



Do masculinities matter?

A look at the implications for involving men in gender-orientated development practice

Pétur Hjörvar Þorkelsson

Lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í mannfræði

Félagsvísindasvið



HÁSKÓLI ÍSLANDS

Do masculinities matter?
***A look at the implications for involving men in gender-orientated
development practice***

Pétur Hjörvar Þorkelsson

Lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í mannfræði

Leiðbeinandi: Kristín Loftsdóttir

Félags- og mannvísindadeild
Félagsvísindasvið Háskóla Íslands
Júni 2014

Ritgerð þessi er lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í mannfræði og er óheimilt að afrita ritgerðina á nokkurn hátt nema með leyfi réttihafa.

© Pétur Hjörvar Þorkelsson 2014
080791-2759

Prentun: Háskólaprent
Reykjavík, Ísland 2014



Abstract

This thesis focuses on the implications of further involving men and masculinities in gender research and practice. Gender and Development, or GAD is a sub-field within International Development that theoretically focuses on gender relations, although historically it has mainly steered its attention towards women. In the last decade or so a discourse on whether an increased focus on the engendered lives of men. I look critically at the implications for gender equality and development effort in involving men's gendered realities in GAD work. I found that there are potential risks for GAD's main clientele; women in developing countries, if a careful approach is not adhered. These risks are outlined in my thesis where I draw upon research by leading scholars in masculinity studies and GAD. The current GAD discourse suggests that although there is potential for failure, the potential gains for gender equality are immense. I argue that by looking critically at masculinities and men's gendered lives, a potential for various health and social benefits in development effort arises.



HÁSKÓLI ÍSLANDS

Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	5
2 Theory	7
2.1 Feminist anthropology and gender theory	7
2.2 Masculinities	12
2.3 Development Theory	17
3 Gender and development	19
3.1 Theoretical and historical Background	19
3.2 Directions and goals in gendered development	21
3.3 Implications for involving men	22
4 The case for involving men	24
4.1 Overview	24
4.2 Men as allies	26
4.3 Men's gendered vulnerabilities.....	29
4.4 The case against involving men	33
Conclusion	35
Bibliography	38

1 Introduction

In this thesis I will discuss the role and place of men and masculinities within international development and try to answer whether masculinities as an analytical category within gender deserves more attention. In the context of this thesis, masculinities refer to certain values, mainly embodied by men but certainly not limited to them. My focus is on the theoretical framework within the gendered sphere of international development, often referred to as *Gender and Development (GAD)*. The topic at hand stems from a debate that's been receiving increased attention within Gender and Development academia; whether an increased focus on masculinities and men as gendered beings is beneficial to gender-driven development projects. I will look at an increased attention on masculinities and men as gendered beings and explore its effects on both men and women separately. Gender within development has historically been a project steering its theoretical focus almost entirely on women, but recently a discourse on an increased focus on men and masculinities has arisen and gained a lot of attention. This thesis is largely constructed from an anthropological standpoint, but I also draw upon important research by scholars from both sociology and international development. Within this thesis I also aim to deconstruct gender as a concept and explain its importance in people's daily lives. The first chapter is dedicated to the three cornerstones of this thesis; gender, masculinities, and development. I introduce a theoretical—and historical—background by discussing theories from scholars that brought gender research to light. Sherry Ortner's nature vs. culture gender symbolism theory, Michelle Rosaldo's public vs. private gendered spheres theory, and Henrietta Moore's carefully constructed history of feminist anthropology offer a valuable viewpoint for this thesis. By discussing pioneering work of these early feminist anthropologists I aim to shed light on the inspirational work that early feminist development practitioners drew upon in the early days of GAD, and although their study was not masculinity-orientated, their theories provide context for gender roles. As my dialogue depends significantly on theory, I rely heavily on the first chapter to provide the groundwork needed to understand the rest of the thesis.

I start off by putting gender research in a historical context by exploring the influences of feminism and the origins of gender within anthropology. I briefly discuss development theory in order to give the discussion further context. From there

I move on to examine the connection between anthropology and feminism and connect it to the current discourse on masculinities. My discourse is supported mainly by R.W. Connells' work on gender and masculinities. Connell popularized the concept of hegemonic masculinities, and influences from her writings on the complexities of gender roles vastly shaped the character of the whole thesis. I touch on various topics within feminism, such as gender and masculinity theories.. From theory and history I move on to discuss the fragile state of GAD and the agenda and main focus points of a gendered approach to development. I discuss the implications for involving men in GAD and argue that there are two opposing views: for and against the involvement of men.

I discuss how GAD theory doesn't seem to work realistically, and briefly conclude on how that argument developed. I then move on to the fourth chapter, which covers in detail the main argument of this essay. I start of with an overview of the current state of the debate, which is overwhelmingly "pro-men." In keeping a critical eye through the thesis, I try to analyze the opposing views. The debate over involving men in GAD work arguably tends to favour the involvement of masculinities. Many people who support the increased involvement of men as gendered beings emphasise a cautious approach, as there still remains great scepticism over how men should be involved in the movement. A cautious approach is well warranted for a few reasons, which I will expand upon in chapter four. GAD was constructed with feminist values at heart and as such its main priorities have always been improving women's lives. There is a potential for much to be lost if an increased focus on the gendered lives of men is to be implemented. Hence, worries of the discipline's attention being steered away from women's issues have arisen. I propose the implementation of men in GAD does however present a great potential for positive change in the fight for gender equality.

2 Theory

2.1 Feminist Anthropology and Gender Theory

According to Henrietta Moore (1988), the ‘anthropology of women’, established in the early 1970s sought to challenge classic anthropological theory and give voices to women who were previously a muted group in ethnographic fieldwork. The first problem at hand was to correct the inherent male bias that had caused a skewed view of women’s lived experiences. The problem consisted of male ethnographers treating women as essentially unimportant agents within their societies. Male bias was identified as having three “tiers.” The first layer is imported by the ethnographer himself. The bias consists both of a set of assumptions and expectations about the relations between women and men, and the significance of those relationships. It is perhaps best illustrated as a self-fulfilling prophecy, where ethnographers bring with them certain ideas such as the belief that men are easier to talk to and thus more worth their while for the purpose of collecting ethnographic data. The second layer is fundamentally different from the first in that it entails a built-in view of women as subordinate to men in the societies being studied. The third bias was identified as a bias incorporated into Western culture. The third and final layer affects the ethnographer’s ability to understand relationships between men and women. The bias here is therefore one of misunderstanding, as the ethnographer is unable to comprehend relationships between men and women in other societies that were not westernized. Researchers hence perceive asymmetrical relationships in the society being studied to be analogous to the uneven, hierarchical gender relationships they are accustomed to in their own cultures. Feminist anthropology’s first task was therefore an essential task of “deconstructing this three-tiered structure of male bias” (Moore, 1988:2).

