid 19 coronavirus: Family violence increasing during lockdown, police say. *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/covid-19-coronavirus-family-violence-increasing-during-lockdown-police-say/E3VPF3OZCP3AH7WCXJTQTHZCRQ/

Kruger, T., Pitman, M., Grennell, D., McDonald, T., Mariu, D., & Pomare, A. (2004*). Transforming whānau violence: A conceptual framework. An updated version of the report from the former Second Māori Taskforces on Whānau Violence*. Te Puni Korkiri. https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/default/files/transforming_whanau_violence.pdf

Kukreja, R. (2018). Caste and cross-region marriages in Haryana, India: Experience of Dalit cross-region brides in Jat households. *Modern Asian Studies, 52*(2), 492–531.

Lamani, R. B. (2013). Police corruption in India. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory, 6*(4), 228-234.

Laverty, S. M. (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: A comparison of historical and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2*(3), 21-35.

Lowe, M., Khan, R., Thanzami, V., Barzy, M., & Karmaliani, R. (2018) Attitudes toward intimate partner 'honor'-based violence in India, Iran, Malaysia and Pakistan. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 10*(4), 283-292.

Martin, J. & Sugarman, J. (2001). Interpreting human kinds: Beginnings of a hermeneutic psychology. *Theory and Psychology, 11*, 193-207.

Mattson, A. (2020). *Be(com)ing men in another place: The migrant men of Gandhi Nivas and their violent stories* [Doctoral dissertation, Massey University]. https://mro.massey.ac.nz/server/api/core/bitstreams/6fd5b571-ded6-40cd-9446-3d30e72b12f7/content

Mayeda, D. T., & Vijaykumar, R. (2015). *Developing intimate partner violence intervention services for youth from migrant communities of colour: A technical report.* University of Auckland. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/27503/Developing_Intimate_Partner_Violence_Int.pdf?sequence=6

McCarthy, J. R., & Edwards, R. (2010). *Key concepts in family studies.* Sage Publications.

Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment. (2019). *Addressing temporary migrant worker exploitation: Consultation document*. Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment. https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/7056-addressing-temporary-migrant-worker-exploitation-consultation-document

Ministry of Justice. (2018). *2014 New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey. Key Findings, Cycle 1 (March-September 2018).* Ministry of Justice. https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/NZCVS-List-of-key-findings-Y1-fin.pdf

Morgan, M., & Coombes, L. (2016). *The first year at Gandhi Nivas: A preliminary statistical description*. Massey University.

Morgan, M., Coombes, L., Denne, S., & Rangiwananga, M. (2019). Critical social psychology and victims of crime: Gendering violence, risk, and dangerousness in the society of captives. In K. C. O'Doherty & D. Hodgetts (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of applied social psychology* (pp. 583-604). Sage Publications.

Morgan, M., Jennens, E., Coombes, L., Connor, G, & Denne, S. (2020). *Gandhi Nivas 2014-2019: A statistical description of client demographics and involvement in Police recorded Family Violence occurrences*. Massey University.

Mossman, E., Kingi, V., & Wehipeihana, N. (2014). *An outcome evaluation of Police Safety Orders.* New Zealand Police. https://www.police.govt.nz/sites/default/files/publications/pso-outcome-evaluation-report.pdf

Murphy, C., & Fanslow, J. (2012). *Building collaborations to eliminate family violence: Facilitators, barriers and good practice.* New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/nzfvc.org.nz/files/issues-paper-1-2012.pdf

Murshid, N., & Bowen, E. (2018). A trauma-informed analysis of the Violence Against Women Act's provisions for undocumented immigrant women. *Violence Against Women, 24*(13), 1540-1556.

New Zealand Police. (2019). *Our data – you asked us.* New Zealand Police. https://www.police.govt.nz/sites/default/files/publications/our-data-you-asked-us-web.pdf

Paulin, J., Mossman, E., Wehipeihana, N., Lennan, M., Kaiwai, H. Carswell, S., Lynn, R., & Gauper, E. (2018). *An evaluation of the Ministry of Justice-funded domestic violence programmes.* Artemis Research. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hector-Kaiwai/publication/331223255_An_Evaluation_of_the_Ministry_of_Justice-funded_Domestic_Violence_Programmes/links/5c6cfa90a6fdcc404ebefc40/An-Evaluation-of-the-Ministry-of-Justice-funded-Domestic-Violence-Programmes.pdf

Périvier, H. (2018). Recession, austerity and gender: A comparison of eight European labour markets. *International Labour Review, 157*(1), 1-37.

Peteru, M. C. (2012). *Falvitu: A literature review on culture and family violence in seven Pacific communities in New Zealand*. Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families. http://www.pasefikaproud.co.nz/assets/Uploads/MSD3692-Pacific-Framework-Literature-review-WEB.pdf

Peteru, M. C., Mitaera, J., Lealea, S., Tavelia, M., Fuli, S. E., Afeaki-Mafile'o, E., & Tausi, M. (2012). *Nga vaka o kāiga tapu: A Pacific conceptual framework to address family violence in New Zealand*. Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families. http://www.pasefikaproud.co.nz/assets/Resources-for-download/PasefikaProudResource-Nga-Vaka-o-Kaiga-Tapu-Main-Pacific-Framework.pdf

Postmus, J. L., Hoge, G. L., Breckenridge, J., Sharp-Jeffs, N., & Chung, D. (2020). Economic abuse as an invisible form of domestic violence: A multicountry review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *21*(2), 261-283.

