



# HELEN JOSEPH MEMORIAL LECTURE

MEN AND GENDER EQUALITY:  
BETWEEN THE URGENCY AND THE CONFUSION

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

RETHINK EDUCATION.  
REINVENT YOURSELF.



UNIVERSITY  
OF  
JOHANNESBURG

## MEN AND GENDER EQUALITY: BETWEEN THE URGENCY AND THE CONFUSION

**GARY BARKER, PHD**  
**INSTITUTO PROMUNDO,**  
**RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL AND WASHINGTON, DC, USA**  
**G.BARKER@PROMUNDO.ORG.BR**

PREPARED FOR THE HELEN JOSEPH MEMORIAL LECTURE  
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES, UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG  
10 AUGUST 2011

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to start by thanking colleagues at the University of Johannesburg for this invitation, particularly Professors Angina Parekh, Rory Ryan, Leila Patel and Tina Uys. I also want to thank colleagues at Sonke Gender Justice for their support in hosting me.

It is an honor of the daunting kind to be invited to give the Helen Joseph Memorial Lecture. And it is a privilege to engage with like-minded researchers, students, and activists who have social justice as the fire in their bellies and intellectual rigor as their guiding light.

I have always been inspired by the courage and audacity I find in South Africa. And I have also, in my multiple visits and collaborations here, learned to be cautious in my observations. Every time I feel I understand a bit more about South Africa, I am quickly reminded of how many lifetimes it would take to understand it. I think of Tom Jobim, the singer-songwriter from my adopted country of Brazil, who said: "Brazil is not for beginners." I think we could easily

substitute South Africa for that. It is not for beginners.

It is, however, for believers. And I believe the topic I will discuss this evening – men, gender equality, the urgency and the confusion – resonates with the life and legacy of Helen Joseph. I think that as a white, English-born woman she was keenly aware of the privilege she carried with her. For myself, as a North American man who has dedicated his career to working on gender justice in Latin America, and in my adopted country of Brazil, I'd like to think that in a very humble way, I understand something about how confusing that can be. Helen Joseph's cause was the pernicious interaction between discrimination based on race and on gender. I believe we can acknowledge men as part of gender equality – that we can see and understand and begin to deconstruct patriarchy, because of the movement that she and so many other women started. 55 Years after that historical march of 20,000 women, the issue is no less urgent and that is what I want to talk about tonight.

## INTRODUCTION

In the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC, there is a collection of manuscripts and folios written by and for midwives in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Elizabethan England. They include the herbal remedies and treatments of ailments of the time that were passed from midwife to midwife. One of them is a matter-of-fact description of how to help a pregnant woman not to miscarry after being kicked in the abdomen by her drunken husband. This is described in naturalistic terms as if this is simply what some men do.

It would be comforting to look back at those 17<sup>th</sup> Century folios and consider how far we have advanced. But if I look back at a series of personal incidents, I'm not so sure. In the course of my life I witnessed a young man kill another young man in a dispute about a girlfriend in my high school cafeteria in Texas. In that same school, I was pinned up against a wall by two young men in cowboy boots, both much larger than me, one of them holding his knee to my groin and asking if I was a "hippy or a cowboy." A gang rape took place in the dorm I lived in during my freshman year in university. And nearly all of my girlfriends or partners related to me some incident of having experienced sexual coercion or some threat or actual use of violence by a male partner. And this is not to mention the incidents of violence that nearly all of my male friends report having experienced at some point in their youth at the hands of other men. As I reflect on these personal experiences I find myself using the same naturalistic tone of that 17<sup>th</sup> Century folio from Elizabethan England - as if this is simply what some men do.

Of course, gender dynamics and the gender order have changed since Elizabethan England, particularly in recent years. While tremendous

variation exists, the objective quality of life and political conditions for women and girls have improved markedly around the world in the past 25 years. Women are now 40% of the global workforce and represent half of those enrolled in universities. Women's income has increased substantially compared to men, although it is still on average 22% less than men's. Nearly 140 countries have explicit guarantees of gender equality in their constitutions, however slow they may be to act on those (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2010). In terms of education, global data from the World Bank, UNESCO and other sources affirms that on aggregate, the gap between boys' and girls' enrollment in primary and secondary school has closed and that in many middle income countries girls are now out-performing boys at the secondary and tertiary level (Grant and Behrman, 2010).

Equally important is what is happening in the social imagination: there is now a generation of boys and girls in many countries who have gone to school together, who may (in some settings but clearly not all) see each other as equals and who have increasingly seen their mothers carry out activities - in particular, working outside the home and contributing to household income - that used to be considered the purview of men.