Henrietta Moore (1988) discusses the important work done in the first decade of feminist anthropology and refers to Edward Ardener, Michelle Rosaldo, Reyna Reiter, Sherry Ortner and others whose work produced an influential framework for exploring the subordination of women. Edward Ardener’s (1975) article, “Belief, and the Problem of Women,” gave anthropologists a valuable tool to understand why women’s voices were silenced. He argues that the “problem of women” in social anthropology is twofold—technical and analytical. Women’s problem lays not in observation, as Ardener notes that women’s, much like that of men’s, behaviour has

been exhaustively plotted. In accordance with Moore (1988), he argues for a problem of representation residing on the 'meta', or analytical level. The difference between ethnographic fieldwork on men and women hence must be considered analytical, and on that stage women's lives are incorrectly interpreted and explained. "The study of women is on a level little higher than the study of ducks and fowls they commonly own – a mere bird-watching indeed" (Ardener, 1972:136). He concludes that the problem consists of whose voices are heard and made apparent in ethnographies, and whose are not.

The introduction of gender to these ethnographers' studies was imperative as it offered a tool to better understand the reasons for the inequality that plagues women because of their anthropologically misunderstood identity. Socially constructed gender identities shape peoples' various opportunities, such as work, education, sexuality, and authority roles. The analysis of the relationship between sex and gender and the cultural construction of the latter is one of feminist anthropology's most outstanding contributions. According to Henrietta Moore, a feminist critique emerged within anthropology not because of a lack of representation, as was the case in some of the other social sciences, but because of how women were represented. The problem was made up of the fact that anthropology was a male-dominated science. The consequences were that women were not being accurately represented. Rather, their portrayal was comprised of how they were seen by male anthropologists. A new 'anthropology of women' was born in the 1970s in order to contest the dominant ideas about women in anthropological research. An initial problem of a threefold male bias was quickly realised by the practitioners of the 'anthropology of women'. The first layer of the male bias consists of the bias that the anthropologist himself brings to the field. His socially constructed notions of relations between men and women were identified as shaping the ways he did fieldwork and ultimately leading to a fault in his research. The self-fulfilling prophecy of male ethnographers seeking out men in the field to write history because of pre-constructed ideas of easier access is perhaps a prime example of the first layer of male bias.

The second layer consists of an internal bias within the societies being studied. In many societies women are considered subordinate to men and the researcher is therefore likely to ascertain this from the society being studied. The third and final layer consists of a lack of ability by the researcher to understand the culture being

studied because of their 'Western biases'. Researchers, Moore argues, assumed that when an asymmetrical relation between men and women is discovered, an unjust power structure must also be at play. Moore argues that researchers were unable to perceive difference without assuming it to be analogous to the power hierarchy in the West (Moore, 1988). The initial task of feminist anthropology was consequently determined to be the deconstruction of the threefold male bias. Moore argues that this task was detrimental to the mission of incorporating women into anthropology, although many other problems remained for women in anthropology (Moore, 1988).

The feminist anthropology movement had a mighty task set out for them, in correcting for male bias and improving women's status within the field. Moore (1988) claims that the problem lies not in empirical research, but rather in theory. Something drastic had to be done. Simply incorporating women into traditional anthropology could not do anyone justice nor could it correct the male bias that had been fundamentally institutionalized in the field. The task of feminist anthropology was therefore not simply to "add women and stir" but "to confront the conceptual and analytical inadequacies of disciplinary theory" (Moore, 1988:4). The task was not to create a sub-discipline of feminist anthropology, but rather challenge the norms within traditional anthropology by questioning knowledge attained only written with male bias. Worries arose as women's point of view was not meant as an opposite to men's point of view, which would in turn miss the point of feminist anthropology. Moore claims that feminist anthropology is more than simply the study of women. It is the study of the relations between men and women, the study of gender (Moore, 2003). I will hence discuss briefly some pioneering work done by feminist anthropologists in the early days of the discipline, as it has been a major influencing force for gender orientated development work (Cornwall, 1997).

Sherry Ortner (1974), one of the original leading voices in the 'anthropology of women,' wrote on the nature of women's gendered subordination by society. She claims that women's secondary status is a pan-universal reality and the current GAD discourse echoes a similar view of women as the 'poorest of the poor'. Chant (2007), however, argues that these views are not supported by sufficient data. He questions if it is of benefit to anyone to uphold an image of women as universally poorer than their male counterparts. Ortner (1974) theorizes that since biological determinism, the belief that men are in superior social positions because of biological factors, has failed

to establish the satisfaction of academic anthropologists. The answer must be found in the social world. For Ortner, this poses a particular problem, as an explanation to this cross-cultural phenomenon must exist in the generalized structures of every society. In short, she finds that women have come to symbolize nature, and men have come to symbolize culture. The latter, she argues, has a constant project of trying to dominate nature. Michelle Rosaldo (1974) put forth a different model of female subordination than Ortner, which claims that women's social, subordinate status stemmed from a structural model of social organization that places women in the "domestic" sphere and men in an opposing extra-domestic, or public, sphere. Rosaldo starts her thesis by dismissing Western views of "natural" behaviour of men and women as non-universal values. She claims that the attitudes connected to femininity, such as passivity and willingness to care for children, are in fact cultural understandings of reality and not biological ones. They therefore must depend on cultural context. She in turn identifies some values that are pan-culturally primarily associated with either men or women. The domestic sphere consists of "minimal institutions and modes of activity that are organized immediately around one or more mothers and their children; (whereas) "public" refers to activities, institutions and forms of associations that link, rank, organize or subsume particular mother-child groups" (Rosaldo, 1974:24). She argues that men's lack of a role as time-consuming as childbearing- and rearing has hence allowed them to "form those broader associations that we call "society," universalistic systems of order, meaning and commitment that link particular mother-child groups" (Rosaldo, 1974:24). Her theory is much more widely encompassing, but in essence the domestic vs. public opposition model has a lot of explanatory value. It provides the researcher with a way to link the cultural values encompassed in the category of 'woman' to the organization of women's activities in society (Moore, 1988).

Gender offered anthropologists, sociologists, and others with a stake in the beginning of the 1970s a more effective analytical framework for exploring the social hierarchy of men and women in any given society. Ortner's landmark thesis, for example, provided anthropology with a tool to link "sexual ideologies and stereotypes both to the wider system of cultural symbols and to social roles and experience" (Moore, 2003:15) Moore (2003) furthermore notes that the value of a symbolic analysis of gender becomes apparent when we try to understand men and women as socially constructed categories and how these constructions affect social activities.

Moore maintains that the nature vs. culture theory provided a useful starting point in understanding the lives of 'man' and 'woman' through a cultural construct rather than a biological one (Moore, 2003). Lorber & Farrel (1991) are among those who point out that gender, and therefore gender relations, are not universal. They change from generation to generation between social classes and ethnic groups, and must therefore be observed in their respective social context. Although I mainly base my argument on anthropological work, I find it beneficial to encompass a broader view and agree with Jackson (2002) who points out that GAD's success depends heavily on retaining a multi-disciplinary view.