The Protection of Women From Domestic Violence Act 2005. https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/2021/5/A2005-43.pdf

Puri, J. (1999). *Woman, body, desire in post-colonial India: Narratives of gender and sexuality.* Routledge.

Qureshi, K. (2004). Respected and respectable: The centrality of ‘performance’ and ‘audiences’ in the (re)production and potential revision of gendered ethnicities. *Particip@tions, 1*(2), 1-32.

Segal, U. A. (1999). Family violence: A focus on India. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4*(2), 213-231.

Seth, N., & Patnayakuni, R. (2009). Online matrimonial sites and the transformation of arranged marriage in India. In C. Romm Livermore (Ed.), *Gender and social computing: Interactions, differences and relationships* (pp. 329-352). IGI Global.

Sharma, N. (1990). Current trends in infant care: An Indian experience. *Early Child Development and Care, 58*(1), 71-79.

Simon-Kumar, R. (2019). *Ethnic perspectives on family violence in Aotearoa New Zealand.* New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. https://nzfvc.org.nz/sites/nzfvc.org.nz/files/NZFVC-issues-paper-14-ethnic-perspectives.pdf

Simon-Kumar, R., Kurian, P. A., Young-Silcock, F., & Narasimhan, N. (2017). Mobilising culture against domestic violence in migrant and ethnic communities: Practitioner perspectives from Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 25*(4), 1387-1395.

Singh, P. (2019). Combating corruption in India. *Police Practice and Research, 20*(4), 420-421.

Smith, J., & Eatough, V. (2012). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In G. Breakwell, J. A. Smith, & D. B. Wright (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (pp. 439-459). Sage Publications.

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersection of race, class, and gender. *Violence Against Women, 11*(3), 38-64.

Somasekhar, S. (2016). *“What will people think?” Indian women and domestic violence in Aotearoa/New Zealand* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato]. http://hdl.handle.net/10289/10592

Southern, S. (2013). Best practices in offender rehabilitation. In S. Southern (Ed.), *Annual review of addictions and offender counselling: Best practices - 19*, (pp.19-48). Wipf and Stock.

Spoonley, P. (2015). New diversity, old anxieties in New Zealand: The complex identity politics and engagement of a settler society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 38*(4), 650-661.

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford University Press.

Stats NZ (2019a). *Ethnicity*. https://www.stats.govt.nz/topics/ethnicity

Stats NZ (2019b). *2018 Census population and dwelling counts*. https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/2018-census-population-and-dwelling-counts

Stats NZ (2019c). *Income*. https://www.stats.govt.nz/topics/income

Sullivan, O. (2018). The gendered division of household labor. In B. J. Risman, C. Froyum, & W. J. Scarborough (Eds.), *The Springer handbook of the sociology of gender* (pp. 377-392). Springer Press.

Tang, C. S., Wong, D., Cheung, F. M. C., & Lee, A. (2000). Exploring how Chinese define violence against women: A focus group study in Hong Kong. *Women's Studies International Forum, 23*(2), 197-209.

UN General Assembly. (1993). *Declaration on the elimination of violence against women.* http://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f25d2c.html.

UN General Assembly. (2000a). *Convention against transnational organized crime*. https://www.unodc.org/documents/middleeastandnorthafrica/organised-crime/UNITED_NATIONS_CONVENTION_AGAINST_TRANSNATIONAL_ORGANIZED_CRIME_AND_THE_PROTOCOLS_THERETO.pdf

UN General Assembly. (2000b). *12. A protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children, supplementing the United Nations convention against transnational organized crime.* https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XVIII-12-a&chapter=18&clang=_en

UN Women. (2011). *Progress of the world's women, 2011-2012: In pursuit of justice.* UN Women.

UN Women. (2020). *COVID-19 and ending violence against women and girls*. UN Women.

US Department of State. (2019). *Trafficking in persons report: June 2019.* US Department of State. https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2019-Trafficking-in-Persons-Report.pdf

Verma, A. (1999). Cultural roots of police corruption in India. *Policing, 22*(3), 264-279.

Westmarland, N., & Kelly, L. (2012). *Why extending measurements of 'success' in domestic violence perpetrator programmes matters for social work*. *British Journal of Social Work, 43*, 1092-1110.

Wilson, D., Jackson, D., & Herd, R. (2016). Confidence and connectedness: Indigenous Māori women's views on personal safety in the context of intimate partner violence. *Health Care for Women International, 37*(7), 707-720.

Wilson, D., Mikahere-Hall, A., Jackson, D., Cootes, K., & Sherwood, J. (2019). Aroha and Manaakitanga – That's what it is about: Indigenous women, "love," and interpersonal violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260519872298.

Yamashiro, G., & Matsuoka, J. K. (1997). Help-seeking among Asian and Pacific Americans: A multiperspective analysis. *Social Work, 42*(2), 176-186.

Yoshihama, M. (1999). Domestic violence against women of Japanese descent in Los Angeles: Two methods of estimating prevalence. *Violence Against Women, 5*(8), 869-897.