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The “Engaging Men and Boys” Global Symposium

We say to our brothers in fields and offices, on factory floors and sports venues, in classrooms and at kitchen tables, in parliaments and the halls of power: The world of men has changed. It must change even more. The days of men’s control over women and society is coming to an end. So too are the days when we expect boys and men to suffer from the impossible demands of manhood. Now it is the time for all men and boys to embrace this change with determination, strength and love. (Excerpt from the Rio Declaration)

The theme of the first Global Symposium on Engaging Men and Boys in Gender Equality was: “Scaling up Work with Men and Boys in Gender Equality”. The Symposium emerged from the hundreds of civil society and governmental programs around the world that are already working to engage men and boys in preventing violence against women and girls in a number of areas: sexual and reproductive health and rights; HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation; fatherhood and caregiving; ending homophobia; and maternal and child health. There is resounding consensus among individuals and organizations involved in these efforts with men and boys on the need to move from small-scale and short-term interventions to sustained, long-term and large-scale efforts to reach men and boys and involve them in achieving gender equality. Greater advocacy is needed to mobilize governments, donors, women’s groups, the private sector and other key stakeholders on the importance of working with men and boys.

The Symposium brought together 439 delegates: members of NGOs, researchers, policymakers, United Nations officials, young people, and women and men from 77 countries to exchange ideas and experiences, and to forge collective actions for engaging men and boys in achieving gender equality and social justice.

The delegates came together in eight plenaries, twelve simultaneous breakout sessions, seven training workshops, four regional planning meetings, and a youth forum. They also interacted at informal venues, such as the Global Village, poster displays and the “Inspirational Men” photo exhibit. Sessions were organized around four themes: promotion of gender equality through gender transformation; gender-based violence; fathering and care-giving; and sexual and reproductive health.

In his opening remarks, Gary Barker (International Center for Research on Women [ICRW], USA) expressed the collective outrage that motivated and permeated the Symposium in noting the following realities:

- Despite clear blueprints in international agreements for engaging men and boys in achieving gender equality we have progressed relatively little;
- The planning of families is still too often seen as solely women’s responsibility;
- Globally an estimated 30% of women experience physical violence from a male partner;
- Women make 80% of what men make for equal work, despite women’s large-scale entry into the workplace outside the home;
- As a community of nations, we have lacked the political will to build on integrated approaches to the global HIV/AIDS epidemic that combine effective education; access to care, treatment, and condoms; legal protection from stigma; respect for sexual diversity; and frank education on sex and sexuality that includes discussions of gender inequalities;
- We often look for technological explanations and solutions to HIV/AIDS and not enough at how poverty, gender inequality, stigma and homophobia fuel this epidemic; and
• Too many boys grow up thinking that violence is normal and indeed expected, and that achieving manhood and being recognized as a man means using violence, or driving too fast, or drinking too much, or wielding a weapon.

The Symposium participants reaffirmed their fervent commitment to turn their outrage into concrete actions, and to use this opportunity to learn from and build on their enormous collective knowledge and experience. As Gary Barker declared: “We affirm with the MenEngage Alliance – a network of over 400 NGOs and UN partners – and we affirm by our presence here that we are outraged by gender injustice in all its forms, and that we believe that men and women, girls and boys must be engaged to overcome it.”

United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon sent a message to Symposium participants via video: “Around the world, we need to make a great effort. Men and boys need to do their part. Men need to teach each other that real men are not violent, nor do they oppress women. Women’s place is not only in the house and the fields, but also in the schools and offices.”

As one step toward transforming this collective sense of outrage into ever-expanding and increasingly effective actions, this summary was produced and is being disseminated to share the enormously rich content of the Symposium and to stimulate more work, strengthen our sense of urgency, and provide tools and ideas to increase gender equity and equality. This report identifies cross-cutting themes, lessons learned, research results, and dilemmas and challenges in each area, highlights promising tools and offers practical steps that groups around the world can take to advance this urgent agenda.

One caveat is needed from the outset. Although a panel was included with leading participants of women’s movements, it was not representative of the wide range of feminist and women’s movement thinking about men’s work on gender transformation. Nevertheless, throughout the Symposium, both men and women reiterated that it is of utmost importance that individuals and organizations working with men and boys engage in dialogue and collaborate even more with women’s rights groups, and ensure that their work furthers women’s empowerment and gender equity in the most effective ways possible.
The Global Symposium brought together approximately 30 youth leaders and activists from around the world, including Bosnia, Colombia, India, Jamaica, Philippines, and Tanzania. These youth leaders and activists came together one day prior to the start of the Symposium to share their experiences and recommendations for the Call for Action. The group also convened together in other moments throughout the Symposium to continue networking and sharing their experiences.
The International Context

Coming exactly 15 years after the groundbreaking International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) of 1994, the Symposium built on and furthered the agendas enshrined in ICPD’s Programme of Action, the Platform for Action of the Fourth World Conference on Women (1995), the Millennium Development Goals (2000), the Expert Group Meeting on the Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality (2003), and the 48th Session Agreed Statement of Action of the Commission on the Status of Women (2004) to promote gender equality through more equitable participation of boys and men. A solid basis for such work was established by ICPD: “The objective is to promote equality in all spheres of life…and to encourage and enable men to take responsibility for their sexual and reproductive behavior and their social and family roles.”

The work of the Symposium was also rooted firmly in a human rights framework, with specific emphasis on promoting the universal right to health, women’s rights, and freedom from discrimination related to social, economic and racial/ethnic identities. Principles, strategies and lessons learned from social justice movements were also central to the Symposium’s analyses. Delegates situated their work within efforts to overcome all forms of discrimination, including discrimination based on sexual identity, gender, race, and poverty. Alongside paying homage to feminist pioneers and feminist analysis, participants repeatedly challenged men’s groups to steadfastly ensure that their work contributes directly to the broader goal of achieving women’s empowerment and gender equality, while keeping in mind that men and boys, too, are vulnerable to rigid notions of gender.
The Promotion of Gender Equality through Gender transformation

While all presentations at the Symposium were directly or indirectly focused on changing the way men and boys relate to themselves and to the women in their lives (for example, by specifically focusing on reducing violence against women, improving men’s caring and fathering behaviors, and enhancing men’s participation in sexual and reproductive health programs), a large group of programs and presentations focused on changing the broader gender systems per se that underlie all of those specific problems. Several presentations discussed how gender norms and patriarchal views of masculinities create and sustain vulnerabilities for men themselves. We have grouped these in this section as gender transformative approaches.

The emphasis on gender transformation encompasses two major dimensions that are sometimes ignored or downplayed in work with men and boys:

- The relational nature of gender; and
- The urgency of fundamentally changing the gender power dynamics involving both women and men.

Gender does not refer to either women or men, but rather the complex social system of power imbalances between males and females that rigidly constrains women and men, girls and boys, limiting their rights and choices for healthy, productive and happy lives. While the Symposium focused on the ways boys and men are harmed by the engendered relations, norms and structures in which they are immersed, participants were continually reminded that women are persistently and negatively affected by gender systems and are courageously struggling to break free of these shackles. To become more effective, efforts to overcome gender inequalities must involve both men and women working together to transform what it means to be women and men in any specific society.

Further, although some projects reported on at the Symposium did not directly try to challenge gender norms and mandates, the evidence base and the majority of the discussions at the Symposium called for a focus on ways to make profound changes in how men and women relate to each other at all levels, rather than only accommodating or being sensitive to the differences and inequalities that currently exist.

The core elements that gender-transformative programming with men and boys should encompass are:

- Attention to socialization processes from early in life that contribute to women and men’s gender-constrained behaviors;
- Critical awareness of the negative consequences of gender mandates for females and males, and the potential to change them;
- Challenges to the imbalance of power, distribution of resources, and allocation of duties between and among women/girls and men/boys;
- Constructive ways of reducing or eliminating power differentials by promoting the position of women relative to men, and helping men become more equitable and involved in traditionally “feminine” spheres of life (such as care-giving) and respectful of sexual and gender diversity;
- Focusing on multi-level, multi-faceted societal constraints and obstacles to equitable participation of men and women in private and public domains;
- Inclusion of compensatory or affirmative action components to overcome women’s longstanding disadvantages;
- Helping men overcome constraints on engaging more fully in reproductive and domestic domains, and rewarding them for learning and implementing gender-equitable behaviors; and
- Avoidance of rigid dichotomies differentiating genders and sexes, and acceptance of diversity, gradations and individual freedom of choice.
What are the “gender-equitable” behaviors that programs at the Symposium work toward?

Based on programs described at the Symposium, gender-equitable men would:
• Never commit, condone, or remain silent about men’s violence against women or against other men;
• Respect and support girls and women as equal members of society in all walks of life;
• Share equitably and enthusiastically in care-giving, child rearing and home-making, treating boys/sons and girls/daughters equally;
• Make mutual decisions around sexual and reproductive health issues as well as other intimate domains;
• Express their sexuality free of stereotypes, coercion or violence in ways that are safe, pleasurable and mutually desired;
• Feel proud of themselves without necessarily being the sole breadwinner, a father (especially of sons), having many sexual partners, or being aggressive;
• Accept and feel comfortable with the “feminine” aspects of their personalities and with those of other men;
• Feel comfortable expressing emotions in positive and non-violent ways;
• Be capable of forming emotionally supportive friendships with men as well as women.

Several recurrent key themes emerged from the presentations on gender transformation:

Promote awareness and acceptance of gender diversity and avoid gender binaries: A central premise of the work on gender transformation with men is that the same system that discriminates against women also discriminates against men who do not conform to dominant masculine appearance and behavior. Therefore, work must support diversity among males in terms of their sexuality and gender behavior and foster acceptance and celebration of diversity.

Participants were repeatedly reminded that there are multiple gender definitions in diverse societies. These are often confused with sexual orientation and/or behavior. For example, in India, there is a distinction between being a male and being a man. To be a man one needs to be married and have children, and thus public discourse about men makes male-to-male sex invisible. Shiv Khan (Naz Foundation International, India) argued for the need to avoid thinking in only binary terms, and suggested using a gendered framework rather than a sexual identity framework to understand the diverse ways men in South Asia define themselves and their sexual practices.

Alan Greig (Independent consultant, USA) highlighted the implications of rethinking the gender binary: “The prevailing discourses of violence and masculinity presume a necessary alignment between men and masculinity rather than question their relation to one another. Defining masculinity as men’s gender identity means that efforts to re-define a non-violent masculinity for men remain within the logic of not being a woman. In these terms, a ‘non-violent masculinity’ can only mean a set of non-violent values and behaviors which are defining of, and thus exclusive to, men, and hence not available to women. Yet the values and behaviors required for non-violent social relations are gender-neutral, available and applicable to both men and women. Working with men to create non-violent social relations must involve challenging the violence of gender itself, and its logic of hierarchical and oppositional social relations. The focus should be on challenging the misogyny and homophobia at the heart of the gender binary.”
Encourage greater sensitivity to the role of culture and religion when seeking to transform gender norms: More discussion was called for on how to be sensitive to – while working to change – cultural aspects that place both women and men at risk. Participants emphasized the need to engage with religious leaders. Furthermore, as cultures constantly evolve, they sometimes need to be challenged. Participants urged the building of common ground by connecting universal human values, such as the health and well-being of the family, to the values present in religious teachings.

Khaled al-Hammadi (Women’s Forum for Research and Training, Yemen) described one of the Forum’s programs that engages moderate religious leaders along with professors, lawyers, journalists, and politicians to use their influence to disseminate women-friendly interpretations of the Qur’an through a series of workshops, seminars, roundtables, and trainings on women’s rights in Islam.