According to Connell (2000), a sociologist herself, gender is a set of structures that influence the organization of all social practice. I find it beneficial to explore her view on gender in order to better explain gender relations and how gender essentially affects every part of the social structure of societies. She puts forth four distinctive structures: power relations, production relations, emotional relations and symbolism. She argues that power relations are "the main axis of power in the contemporary European/US order is the subordination of women and dominance of men," also known as the patriarchy (Connell, 2000:26). She further argues that this social order is now widely known and acknowledged, as well as being a main fighting point for modern United States vs. European feminism. Production relations, or the division of labor, is beneficial to men while the exact opposite is true for women. Connell argues that uneven wealth distribution is built in to a capitalist economy and "the accumulation of wealth has become firmly linked with the reproductive arena, through the social relations of gender" (Connell, 2000:27). Emotional relations, or *cathexis*, are another important aspect of gendered relations between men and women, and Connell argues that the gendered identity is influenced by desire and emphasizes sharp questions about the relation between men's social dominance and sexuality. Emotional relations, as well as most other relations, are socially engendered and therefore deserve a closer look. Lastly, symbolism such as dress, makeup, tone of voice, body expression, and other aspects in everyday social life enforce the gender dichotomy. Linguistic symbolism, such as using titles that refer to women as someone's wife rather than an individual and vice-versa for men, also plays its part in enforcing an engendered social order (Connell, 2000).

2.2 Masculinities

So, what does gender have to do with masculinity? I've already shown that gender is socially constructed, through examining the works of Ortner, Rosaldo and Moore. This of course entails that the categories of 'men' and 'women' are equally socially constructed (Moore, 1988). Hence, some cultures are not bound by the gender dichotomy other are. By separating gender from sexual morphology and rather connecting it to social and labor roles there is, in essence, no constriction on what constitutes as one's gender. This allows certain "gender cultures," that is, a society's understanding of genders, to have more than two genders. One example of this tradition comes from certain Native American tribes (Ramet, 1996) and Hijra's (Herdt, 1996). The gender research sphere has arguably consisted mainly of feminist research that understandably focuses more on women, but men and masculinities are quickly becoming a popular research area, both within and outside feminist circles as a response to a changing reality and acknowledgement of power structures associated with gender.

So far I've portrayed masculinity as a category within the socially constructed gender structure. I've also associated gender with power, noting that power relations are disproportionate, benefitting men. I have shown that within feminist studies, gender is a hierarchy where men have risen to have a better position than women. It's very unfortunate, but in order to convey my message I need to use concepts that in some ways contradict arguments made previously. Such is the case when talking of both men and women, of masculinities and femininities—all socially constructed categories that in their very nature are difficult to compare cross-culturally. However, anthropology has a long tradition of cross-cultural comparison, and in order to explore other cultural constructs, analytical categories such as 'men' and 'women' must be used. Ortner (1974) bases her nature vs. culture gender theory around these issues, and agrees that differences between men and women have no significance outside of their "culturally defined value systems" (Ortner, 1974:71). She argues that while the categories of men and women must be viewed within their cultural constructs, in order to deconstruct women's universal subordination, we must look to other universals. She argues that "we must attempt to interpret female subordination in light of other universals, factors built into the structure of the most generalized situation in which all human beings, in whatever culture, find themselves" (Ortner, 1974:71).

Concepts such as femininity and masculinity are hence needed, if only to describe patterns of gender practice, instead of groups of people (Connell, 2000).

It is important to acknowledge that there is immense diversity within masculinities as an analytical category and according to Connell (2000), talking about masculinity in its singular form whilst referring to men overall is nothing short of the worst kind of essentialism. The *men's movement* owes a great deal to the feminist scholars who paved much of the theoretical way in terms of gender. I find it essential to explain what men's movement I am referring to, as there are undeniably more than one. The men's movement, in this text, does not refer to a certain place-bound movement, rather an ideology, a set of shared opinions that men can change their own lives and the lives of others by resisting some of societies hegemonic ideas, such as the patriarchy. There is of course another men's movement, one associated with men's rights and a retreat back to a primal "inherently masculine" nature. This is however a movement that would in all likelihood fundamentally disagree with much if not all of the theoretical standpoints of this thesis and not of further importance, and will hence not be discussed further (Adair, 1992). Masculinities are thus not viewed as a homogenous group within masculinity studies, although this essentialism can be seen elsewhere. Cornwall warns of the dangers of gender stereotyping for both women and men and argues that international development has a rather depressing history in this matter. On a critical note she maintains that "all too often in development... women are treated as an identifiable single category, thought of in a narrow range of stereotypical ways. 'Men', equally thought of as a single category, lurk in the background, imagined as powerful and oppositional figures" (Cornwall, 1998:46). This was an important fight for feminism, and according to Cecile Jackson it still is, as she argues that it is still common practice to speak of women as an undifferentiated group that embodies a set of characteristics (Connell, 2000; Jackson, 2002). Femininities and masculinities are thus acknowledged as having a wide range of different forms, each represented and formed in different setting. As mentioned before, a recurring theme in critical gender studies is power, and masculinities have been interpreted to have an underlying hierarchy (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Hegemonic masculinity, in its simplest form, is a concept that portrays one form of masculinity to be superior to others. Hegemonic masculinity theory is however a bit more complex, and has evolved since it first appeared in the early

1980s. Hegemonic masculinity theory is often connected with R.W. Connell, as she was among the first to write about it and has produced some well-acclaimed literature on the subject (Oca, 2012; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity is comprised of a few core elements. Firstly, it's a pattern of practices that allow men's continued dominance over women and other men. Secondly, it's distinguishable from other forms of masculinities, especially subordinated masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity is certainly not the masculinity accessible to most people, although its desirability makes it normative. Hegemony does not mean violence. In fact, today's hegemonic masculinity, discussed later in this sub-chapter, is not at all connected to physical dominance, although hegemonic masculinities in the past most certainly have been connected to violent symbolism (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Connell, 2000). Although it can be supported by force, hegemony is first and foremost achieved through social institutions, persuasion and culture. Hegemonic masculinity is not static and in theory, and practice, new forms of masculinity arise and challenge the existing hegemony. The theory thus portrays masculinities in a rather negative manner but allows for a touch of optimism in a potential hegemonic masculinity that emphasizes equality and justice as prime attributes. Unfortunately no such hegemonic masculinity has emerged, despite there being a rise in masculinities sensitive to feminist issues (Connell, 2000; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Adair, 1992).

According to Connell (2000) Globalization has over the years been a very influential force, and masculinities have not been exempt from its claws. Connell further argues that the culture of colonial conquests influenced masculinities worldwide. The masculinity that was in a sense created by, or at least shaped by, the abnormal conditions of colonial conquest was characterized by violence and lack of social control. *Frontier masculinities*, as dubbed by Connell, belonged to men who uprooted their homes and joined the colonial missions of their times. These masculinities were in some cases reproduced in local settings, as was the case with cowboys of the western United States and the gauchos of southern South America. The ruling group in the colonies was an extension of the ruling group in the metropolis. This is believed to have had a severe impact on how masculinities were shaped in the colonized world. Social structures within the colonized societies were

greatly affected by the forces of modernizations violently thrust upon them by the colonial powers (Connell, 2000).