We cannot of course declare that the gender equality agenda is done. The gaps within countries and regions, and between rich and poor continue and in some cases have increased. Although we know about simple ways to reduce maternal mortality, the chance of a woman dying in childbirth in parts of Africa and Asia are still as high as they were in Europe and North America in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Afghanistan's rates of maternal mortality are about the same as Europe's were during the

time those Elizabethan folios were written (WHO et al 2010).

Promundo and the International Center for Research on Women have recently asked men and women in six countries (Brazil, India, Chile, Mexico, Rwanda and Croatia) about their life conditions and how those intersect with gender equality (Barker et al 2011). Not surprisingly, when we asked women in these household surveys if they perceived that their lives had improved or not, we could see two key areas in nearly all six countries where things seem to have changed little. First, their responses told us that we have made little progress, with a few exceptions, on reducing or ending physical and sexual violence against women and girls. And second, their responses tell us that men for the most part are not assuming a greater share of care work, even as both men and women affirming that in all these settings women have assumed a greater role in productive, income-earning work.

The continuing high rates of violence against women by male partners are a shame to us as women and men. Our lack of progress on it makes a mockery of our global commitments to end it. From global surveys with women, inspired by the World Health Organization multi-country study on violence against women, and others that have followed the same methodology, we know that about a third of the world's women will suffer physical violence from a male partner at least once in their lives, with rates from about 15 percent to 71 percent (García-Moreno et al 2005).

And we have now begun to ask men about their use of physical violence and have heard similar rates, in South Africa in research coordinated by the Medical Research Council, and in the multi-country studies with men that Promundo and ICRW have coordinated, along with other

similar research (Jewkes et al 2009). While it is dubious good news that men tell us about their use of violence against women, it means we know which men use violence, and it means we have a better chance of understanding why they use it and of designing effective ways to end it.

It is a shame of a different order that as men we have not assumed a greater role in care work, that the care of children and the home is still considered in our social imagination, in our policies and in our workplaces to be the work of women and girls, whether paid or unpaid. Research from diverse settings shows that women carry out between two and 10 times the amount of care work as men even if women are working outside the house (Budlender, 2008).

And what to make of men and masculinities in all of this? If we've had a global gender equality agenda that has sought to revolutionize women's and girls lives, what of the revolution in men's lives and in masculinities? What do men make of this global gender equality agenda? I would argue that men are being dragged kicking and screaming into this new gender order. And I would argue that this kicking and screaming - which is as its core the troubling of hegemonic masculinities and of patriarchy - is one of our biggest social problems.

I want to focus on *three questions* in this lecture. **First, what is happening with men and masculinities in terms of gender equality?** What do they think about these changing realities? **Second, what do we make of poor and disadvantaged men?** As we talk about gender inequality and have a global project of economically empowering women, what do we make of economically disadvantaged men? **And finally, I want to talk about the challenges of programs and policies and why I think we've**

*been misguided* in our dealing with kicking and screaming men and in understanding the troubled state of masculinities.

I will draw extensively from data from the recent global study called the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES), a multi-country study that includes six countries so far (Brazil, Chile, India, Mexico, Rwanda and Croatia), and which has sister studies in South Africa and Norway. It will be carried out in an additional 10 countries during 2011-2012, making it one of the largest studies ever to look specifically men's gender attitudes and gendered practices. So far we have data from household surveys from more than 11,000 women and men focusing on men's practices and attitudes on a wide array of issues related to gender equality. There is also a qualitative component - called the Men Who Care study - which includes life histories of men involved in alternative care work - either as professions or in their family and personal lives. Together, these interweaving stories provide some important insights on men's lives and their reactions to the global gender equality agenda.

### **QUESTION 1: MEN AND THE GLOBAL GENDER EQUALITY AGENDA**

We now have on paper in many key UN documents affirmations and official recognition of the need to include or engage men and masculinities in gender equality. But our engagement of men for the part, to date, has been project-based and short-term. It is politically and symbolically important and it is having an impact on the relatively small number of women, men and children it effects, but it is limited in reach and often far shy of what is needed to achieve large-scale social change.

As co-author of some of the impact evaluation studies and some of these interventions, I

am keenly aware that we are often trying to show our results in three bullet points in our PowerPoints, attempting to show that men can and do change in sometimes unrealistically short amounts of time. Change does happen; we have seen it and we have measured it. We affirmed in a 2007 review of evaluation data health-based interventions with the World Health Organization that interventions that question social norms related to masculinities were, in general, more effective than health interventions that did not include a discussion or component to question these norms (Barker et al 2007). However, in looking at our interventions, I am reminded of what the influential developmental psychologist Urie Broffnenbrenner once said about the field of child development. He said, and I paraphrase, that the field of child development as commonly practiced was mostly developed by carrying out observations with young children interacting with strangers in strange situations in unrealistically short amounts of time.