Reverend Adrian Cardenas (Fundación Sagrada Familia, Venezuela): “Religion has both destructive as well as constructive potential, [but] given the central role that religion plays in the lives of societies, including men, it is critical to work within religion to support the questioning of masculinities including different dimensions of risk, sexual conquests, and how men demonstrate being ‘men’.”

Juan Carlos Arean (Family Violence Prevention Fund, USA): “In order to work within a culturally sensitive approach one must understand his or her own culture first.”

Ensure gender relational approaches: To ensure that the work with men and boys is designed to empower women and eliminate gender-based discrimination, Judith Bruce (Population Council, USA) challenged participants to have their programs select male participants in consultation with female stakeholders. Men are directly relevant to many gendered risk factors, e.g., men with a history of violence, male partners of pregnant women, male employers, brothers, and fathers of girls who are at particularly high risk of negative health and rights outcomes. Judith encouraged programs to work in parallel fashion to build the protective assets of specific groups of females and address those men embodying the greatest challenge to the well-being of these girls and women.

To achieve such gender-relational approaches, program planners should undertake the following steps:
1. Choose and work with a population of women that faces the greatest risk of experiencing violence or other negative health outcomes arising from gender norms.
2. Identify the men (e.g., brothers, partners) who present the greatest problem to these women, and who could help promote the changes sought.
3. Design program activities to produce the changes needed among the women as well as among those men who represent the greatest risk to them.
4. Confirm that the program is actually working for the targeted populations.
5. Track changes in parallel fashion with both populations.

Always work from the positive: There was broad consensus that programs will be far more successful if they see men as allies rather than as enemies, and work to understand and defuse the forces that lead men to act negatively. While neither sanctioning nor ignoring discrimination, violence, or gender injustices, programs and policies need to:
• Create positive images;
• Believe that men can change; and
• See men as part of the solution, not only as the problem.

Steven Botkin (Men’s Resources International, USA): “All around the world there are men eager to learn how to support women and end violence. And all around the world there are women who are welcoming men as partners in the struggle for gender equality and non-violence.”

Work on multiple levels: Gender refers to far more than roles or functions prescribed by
society. “Instead, gender is a complex and dynamic set of ideas, actions and feelings about what it means to be a boy or a girl,” or a man or a woman, “in a specific place, culture and time” (Glenda MacNaughton, Centre for Equity and Innovation in Early Childhood, University of Melbourne, Australia). Gender mandates and rules are reinforced on multiple levels, through cultural practices, laws and policies. Thus all programs – including those described in other sections of this report – need to promote changes at all levels of the ecological framework: individual, family, community and institutions. Dean Peacock (Sonke Gender Justice Network, South Africa) emphasized the need for multifaceted strategies to engage men and boys as highlighted in the “Spectrum of Change” model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectrum Levels</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with Government to Influence Policy &amp; Legislation</td>
<td>Work with government to develop and implement strategies to promote gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Based Community Mobilization &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td>Support community members to hold government and civil society accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Coalitions and Networks</td>
<td>Convene regular meetings to coordinate, promote peer exchanges and reduce duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing and Strengthening Organizational Practices</td>
<td>Developing gender policies, creating awareness and increasing commitment and capacity to engage men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating Providers &amp; Key Stakeholders</td>
<td>Training gender focal staff, police, health service providers, traditional/faith based leaders &amp; NGO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Community Education</td>
<td>Educate large numbers of people at the community level through community mobilization and the use and development of media/IEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Individual Knowledge, Skills and Leadership Capacity</td>
<td>Build the capacity of individuals to engage men to promote gender equality, end gender-based violence and address all health problems such as maternal mortality, unwanted pregnancy, STIs and HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spectrum of Change model, adapted by Sonke Gender Justice Network from the Spectrum of Prevention developed by the Prevention Institute in Oakland, California.*
Start early and continue throughout the life cycle: Gender influences begin even before birth and continue throughout the life cycle. Thus, work to foster equity is needed at all stages of people’s lives, as illustrated in this model presented by Saghir Bukhari (UNIFEM, Bangladesh). Designed to underpin work in Nepal and South Asia aimed at creating safer environments for girls, women and boys while working with boys and men, this diagram illustrates how the specific interventions presented at the Symposium can fit together to form a comprehensive matrix of actions essential for encouraging gender-equitable behaviors among men and women, families, communities and societies across the lifecycle.

---

**Birth**
- Saving women and children’s lives
  - Birthing and bonding
- Value for male involvement in pre, during and post pregnancy care and support
  - Fight female feticide

**Old Age**
- Elderly men participating more actively in child care
  - Sharing domestic responsibilities
- HIV/AIDS and men and boys assuming parental roles

**Adulthood**
- Commitment to women’s reproductive rights
- Bringing up boys and girls with equal rights and opportunities
- Actions against sexual and gender-based violence
  - Supports investing in girls
  - Fights against HIV/AIDS

**Adolescence**
- Pressure on adolescent boys to be breadwinners
- Burden of male stereotypes
- Sexuality and HIV prevention education
- Responsible sexual behaviour
- Learning non-violent equitable gender roles
- Life skills including domestic and livelihood domains

**Childhood**
- Early and equitable childhood development programs
- Shun corporal punishment
- Fathering - Caring of infants
  - Promote girls education
  - End sexual abuse
Examples of programs and lessons learned at each level:

**Individual:** Traditionally, men’s domains have been predominantly public, leaving the private and the personal to women. Therefore, work on gender transformation for men tends to focus on opening up and redefining men’s relation with their emotions and with their awareness of self.

A variety of options were presented for working with individual men, usually in group settings, often with an inherently therapeutic or cathartic focus. This work is considered basic and essential, though fraught with challenges and requiring in-depth processes that need time and repetition as well as social support to be successful.

Key areas highlighted in several curricula and workshop methodologies – all using experimental and participatory approaches and some building on Paulo Freire’s consciousness-raising approach include:
- Critically analyzing gender as it operates in the specific context of the participants, including positive and negative aspects of masculinities;
- Getting in touch with one’s own emotions and learning how to express them non-violently;
- Understanding one’s own body and re-educating oneself about sexuality, thereby promoting a more comprehensive and equitable vision of sexuality and sexual relations;
- Learning about violence, empathy and respect for others’ feelings; management of stress, anger and jealousy; communication and joint decision-making skills;
- Preventing HIV, caring for one’s health and body, and caring for others’ health as well; and
- Reflecting on the relationship with one’s own father and creating new options for fathering and, more broadly, for caregiving.

Program H, originally developed by Promundo, ECOS and Instituto Papai in Brazil and Salud y Género in Mexico, was adapted for use in India and Ethiopia (and has been adapted for use in Vietnam, Tanzania, Balkans and elsewhere). Results presented by Pallavi Kamlesh (CORO for Literacy, India) based on adaptation of Program H in India revealed a series of stages through which men pass as they struggle to become more gender-equitable:
1. Denial of gender-based inequity;
2. Justification of gender-based inequity;
3. Self-questioning on gender-related attitudes;
4. Acknowledgement of gender-based inequity;
5. Change of gender-related attitudes;
6. Changing behavior toward gender-equality;

Presenters shared a number of encouraging findings from participation in Program H that may have applicability in other contexts:
- Group education intervention positively affected young men’s knowledge, attitudes, and HIV-related behaviours as reported by program participants;
- Response was positive to participatory methods and the opportunity to work in male-only peer groups;
- Communities strongly accepted the intervention;
- Even among conservative populations, there was a high comfort level with topics related to sex and sexuality;
- Community outreach stimulated public dialogue and created a supportive environment for young men;
- Complementary interventions with young women should be conducted concurrently and, when possible, opportunities should be created where young women and young men can come together to discuss these issues along with same-sex groups;
- Rural youth require basic information on reproductive health and HIV/AIDS because of less exposure;
- Applying lessons learned from field-testing can mitigate potential obstacles during scale-up.

**Family and partners:** Since gender exerts its influence as a multi-faceted system, it is insufficient to try to influence men – or women – only at the individual level. Just as men influence women’s constraints and opportunities for greater empowerment, women also influence the ability of boys and men to free themselves from the straitjacket of traditional gender mandates. As Pallavi Kamlesh reported, even programs that work on the individual level find it essential to work with women at the same time they work with men so that women learn:
- Not to reinforce or perpetuate normative
Youth Forum Speaks Out:

- We need to change the binary of the nuclear heterosexual family to include diversity, alternatives, and families of choice.

- We need more discussion groups with mothers and women, with a focus on mothers (boys’ education).

- Before engaging men, we should involve women themselves, since the levels reached by different countries in achieving gender equality are different.

- Get more groups involved, make connection with women groups, and educate more children.
masculinity;
• To resist and avoid being targets of gender-based violence; and
• To begin their own processes of empowerment.

Further, real changes in men’s household participation may be difficult to achieve in some contexts and will need sustained efforts. We heard a number of examples of men, despite some advances, who are still unwilling to participate equitably within the household and within couple relations. Simone Diniz (University of São Paulo, Brazil) reported that in Brazil, although women represent nearly 50% of the work force, fully 50% of school enrollment; head 1 out of 4 households, and have increasing political participation, they still carry out a disproportionate amount of housework. When asked who washed and ironed clothes, 73% of women compared to 2.3% of men answered that they alone did; and 63.4% women compared to 3.7% men answered that they alone cleaned the house. Women who work outside the home reported an average of 26.9 hours of housework per week as compared to 10.6 hours for men who work outside the home. Simone Diniz reported that the researchers found that, “for many men, taking care of the children is still seen as a form of failure, of becoming subservient to women and as evidence that they were not able to discipline their partner adequately. This inequitable division of home labor has major negative consequences on women’s ability to earn income, develop careers and gain higher levels of education.”

An example of a program designed to overcome precisely this kind of inequity was presented by Isabel Pizarro Pacheco (The University of the Basque Country, Spain). A three-year program in Álava, Spain, trained groups of men, developed a guide for the intervention, created a network of men’s groups, and designed a gender equity promotion center. As a result, four men are now trained to replicate and expand the group workshops. Evaluation found positive effects on couples and families, including:
• Better couple communication;
• More egalitarian models of negotiation around household chores;
• Greater positive emotional expressivity on the part of men; and
• Improvements in father-child relations.

Brad Kerner (Save the Children US, USA) described work in Nepal designed to humanize boys’ perceptions of sisters and mothers, enhance respect and improve communication. The researchers hypothesized that this will create a more humanized awareness of wives when the boys are older, and eventually lead to reduced rates of domestic violence and improved reproductive health.

Evaluation results found that the boys in the program underwent several important positive changes. They reported that they:
• Assisted sisters with outside chores;
• Talked to their sisters and learned about their feelings, hopes and dreams;
• Assisted sisters with homework;
• Prepared own bed, and cleaned own room & own dishes;
• Advocated for sisters to continue in school rather than become household helpers;
• Talked to their mother about her feelings; and
• Accompanied their mother out in the community.