Connell (2000) points out that resistance to the colonial powers is believed to have been a major influence on some masculinities, such as the mobilization of ethnic-masculine identities within the Zulu nation. This effect was caused both unintentionally as with the previous case, but also intentionally as was the case with Bengali men in India. Colonial powers in British India regarded Pathans and Sikhs “more manly” than their fellow Bengalis, whom they considered effeminate. The general contempt and disrespect also played its part in shaping masculinities in the colonies. Indigenous men were often referred to as boys by their colonizers, which goes coincides with the rest of the rhetoric of superiority imposed on the “global South” by colonizers. The pressures from the colonial authorities were used strategically to subordinate indigenous people. In the case of Bengalis being treated as effeminate, the intention was to maintain colonial privilege. The pressures were nonetheless not only confining to indigenous people as they were also meant to prevent the colonizers from ‘going native’. The masculinities created in the periphery tended to emphasize a gender contrast made popular in the European metropole. These masculinities varied between localities, but still shared some similarities and tended to stress a gender contrast shaped by the rationality of men and irrationality of women. These masculinities were often shaped by economic action. An excellent example is the Japanese *Salaryman*. The Salaryman was first mentioned around 1910 and referred to men who worked for large corporations and had a stable salary. However, the masculinities formed and upheld in the colonies were not only limited to the colonies. By forces of globalization, masculinities were formed and reshaped by colonizers, and by the same forces, new masculinities in the metropole emerged. The rapid accumulation of wealth made possible a new specialized class of leaders. The old hegemonic masculinity linked with violence and conquest came under attack by this new form of masculinity (Connell, 2000).

Masculinities have been steadily evolving and changing in accordance with global and local influences. The cultural and political climate at any given time lends a great deal of sway over how masculinities are structures and restructure. Decolonization was a major cause of disorder in the gender hierarchy. Violence and armed struggle sometimes influenced men to embrace masculinities connected with

violence and hardness, despite making a negative impression on women involved in the decolonization movement. Some activists and theorists of liberation struggles saw this as a necessary step to freedom. Violence and hardness was seen as an answer to the colonial oppression and violence that had been inflicted on them. A variety of factors therefore can and have influenced the elements that comprise masculinities. Connell points out that masculinities exist in many states and variations dependent on localities and their historical connections with the globalized world. Global politics and policy now constitute one of the leading stimuli for the image of masculinities. Neo-liberal policies have become the leading economic paradigm after the 'leftist' policy failed to thrive in a global context. The fall of Soviet Communism and declining Post-Colonial Socialism has paved the way for right-wing policies to claim their ground. Neo-liberal policies on their own are not gendered and their only real aim is to allow the individual to prosper. However when placed into the context of the modern world, neo-liberal economic policy becomes very gendered by approving and supporting the power hierarchy currently in play (Connell, 2000).

Connell (2000) argues that neo-liberal policies have come to systematically attack the welfare state and all of its rigorously fought for universal privileges. In a completely neutral power structure, neo-liberal policies might not affect the gender order or other power structures. However, in its current form it weakens the position of women worldwide and places strategic power in the hands of men. She further points out that a prime example can be seen in some of the former soviet nations, where increased market capitalism has brought on a resurgence of dominating masculinities and tougher conditions for women. Connell hence argues that the powers in control of the dominating institutions comprise the hegemonic masculinity. In today's world, the hegemony belongs to the business executives, those who hold control over the financial institutions, and the politicians in high positions who control policy reform. These two types interact with each other, and often emerge, to form what she labels *transnational business masculinity*. She argues that this form of masculinity is not easily accessed, and there exists a lack of ethnographic study on the powerful (Connell, 2000). Conti and O'Neil (2007) concur and argue that the global elite, which coincides with the transnational business masculinity, are not as easily studied as groups lower in the social power hierarchy.

2.3 Development Theory

International development theory has evolved significantly over the years, and so has the concept of development itself. Development thinking began, according to Martin (1991; within Pieterse, 2010) with the classic political economists, such as Ricardo and Marx as they focused on similar problems as economic development theorists and practitioners do now. Development thinking began in the post-war era, where latecomers to industrialization confronted development challenges similar to those going on today in the “global South.” Before that period, development was in some sense being used by colonists, but the ideology behind it goes against all modern development theory in the sense that it sought only to improve conditions for the colonialists. For example, medical programs were set up to fight pandemics, and although they sometimes benefitted locals in dire need, the aim was set on developing a better environment for the rulers (Farmer, 2004). There was very little concern for living conditions and economic potential. Colonial activity often intentionally damaged the natives’ activity, with actions such as hindering industrialization and the destruction of manufacturing operations (Pieterse, 2010).

So, what is development? Gilbert Rist (1997) argues that in order to fully understand the concept we must first look well into the past. Rist lists a few important stepping-stones that have shaped development over the years, from ancient Greece, to the Enlightenment, and finally to how President Truman’s concept of ‘underdevelopment’ came to change the world. Rist goes on to discuss definitions of development and concludes that most definitions development are heavily reliant on individual experiences and can hence not easily be understood out of cultural context. I try my best to avoid posing what Rist dubs a ‘pseudo-definition’, a definition that is “based upon the way in which one person (or set of persons) pictures the ideal conditions of social existence” (Rist, 1997:10). Instead I will briefly discuss the history of development thinking and offer a summary of some of the leading theories and sub-disciplines.

Gilbert Rist (1997) points to the end of the Second World War as a massive ‘game changer’ for the evolution of development. He argues that the development agenda was squeezed into a post-war reform discourse that prioritized the restructuring of Europe, while mainly overlooking issues in the ‘global South’. Rist maintains that the new ‘development age’ was born, in a sense, out of an accident.

Former United States President, Harry S. Truman, was due to address the public on the 20th of January in 1949 on the subject of European reforms, funding of the United Nations, and the creation of NATO. In a meeting prior to the President's speech, the three points previously mentioned received unanimous support. Later in that meeting, a civil servant suggested that assistance currently being given to some Latin American countries should be extended to other less privileged countries. The idea was contested, but in the end it was employed and what has come to be known as "Truman's Point Four" was born. The revolutionary concept of 'underdevelopment' was first used in Point Four. According to Rist, international relations were conceived in a new way after Point Four and its notion of underdevelopment. He argues, "development took on a transitive meaning (an action performed by upon another) which corresponded to a principle of social organization, while 'underdevelopment' became a 'naturally' occurring (that is, seemingly causeless) state of things" (Rist, 1997:73). Rist claims that this caused a transition from the previous 'North' as colonizer vs. 'South' as colonized model towards a dichotomy of North as 'developed' versus South as 'underdeveloped'. Arturo Escobar (1995) argues that the post-war 'discovery' of global poverty also played a role in the restructuring of the development discourse. Escobar argues that two-thirds of the world's population was re-defined overnight as poor, and hence the countries they lived in.

Arturo Escobar (1995) argues that the problematization of poverty shaped the third world's image of itself as a place in some way behind the rest of the world, in fact, Escobar claims poverty became their main trait. Development and economic growth hence became a de-facto number one goal for the 'third world' nations. Escobar regularly examines modernization in his book, *Encountering Development: the making and unmaking of the third world*, on the discursive analysis of development. He talks about the notion of catching up with the West and moving away from the 'traditional' to the 'modern,' which was seen as a necessary stepping stone and in many ways is still inherent in developmental thinking. Escobar argues that while the Marxist and Neo-Marxist modes of thought entering development in the early 1960s did not bring an alternative model of development to the table, their contributions to the field were valuable. Neo-Marxists and Marxists challenged previously agreed upon notions within development, such as the undeniable dominance of a free market. Escobar argues that various theories and claims were put

forth by the development economists, of which he does not speak kindly of, about the nature of economic growth in developing countries. He further argues that most of them have ultimately failed, as witnessed by the current state of the world.