I sometimes think that our interventions with men to achieve changes in attitudes and practices are analogous to that: strange situations trying to achieve measurable impact in the shortest amount of time with the least amount of resources. It is as if we believe that centuries of patriarchy can be overcome with something analogous to a vaccine or a five-minute counseling session.

I do believe that well-designed, participatory, and emancipatory program interventions can make a difference and lead to change in the lives of individual men and women. I have spent much of my career developing such interventions. But we must acknowledge how little we have done to change health and education systems, or the overcrowded prisons filled with low income men with limited educational attainment, or income support

systems and social justice policies. We have been slow to understand and timid in affirming that there is only one pathway to sustainable, structural gender equality: supporting the full rights of women and men and supporting the roles of both men and women as equal caregivers and providers.

And if we hope to get men on board with the revolution in women's lives, it seems at the very least that we need ask men themselves what they think about gender equality policies, something we have seldom done. In the *IMAGES* study we found that men are generally supportive of gender equality, at least until it gets too close to home. 87-90 percent in all six countries said that "men do not lose out when women's rights are promoted." However, when we asked men if they support quotas and other concrete affirmative action policies for women to increase their participation in politics, education and the workplace, men's support dropped in the range of 40-74%. In other words, gender equality is fine in the abstract, men seem to be telling us, but take away their jobs and privileges to achieve equality and patriarchal resistance rears its head.

Apart from the obvious, let us probe why men may be resistant. In all six countries where we carried out *IMAGES* so far, men (regardless of whether they reported having used violence against a partner) were overwhelmingly against or opposed to current laws that make it illegal for men to use violence against a female partner, at rejection rates from 70% to above 90%. At one level, this is positive: it means that these laws have left men with the impression that they no longer have the impunity they once had for how they treat female partners. Actions and practices that men could at one point carry out with relative confidence that no one would stop them can now be questioned. Men in the countries we studied so far showed

this opposition to gender-based violence (GBV) laws even though the number of men actually charged and held legally accountable for using violence against women in the six countries is minimal.

In short, I think it is fair to say that GBV laws have apparently shaken patriarchy and many men are not happy with it. Most men cannot and do not articulate their opposition to such laws clearly nor directly. Most men have a sense of losing privilege in a vague way and probably also know or perceive that it is not politically correct to say that they oppose such laws.

But in some cases, we see men literally kicking and screaming. We know from evaluation studies and program interviews from women's economic empowerment programs both in parts of Africa as well as South Asia, for example, that in the short-term, unless accompanied by social support for women and/or work with men, increases in women's income can lead to an increase in men's use of violence against female partners (Rahman, 1999).

Might men react differently to women's empowerment initiatives and gender equality policies if we approached men differently? In our *IMAGES* household surveys, between half and 80% of men have seen some campaign on gender-based violence at least vaguely targeting them as men. But only 12% to 23% of men in the six countries where *IMAGES* was carried out have ever seen a campaign about fatherhood and men's roles as fathers, in spite of the fact that some 80% of the world's adult men will be or are fathers.

Might men be more supportive of gender equality if they could see something in it for them, that is, if we included violence prevention efforts along with other themes?

The experience of Scandinavian countries and Canada, with their generous paternity and maternity, leave suggests that men have reacted in more supportive ways when they perceive the gender equality can be good for them as well. In Norway, for example, results from the recent national household survey that inspired many of our IMAGES questions confirmed that the vast majority of women and men were in favor of three months of paternity leave, that most in fact supported more paternity leave, and that 70 percent of women and 80 percent of men were satisfied with the current division of labor in the home (Holter et al 2009). What we see in Norway and other countries who have advanced on gender equality policies that have engaged men in positive ways, is that both women and men now see gender equality as a public good for all. And politicians in those countries have found that such policies win votes.

As we look at the IMAGES results, we have also found a generational shift that I think we have been slow to acknowledge. Younger men and men with higher levels of education (completed secondary education and above) showed more support for gender equality, less use of violence and higher rates of participation in care work. We have also largely failed to reach out to the men who already see that gender equality makes sense and are living it. Tellingly and somewhat predictably, our research also found that men who support gender equality or have more equitable attitudes are more likely to report life satisfaction. In other words, men who believe in and live equality are for the most part happier men. And, not surprisingly, women are happier with them. Results from three countries (India, Brazil and Croatia) found that when men did a greater share of care work, women reported that they were happier overall with their relationships and happier

with their sex lives with their partners. Seldom do we frankly and openly talk with men about these benefits, including the possibility of more fulfilling sex lives as a result of gender equality. And seldom do we listen to the voices of young people – women and men – who already get and live gender equality and who might teach older generations a thing or two.