Community level: Traditionally, men’s domain has been outside the home and in the community, so many of the factors that reinforce hegemonic masculinities are located in the broader community, in male-specific spaces like bars, nightclubs and sports venues. Indeed, we were reminded by Gabriel Siquera (Instituto Sou da Paz, Brazil) that to promote gender equity it will be necessary to open up the public space to women. Just as equity means men participating more freely in the domestic space, equity and equality includes women being more welcome and less threatened in the public space. Gabriel described a project that works with youth-serving organizations to help them undertake projects that encourage greater engagement of girls and women in public spaces.
Most of the programs that focus on the individual acknowledged the parallel importance of community mobilization to legitimize and reinforce the individual-level changes. Findings from Program H, using the GEM Scale (Pulerwitz and Barker, 2008) to measure changes in individual attitudes, showed that while interactive group education was a key strategy to increase support for gender equity, combined interventions with community-based components were often more successful in generating change. Some presenters, including Abhijit Das (Centre for Health and Social Justice, India), observed that external calls for change need to be reinforced by an internal aspiration for change.
Several presentations also reminded participants of the pervasive and often deleterious influence of mass media, and the possibilities of leveraging new social media technologies to forge more positive and equitable gender relations and ideologies. For example, through a dramatic presentation and analysis of international commercial media images, Dario Ibarra (Espacio Salud, Uruguay) showed how dominant, aggressive, hegemonic masculinity is often portrayed as power, sexual potency, virility and force, while women are often depicted as passive, perverse, abused or abusers and as whores. In his research, he found that images of the kinds of mothers and fathers, men and women that we are working toward are almost completely absent.

As an example of how to question or counter gender inequitable messages in the media, in Mexico, a network of sexuality education organizations called Democracia y Sexualidad mounted a media campaign to counteract the unquestioning support that dominant mass media was giving to the Catholic Church’s promotion of the patriarchal “traditional family” as the antidote for many of society’s ills. The campaign was successful in generating unpaid media messages that were more supportive of diversity and that male dominance in traditional nuclear families is neither normative nor necessary for democratic societies to function well.

Other media options described included use of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) in promoting a questioning of violent notions of manhood. Laxman Belbase (Save the Children Sweden, Nepal) described a series of modern technologies that could be used to foster greater gender equality, including on-line discussions, e-mail, instant messaging, podcasts, audio-video and games, e.g., offering one laptop per child and installing the software on the laptop, and animated videos with relevant messages. He concluded: “ICT is a vehicle that you can drive and be proactive in addressing violence against boys, girls and women by involving boys & young men.”

Klas Hyllander (Men for Gender Equality, Sweden) presented plans for a Gender Transformative On-Line Forum for Teenage Boys called www.killfrågor.se (which in English would read: boyquestions.com). The web tool will be staffed by volunteers who:
- Are chosen carefully through an application procedure that includes interviews;
- Receive training (40 hours) in gender relations, masculinities, understanding the situation of boys, self-reflection and awareness, and communication methodology;
- Work in pairs; and
- Receive regular debriefing and advising.

Along these same lines, the Men’s Story Project was described by Jocelyn Lehrer (Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, University of California at San Francisco, USA). Its aim is to create an ongoing, visible, mainstream social space where critical discussion regarding masculinities occurs, and where healthy masculinities and discourses are highlighted.

**Societal institutions:** Despite the importance of work at individual, family and community levels, many presenters emphasized that societal institutions reinforce hegemonic gender norms and limit options for greater equity. Further, militarization of societies and neoliberalism were two global tendencies that needed greater attention since their pervasive and adverse impact may cancel out or overpower much of the more circumscribed work being proposed and undertaken. Alan Greig urged us not to “pathologize already marginalized masculinities [in ways] that render individual poor men culpable for a range of development outcomes better explained – and resolved – at the supra household level.”

We heard impassioned pleas for gender transformative work focused on schools, police forces, health care institutions, labor force and employment, and parks and public spaces – and, of course, policies that directly target family life such as paternity recognition (birth registration), divorce laws, parenting leave and alimony. All these domains exert forces that reinforce harmful male and female roles and need to be targeted to reverse these trends.

In some cases, only policy initiatives by government can make the needed structural changes, such as reduction of unemployment and access to housing, that could positively influence gender as well as a whole array of related social conditions as illustrated in the following case presented byMarc Sommers (Institute of Human Security, Tufts University,
Marc described how poverty and job creation policies intermingle with gender roles and health risks in Rwanda, where the construction of masculinity is seriously effected by the dire housing shortage and extreme poverty in a stressful post-conflict setting. To become adults, young men are expected to attain some level of financial independence, build their own house, marry and start a family. For young women, being an adult is socially defined by marriage and starting a household. He observed that, given “the endemic housing problems…most male youth in rural areas may never finish building their house. The situation negatively affects vital social and economic concerns, including marriage, illegitimate children, prostitution, urban migration, the spread of HIV/AIDS, crime, and the pursuit of education. Thus, issues like housing and access to land…may figure much more prominently as development priorities than education.”

Other presentations raised some important caveats about a focus on policy changes alone. Abhijit Das reminded participants that legal changes must not be perceived as external impositions or foreign to the local culture. He cited an example from India: “…the law relating to age at marriage was kept pending for over thirty years till it was championed by a local legislator…The key concern that emerges by reviewing history and contemporary events is that…laws and policies relating to gender equality [will not] have their desired impact if they continue to be seen as external impositions and do not match local/internal aspirations.”

And, finally, Alan Greig reminded everyone that racism is another predominant factor that is gendered and needs to be considered in all work where race is an issue. Citing Promundo’s analysis of homicide and public security in Brazil, he noted “the trauma of growing up black, male and poor in Brazil, which has one of the highest rates of homicide in the world and where men’s rates of homicide are over 12 times higher than that of women, but where men of African descent have a 73 percent higher rate of homicide than men of European descent. As well as a concern with norms of masculinity, it is these realities that must also shape work with young men on gender, HIV/AIDS and social justice.”
What do we know about what works?

John Townsend (Population Council, USA) presented a synthesis of results from a WHO-Promundo study published in 2007 (*Engaging men and boys in changing gender-based inequity in health: Evidence from programme interventions*) based on a review of 58 evaluation studies of interventions with men and boys. Researchers from Promundo categorized the programs as being gender-neutral, gender-sensitive or gender-transformative. They then rated the programs as effective, promising or unclear based on how well they were designed and the nature and extent of impact on behavior change. The major findings showed:

Gender transformative educational programs work best in the following ways:
- Programs in each health area show effective or promising results.
- Integrated programs combining group education, outreach, mobilization and mass media are more effective in changing behavior.

Documented changes showed:
- Decreased report of intimate partner violence.
- Increased contraceptive use.
- Increased communication with partner on decision making.
- Increased condom use, lower incidence of STI.
- Increased social support for spouse and more equitable treatment of children.

Best practices for group education:
- Weekly group education sessions should be at least 2 hours long for 10-16 weeks.
- Themes should be applied to real-life experiences between sessions.
- Facilitated activities should reflect critically on masculinity and gender norms.
- Personal reflections and practical participation are key.
- Knowledge is necessary but insufficient for change.

Best practices for outreach, mobilization and media:
- Use affirmative messages based on formative research.
- Focus on key opinion leaders and men already supporting gender equality.
- Mass media reaches the greatest audience and needs to last 4-6 months.
- Combining community, communication and outreach reinforces messages.

Best practices for service-based programs:
- Training and sensitization of staff on working with men and boys is needed.
- Make spaces friendlier for female and male clients.
- Outreach is needed for hidden and hard-to-reach populations.
- Personal characteristics of providers are more important than their sex.

Challenges remain:
- Few programs with men and boys go beyond pilots or short time frames.
- Programs rarely use a life-cycle approach or deal with men with a wide age range.
- There are few data on impact of public policy on men and boys to change gender equality.
- Little is known about the costs and complexities of scaling up.

Issues for scale-up:
- Get conceptual framework right and identify readiness for moving to scale.
- Use social movements and technologies to facilitate diffusion.
- Specify policy and resource targets and what change is needed for tipping point.
- Seek partnerships and linkages with women’s groups in pursuit of gender equality.
Gender-based violence

One of the most persistent and pervasive problems women face is violence – physical, emotional, economic, and social – at the hands of men who are intimate partners, fathers, brothers and other close relatives, but also at the hands of strangers, including police and soldiers. Even when violence is not actually carried out, the threat of violence serves to control women’s behavior and thwart their efforts to become more independent and autonomous, get an education, work outside the home, and walk in public spaces without fear.

Despite decades of pronouncements and intense worldwide women’s rights campaigns and mobilizations against violence against women, too many women still live in fear of men’s violence. But there are new calls for action to men to reduce gender-based violence (GBV), including the United Nation’s Secretary General’s Campaign. This is a worldwide call for action to men.

The new focus clearly identifies GBV as a man’s issue (as men’s use of violence), a societal issue, a development issue, and an issue of human rights for all. In this new paradigm, violence against women can no longer be seen exclusively as a women’s issue.

Without losing sight of the overwhelming prevalence of male-to-female violence, gender-based violence also encompasses male-to-male violence, motivated by society’s construction of gender categories and expectations and by rejection and disdain for “the feminine.” Participants were reminded repeatedly of the widespread occurrence of such violence and its close relation to negative outcomes for both women and men.

Key messages derived from numerous presentations on GBV include:

• Men’s work against gender-based violence needs to start from a feminist, gender transformative perspective and continue in close collaboration with women’s groups;
• Prevention must attack the roots of the problem, i.e., the gender system;
• The same gender system that drives male-to-female violence also encourages men to be violent against other men who do not conform to hegemonic gendered stereotypes;
• More dialogue and interaction on a diversity of topics, including racism, sexism and heterosexism, is needed, because they are also subject to the same gender system;
• We should call the violence by its real name: men’s violence against women; and men’s violence against men (which also is often based on existing notions of gender);
• Be careful to avoid unintended adverse consequences when men are included without deep work on gender transformation – such as violence in the birthing room or domestic violence as male backlash against women’s increasing autonomy.

Maria José Alcalá (United Nations Development Fund for Women [UNIFEM], USA) reinforced the importance of men’s groups working with, and not against, women’s rights groups. Consequently, UNIFEM’s work is guided by the following principles:

• Mandates and vision of men’s groups should be explicitly focused on gender equality;
• Recognize, respect and support women’s leadership on ending violence against women;

Jackson Katz (Mentors in Violence Prevention, USA): “We need a paradigm shift on Gender-Based Violence. It is not only a women’s issue. It’s a men’s issue. Men use the fact that it is framed as a woman’s issues as an excuse to not get involved…. We need men to challenge other men’s sexism.”

Todd Minerson (White Ribbon Campaign, Canada): “By accurately naming it ‘men’s violence against women’ we can begin a process of men’s accountability and responsibility.”
Shiv Khan: “Accepted notions around masculinity and effeminacy are one of the major factors that lead to disempowerment and open perceived feminised males to abuse and assault and to a denial of service provision. Unless we address the social construction of penetrative masculinity that incorporates genderphobia and socially permits violence against feminized males (and females), there will always be a difference between policy and implementation.”
• Men’s groups should engage in partnerships with women’s organizations and expertise.
• Ensure that resources are not diverted at the expense of women’s rights movements.

Several dramatic examples revealed how deeply violence is immersed within social constructions of masculinities and how serious and widespread its impacts are:

Male-to-female violence:
Rachel Jewkes (Medical Research Council, South Africa), reporting on a household study with men on sexual violence, affirmed that in South Africa:
• Men who are physically violent toward female partners are more likely to have HIV, after adjusting for other HIV risk factors;
• The use of physical violence against partners is correlated with a range of other violent and sexually risky behaviors;
• Results provide further evidence of an underlying construction of masculinity which is predicated on use of violent and sexual behaviors, and which is a key driver of the HIV epidemic;
• Promoting more gender equitable models of masculinity must be a key priority in HIV prevention, and interventions such as Stepping Stones, which have been shown to be effective, need to be promoted.