Escobar argues that the history of development is usually seen as an evolution of ideas and theories. He claims that alternatively, the history of the development discourse can also be looked at with a focus on its subjects. Escobar argues that the domain and clientele that the development discourse centers on has been very important to the evolution of the 'development' discourse itself. Such sub-fields include 'sustainable-development', which claims that human development and sustainability of the planet go hand in hand (Escobar, 1995). One sub-field undeniably stands out as the most important one for this thesis; Women in Development, or WID. Discussed better in the next chapter, WID grew into what is now commonly referred to as gender and development.

3 Gender and Development

3.1 Theoretical and Historical Background

In its simplest term, *Gender and Development*, or GAD, is a sub-discipline within international development. In theory focuses on improving peoples' lives through a gender-focused approach (Escobar, 1995; Chant & Guttman, 2000). Arturo Escobar (1995) claims that visibility often dictates who receives attention from the development discourse. Women only entered the spotlight in the 1970s, with the emergence of the Women in Development movement. According to Cornwall (1997), feminist development practitioners in the 1970s and 1980s drew inspiration from work done by feminist anthropologists in the same decades. She points to scholars such as Ortner and Rosaldo and their groundbreaking work on gender, as previously discussed

Chant and Guttman (2000) point out that the WID movement has its roots in the Women's Committee of the Washington D.C. Chapter of the Society for International Development. Formed as an answer to the gender-blindness in development projects, the WID approach was first put in action by the United States Agency for International Development. It aimed to support women's needs, which had been previously overlooked in development projects up to a point where interventions and development effort negatively affected women's lives by not

confronting the patriarchal power structure in play. WID's glory days came in the mid 1970s with the UN Decade for Women. The approach emphasized "women as an 'analytical and operational category', the setting-up of separate organizational structures for dealing with women, and the development of women specific policies and projects" (Chant & Guttman, 2000:7). Chant and Guttman claim that WID presented a major breakthrough for women in development. For the first time, women-specific policies were introduced and resources became increasingly available for development projects focusing on women. Gender inequality became a visible subject to be targeted by international development for the first time. WID was widely praised, although voices of scepticism and doubt soon arose over some of the approaches key stances.

According to Chant and Guttman (2000), critics questioned the theoretical standpoints of WID, especially its women-centric inclination. Critics argued that women should not be looked at as a homogenous group and that attention should be paid to their cross-cutting differences. Ultimately, WID failed to consider women's social differentiation on account of ethnicity, age, social status and a variety of related factors that shape people's lives. Chant and Guttman (2000) argue that the failures and shortcomings of WID became building blocks for the paradigm that would eventually replace it. GAD projects first appeared in the 1980s and emphasized gender relations over a focus on improving women's status. Chant and Guttman (2000:9) argue, "although GAD has been interpreted in different ways by different stakeholders, its basic theoretical premise is that gender is a dynamic social construct". GAD theory, likewise claim gender to be shaped by various socio-cultural institutions and factors. It is also mediated by several socially constructed categories such as age, ethnicity, and class. GAD theory therefore differs radically from WID theory in that its main concerns are with the relations between the genders, and how those relationships affect gender inequality and the efficiency of development project. They further argue that current state of the field contradicts GAD theory. They point out that according to GAD theory, a unilateral focus on women both deprives gender interventions of their potential for positive change and go against GAD's theoretical standpoint. They further argue that planning for change in women's gender relations irrefutably entails changes for men's lives. Consequently, Chant and Guttman (2000:9) argue that, "GAD approaches call for 'gender relations' (rather than women)

to be adopted as the primary analytical tenet, and for the integration of a gender perspective in all development activities, and at all levels of the development planning process.”

3.2 Directions and Goals in Gendered Development

GAD has for a while now been in a state of flux, mainly stemming from the unreliability and inconsistent use of the concept of gender. According to Cornwall (2007), in the practical development sphere, gender has been radically altered from its original form. It has become a concept stripped of its political and analytical bite and domesticated by development agencies. It's easy to see how the discipline is slightly unstable, as it is being forced to re-evaluate its main concept. At the very least, it can't be said that the discipline is in denial, as there has been no shortage of reflexive work in the last decade (see for example; Cornwall & Eade, 2010; Cornwall, 2007; Smyth, 2010). In general, the discourse revolves around a need to restructure gender, as the current discourse is very confusing (Smyth, 2010; Cornwall, 2007). Eade (2010) argues that gender has become a victim of the Humpty Dumpty Syndrome or that the word has lost all of its meaning, and is being used without reference. Gender, as a concept, has therefore developed to be at the mercy of those who use it. Eade furthermore argues that the development vocabulary is shaped by bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies. According to Eade (2010) and Smyth (2010), gender has come to represent a handful of meanings, dependent on context and user and in turn many have argued that it no longer remains as critical and valuable as it was originally meant to be (Cornwall, 2007; Eade, 2010).

According to Francis Cleaver (2002) GAD has, and still mainly focuses on women. Cleaver points out that feminist scholars founded and proved the need to look at gender as a cornerstone in all development action. Therefore it remains that talk of gender often provokes or simply implies talk of women. The field has, however, grown a lot since it's early days and with new times come new points of emphasis. Men's gendered issues have been on the fringe for a while and the knowledge accumulated is nowhere near what has been gathered on women's gendered issues. Hence, there has been much debate within the gendered development sphere, by practitioners and scholars alike to direct more attention to the subject of masculinities and men as gendered beings in the same manner as has been done to women

(Kimmel, 2002; Cleaver, 2002; Chant & Guttman, 2000). This has invoked a debate over what can be gained and what could be lost by steering attention—and more importantly—funds towards projects that don't directly focus on women. The discourse of this debate centers around two opposing views. One argues that GAD is essentially a field that should only concern women and the inclusion of masculinities is non-beneficial. The other argues that in theory GAD is gender-orientated and the implementation of masculinities within the field both furthers the status of women and confronts harmful gendered issues in men's lives. The argument isn't black and white and these arguments are not mutually exclusive on every level. I will try and expand on these arguments, showing how both sides have very valid points by exploring the case for and against involving men in GAD (Cleaver, 2002). The optimal results of involving men in GAD, according to Chant and Guttman (2000:40), are of course the furthering of “the feminist goal of equality”.