In thinking about the benefits to men of gender equality, we should also take a closer look at data from studies on men's participation as fathers showing that men's participation in responsive, non-violent ways in families and as caregivers is good for men themselves. Numerous studies from the Global North have found that men who are more actively involved in caring for children live longer, and report lower rates of mental health and other health problems, including high blood pressure and cardiovascular disease (Brown et al, 2003; Bartlett, 2004; Holt-Lunstad et al, 2009; Smith and Zick, 1994; Hemström, 1996). Research from South Africa and Brazil suggests that low income, young, unmarried men in settings of high violence sometimes adapt more pro-social behavior after they become fathers (Swartz and Bhana, 2009; Barker, 2005). And a study in Sweden showed that men who took paternity leave were less likely to take sick leave and lived longer than men who do not take paternity leave (Wamala, 2009). While it may be that men who take paternity leave are healthier to begin with, these results are nonetheless compelling. Overall, the data suggest that men's connected relationships with children provide benefits for men's physical and mental health, for their social networks and connections to others and help to reduce stress related to separation and family conflict.

It is not merely by dangling these benefits before men that they will give up privilege

and stop using violence in large numbers. In conflict settings, humanitarian settings and the poorest countries and settings in the world, there are few public goods to go around and men may be even more likely to hang on to the limited privileges they have. The point is that much of the gender equality agenda requires men to give up privilege. There is no getting around that and we must be frank in telling men that. But we've been confused and short-sighted in not seeing that men can also gain from gender equality – that men's lives are made better by gender equality – even as they have to give up some privileges.

## QUESTION 2: WHAT TO DO WITH DISADVANTAGED MEN?

One of our biggest points of confusion in the gender equality agenda is what to do about disadvantaged or low income men. We have long taken seriously women's economic disadvantages. We have understood that women's lower income relative to men is in itself a tremendous inequality but is also the driver of many other social inequalities that women live every day. One of the results of this understanding or affirmation is the boom in women-focused microfinance programs. Currently, Oxfam and other international NGOs estimate that there are about 100 million beneficiaries of microcredit programs globally, of which 70-90% are women (CGAP, 2010). Indeed, microfinance schemes have been held up as a success story in economically empowering women and reducing income insecurity. Conditional cash transfers (CCTs) are the other success story of income security boom, again also nearly always targeting women.

In both examples, it is telling that we do not know what to do with or about low income men. The logic both in prevailing

microfinance initiatives and in conditional cash transfers – supported by research – is that women contribute on average more of their income to the household and children than men do. The problem is that while this finding holds up across settings, it also reinforces our assumptions that men are careless, or cannot be convinced to provide more income to their families and that they do not need income support. All of those are questionable and complex assumptions. We have, in such policies, either assumed that all men are the same or assumed that men will not change. As Fauzia Ahmed said based on field work in Bangladesh:

*The concept of 'universal man' that is implemented in these programs falsely assumes that men are all alike and inimical to women's rights. On the other hand, this framework also assumes that once the woman starts earning, her husband as the 'universal man,' will inevitably start to value her and things will improve in the household. But this imposition of sameness ...is a belief as yet unsupported by any evidence. (Ahmed, 2008)*

As in the case of how to engage men in gender equality policies in general, we have seldom considered the complexity of low income men.

The simplest and most direct way to think about disadvantaged men is this: if a poor woman makes US\$1.00 a day (the very crude global indicator of poverty), this poor woman's husband on average makes US\$1.22 a day. He may have other kinds of power and privilege compared to his wife. His male peers may laugh it off and support him if he spends most of his weekly pay at the bar, takes an outside sexual partner and comes home and uses violence against his wife. But he is not a rich man; he is not even middle class. And when he compares himself to other men around him,



which is what patriarchy makes him do, he is not and does not feel like an empowered human being. And very often he questions whether he is, as commonly socially defined, even a man.

In our IMAGES study, with an understanding of the social meanings of income, we decided to measure poverty not as absolute income but by men's reported economic stress. The results found that between 34 percent and 88 percent of men in the survey sites reported feeling stress or depression because of not having enough income or enough work. That sense of stress was not related to absolute poverty; in fact men in middle income countries were as or more likely to report it as those in lower income countries. What we think it shows is the income and livelihoods men feel they need to be socially recognized as men and to fulfill their proscribed role as breadwinners.