Imtiazul Islam (ARSHI-CARE, Nepal) found:
• Almost 95% of girls faced severe forms of eve teasing and sexual harassments;
• Many men/boys think girls provoke these behaviors through their dress, movements, etc., or that girls enjoy these male behaviors but cannot express it;
• Many men view sexual and gender-based violence, including rape and gang rape, as a
means to teach girls and women a “lesson” in terms of obedience or as punishment for perceived “bad” behavior.

Male-to-male violence:
Sergio Carrara (Latin American Center on Sexuality and Human Rights - CLAM/IMA/UERJ, Brazil) found, through a study of 3229 people who went to Gay Pride Parades in Brazil, that:
- Young bisexuals reported aggression in 63% of cases and discrimination in 57% of cases;
- Transsexuals were the most discriminated against in businesses and by police;
- Health professionals were reported as having the lowest rates of discrimination;
- Male homosexuals reported threats of aggression in 67.6% of cases, blackmail in 17.8%, and physical aggression in 18%, while 70% of transsexuals had been threatened and 47% had suffered physical violence.

Shiv Khan found extensive “genderphobia” directed against feminized men in six cities in India and Bangladesh:
- 42% had been sexually assaulted or raped by police;
- 60% had been sexually assaulted or raped by thugs; of these, 75% said it was because they were seen as effeminate;
- 50% were harassed by teachers and fellow students.
Todd Minerson: “Men are more likely to change when we focus on what is strong in them and not what is wrong with them, when we demonstrate positive examples of masculinity, rather than highlighting only the negative.”

What can be done?

We heard reports on an array of programs which show encouraging results, primarily based on short-term assessments, and often through self-report. A number of general principles emerged from the presentations:

It is essential to present and start from positive images and encouragement.

Despite strong rejection and anger that many people share over the violence that some men commit, presenters urged participants to focus on the positive. This seemingly difficult challenge refers to a number of aspects mentioned in the presentations:

• Create positive images of non-violent men and non-violent relationships;
• Emphasize the positive gains men will experience from abandoning or avoiding violence.

Men’s Action for Stopping Violence against Women (MASVAW), in Northern India, asked the key challenging question: Are men willing to give up their privileges or are they just working against violence as part of their gender mandate to protect women? Abhijit Das responded cautiously but with optimism. MASVAW found that men who participated in their programs felt they had gained rather than lost their privileges. In the personal domain, they had gained a better relationship with their wives and in the public domain they had gained increased respect and leadership among other men.

Assume that men want to do more but need to learn new skills.

Renouncing violence is a difficult and heterogeneous process that will take time.
Steven Botkin presented the model used by Men’s Resources International (presented below), which assumes that men are naturally caring and need the support and skills to join the struggle against men’s violence against women.

Guiding Men Along the Stages of Change

MRI’s Principles for Engaging Men in Ending Violence

**AFFIRMATION**

1. Emphasize the important role men can play in ending violence against women.
2. Affirm men’s inherent compassion and desire for connection with women, children and other men.

**AWARENESS**

3. Broaden our understanding of violence to include domination, abuse and neglect.
4. Expose the costs and benefits of conformity to masculine domination and violence.
5. Help men understand the connection between their own experiences with violence and ending violence against women.

**SKILLS**

6. Help men practice listening to women and other men with compassion.
7. Teach men to talk vulnerably about their own experiences with violence.
8. Teach men to be proud and powerful allies with women.
9. Provide opportunities for women to witness and support men as they learn to challenge violence and domination.

**ACTION**

10. Provide specific actions for men to take toward ending violence against women.
11. Promote the development of men’s networks and men’s centers to support men to challenge masculine domination and violence.
12. Organize collective actions of men and women to challenge violence.

*Guiding Men Along the Stages of Change by Steven Botkin, Executive Director Men’s Resources International, www.mensresourcesinternational.org*
A collage of posters from Michael Kaufman’s presentation on the White Ribbon Campaign.
Benno de Keijzer (Salud y Género and Veracruz University, Mexico) found that Mexican men who participated in a program called, “Men Renouncing their Violence,” went through several steps:
1. Recognizing that there is a problem;
2. Seeking help;
3. Deciding what kind of help;
4. Arriving at the program;
5. Stayng in the program;
6. Recognizing their violence;
7. Putting into practice the tools for withdrawing from conflict and negotiating conflicts; and
8. Learning to communicate deep emotions and empathizing with partner and children.

Furthermore, the men he studied followed different trajectories:
• Some just wanted to “lower the volume”; and control the violence problem;
• Others wanted to transform other aspects of their masculinity; and
• The most successful men had been seeking transformation even before they arrived at the program, benefited from it, and found other kinds of psychological support to help them.

Brian O’Connor (Family Violence Prevention Fund, USA) reminded participants that social norm change is slow, — but it is happening. FVPF data show that more men are talking to boys about preventing violence against women. Nevertheless:
• With high exposure, there is a huge improvement in people viewing the issue differently and taking action;
• One size does not fit all;
• It is necessary to engage broad and diverse audiences;
• Achieving the right tone is critical, but we also need time and resources; and
• A “top down” national strategy combined with a “bottom up” local strategy achieves the greatest results.

The need to reach broad and diverse audiences.

One example of a group that is reaching out to unlikely audiences is Rozan, which works to sensitize and train police in Pakistan (Maria Rashid, Rozan, Pakistan). Starting with training at the individual level, Rozan developed training approaches to build skills for alternative modes of behavior. Rozan’s approach encourages police officers to challenge aggression as a norm and assertive behavior as a practice, manage stress, and learn non-violent ways of dealing with anger and expressing feelings. Over the years, Rozan staff learned that they had to:
• Continue focusing on the individuals within the system;
• Address the culture of such masculine institutions; and
• Foster specific systemic procedural reforms.

Rozan’s curriculum for police training was formally approved by the National Police Training Management Board in July 2006 for inclusion in all 20 police colleges and schools across the country.

Individual change, community mobilization, and societal policy changes are all needed.

The Cambodian Men’s Network developed a multifaceted community-based program which involves the active participation of Community-based Men’s Groups (CMG). CMG members are trained to educate and counsel their fellow men in the commune to transform their traditional masculine ideologies that contribute to violence against women with positive messages, such as:
• “Violence is not only a women’s problem, it is also a men’s problem.”
• “Violence is not the way to show manhood.”
• “Mutual respect (between husband and wife) can bring peace and prosperity in the family, the community and the nation.”
CMG members hold meetings, workshops and provide personal counseling in participating villages and monitor implementation of laws in the commune. They help local authorities (village chief, commune counselors and police) to implement laws in case of violation of women’s rights in the commune.

Chhay Kim Sore (Gender and Development for Cambodia, Cambodia) reported that, based on this integrated approach, men increasingly recognize the importance of women’s roles in managing the family, the community and the nation. Based on their work, they affirm that men, particularly the perpetrators of violence, are changing their harmful behaviors and becoming non-violent. Men at the grassroots level tend to report more cases of domestic violence to local authorities for action, and are likely to intervene when they witness violence.

Media should foster reflection, debate, and critical analysis so that people perceive risks and make their own decisions.

Through the program, “We are different, we are equal,” Douglas Mendoza (Puntos de Encuentro, Nicaragua) showed that communication processes such as the Sexto Sentido TV series along with community mobilization can help build:
- Capacities for critical thinking;
- Abilities to implement changes; and
- Momentum to catalyze changes in social norms and collective attitudes.

Groups who had been more exposed to Sexto Sentido showed:
- More equitable gender attitudes than a control group;
- 33% more chance of knowing where a violence attention center was located;
- 48% greater probability of having attended a violence prevention center in the last 6 months;
- 62% greater probability of having spoken with someone in the last six months about domestic violence, HIV, homosexuality or the rights of young people; and
- 11% greater probability of perceiving their friends as capable of jointly taking action to resolve domestic violence problems.

“It was like a bomb when the program came out...to see young people talking openly about taboo topics...even in civil society organizations the series opened things up so we could talk.

When a family sits down together to see it, it generates debate and discussion...that helps mothers and father talk about difficult topics.

Various topics like violence and HIV really influenced me...People had talked about these topics but I had never seen them in such real detail as in ‘Sexto Sentido’. I have now talked with my friends about these topics.”

(Reflections from individuals who were exposed to the Sexto Sentido TV series)

The need to ensure that changes are real and meaningful, and not just men learning to dominate women with new language.

Despite encouraging results from gender transformative projects around the world, activists and researchers alike warned participants to maintain a healthy skepticism to ensure that the changes they are seeing are deep and persistent enough to make a real difference in the lives of the men and boys, and girls and women, with whom they interact.

Satish Kumar Singh (Centre for Health and Social Justice, India) discussed lessons MASVAW had learned through their anti-violence campaigns in Northern India. MASVAW members had realized that they need to:
- Be vigilant about promoting a superficial (patronizing and paternalistic) approach;
- Question how much members actually internalize the concept of gender justice in their own lives;
- Make sure they have productive relationships with women’s organizations;
- Ensure the same degree of commitment at political and personal levels; and
• Support mechanisms for providing crisis support to women survivors of violence.

Along these lines, Imtiazul Islam (ARSHI-CARE, Bangladesh) affirmed that CARE’s work incorporates accountability mechanisms into their multi-level community-based work against violence in Bangladesh by:
• Engaging men and boys in monitoring sexual and gender-based violence and analyzing the true incidences of violence;
• Forming critical masses or forums to prevent any future incidences; and
• Promulgating a declaration of violence-free and safe communities when no such cases are found; and
• Respect for and collaboration with women’s groups is essential.
Todd Minerson: “Men’s violence against women is neither exclusively a women’s issue, nor a men’s issue, but it is a society-wide issue. It is as much about women’s empowerment and reclaiming safe space as it is about deconstructing masculinity and dismantling privilege. It is as much about support and intervention for women, as it is about education, awareness and prevention for men.”

Steven Botkin: “By connecting with other men and with women about our experiences with violence and with privilege, men can challenge violence and develop positive models of masculinity.”
Positive preventive approaches need to ensure accountability and work in tandem with punitive measures where appropriate.

Despite the Symposium’s primary emphasis on prevention, attention was also given to the need to ensure that punitive measures for perpetrators of violence are strengthened.

As is often the case in many countries, laws designed to curb GBV focus on punishing the perpetrators. For example, in Brazil, the Maria de Penha Law (against men’s violence against women) never mentions men other than as aggressors, giving priority to protecting women. Jullyane Brasilino (Center of Research in Gender and Masculinities - GEMA, Brazil) reported that although the law mentions actions such as education, rehabilitation, recovery and re-education, no procedures are stipulated to promote such actions.

The importance of accountability and punishment was further reinforced by results from Norway. Ulf Rikter-Svendsen (Resource Centre for Men - REFORM, Norway) reported that, despite 30 years of gender equality policies, “state feminism,” and excellent indicators – e.g., 90% of men take paternity leave, and Norway scored first place in gender equality on international indices – they still find that 10-25% of women report some form of violence from men over their life span. The current Norwegian Action Plan against Domestic Violence (2008-2011) commits to taking more effective multifaceted approaches, by asserting:

“We must take action. It is our responsibility to safeguard the right of both women and men to a life free of violence and threats of violence, and to ensure that children can grow up without suffering abuse or fear. Through improved prevention, more detection, more rapid reaction and better rehabilitation, we will promote a safer, fairer society.”