3.3 Implications for involving men

As discussed throughout this essay, men's lived realities are constantly changing. Changes in the economy, in household and social structures, and other parts of life are resulting in what has been called ‘the crisis of masculinity’. This crisis centers on the fact that many men have become unable to live up to their traditional gender roles and don't have access to alternative models of masculinity. This is perhaps best represented by cases of men who are unable to attain employment, and consequently may experience themselves as ‘demasculinized’ because their core identity has been challenged (Cleaver, 2002). The ‘crisis of masculinity’ is in essence connected to what has been dubbed the ‘fragility of masculine identity’. Cleaver (2000) argues that masculinities desperately need to be reconstructed, in light of their flawed nature. Messages of what it means to be a man are limiting men's potential, and in turn, women's potentials are also being limited. The empowerment of women does not go hand in hand with the disempowerment of men. It is a bleak reality where people are socialized into a limited life where their potentials are seriously restrained by a fabricated social construct (Thompson, 2002; Cleaver, 2002). There is a dire need to include men's perspective in gendered development projects. Ignoring masculinities both requires ignoring the gendered realities of half the population, and perhaps more importantly, has potential drawbacks for women. According to Odame (2002) “it is

widely acknowledged that gender-blind approaches to rural development made women invisible despite their significant contributions...” (Odame, 2002:138). She further argues that a similar predicament has arisen within GAD. Men have been excluded and made invisible in important circumstances (Odame, 2002).

Cornwall and White (2000) point out the implications of involving men in GAD, and argue that the question of who actually gains from it is an essential one. They argue that certain risks might emerge if an increased focus on masculinities were to arise within GAD, such as an allocation of already scarce funds away from women and towards men, potentially harming women’s position within GAD. Alternatively, they argue that the inclusion of men might be beneficial to women and the overall development agenda. There is also the subject of whose issue men and masculinities are. There are different stands on this vital question, but they point out that some have argued that men and masculinities are primarily men’s issues, while others argue for an all-inclusive GAD, encompassing men for the overall betterment of gender equality and overall development efforts. Last but not least, a focus on men and masculinities is needed to engage men within development organizations and political movements to advocate for gender issues, as these issues have a tendency to be overlooked in male dominant organizations (Cornwall & White, 2000).

4 The Case for Involving Men

4.1 Overview

Francis Cleaver (2002) among others (Hendra, FitzGerald, & Seymour, 2013; Connell, 2005; White, 1997; Cornwall, 2000) argue that men and masculinities have been missing from GAD policy and research. As previously mentioned, the shift from WID to GAD promoted a widened focus not only on women but also on men, masculinities, class, age, and other factors that are now recognized to be important analytical categories for human development. Men have been often automatically equated with power. However statements that claim men should give up power in order to empower women are in many ways flawed according to Cornwall and White (2000), at least in a GAD setting. Equating men with power “masks the complexity of social relations in which different dynamics of inclusion and exclusion are mutually imbricated” (Cornwall & White, 2000). There are a few cases for implementing men into GAD. One is that involving men will benefit women and while there is general consensus on this, many other reasons are just as important to acknowledge. The rest of this thesis will focus on the details of how an increased focus on men can impact various GAD projects (Cleaver, 2002).

Women have been traditionally depicted as the victims of gender inequality, and whilst that is entirely true, it does not mean that men aren't affected by an unjust gender structure. Gender equality and social justice approaches see gender as more than an effective method towards social development. Instead they acknowledge that both men and women can be affected and deserve a life free from poverty and oppression caused by gendered social structures (Cleaver, 2002). Batliwala (1994, in Cleaver, 2002) proposes that women as well as men can be empowered to become free of the oppressing forces of gender stereotyping. Consequently, gender equality doesn't have to involve winners and losers. The social justice approach hence claims that both men and women can be empowered to improve the lives of themselves and their families, without disempowering the other one (Cleaver, 2002). There is also a vast literature (see Chant & Guttman, 2000 and Conell, 2000, for example) that points to the importance of recognizing men's—as well as women's—changing status in a modernized world.

Chant and Guttman (2000) argue that women are still bear a disproportionate share of material, social, and civil burden around the world. Relatively recent trends

have, however, shown a rise in men's vulnerabilities due to changing gender roles. There is a growing body of evidence showing that in many countries, boys are now falling behind girls in education and have a harder time than their female counterparts in securing employment (Chant & Guttman, 2000). On a global scale, women are adversely affected by gender inequality. Nevertheless, in many localities, men are severely affected by gendered social roles and often more so than women. Men are in many cases much more likely to suffer ill health, commit suicide, and have various accidents. Men's gender roles, their masculinities, often play an integral part in their unfortunate fate. HIV infections are an excellent example of men's gendered vulnerabilities. Transmission of AIDS is spreading much faster globally among men than women. This is mostly due to men being around 80% of today's 6-7 million injecting drug users but also because of homophobia. While most AIDS transmissions stem from heterosexual men, same-sex sex between men is so frowned upon in some places that homosexual men have less access than others to healthcare initiatives. Ignoring the effect gender and gender relations have on men won't do any good, it might provoke the exact opposite. When men face troubles such as lack of employment, they're more prone to violent behavior, both towards men and women (Cleaver, 2002; Chant & Guttman, 2002).

I believe the case for involving men has enough merit without mentioning the positive effects a mobilization of supportive masculinities could have on women's lives. However, there's no reason not to mention it in this context, as I'll argue it's one of the leading reasons for involving men in gendered development projects. According to Francis Cleaver, *strategic gender partnerships* are a remarkably valuable tool for progress in development. More can be achieved for all genders if cooperation rather than competition is a fundamental perspective. It is essential that men do not become obstacles, as much can be achieved with their cooperation. If gender inequality is to be abolished, men are needed to step up in a few arenas of their personal and professional lives. This, and all the other arguments made in this chapter, will be discussed further in sub-chapters that focus on ethnographic data from gendered development research (Cleaver, 2002).

4.2 Men as Allies

In this sub-chapter I will mainly discuss the potential that an increased attention on men and masculinities has for women and gender equality. According to Chant and Guttman (2000) the dichotomous categories of men as ‘bad’ and women as ‘good’ are results of gender stereotyping and solely connecting ‘gender’ to women. They argue that this view is fundamentally harmful to the advancement of gender equality. They view the aforementioned discourse as a problem as it has tended to deny men the chance to challenge their social systems. At the same time women are routinely portrayed as a ‘vulnerable group’, universally oppressed by their male counterparts. This view is problematic for a few reasons. Chant and Guttman (2000) argue that the exclusion of men in gender projects has severe consequences for women on several levels, and imposes excessive burdens on them that arguably need to be shared by men as well.

Francis Cleaver (2002) and Chant and Guttman (2000) agree that the exclusion of men in GAD can lead to excessive labor burdens for women. An over-emphasis on women in GAD projects has shown men to steer even further away from their care-giving responsibilities. They further argue that neo-liberal market orientated policy frameworks that target women and prioritize efficiency first and foremost have especially led to over-working women involved with said projects. Another important point mentioned by Chant and Guttman (2000) is that the alienation of men can lead them to develop hostile attitudes toward female-centric projects, potentially retaliating as a protest. They also argue that the exclusion of men in gendered development project can lead to a variety of other unpredictable outcomes. Chant and Guttman (2000) point to analysis of women’s income generating projects in Kenya, Greece, and Honduras to their support. Analysis of said projects showed that projects trying to improve women’s access to income in conditions where men had difficulties being breadwinners did not lead to positive results. They argue that “men facing pressures of long-term employment insecurity would respond to what they regarded as ‘threats’ posed by improvements in women’s economic status by taking over projects, controlling the income women derived from them, and/or, as a further backlash increasing their authority and control within the home” (Chant and Guttman, 2000:25). They raise the question of whether these backlashes from men stem from the fact that men are excluded from said projects or whether general anxieties over the

fragility of their conditions are to blame. They find it likely that both factors play a part in these unfortunate events (Chant & Guttman, 2000).