Men who reported work-related stress were more likely to report depression, suicide ideation, ever having been arrested, and use of violence against intimate partners. This suggests the needs for more comprehensive livelihood policies that understand how economic stress affects men, women and families and how work and livelihoods are important to men beyond the material benefits of income.

Let us step out from behind the statistics to understand what this means in the lives of men. We hear from men around the world a syllogism: To be socially recognized as a man, you have to work. No work means no manhood. Men's employment status plays a role in determining when they can form families, whether they are able to contribute financially to their families and in some cases, whether they live with their children. If men globally derive their identities and chief social function from their role as providers, what

happens when men are without work, or do not have sufficient income to meet the social expectations placed on them as providers? Specifically, what happens under such conditions in terms of men's participation in family life, involvement with their children and family formation?

According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), in middle and upper-income economies, the global economic crisis may be at least as detrimental for men as for women. More than 80 per cent of job losses in the United States during the recent recession have been among men. More than 6 million jobs have been lost in the United States and Europe in the so-called "brawn" sectors traditionally dominated by men (construction and heavy manufacturing), and they continue to decline further and faster than in those sectors in which women traditionally have predominated (public-sector employment, healthcare, and education) (ILO 2009a and 2009b).

These effects are most felt by men with limited education. In the US, 35% of men ages 25-54 who have not completed secondary school are currently out of work, up from 10% in the 1960s. Among African American men in the US, 30% of men are currently out of work (three times the overall unemployment rate in the US) and 70% of African American men who have not completed high school are out of work. Even if full employment returns in the US, economists estimate that that number would only reach 60% (The Economist, 2010). In South Africa, Brazil and many of the middle income economies of the world, we see similar increases in the population of undereducated, low income men, who not surprisingly in every country we studied in IMAGES, had the highest rates of incarceration, delinquency and alcohol use.

In the regions of the world with the largest youth cohorts, Africa and Middle East, these issues are particularly acute. There has not been enough economic growth in either region to sufficiently resolve their education and employment problems. The global economic slowdown is hitting the world – but particularly its youngest regions, the Middle East and Africa - at a time when the youth share of the total population is at a historic high (Dhillon et al 2009).

Unable to secure the economic independence and social status that comes with gainful employment, young men and women in these and other regions make adjustments by delaying their plans to marry and form families. Young men in both regions report delaying marriage because they cannot accumulate the capital or goods (for example apartments and appliances) considered necessary to be able to marry. In regions where marriage and family formation are considered fundamental rites of passage to adulthood, the involuntary delay of marriage is a form of exclusion (Dhillon et al 2009). Combine those personal frustrations with political frustrations – in particular anger at the handful of powerful “big men” who name themselves presidents for life - and we get the conditions that exacerbate, ignite or fuel conflicts and delinquency.

Let’s put a face to these trends. I met with and worked with a young man named Joao in a *favela* in Rio de Janeiro. Most of his extended family was part of drug trafficking, either as users or sellers or both. He had become a father at the age of 17, unplanned, and was extremely involved in his daughter’s care. Joao washed cars for a living in the middle class neighborhood my family lived in for many years in Rio. Coming home at night on the lagoon that borders Ipanema, he knew that most middle class people were afraid of

him. When he thought someone might be worried about his presence there at night, he would say: “Don’t worry, I’m not a thief,” and he would put on his best, docile, non-threatening smile. His girlfriend’s family would not let her live with him, because he didn’t make enough money. They were in effect holding out and hoping for her to take up with another man who might offer her a better life. But he visited his daughter and the mother of the child on a daily basis. He worried tremendously when gunshots broke out, wanting to leave our education sessions immediately. He did his best to stay out of drug gangs, and thanks to a grandmother who decided that he was the grandchild she could save, as far as I know he never joined. Once he told me: “Work isn’t everything but it’s almost everything.”

Joao felt in his skin color, in his social status, in his lack of education, in the eyes of the middle class clients whose cars he washed and in the eyes of his girlfriend’s family, the scorn of not being a respectable, working man. That is what it means for men in much of the world to be without work, or without enough work to socially recognized as men. It is ego-breaking, hope-killing and identity-crushing. The disappearance of brawn jobs and the slow adaptation of men to new service sector (the so-called brain jobs) in some countries means that working class men are losing employment and income. That coupled with lower educational attainment among men in most middle income countries, suggests an expanding underclass or segment of low income, economically stressed men, with implications for women’s lives and for men’s.