Through the White Ribbon Campaign men pledge to never commit, condone, or remain silent about men’s violence against women.

Michael Kaufman: “Men and boys have waited their whole lives for White Ribbon…to not have to prove to the world that they are tough.”

Youth Forum Speaks Out:
- Promote healthy non-violent ways of dealing with emotions for young men and boys.
- Start to talk about why boys commit suicide at higher rates than girls, and connect this with norms related to masculinities.
- Address bullying and the way it shapes boys’ understanding of masculinities.

In each of nearly 60 countries, community-defined goals, objectives and strategies have led to grassroots and policy level activism, and meaningful community engagement and mobilization within the framework of the worldwide White Ribbon Campaign.
Posters from Spain’s Zero Tolerance Campaign, crafted by the Ministry of Equality. Captions read, left to right: - “If you mistreat a woman, you are no longer a man.” - “Don’t ever even think of laying a hand on me.” - “Mommy, do it for us. Take action.” - Tag line for all the posters: - “In the face of an abusive man, zero tolerance.”

Sex Work

Conference participants acknowledged the controversial nature of sex work within feminist movements. Increasingly, sex work – as separate from sexual trafficking – is being seen as a legitimate form of work that needs to be safe and preserving of women’s dignity. Men are involved as clients, sex workers and managers (pimps and traffickers).

Several speakers emphasized that the problem is violence in sex work and not necessarily sex work itself. Violence derives from gender roles and relations, social norms and practices related to violence, and lack of access to resources and systems of support. Violence and exploitation in sex work are shaped above all by sex workers’ working conditions.

Michael Flood (LaTrobe University, Australia) reminded us that the goal of our work with men and boys should not be to deter buying sex, but to prevent violence and exploitation in commercial sex. He also urged us to develop principles to guide this work, and to remember that sex work is also a men’s issue.

Research from West Bengal India (Roop Sen, Groupe Developpement, India) found that men who experience little or no emotional experience in sex work, and have lower social and sexual confidence, tend to buy sex more frequently, thereby confirming that non-relational sexuality is often typical of commercial sex transactions. In Brazil, a study of truck drivers (Itamar Gonçalves, Childhood Brazil) found a high level of inequitable gender attitudes among men who had sex with children or adolescents. The reasons given by the respondents included: for greater excitement (36.3%), having been “lured” by the youth 21.5%, and to feel powerful and reaffirm one’s masculinity (15.7%).
Fatherhood and Caregiving

Involving men more actively – and equitably – in parenting is a promising entry point and a laudable objective in and of itself for projects that work with men. However, a number of issues surfaced at the Symposium concerning the extent to which such work may perpetuate or transform gender inequalities. While gender-sensitive approaches tend to build on men’s traditional role as provider and sometimes encourage greater emotional involvement with young children, they are sometimes carried out without challenging the power disparities that predominate in all societies. Participants expressed concern that while such programs can have positive effects on women and children, they should not be confused with nor encourage initiatives aimed at reinstating traditional male dominant family systems. Rather, gender-sensitive approaches need to build on men’s genuine and laudable self-interest in wanting closer relationships with their children while being supportive of women’s autonomy and empowerment. Nor should such programs be used as a pretext to limit a couple’s right to divorce when their relationship warrants it, or to stigmatize or withhold services from single mothers.

On the other hand, gender-transformative approaches purposefully go farther toward modifying gender power and relations, encouraging men to assume equal responsibilities in child-rearing and opening up the possibility of men finding major sources of self-esteem and identity in active, non-violent and emotionally supportive fathering. Such programs acknowledge that if women are to become equal participants in all aspects of society, men will have to share more equitably the responsibilities, joys, and burdens of child care. However, since social constructions of masculinities in many settings still exert enormous pressures on men to make them feel ill-equipped to engage in direct child care and/or unwilling to assume such responsibility, gender transformative programs or policies need to provide skills-building, positive social messages and support and, in some cases, incentives.

In addition to the potential benefits for women’s empowerment, men’s greater participation in child care has also been shown to have positive effects on men themselves and on their children. Of course, abusive, absent, manipulative, gender-biased fathers can have dramatically negative effects on their children. But children of fathers who are engaged, equitable, and non-violent have been shown to develop better relationships throughout their own lives, be happier themselves, do better at school and be less involved in crime (Adrienne Burgess, Fatherhood Institute, UK).

Summarizing the evidence on men’s roles as fathers (Barker and Verani, 2008), Promundo concludes that:

- Men are just as capable as women of interpreting and being sensitive to children’s needs;
- A Good quality father presence is generally positive for children, though having multiple, supportive caregivers, regardless of their sex, is probably the most important protective factor for child well-being;
- Father or male presence, other things being equal, is positive for household income;
- Men’s greater participation in child care and domestic tasks is generally good for women; it frees them to work outside the home, study and pursue other activities that are generally positive for themselves and their households;
- Positive engagement as caregivers and fathers is generally good for men themselves.

Despite such positive findings, research, policy and programs have often ignored fathers, defined them as superfluous or incompetent, or demonized them. While women have borne the major burden of childrearing historically, we need to learn more about fathers, understand and acknowledge their importance, and build on and reinforce the positive contributions they have been making and can make to healthy families and gender equity.
Sarah Wamala (Swedish Institute of Public Health, Sweden): “Even in today’s expert international literature, there is a tendency to leave out the role of the caring father. A recent review by WHO found only references to a mother or a “caregiver” as the person who interacts with the child. This is counterproductive to the integration of the male in such responsibilities and thus the positive health effects that can be gained.”

Cristiane Cabral (CLAM/IMS/UFERJ, Brazil) emphasized the “invisibility of adolescent fathers.” There is little research on them, since too much of the research has focused on the mothers. It appears, she affirmed, that we expect young fathers to disappear and young mothers to assume full responsibility.

Fathers can also be invisible by not registering paternity. In Africa, this simple act alone can be important. Since it is optional in some countries whether the father’s name is on the birth certificate, many children do not even know who their fathers are. Trevor Davies (African Father’s Initiative, Zimbabwe) noted the serious implications for the child of losing the father’s social networks. The child loses access to social networks that could be useful in getting a
job, education, and be helpful in other important aspects of life. Further, in Africa it is the aunts and uncles who provide sex education but in the case where the father has disappeared, there will be no paternal aunts and uncles. Thus, even without focusing on child caregiving, the presence of the father can be vital for expanding a child’s opportunities in life.

Margaret Greene (International Center for Research on Women [ICRW], USA) further highlighted this important distinction between encouraging and valuing men’s role as fathers in terms of protector, provider, and link to networks, without necessarily emphasizing their participation as direct caregivers. She pointed out that often public policy takes a deficit view of men, assuming that men are not important in the lives of children and that they do not want to participate in their care. Policy sometimes generalizes research findings by assuming that all men are violent and that all men contribute proportionally less to family income than mothers/women. While this is true in some cases, many men are not violent and do contribute equitably to their family’s income and well-being.

She urged participants to address the following challenges:
• Make caregiving part of the gender debate;
• Avoid pessimism that men will change on this dimension;
• Involve non-resident fathers;
• Relate efforts to economic roles and employment issues; and
• Use multiple strategies, such as:
  - public & media discussion
  - gathering and disseminating data
  - finding local champions

To help promote this kind of work, ICRW and Promundo are coordinating a global study: The Men and Gender Equality Policy Project. The project includes a review of policies that promote gender equality with reference to men and masculinities, qualitative research about men who are involved in caregiving activities, and sample survey research called IMAGES: International Men and Gender Equality Survey, in Brazil, India, Mexico, Chile, South Africa, Cambodia, Rwanda and Croatia, with questions on attitudes and practices in caregiving, and women’s assessment of men’s time use.

Trevor Davies argued that, “fathers’ involvement is one of the greatest, yet most underutilized, sources of support available to children in our world today” (quote from Engle, P.L., T. Beardshaw, and C. Loftin (2006)) since fathers often have the decision-making power and control over resources. Programs need to be sensitive to these gendered dimensions and involve male gatekeepers, since women may not have the authority to put new health approaches into practice.

Trevor also reminded participants that, due to gendered male identities, poverty is closely related to fathering. If a poor or unemployed man does not have enough money for the bride price, he cannot marry nor be recognized as the father of his child. While many feminist activists (women and men alike) would object to the existence of bride price, the current reality has strong implications for men and women in their everyday lives. Interestingly, even in Sweden, which is a much more equitable and industrialized setting, income is still related to the use of paternal quota leave.

Trevor urged participants to embrace diversity in their strategies to encourage fathering, by:
• Acknowledging that there is no single kind of fatherhood;
• Resisting normative prescriptions of provision, protection and domestication; and
• Profiling and supporting:
  - adolescent fathers
  - step-and foster fathers (including same sex male partners)
  - imprisoned fathers
  - disabled fathers
  - migrant dads

Another topic of discussion went even further to encourage more equitable roles for fathers. Adrienne Burgess suggested that fatherhood is one of the few relatively easy ways through which to talk about gender. She suggested that active fatherhood should help achieve some of the key goals in gender equality in the following ways:
• More gender equality at work;
• More sharing of household chores;
• Boys and girls more androgynous in their approaches to earning and caring; and
• Lower levels of domestic violence/sexual abuse.
She reported that the Fatherhood Institute (UK) undertook a campaign to ensure that government programs refer to “mothers and fathers,” not solely “mothers” or “parents.” However, when they found that the government was not adapting this broader perspective, they mounted a ‘Think Fathers’ campaign to kick-start a national debate on the importance of fathers and calling on individual employers to promote their own family-friendly working practices, especially flexible hours for fathers.

The importance of continued policy analysis and modifications, as well as the persistence of traditional gender norms, was highlighted in several presentations at the Symposium. For example, Robert Morrell (University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa) reported that:

- Schools continue to focus on young mothers and tend to ignore young fathers.
- Schools give little support to encourage young fathers to become involved in the lives of their children.
- There is little recognition within schools that it is possible (and desirable) to work with boys in order to contribute to healthier involvement in families.
- The father’s provider role remains firmly entrenched in the imaginations of boys and girls.
- Girls are more assertive about the obligation of fathers to provide for and take care of their children.
- There is still some reluctance to embrace gender equitable child care practices amongst boys.

Cultural advances and resistances were highlighted dramatically by Jorgen Lorentzen (Center for Gender Studies, University of Oslo, Norway). It has taken Norway decades to evolve to the current family policies and cultural discourse that Jorgen described as a stage of “gender-equal family” (1970-2009) in which women are seen to be on the same level as men in the family. But, he pointed out, there are continuous challenges in terms of women’s public position (in the realms of work, politics and power) and men’s intimacy relations (in the domains of children, care, love and sexuality). He reported the encouraging finding that data show that culture is changing, e.g., young people report feeling less of a lack of fathering and report less violence in relationships with their fathers compared to the previous generation.

Paternal leave is generous in both Norway and Sweden and probably the envy of many other countries. However, who takes advantage of paternal leave and how much they use it both reflect initial attitudes of the men and is related to differential outcomes later on, making the analysis of its impact quite complex. For example, as Sarah Wamala reported, men who have poor health seem less likely to take parental leave, and men with university education are five times more likely to use leave.

Similarly, in terms of how paternity leave relates to men’s own outcomes, she reported that:
Youth Forum Speaks Out:

- Young men should be empowered to be fathers if they choose and should be given adequate resources and support to be able to do so.

- State and society should consider young fathers’ needs and perspectives in service, schools, employment and policy.

Men who took paternity leave had 14.1 fewer sick days off work than men who did not.