According to Hendra, FitzGerald, and Seymour (2013), men and boys are required to play a vital role if unequal gendered power relations are to be transformed and gender equality achieved. They argue that men and boys “remain an untapped resource for the pursuit of gender equality” (Hendra, FitzGerald, & Seymour, 2013:112). They do add that there is no evidence that gender equality can not be achieved without the support of boys and men, but that their involvement is desirable. Chant & Guttman (2000) likewise state that not involving men imposes an unjust burden on women in general. They further argue that various initiatives aimed at improving women’s conditions are severely limited by women’s inability to exercise the knowledge they gained due to resistance from men. They argue that including men in initiatives such as workshops on rights, self-esteem, and various other empowering projects might make them more understanding and sympathetic to women’s issues. Furthermore Chant and Guttman point to a 1996 poverty-alleviation programme in Costa Rica, where women who were offered a spot in the programme asked if men could also be included. They argue that placing all the responsibility on the ‘victims’ is unjust and can impose a responsibility they are unable to fulfil. Women still have to deal with the patriarchal structure of society both in the private and personal arena as well as deal with desensitised men. Hendra, FitzGerald, and Seymour (2013) point to unpaid care work as a potential field of emphasis to target men more actively.

On a global scale, women and girls perform substantially more unpaid work than their counterparts. Hendra, FitzGerald, and Seymour (2013) argue that there are various socio-cultural factors that pressure girls and women to assume unpaid positions, especially in the domestic sphere. Rosaldo’s (1974) theory on the gendering of the private vs. public spheres, discussed in the first chapter, has considerable explanatory power here. Ortner’s (1974) nature vs. culture gendered symbolism is also a valuable tool to understand women’s subordination and their connection to unpaid work in the modern world. Hendra, FitzGerald, and Seymour (2013) argue that gender socialization that depicts women as naturally better suited as domestic care workers and men as breadwinners, better suited for work outside the home. They furthermore point out that public policies must not reinforce the aforementioned

gender stereotypes. Instead they argue that men must be engaged in order for women to have the agency to achieve their potentials. The incentive to engage men to participate in unpaid care work is however not only beneficial for women. According to Hendra, FitzGerald, and Seymour (2013), if men embrace more progressive conceptions of masculinity and support women's paid economic activity, then there's great potential for poverty reduction, economic growth and more equitable development initiatives. According to Connell (2005) the global power dynamic between men and women calls for men and boys to be implemented if positive change is to be achieved.

Connell (2005) argues that the gender reforms and initiatives implemented to challenge gender inequality are constructed in such ways that men are the 'gatekeepers' to success. She further argues that the gender inequalities in political power, cultural authority, and economic assets mean that men have control over the resources needed to implement said projects and initiatives. Connell also points out that the power often belongs to specific groups of men (see 'hegemonic masculinity, chapter 2.2). Connell (2005) further points out that many historic advances by women's rights activists have been won with active cooperation from men who held positions of political or organizational power. She points to successful equal employment opportunity reforms in New South Wales, Australia that received strong support from influential men in the public sector. She notes that sometimes men largely organize these reforms and points to NOMAS, U.S. National Organization of Men against Sexism who have been active for over twenty years. She does however point out that these organizations, although widespread, are mostly small-scale operations.

4.3 Men's Gendered Vulnerabilities

In this sub-chapter my argument shifts a little, as I will no longer be focusing primarily on the benefits of targeting men as gendered beings for the benefit of women and gender equality overall, rather the benefit men themselves stand to gain. Many have argued that a focus on masculinities and men as gendered beings is very beneficial to women, as noted in the above chapter. Most of those scholars also point out that within a human rights approach, there's enough merit to warrant more attention to men's gendered vulnerabilities (Cleaver, 2002; Chant & Guttman, 2000). According to Connell (2005) men are often collectively portrayed as having a stake in upholding gender relations as they are today. For example, she points to the UN Development Program's inclusion of the "gender-related development index" and the "gender empowerment measure." She further argues that this way of looking at inequality might hide as much as it reveals. Connell points to the substructure of gender to prove her point, and concludes, "if we look separately at each of the substructures of gender, we find a pattern of advantages for men but also a linked pattern of disadvantages or toxicity" (Connell, 2005:1808). There is considerable evidence that the gendered development discourse is not entirely based on hard facts (Chant & Guttman, 2000; Cornwall & Eade, 2010; Smyth, 2010).

Chant and Guttman (2000) point to an often-unjust treatment of men in GAD policy, and argue that gender as an area of research should include men and the studies of masculinity, as well as women and feminist studies. They do, however, also point out that perhaps the inclusion of men is not called for until greater effort has been given to women's agenda, as "it could be argued that men remain a privileged group in this area" (Chant and Guttman, 2000:27). There is on the other hand plenty of research that suggests, as mentioned in the previous sub-chapter, that the inclusion of men is beneficial for all. I will nevertheless point to works by Connell (2005), Cleaver (2002) and Chant and Guttman (2000) that suggest men and masculinities deserve attention on their own basis, as masculinities research is to say the least, far behind feminist research. I'll point to Whitehead (2000), who claims that men's work has been severely misrepresented within development.

GAD agenda men have often been seen as obstacles—or even in the extreme cases as enemies (Chant & Guttman, 2000; Cornwall, 1997). A topic that has been popular in the last decade or so is men's work, which, according to Whitehead (2000),

is often incorrectly estimated. There are of course other examples and this argument is dependent on localities. Since the 1970s there has been a great deal of action within the feminist movement promoting women's role in the economy. Starting with Ester Boserup's revolutionary book *Women's Role in Economic Development* (1970), a need to include women in development was realized. Previously ignored by a male-dominated development paradigm, women's issues were finally given some attention (Chant & Guttman, 2000; Escobar, 1995). Ann Whitehead (2000) argues that this has brought some undeserved backlash for men, specifically rural African men.

Whitehead further argues that African people had to endure being demonized and misrepresented by colonial powers for a long time and the effects of this intense racism are still very visible. The colonial discourse on African men's work revolved around their laziness and poor work ethic. Colonial powers were, to say the least, not very understanding. Their understanding of work obviously differed from definitions of work in the colonies, being different cultures with different social constructs. Colonial powers were not known for their understanding of indigenous cultures, and men's work is a prime example of how an ethnocentric outlook produces biased information. Whitehead argues that this produced an image of 'the lazy African,' a stereotype that depicts Africans as a somewhat homogenous group of people with little or no willingness to succeed in life. She also points out that this couldn't be further from the truth, and that the stereotype was born out of ethnocentric assumptions and perhaps more importantly, a resistance to be abused by European settlers looking to exploit Africans as a cheap labor force. The Lamba people of South Africa were subjected to derogatory stereotypes and the discourse still lingers in their identity and in how the public discourse surrounds them. According to Whitehead, they were forced out of their land, and attempts were made to exploit them as a cheap labor force in unsafe copper mines. They refused to work because of the unsafe working conditions, and presumably because there had been large-scale evictions designed to coerce the indigenous people into working for Europeans. Whitehead argues that the racist colonial discourse still lingers in some feminist activity that strives to promote women's role. This is problematic as it produces and even maintains an image of rural African men as "at best underemployed and at worst selfish wastrels" (Whitehead, 2000).