In giving this example, I am not suggesting that men’s poverty is somehow worse or more pernicious than women’s. These examples affirm that poverty plays out in gendered ways in the lives of women *and* men. It is

problematic to say the least that the two largest waves of poverty alleviation initiatives in the world today – microcredit and conditional cash transfers – do not know what to do with poor men. We need gendered social justice and poverty alleviation policies that are sophisticated enough to acknowledge women’s overall economic disadvantages while also acknowledging that poverty has different but urgent and deep effects on men.

Indeed, we get nowhere in reaching the structural level in gender politics attempting to show who suffers more. Take the atrocity of son preference and the millions of missing girls and women in South, East and Southeast Asia (Anderson and Ray, 2010). Current data suggest that there are about 1.8 million missing women and girls in China and 1.5 million missing girls and women in India due in large part to son preference and differential treatment of girls in early childhood. These skewed sex ratios in some parts of both countries have implications for men. The Chinese government estimated in 2010 that in the near future one in five Chinese young men will not be able to find a bride (Hudson and den Boer, 2004). A number of researchers have highlighted the implications of potential and real increases in demand for sexual exploitation and increases in delinquency as a result.

While acknowledging the tragedy of the missing women and girls in Asia, and its implications for men, we can also point to missing men, particularly in Latin America. There has been very little attention given to the fact that Brazil’s 2010 census affirmed more than 200,000 missing men and boys presently. The census also affirmed that by 2050, Brazil will have 7 million fewer men than women due to high rates of homicide and traffic accidents among men (IBGE, 2011). The implications for women’s lives of missing men are quite

clear in terms of their ability to form families, to find partners and to contribute to household income. The result of both of these trends is that in India and China, we are missing a number of girls and women that amount to the combined population of Johannesburg, Soweto and Pretoria. In Brazil, in less than 40 years, we will be missing a whole Rio de Janeiro.

Like women’s poverty and men’s poverty, both issues deserve attention. Both are gender issues and both have immediate implications in the lives of women and men, in different and unequal ways. Compare them, but acknowledge both of them as gendered realities. That is what we must do about low income, economically stressed men: acknowledge their realities and plight as a gendered issue. We should not end our income support efforts targeting women, nor our efforts to reduce son preference and other inequalities during early childhood in Asia. We should improve them by also engaging and understanding men.

### QUESTION 3: CHANGING OUR MISGUIDED POLICIES ABOUT MEN

This brings me to my last point: How do we get to more justice-based, nuanced gender equality policies that acknowledge men in thoughtful ways? How do we speed up and complete the full gender equality agenda while also including and understanding men? Too often, averages and aggregates lead us to blunt-headed policies, to conclusions that all men are violent or prone to violence or that men do not carry out the care work so why should we even try. We cannot ignore aggregate inequalities but I do think we have more insights on how to promote change when we focus on and listen to the voices of men who have found non-violent, gender-equitable, caring versions of manhood.

Let us look at the challenges of men who try to become more involved in care work. In our IMAGES results, men's self-reported rates of perpetration of violence against women were in nearly all countries, virtually the same as women's reported rates of victimization. In the realm of care work, however, it seems that women and men live in different worlds. Everywhere but India, men reported much higher rates of doing work in the home than women reported them carrying out. In India both women and men affirmed that men are **not** doing the care work. The fact that men report higher levels of care work than women report that men carry out suggests several things: (1) that couples often don't know or appreciate what the other partner is doing in terms of care work; (2) that women don't value men's care work or don't see it as such; and/or (3) that men overstate their care work. It may also suggest that we have not spent the same amount of time trying to figure out how to measure men's care work (and women's care work) as we have measuring other things.

In the IMAGES results, close to half of men with children say they are involved in some daily caregiving. Unemployed men are dramatically more likely to participate in the care of children than employed men. For men with children under age four, play is the most common daily activity in which they participate (as affirmed by women and men). Women do not seem to give men much credit for playing with children, but from a child development point of view, play is serious work for children and it seems to be pretty good for men as well. It is definitely not enough for men merely to play with children, but it's not a bad place to start.

To explore the issue further of how and when men become involved in care work in the home, we carried out in-depth, life history interviews with men in five countries who were

involved in non-traditional or exceptional ways, either in caregiving professions or in the home. Across the five countries, we found that these are doing many caregiving roles, not necessarily because they "believe" such activities are right but because, like Joao, unemployment and family circumstances obligated them to carry out these activities. Indeed, most of the men in low income settings are doing above average care of children and family members have done so because they have become unemployed; while they see that they are able to do such "care work" and that such work is appreciated, they complain of depression and loneliness and report that they feel like failures as men. As one man in Mexico told us: "I like to do the work at home because it's for our own good, my children and my wife. I clean the house so my children come home and enjoy it .... But then comes the depression."