Men who took 30-60 days paternity leave had a 25% decrease in premature mortality risk compared to men who did not.

How does paternal leave (and more active fathering) relate to children’s outcomes? It is associated with:

- Less problem behavior in boys and psychological problems in girls;
- Lower criminality in low-income families;
- Higher cognitive abilities in children;
- Lower rates of substance use among children.

A few presentations, focused on non-paternity based care work, e.g. men providing care as male nurses and in other caring professions, caring for AIDS patients, and men as caregivers in child care settings. Of course, some of the youth-focused gender transformative work mentioned previously in this report also aims to help young men feel more comfortable and skilled at taking care of others.

Presenting data from the “Men Who Care” study (part of the Men and Gender Equality Policy Project, coordinated by Promundo and ICRW), Rachel Jewkes described results from qualitative interviews of 20 men from Durban, Mthatha and Pretoria/Johannesburg. These men were engaged in some form of gender activism, involved in professional care work (e.g., male nurses), or were taking primary responsibility for child care. She felt that the results called “into question the relationship of care to processes of transformation in constructions of masculinity and to the ideal of gender equality.” She found that:

- Some men who are engaged in care work are influenced by spiritual or political commitments to social justice and this inclines them toward embracing gender equality.
- Men who engage in care work because of necessity (poverty) are less inclined to accept the values of gender equality.
- Men who acknowledge gender inequalities in their lives appeal to models of masculinity that center on other forms of goodness, including being law-abiding, responsible and caring.

The pervasiveness and intransigence of gender norms and mandates were again apparent in the research Dean Peacock reported on regarding the range of factors that lead to men’s lack of involvement in caring for HIV/AIDS patients. Factors included:

- Patriarchal beliefs that care work is “women’s work” and is “beneath men’s dignity;”
- Fear of ostracism from community members, which discourages some men, including many who believe they should be involved;
- Perceived lack of skills; and
- Resistance from women.

Even in Norway, which has made tremendous strides in gender equality and father participation, Knut Oftung (Senior Advisor to Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombudsman, Norway) found that, in order to involve men in child care giving in centers, it may be necessary to “invite men in as men...then give them the whole range of child care tasks” and in order to achieve a level of 30% male care givers the centers needed to advertise and encourage outdoor activities “where men can do what they like to do, and a place that you get much more contact with children in a positive physical way.”

These, and other findings throughout the Symposium, reinforce the urgency of working from a gender transformative perspective that involves women undergoing changes toward greater autonomy, empowerment and sources of self-esteem including but also going beyond childrearing, as well as working broadly at the community level to create positive reinforcements for men who are engaged in care work.
Policy work needs to be long-range, persistent and adjust as progress is made. Important caveats arise again from Sweden. Sarah Wamala showed that even in wealthy countries with good employment levels and excellent gender equity policies, men and women relate very differently to childbirth. Despite policies that provide 1/3 of parental leave to fathers, a larger number of women than men reduce working hours after childbirth, and take longer periods of leave (or reduced working hours), decisions which are less likely to enhance women’s career progression. And although as many women as men work outside the home, yet among the top 20% of men and women earners, the gender wage gap is 19% in Sweden compared to the OECD average of 16%. Thus, Swedes are asking if they need even more progressive policies and legislation. Should parental leave allowance be divided equally: 50% to mother and father respectively? Should gender-equity rewards/penalties to families be implemented more aggressively?

There was considerable discussion about the implications of these results for lower income countries, where unemployment and job instability are major considerations for men and women. Dean Peacock injected a note of caution that men are experiencing change unevenly, even violently. He reminded us that it is essential to note the political and policy context in which policies are being crafted and implemented. It is also essential to keep in mind issues related to trade, aid, debt, and the evisceration of public services. Policies need to reduce the burden on families by modifying the structural causes of poverty. He emphasized that countries need good public sector employment and aid to ensure strong vibrant health systems.
It is difficult, and perhaps impossible, to separate sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) from the topics covered in the preceding sections on gender transformation, violence and fathering. However, in this SRHR section, we will describe presentations and discussions related more specifically to men’s engagement with clinical health and family planning services (for women, children and themselves), and men’s sexuality and sexual behavior, especially as it relates to HIV infection.

Throughout the Symposium, participants were reminded that the gender system influences how men (and women, of course) relate to their own bodies, their health, their strengths and their weaknesses. All too often, people forget that gender expectations prevent men from taking care of their own health while encouraging risk-taking behavior, including abuse of alcohol and drugs.

Erick Savoye (European Men’s Health Forum, Belgium) quoted Will Courtenay (2000) to remind the participants that: "in exhibiting or enacting hegemonic ideals with health behaviours, men reinforce strongly held cultural beliefs that men are more powerful and less vulnerable than women; that men’s bodies are structurally more efficient than and superior to women’s bodies; that asking for help and caring for one’s health are feminine; and that the most powerful men among men are those for whom health and safety are irrelevant.”

Carmen Fernandez (Centros de Integración Juvenil, Mexico) urged participants to focus on gender constructions within alcohol and drug treatment programs. She noted that “violence and drugs are the most common problems faced by women in Latin America. Drug abuse increases violence against women.” And gender constructions are intimately related to the driving forces behind substance abuse. As Carmen noted:

- Alcohol and drug consumption in men is related to the identity process of masculinity, leading men to seek the stimulant effect of drugs and alcohol;
- The relationship between masculinity and alcohol abuse is a constant feature in many societies in which no man is allowed to refuse a drink;
- The lack of healthy male figures in a home influences the construction of male identity in a variety of ways, and is often associated with substance use.

While women, too, are consumers of drugs and alcohol, their consumption is related more to depression, loneliness, anxiety, stress and weight control, also factors that appear to have gender components.

Carmen presented findings from the Centros’ programs that showed that masculinity myths are closely associated with addiction myths:

- Belief in superiority of men over women;
- Patriarchal family structure that places the father at the center of power and domination over all other family members; and
- The impossibility of men to do “domestic-type activities” or to express emotions, affections and feelings, which are considered “feminine.”

Thus she proposed – complementing other presentations – that programs need to help create new kinds of masculinities, so that men can:

- Be non-aggressive and non-violent;
- Discover and accept emotions and feelings;
- Participate more in parenthood;
- Engage in parenthood without violence; and
- Forge democratic relationships.

Gender also influences how men relate to women’s and children’s health. Julie Pulerwitz (PATH, USA) reported use of the GEM Scale in relation to health outcomes, and found that more equitable gender attitudes among men were related to positive health and behavioral indicators for women (and vice versa):

- Brazilian urban young men supporting inequitable norms were more likely to report STI symptoms, partner violence, and less contraceptive use;
- Indian rural young men supporting inequitable norms were more likely to report multiple partners and partner violence;
- Ethiopian married men supporting equitable norms were more likely to report discussing and using contraceptives/condoms and waiting for consensual sex with wife.
Furthermore, when men participated in interventions designed to reduce inequitable values, those men reported better health outcomes. Program participants (who had acquired more gender equitable attitudes based on pre- and post-test data) reported:

• In Brazil: fewer STI symptoms and more condom use with primary partners over time;
• In India: increased condom use and less violence;
• In Ethiopia: less violence.

Manisha Mehta (EngenderHealth, USA) reminded Symposium participants that men’s own SRH needs have often been absent from traditional SRH services and that, indeed, men have often been blamed for women’s health problems rather than encouraged to participate in equitable ways. There have been far too many “missed opportunities” to involve men in SRH services. While reaffirming women’s need for privacy and specialized services, as well as the imperative not to ignore potential violence and domination within couples, Manisha encouraged greater incorporation of men into SRH services – when acceptable to the men’s partner – and attention also to men’s own health needs. Such integration is likely to lead to greater use of services by both men and women.

Some of the actions she proposed include:

• Services addressing men’s SRH, including infertility, sexual dysfunction, prostate and testicular cancer screening;
• Providing men an opportunity to participate in pre-natal counseling, birth planning, and labor and delivery;
• Joint counseling on family planning and HIV, including testing and partner disclosure;
• Encouraging men to participate in post-abortion care services;
• Forming father/husband support groups in the community; and
• Developing programs designed to reach men where they are.

Balwant Singh (Save the Children, USA) issued a call for men, boys, women and girls to work together to fight malnutrition, poor access to health care, unsafe sex, family or sexual violence, lack of girls’ education, and other underlying causes of child mortality. He urged actions at the individual, family, community and policy levels which are highly consistent with other recommendations made during the Symposium.

Individually, at home and in the community, integrated programs like this can:

• Tackle malnutrition – ensure girl children are fed as well as boys, and ensure that women, especially pregnant women, do not get to eat only leftovers;
• Improve access to health care – do not ignore women’s health needs, talk to women about their concerns, do not leave health complaints until it is too late or too complicated, encourage women to have their babies under professional supervision;
• Safeguard women – discuss safe sex, make contraceptive choices together, respect women, do not be violent;
• Improve education – encourage daughters to go to school, do not rely solely on folklore for basic health practices like hygiene, sickness or general child care, teach boys and girls alike about gender equality and child care.

Within groups and consortia:

• Sign up to our campaign to save children’s lives;
• Ask for stronger health care systems;
• Pursue low cost/low tech solutions;
• Participate in global and national coalitions on maternal and child survival;
• Spread awareness through boys’ and men’s clubs;
• Build skills and awareness to combat child mortality; and
• Nurture and educate opinion makers.
Turning to HIV prevention and men’s sexual behavior, several presenters highlighted the often-neglected but much-needed attention to gender influences, particularly those determining men’s sexual behaviors, as well as other gender-based determinants related to migration and poverty.

Migrant men are often seen as the “perpetrators” of the virus. But, as Ravi pointed out, they are also victims of the migration process in ways that are determined by harmful masculinity norms and structural determinants (e.g., poverty and unemployment) that are filtered through gender influences.

Gender factors influence which men migrate and what their pre-migration characteristics are, which in turn will relate to how much risk-taking behavior they will engage in during migration. A Population Council migration study suggests that one-third of the young migrant men engaging in sexual risk at destinations and transits are also the ones who had multiple partners and experimented with sex even prior to the departure.

Isolation, loneliness, and harsh and risky living and work conditions create a social environment that is highly conducive to risky sexual behaviors, particularly when interpreted through the lens of hegemonic masculinities. Workers often speak about their loneliness and anxieties of being away from their families, and there are few opportunities for recreation and leisure except drinking and sex.

One of Ravi’s case examples of these harsh conditions brings home the extent to which

**Ravi Verma (International Center for Research on Women, India):** “Most ongoing programs seem to be based on the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice model, but high-risk sexual behavior is too complex to be changed by simply providing people with health-related information. Sexuality is shaped by a complex process of identity formation rooted in a web of cultural, psychological, and social factors.”
masculinity is a key narrative to cope with harsh and isolated living conditions in highly dramatic detail: “As we stretched the steel sheets through the roller, holding it with our hands, pattiis of all sizes broke and flew like bullets in different directions. That very week Krishan Nandan, from my village, died of stomach injury, working next to me. Shankar was terrified and wanted to leave but other experienced workers asked him to stay, saying that he is a man, he has the responsibility of supporting his family and has no choice but to put up with the risk and stresses of work. ‘A man is someone brave enough to withstand the rigor of the job’.

Citing the Sonke Gender Justice Network and IOM Framework (2008), Ravi summarized mobile men’s vulnerabilities to HIV and other STIs at multiple levels:

Individual Risk Factors:
- High levels of multiple and concurrent sexual partners with low consistent condom use;
- Low awareness on HIV transmission including myths and misconceptions.