While doing "care work" either as a profession or in the home, most men say that they are able to do such work but that such work is still a "female" task. Men say they do not feel they find a sense of identity in this work. Indeed, most men interviewed do not perceive that men's roles as fathers and caregivers are valued in their societies nor in their households. As we shared these results with some women colleagues, they said, not surprisingly: "Welcome to the club. We've felt like that forever." The conclusion may seem obvious but it needs to be said: it is not just that care work is not valued for men to carry out; it is not valued for anyone.

Furthermore, men working in alternative caregiving professions find that families, clients and their supervisors are often suspicious of men and think the worst of men (for example that men involved in child care will sexually molest children) and report that they must negotiate their spaces within the workplace

on a daily basis. And, as in the case of the quantitative study, most men interviewed in the qualitative study do not perceive gender equality policies as benefitting them and perceive that such policies cast men in a negative light. In other words, individual men may be motivated to change, they may be doing the care work and tasks we want them to do, but the collective understandings of masculinities and femininities have not changed.

As a developmental psychologist, I believe that human development progresses with increasing webs of reciprocal connections. I believe that the high point of human development is interconnectedness and flexibility. Most of the world, however, continues to believe that the high point of individual human development is autonomous, economic, individual success - the lone author of great works, the lone accumulator of wealth, the lone designer of new apps for our iPhones. The stories we tell of successful individuals continue to paint men (and women) as singular, bounded authors of their destinies. But I believe that we must drive toward the social construction of masculinities and femininities – of humanity – that holds up the mutual obligations and connections between us as the high point of what it means to be fully human. The developmental psychologist Niobe Way highlights these issues cogently in her recent book “Deep Secrets: Boys’ Friendships and the Crisis of Connection.” She presents portraits of boys who report having had close, intimate friendships in early adolescent but felt increasingly pressured to abandon the possible of such intimacy and connection as the world seeks to make them into autonomous, stoic, emotionally distant adult men.

Similarly, my life histories with young men who managed to stay out of gangs in Rio de Janeiro’s *favelas* or who got out, found that the main reason they were able to do – like Joao – was their connection with significant others. Some young men found alternative identities, some could think in thoughtful ways about their lives, but first and foremost what kept them from going over the edge was the sense that they would be letting someone down if they did those things - that they would lose valuable relationships if they did those things.

I believe that we continue to ignore, at our own peril the *other* component of patriarchy. As Carol Gilligan reminds us:

*Patriarchy is an order of domination, privileging some men over others and subordinating women. But in dividing men from men and men from women ... it creates a rift in the psyche, dividing everyone from parts of themselves. (Gilligan, 2002).*

We must understand that patriarchy is a power structure that works in multiple directions at the same time. A few men have power over the lives of other men and over women. These powerful men decide when a factory closes or moves to another country or decide if they will pay adequate benefits or a decent wage or not. The patriarchal dividend, as Raewyn Connell called it, is not evenly divided, just as dividends in our capitalist system are not evenly divided (Connell, 1995).

I believe that we cannot push men further along the path toward gender equality and reduce their use of violence against women and against other men unless we acknowledge this reality. Whether in the Democratic Republic of Congo or in Soweto or the *favelas* of Rio de

Janeiro, or in middle class households across the world, we must acknowledge that the men who have made women's lives hell have themselves had hellish lives. Our research from IMAGES found that the single strongest factor associated with men's use of physical violence against a female partner was having witnessed violence by a man against a woman as a child. What we seldom stop to think about is that boys who witness their mothers suffer violence themselves experience trauma, fear and anger that they almost never talk about. In our research between 40-50% of men had witnessed such violence growing up. Trauma psychologists tell us that witnessing torture and violence is as traumatic as having actually experienced violence.

If we want men to become non-violent, to become caring, to become empathetic, to treat women with the respect they deserve, we must show empathy toward men. This is **not** to forgive individual men's violence. This is **not** to forgive individual men for the multiple injustices committed in women's and girls' lives. And in saying that we must treat men with empathy, we do not diminish in **any way** the power and urgency of the women's rights movement. In fact, we strengthen the women's rights agenda when we help men develop the connections that make us all human. Only then will we complete the revolution we have started in the lives of women and girls.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, F. (2008) "Microcredit, Men and Masculinity," NWSA Journal, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer).
- Anderson, Siwan, and Debraj Ray. 2010. "Missing Women: Age and Disease." *Review of Economic Studies* 77 (4): 1262–300.
- Barker, G. 2005. *Dying to be Men: Youth, Masculinity and Social Exclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Barker, G., Contreras, J.M., Heilman, B., Singh, A.K., Verma, R.K., and Nascimento, M. *Evolving Men: Initial Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES)*. Washington, D.C.: International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) and Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Promundo. January 2011.
- Barker, G, Ricardo, C., Nascimento, M., 2007. *Engaging Men and Boys in Changing Gender-based Inequity in Health: Evidence from Programme Interventions*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Bartlett, E. (2004). The effects of fatherhood on the health of men: a review of the literature. *Journal of Men's health and Gender*, vol. 1, Nos. 2-3, pp. 159-169.
- Binzl, Christine and Assaad, Ragui. (2008). *Pathways to Marriage in Egypt: How the Timing of Marriage for Young Men is Affected by Their Labor Market Trajectory*. Economic Research Forum. September 2008.
- Brown, S.L., et al (2003). Providing social support may be more beneficial than receiving it: results from a prospective study of mortality. *Psychological Science*, vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 320-327.
- Budlender, Debbie. (2008). *The Statistical Evidence on Care and Non-Care Work across Six Countries*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Geneva.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Consultative Group to Assist the Poor (CGAP) (2010) "Who Are the Clients of Microfinance?" (<http://www.cgap.org/p/site/c/template.rc/1.26.1304/>, last accessed 2/21/2010).
- Dhillon, Navtej and Yousef, Tarik ed. (2009). *A Generation in Waiting. The Unfulfilled Promise of Young People in the Middle East*. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- The Economist, 2011, 30 April. *Decline of the Working Man*. 64-66.

- García-Moreno, C., Janse, H., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., Watts, C. (2005). WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Gilligan, C. (2002). *The Birth of Pleasure*. New York: Random House.
- Grant, Monica J., and Jere R. Behrman. 2010. "Gender Gaps in Educational Attainment in Less Developed Countries." *Population and Development Review* 36 (1): 71–89.
- Hemström, O. (1996). Is marriage dissolution linked to differences in mortality risks for men and women? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 58, No. 3 (May), pp. 366-378.
- Holt-Lunstad, J., and others (2009). Married with children: the influence of parental status and gender on ambulatory blood pressure. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, vol. 38, No. 3 (December), pp. 170-179.
- Holter, Ø, Svare, H. and Egeland, C. (2009). *Gender Equality and Quality of Life: A Norwegian Perspective*. Oslo: The Nordic Gender Institute (NIKK).
- Hudson, V., & den Boer, A. (2004). *Bare Branches: The Security Implications of Asia's Surplus Male Population*. Belfer Center Studies in International Security, The MIT Press .
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) 2011.([http://www.ibge.gov.br/home/presidencia/noticias/noticia\\_visualiza.php?id\\_noticia=1272&id\\_pagina](http://www.ibge.gov.br/home/presidencia/noticias/noticia_visualiza.php?id_noticia=1272&id_pagina), accessed May 15, 2011)
- International Labor Organization (2009a). *Conditions of Work and Employment Programme (TRAVAIL)*. Available from <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/condtrav/family/reconcilwf/natpolicies.htm>
- International Labor Organization, 2009b. *Global Employment Trends for Women: March 2009*, p. 2. Geneva: International Labor Office.
- International Labor Organization. 2010. "Key Indicators of the Labour Market". International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva.
- Jewkes R., Sikweyiya Y., Morrell R., Dunkle K. (2009). *Understanding men's health and use of violence: interface of rape and HIV in South Africa*. Technical Report. Pretoria: Medical Research Council.
- Rahman, A. (1999) "Women and Microcredit in Rural Bangladesh: An Anthropological Study of the Rhetoric and Realities of Grameen Bank Lending," Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Smith, K.R. and C.D. Zick (1994). Linked lives, dependent demise? survival analysis of husbands and wives. *Demography*, vol. 31, No. 1 (February), pp. 81-93.
- Swartz, S. and A. Bhana (2009). *Teenage Tata: Voices of Young Fathers in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- UNESCO: Institute for Statistics. 2009. "Global Education Digest 2009: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World." UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal.
- UNESCO, 2010. "Global Education Digest 2010: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World. Special Focus on Gender." UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal.
- United Nations - Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2010. "The World's Women 2010: Trends and Statistics." United Nations, New York.
- WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, and World Bank. 2010. "Trends in Maternal Mortality: 1990 to 2008." World Health Organization (WHO), Washington, DC.
- Wamala, S. (2009). Presentation at the Global Symposium on Engaging Men and Boys in Gender Equality, Rio de Janeiro, March 2009.
- Way, N. (2011). *Deep Secrets: Boys' Friendships and the Crisis of Connection*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- The World Bank. (2007). *Gender Equality as Smart Economics. A World Bank Group Gender Action Plan*. September 2007.