Environmental Vulnerability Factors:
- Gender power dynamics in migrant sites with exaggerated “masculinity” in all-male settings;
- Separation from usual sexual partners;
- Lack of access to health services, including HIV and AIDS prevention and care programs, due to unstable contact status and mobility.

Structural Vulnerability Factors:
- Poverty and unemployment in rural areas;
- High levels of gender inequality.

Based on this research, programs should:
- Address the socioeconomic and political factors, including gender influences, that drive mobility; and
- Address the structural and living conditions that increase HIV risk for mobile workers.

Ravi Verma: “HIV vulnerability and the impact of AIDS is caused by more than just individual choices and behaviours. It is also driven by structural and environmental forces which very often shape and constrain the choices available to individuals. Instead of focusing exclusively on behavioural change at the individual level, programs [need to] encourage participants to move from reflection to action to address the broader social forces compromising their access to human rights, health equity and social justice. This multi-level approach looks at reducing individual risks by addressing individual and environmental factors and takes into account structural issues that increase HIV vulnerability.”
Youth Forum Speaks Out:

- Sexuality encompasses the total human condition, including emotional, physical, and spiritual elements.

- SRH should include and be directed at the whole family by way of competent campaigns. Public health campaigns must start in the early formative years to ensure sustainability of information within and for the family.

- Sexual diversity should be fully expanded to include exploring and deconstructing dynamics of heterosexuality, not just LGBT issues.

- Integrated sex education should be free from religious and prejudicial morals and not impose or force judgments.

- Pleasure should be an important and integral component of all sex education and sexuality studies, and the concept of “feeling good” and knowing “what feels good” should be considered equal to empowerment.

- Youth need to have full options, choice, and consent regarding their own reproductive lives, including methods of contraception and emergency contraception, abortion, parenting, and adoption.

- Youth need better and complete access to all SRH services, which should respect their right to confidentiality.
The Need for Additional Evaluation

During the Symposium there were repeated references to the importance of evaluating this groundbreaking work that is gaining significant momentum – not only to demonstrate its success, but also to rally allies, convince policy and program planners to scale-up efforts, and know which components should be prioritized. Julie Pulerwitz, Ravi Verma and Gary Barker led a workshop entitled, “Evaluating Interventions to Engage Men in Gender Equality,” which raised a number of conceptual issues needing attention while also providing practical guidance and tips to researchers and program planners.

Key challenges in work on gender issues that make evaluation somewhat more difficult, but are essential, include:

Conceptualization:
- There is much agreement on the importance of gender but no consensus on how to operationalize it.
- Gender is complex and multi-faceted – on which aspects should we focus our efforts?

Design:
- With many activities ongoing, it is difficult to attribute change to the program.
- Rigorous designs involving randomized control groups are rare, and difficult or costly to implement.

Instruments/tools:
- Tools are needed to accurately measure the gender component in interventions and outcomes.

The workshop suggested that when evaluating gender transformative programs, it is essential to ask the following questions:
- What gender norms need to be transformed?
- What insights can you find on how to promote change, e.g. where are the “cracks,” “voices of resistance,” or opportunities for change?
- What interventions will transform those norms?
- How did the implemented program work? Were there any gender-related biases?
- Did norms and behavior change due to this intervention?

Participants were urged to undertake impact evaluation taking into account the following aspects:
- Ensure direct measurement of gender aspects, including behavior;
- Capture perspectives from multiple stakeholders (e.g., participants, facilitators, service providers); and
- Measure at multiple levels (e.g., individual, couple/family, community, structural).

One of the most widespread and challenging issues is the need to confirm changes with significant others. Far too often, training and other kinds of interventions are evaluated by asking only the participants if they changed their own behavior. But, given the fact that the participants may have learned the new norms and attitudes that are expected of them, it is problematic to rely only on self-reports. This is true in many other fields, but perhaps most crucial in programs that try to help people change their attitudes, beliefs and practices.

Judith Bruce strongly urged participants to address this issue. Based on data from a recent study provisionally entitled, “Aligning Gender Strategies to Benefit Both Males and Females: An Examination of Illustrative HIV and Gender Programs,” by Nicole Haberland, Amy Joyce, Tobey Nelson, and Eva Roca, she reported that:
- Only 35% of programs that include men corroborated men’s self-reported changes with women in their lives; and
- When investigated/asked further, only 13% of all programs which engaged males “only” or males and females tried to directly seek women’s/girls’ own opinions about changes in their partners’ (or male peers’) behavior and/or attitudes.

Some of the suggestions Judith highlighted are:
- When the couple paradigm is appropriate, confirm with both partners. For example:
  - Assess changes in females’ autonomy and agency by also asking their partners;
  - Assess changes in men’s use of the threat of violence to control their intimate partner by also asking their partners/wives;
- Assess male willingness to carry a fair share of the work burden by asking the intimate partners or wife if there have been changes in his participation.

• Change takes time and relationships evolve. Ideally, programs would be evaluated over a 5-year period rather than a 3-year period to capture sustained change at the individual as well as couple level;

• If we begin to see negative backlash such as violence and abuse, we should try to mount and measure ameliorative programs or modify the intervention;

• Programs could address important and linked subsets of males and females in parallel to measure individual level and community change in attitudes, levels of violence, reported safety on the streets, and other factors;

• Measure programs’ ability to reduce structural violence, such as child marriage or female genital cutting.
The GEM scale is a useful tool to measure changes in support for gender norms. It has been successfully adapted to diverse contexts, and remains adaptable.

It has shown that gender norms are associated with health outcomes in different cultural contexts, as follows:
- Brazilian urban young men supporting inequitable norms more likely to report STI symptoms and partner violence, less contraceptive use
- Indian rural young men supporting inequitable norms more likely to report multiple partners and partner violence
- Ethiopian married men supporting equitable norms more likely to report discussing and using contraceptives/condoms, and waiting for consensual sex with wife

Once adapted to specific cultural contexts, the scale could be used to:
- Identify men with more inequitable gender norms who might be at greater risk of violence, because studies have found clear links between gender norms, and HIV and violence risk
- Measure changes in support for gender norms which are associated with HIV/STI risk and partner violence

To learn how to adapt the scale for use in your country, see [www.promundo.org.br](http://www.promundo.org.br)
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PART 1: INTRODUCTION

We come from eighty countries. We are men and women, young and old, representing the world’s cultural and linguistic diversity, working side by side with respect and with the shared goals of social and gender justice. We are active in community organizations, faith-based and educational institutions; we are representatives of governments, NGOs and the United Nations. What unites us is our outrage at the injustices that continue to plague the lives of women and girls, and the self-destructive demands we put on boys and men. But even more so, what brings us together is a powerful sense of hope, expectation, and the potential of men’s and boys’ capacity to change, to care, to cherish, to love passionately, and to work for social and gender justice. We know and affirm that men are capable of caring for their partners, themselves and their children.

We are outraged by the pandemic of violence women face at the hands of men, by the relegation of women to second class status, and the continued domination by specific groups of men of our economies, of our politics, of our social and cultural institutions. We know that among women and men there are those who fare even worse because of social class, religion, language, physical differences, ancestry and sexual orientation. We also know that many men are victims of violence at the hands of other men. As we acknowledge the harm done to too many women and girls at the hands of men, we also recognize the costs to boys and men from the ways our societies have defined men’s power and raised boys to be men. Too many young men and boys are sacrificed in wars and conflicts for those men of political, economic, and religious power who demand conquest and domination at any cost. Many men cause terrible harm to themselves because they deny their own needs for physical and mental care or lack health and social services.

Too many men suffer because our male-dominated world is not only one of power men have over women, but of some groups of men over others. Too many men, like too many women, live in terrible poverty and degradation, and/or are forced to work in hazardous and inhumane conditions. Too many men carry deep scars of trying to live up to the impossible demands of manhood and find solace in risk-taking, violence, self-destruction or alcohol and drug use. Too many men are stigmatized and punished simply because they love, desire and have sex with other men.

In the face of these global realities, we affirm our commitment to end injustices for women and men, and boys and girls, and provide them with the means and opportunities to create a better world. We are here because we believe that men and women must work together in speaking out against discrimination and violence.

We also affirm that engaging men and boys to promote gender justice is possible and is already happening. NGOs, campaigns and increasingly governments are directly involving hundreds of thousands of men around the world. We hear men and boys joining women and girls in speaking out against violence, practicing safer sex, and supporting women’s and girls’ sexual and reproductive rights. We see men involved in caregiving and nurturing others, including those men who assume the daily challenges of looking after babies and children.

We also affirm that the work with men and boys stems from and honours the pioneering work and ongoing leadership of the women’s movement. We stand in solidarity with the ongoing struggles for women’s empowerment and rights. By working in collaboration with wom-
...en’s rights organizations, we aim to change individual men’s attitudes and practices, and transform the imbalance of power between men and women in relationships, families, communities, institutions and nations. Furthermore, we acknowledge the importance of the women’s movement for the possibilities offered to men to be more caring and just human beings. For the past decade, the daily work of many of the 450 delegates to the First Global Symposium on Engaging Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality has been to engage boys and men to question violent and inequitable versions of manhood. This work does not promote a spirit of collective guilt nor collective blame. Instead we invite men and boys to embrace healthier and non-violent models of manhood and to take responsibility to work alongside girls and women to achieve gender justice.

We also appeal to parents, teachers, community leaders, coaches, the media and businesses, along with governments, NGOs, religious institutions, and the United Nations, to mobilize the political will and economic resources required to increase the scale and impact of work with men and boys to promote gender justice.

The Evidence Base Exists

New initiatives and programs to engage men and boys in gender justice provide a growing body of evidence that confirms it is possible to change men’s gender-related attitudes and practices. Effective programs and processes have led men and boys to stand up against violence and for gender justice in both their personal lives and their communities. These initiatives not only help deconstruct harmful masculinities, but reconstruct more gender-equitable ones. Global research makes it increasingly clear that working with men and boys can reduce violence against women and girls and between men; improve relationships; strengthen the work of the women’s rights movement; improve health outcomes of women and men, girls and boys; and that it is possible to accelerate this change through deliberate program and policy-level interventions.

Resources

Resources allocated to achieving gender justice must be increased. We believe that the evidence is clear that investing in integrated program and policy approaches that transform underlying gender inequalities — and engage women, girls, boys and men — is effective. We urge governments to allocate increased funding for mitigating the harm caused to women and men by gender injustice, and to allocate increased resources to actions that transform gender inequalities that lead to such harmful outcomes. We acknowledge that engaging men and boys in activities that have traditionally focused on women and girls requires additional resources, not taking away resources that are already limited.

International and UN Commitments

Through the UN and other international agreements, the nations of the world have committed themselves to taking action to involve men and boys in achieving gender justice. Policy makers have an obligation to act on these commitments to develop, implement, scale up and evaluate policy and programming approaches to working with men. These commitments provide civil society activists with leverage to demand rapid implementation.

These international commitments include:

- **The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development** affirmed the need to "promote gender equality in all spheres of life, including family and community life, and to encourage and enable men to take responsibility for their sexual and reproductive behaviour and their social and family roles."

- **The Programme of Action of the World Summit on Social Development (1995)** and its review held in 2000 paid particular attention to men’s roles and responsibilities with regards to sharing family, household and employment responsibilities with women.

- **The Beijing Platform for Action (1995)** re-stated the principle of shared responsibility and affirmed that women’s concerns could only be addressed “in partnership with men”.

- **The Twenty-sixth Special Session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS (2001)** recognized the need to challenge gender stereotypes and attitudes and gender inequalities in relation to HIV/AIDS through the active involve-
ment of men and boys.

• The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), at its 48th Session in 2004 [and the session in 2008], adopted conclusions calling on Governments, entities of the United Nations system and other stakeholders to: encourage the active involvement of men and boys in eliminating gender stereotypes; encourage men to participate in preventing and treating HIV/AIDS; implement programs to enable men to adopt safe and responsible sexual practices; support men and boys to prevent gender-based violence; implement programs in schools to accelerate gender equality; and promote reconciliation of work and family responsibilities.

To achieve transformative and sustainable social change around gender inequalities, we must go beyond scattered, short-term and small scale interventions and harness all efforts towards systemic, large-scale, and coordinated action.

The time has come for us to fulfil these existing global commitments.

PART 2: SPECIFIC THEMES AND AREAS OF ACTION

Furthermore, we call for action on the following dimensions of working with men and boys to achieve gender justice:

Violence against Women

Women and girls suffer from a pandemic of violence at the hands of some men: physical violence by husbands and male partners, sexual assault (including rape in the context of marriage), trafficking of women and girls, femicide, rape as a weapon of war, sexual harassment at work, and genital mutilation. For too long, all forms of violence (including physical, psychological and sexual violence) against women and girls have been seen primarily as a “women’s issue” and have been invisible, regarded as a private matter and been the concern of the women’s movement. Patriarchal structures sustain this impunity. Men’s and boys’ accountability and engagement for social transformation is essential to ensure violence-free lives for women and girls.

Violence against Children

Girls and boys suffer from large-scale abuse and violence (including corporal and other forms of humiliating and degrading punishment) in the home, community, school and institutions that are charged with protecting them. This violence often follows gendered patterns; in some contexts boys are more likely to suffer physical violence from parents while girls are more likely to suffer emotional and sexual violence. Witnessing and suffering violence as children is one of the factors that leads boys and men to repeat violence against intimate partners later in life. This implies the need for a life cycle approach to reducing violence and to engaging with boys, and girls, to break cycles of family violence.

Violence Among Men and Boys

Although violence against women is a priority in our agenda, we also must address different forms of violence among men and boys. These include armed conflict, gang violence, school bullying and homophobia-related violence. Men and boys face higher homicide rates than women and girls worldwide. These deaths – the vast majority gun-related – are highly preventable and are also directly linked to boys’ socialization around risk-taking, fighting and the dominance of some groups of men and boys over others. Questioning cultures of violence and gun cultures requires engaging men and boys with an understanding of how salient versions of manhood are too often defined in relation to violence.

Violence in Armed Conflict

In countries that practice sex-specific conscription or demand longer military service from men than women, young men are treated as socially expendable and sent to their deaths in large numbers. Militaries that refuse to enforce international laws on the treatment of civilians in conflict explicitly condone and sometimes encourage the use of sexual violence as a method of warfare, explicitly privileging militarized models of masculinity and ensuring that those men who do refuse violence are belittled and subject to stigma including homophobic violence. Girls and boys are increasingly drawn into armed conflict, both as victims and perpetrators. We call on national governments, to up-
hold Security Council Resolutions including 1308, 1325, 1612 and 1820 and to proactively contribute to the elimination of all forms of gendered violence, including in times of armed conflict.

**Gender and the Global Political Economy**

Gender identities are strongly influenced by current trends in the global political economy. The values of competition, consumption, aggressive accumulation and assertion of power reinforce practices of domination and violence. The dominant economic models have led to increasing economic vulnerability as livelihood opportunities have been lost on a large scale. While women have entered the workforce outside the home in large numbers in the past 20 years, men are still primarily defined by being breadwinners and providers. Many men who are not able to live up to this social expectation to be providers experience stress and mental health issues, including substance and alcohol use. Economic stress is also associated with men’s use of violence against women and children. We need a better understanding of these phenomena, and we need to advocate for the inclusion of these issues in international economic fora.

**Men and Boys as Caregivers**

Across the world gender norms reinforce the expectation that women and girls have to take responsibility for care work, including domestic tasks, raising children and taking care of the sick and the elderly. This frequently prevents women and girls from accessing their fundamental human rights to health, education, employment and full political participation. Correcting this requires that National Governments, civil society organisations, UN agencies and donor organisations put in place strategies that shift gender norms and encourage men to share the joys and burdens of caring for others with women, including in their capacity as fathers and providers of child care. It will also require significant investments in public sector services to reduce the total care burden, especially in the context of HIV and AIDS and other chronic diseases.

**Sexual and Gender Diversities and Sexual Rights**

There are tremendous diversities among men and boys in their sexual and gender identities and relations. Too many men are stigmatized for the fact that they love, desire and/or enjoy
addressed to better understand the root problems of violence, suicide, substance use, accidents and limited health-seeking behaviour. Gender-responsive and socio-culturally sensitive mental health programs and services are needed to address and prevent these issues at the community level, working to achieve gender-appropriate health services and promotion for women, girls, men and boys.

**Sexual Exploitation**

Men’s use of sexual violence results from social norms that condone the exploitation of women, girls, boys and men. The objectification and commoditisation of women, girls and boys and men normalizes violent and coercive sexual behaviours. Ending sexual violence and exploitation requires holistic strategies from the global to local level to engage men and boys in challenging attitudes that give men dominance, and treating all human beings with dignity and respect. We must also include in this discussion the use of the Internet in sexual exploitation and explore ways that men and boys can be engaged in questioning this new form of exploitation.

**Men’s and Boys’ Gender Related Vulnerabilities and Health Needs**

In most of the world, men and boys die earlier than women and girls from preventable diseases, accidents and violence. Most men have higher death rates from the same illnesses that affect women. We need to work with boys and young men to promote health-seeking and help-seeking behaviours for themselves and their families. Additionally, the emotional and personal experiences of men and boys have to be addressed to better understand the root problems of violence, suicide, substance use, accidents and limited health-seeking behaviour. Gender-responsive and socio-culturally sensitive mental health programs and services are needed to address and prevent these issues at the community level, working to achieve gender-appropriate health services and promotion for women, girls, men and boys.
**Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights**

Sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) are largely considered a women’s domain, leaving women and girls responsible for their own sexual health. Men often do not have access to sexual and reproductive health services, do not use such services and/or behave in ways that put themselves and their partners at risk. It is essential that we work with men and boys to fully support and promote the SRHR of women, girls, boys and other men, and that health services address issues of power and proactively promote gender justice. Such services should help men to identify and address their own sexual and reproductive health needs and rights. This requires us to advance sexual rights, including access to safe abortion, and to adopt positive, human-rights based approach to sexuality.

**HIV and AIDS**

HIV and AIDS continue to devastate communities across the world. Gender inequalities and rigid gender roles exacerbate the spread and the impact of the epidemic, making it difficult for women and girls to negotiate sexual relations and leaving women and girls with the burden of caring for those with AIDS-related illnesses. Definitions of masculinity that equate manhood with dominance over sexual partners, the pursuit of multiple partners and a willingness to take risks while simultaneously depicting health-seeking behaviour as a sign of weakness, increase the likelihood that men will contract and pass on the virus. In line with commitments made at UN General Assembly Special Sessions on HIV and AIDS and in many national AIDS plans, governments, UN agencies and civil society must take urgent action to implement evidence-based prevention, treatment, care and support strategies that address the gendered dimensions of HIV and AIDS, meet the needs of people living with HIV and AIDS, ensure access to treatment, challenge stigma and discrimination and support men to reduce their risk taking behaviours and improve their access to and use of HIV services.

**Youth and the Education Sector**

The young men and women who participated in the Symposium affirm that early and active involvement in programs that promote gender equitable behaviour at all levels will systematically create an environment where girls and boys are viewed as equals, will promote their awareness of their rights as human beings and instil the capacity to realize these rights in every aspect of their lives, from access to education to the prevention of early marriage, the right to dignified labour, the right to live in equitable relationships and the right to live lives free from violence. Gender justice issues must be included in the school curricula from the earliest ages with a focus on promoting a critical reflection about gender norms.

**Recognition of Diversity**

We stress that debate, action and policies on gender relations and gender inequities will be more effective and have more impact when they include an understanding and celebration of differences based on race, ethnicity, age, sexual and gender diversities, religion, physical ability and class.

**Environment**

One foundation of male-dominated societies has been the attempt by some men to dominate nature. With catastrophic climate change and environmental degradation, these actions have had disastrous outcomes. Our goal goes beyond gender justice to say that a world made in the image of violent, careless men is selfdestructive. All levels of our societies must urgently act to stop this most dramatic expression of unjust social and economic power.

**Strengthening the Evidence Base**

It is vital to continue to build the evidence base for gender transformative programs through research and program evaluation, to determine which strategies are most successful in different cultural contexts. Indicators of success should include a specific examination of whether gender norms and behaviours have changed. Furthermore, program and policy evaluation should examine the effects of gender-focused programs and policies on both men and women.
PART 3: THE CALL TO ACTION

1. Individuals should take forward this call to action within their communities and be agents of change to promote gender justice. Individuals and groups need to hold and keep their governments and leaders accountable.

2. Community based organizations should continue their groundbreaking work to challenge the status quo of gender and other inequalities and actively model social change.

3. Non-governmental organizations, including faith-based organizations, should develop and build on programs, interventions and services that are based on the needs, rights and aspirations of their communities, are accountable and reflect the principles in this document. They should develop synergies with other relevant social movements, and establish mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on government commitments.

4. International non-governmental organizations working in the field of gender based violence, gender equity or issues of violence against boys and girls should engage boys and men together with women and girls; should support involved national organizations through facilitating networks, providing capacity building, technical support and should collaborate with governments to develop policies and strategies that promote gender equity and non-violent behaviours for proper implementation and follow-up of international and UN commitments.

5. Governments should act on their existing international and UN obligations and commitments, prioritize and allocate resources to gender transformative interventions, and develop policies, frameworks and concrete implementation plans that advance this agenda, including through working with other governments and adherence to the Paris Principles.

6. The private sector should promote workplaces that are gender-equitable and free from violence and exploitation, and direct corporate social responsibility towards inclusive social change.

7. The role of media and entertainment industries in maintaining and reinforcing traditional and inequitable gender norms has to be addressed and confronted and alternatives must be supported.

8. Bilateral donors should redirect their resources towards the promotion of inclusive programming for gender justice and inclusive social justice, including changes to laws and policies, and develop synergies amongst donors.

9. The United Nations must show leadership in these areas, innovatively and proactively supporting member states to promote gender equitable and socially transformative law, policy and program development, including through interagency coordination as articulated in the One UN approach.

10. We, gathered at the Symposium, pledge to answer the call of the Secretary-General's Campaign UNite to End Violence against Women 2008-2015, to galvanize our energies, networks and partnerships in support of world mobilization of men and boys, and their communities, to stop and prevent this pandemic.

We call on governments, the UN, NGOs, individuals and the private sector to devote increased commitment and resources to engaging men and boys in questioning and overcoming inequitable and violent versions of masculinities and to recognize the positive role of men and boys – and their own personal stake – in overcoming gender injustices.


See paragraphs 7, 47 and 56 of the Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development, and paragraphs 15, 49, 56 and 80 of the outcome of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly on Further Initiatives for Social Development.

See paragraphs 1, 3, 40, 72, 83b, 107c, 108e, 120 and 179 of the Beijing Platform for Action. See paragraph 47 of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS: “Global Crisis – Global Action".
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