Combined with the lingering stereotype of the 'Lazy African', incorrect measurements of time-use data form the basis of how men's work has now come to be misrepresented. According to Whitehead (2000), there had been a lot of lobbying within the feminist sphere to make women's work more visible. As an outcome of the 1995 Beijing conference, there was a shift towards a new work measurement tool, known as *time-use auditing*. Whitehead furthermore argues that while there was an absolute need to consider women's activities that were previously considered non-work, as work, the way it was done was flawed. She goes on to conclude that time-use auditing presented an incomplete image of both men's and women's work. While it was in theory meant to provide an objective representation of work, it left the power in the hands of the researcher. Assessing what constitutes work and what doesn't remained a challenge. Problems arose, such as counting all time spent on childcare as work. Whitehead maintains that although childcare is undeniably hard work, it's hard to constitute all childcare as work. Some of it must be simply for pleasure. This may seem trivial, but when put in context it's easy to see why there is a need to get these facts right. Child-care often overlaps with other work, and in an effort to compensate for the extra work involved in multi-tasking something had to be done. When someone is imposed with double (or triple and so on) work burden time is counted double, and hence the day extends to 24 plus hours. Whitehead argues that creating a category that doesn't exist, such as the 28-hour workday, is perhaps not the most efficient way to measure work burden (Whitehead, 2000). Connell (2005) remarks that there has recently been an upsurge in masculinity research, but she had previously claimed that there was a need for just that (Connell, 2000). Connell (2005:1806) nevertheless points out that the subject of gender is undeniably dominated by concerns for women and she argues that this makes it "difficult to raise issues about men's and boys' interests, problems, or differences."

Chant and Guttman (2000) agree with Connell (2005) that there is a need to restructure masculinities, as current forms have an undeniably negative effect on the majority of people. According to Chant and Guttman (2000), there are two sides to masculinity. One favours men over women, but at the cost of increased risk and vulnerability in health, education, well-being and other factors. Foreman (1999) discusses the two sides of masculinity and argues that with the privileges associated with masculinity, which are denied to women, come certain burdens. According to

Foreman, men are more vulnerable to various health risks, especially sexually transmitted diseases. He points out that “many men [are] having sex and refusing condoms because they are conditioned to do so, rather than because they want to” (Foreman, 1999:14). Cleaver (2002) points to the area of health as men’s primary gendered vulnerability. He argues that men are in greater risk of suicide as a result of mental health problems, and points to Sub-Saharan Africa as an example. There, young boys are at the greatest risk of *schistosomiasis* due to their gendered positions. He likewise points to South Asia, where the gendered division of labor results in men and boys being much more likely to be exposed to dangerous chemicals than women and girls. Chant and Guttman (2000) conclude their argument by pointing out that male-inclusive gender and development is not solely about involving men at the grassroots, but also at an institutional level. According to them, the inclusion of men at an institutional level could lead to more ‘gender-sensitive’ men at the grassroots level. They further argue that men are more likely to listen to other men, and that implementing men at the operational level alongside women could lead to a positive change. Chant and Guttman claim that the benefits are two-sided. For one, they argue that encompassing men on an operational level could lead to greater resources being allocated to the GAD project and a more sustained effort to keep it going. Chant and Guttman also point out the positive effects that can be seen on the grassroots level if men are included. They argue that men tend to listen to men more than they do women, and this is important because men at the grassroots level can further influence others and spread the word on gender equality.

4.4 The case against involving men

It's important to note that the central debate of this dissertation, whether an increased focus on masculinities and men as gendered beings is warranted is centred within GAD. GAD is pretty much the only relevant field for this debate, but it's important to have that point well defined, as this discussion could otherwise easily be misunderstood. White and Cornwall (2000) argue that there's some tension within GAD between the need to include men and the need to focus on women. I maintain throughout this thesis that there is a definite need to focus on men as gendered beings, both for their own good as well as others. However, it remains a question whether including men as subjects of GAD could negatively affect women (Cornwall & White, 2000). There's always need to highlight gender relations in development projects. Research has shown that if no such focus exists, development projects tend to strengthen local structures of power that most often favour men over women. In fact, Chant and Guttman (2000:19) argue that "if women are not targeted specifically it is questionable how they might fare in respect of access to any development expenditure at all." Chant and Guttman further point out that although they argue for a male-inclusive approach, the reasons for excluding men in the process must be examined. They argue, "...the priority accorded to women's needs and interests in GAD is justified by the fact that because 'gender relations almost universally favour men and disadvantage women, explicit and on-going recognition of women's subordinate position in the gender hierarchy is necessary'" (Chant and Guttman, 2000:9). 'Gender' has repeatedly been interpreted as 'women', that is, 'gender projects' as women's projects, and this has caused many to criticize the state of the field. Many have however claimed a move back to some WID values is needed and that an implementation of men into GAD will simply move women's interests even further down the line. The questions of how men and masculinities could be included is one that deserves more research than there currently exists (Cleaver, 2002; Chant & Guttman, 2000).

According to Cornwall and White (2000), the potential inclusion of men and masculinities produces a few problems, mainly on how this process can be done effectively. Therefore, the inclusion of men in the GAD sphere should not be taken lightly, for the consequences might be severe. It's also important to note that men aren't exactly excluded, as GAD projects have to encompass local circumstances and

more often than not projects that focus on women, such as women's groups, also encompass men up to a certain extent. Therein lies the problem, "simply 'inviting men in' without engaging with some of the concerns that they have, as men, might not provide a very inviting prospect to anyone but the most ardent pro-feminist" (Cornwall & White, 2000).

Ruth Pearson (within Cornwall & White, 2000) argues that in order to 'bring men in' there must be political commitment amongst men to challenge gendered power relations. A focus on men in development projects has also shown that there is a possibility that women can be disempowered at the cost of men. A focus strictly on men is therefore not advised and rather a focus on gender relations, which as previously mentioned is in fact GAD's theoretical standpoint (Figueroa within Cornwall & White, 2000). White (2000) argued 14 years ago that it was time the transition from 'women in development' to 'gender and development' is completed. She does however retain the right to hold that transition to certain terms, as she argues that there's nothing that guarantees success if men are implemented without proper thought. She argues that there are a few concerns over implementing men into GAD. According to White, the debate over including men reveals some of the faults in GAD theorising. She argues that the shift from WID to GAD was supposed to signal a move away from treating women as a natural group based on their sex. She further points out, in great detail, that a focus on men takes sway from the aforementioned move from WID to GAD, as it places focus away from important values that are to be looked at alongside gender, such as ethnicity, age and social status and emphasises a move back to looking primarily at sex. White (2000) furthermore points out that there is also considerable risk of men stealing attention and resources from a field that was at the time of its construction a massive breakthrough for women's issues in development. White (2000) concludes her argument by pointing out that encompassing men in GAD work has great potential for advancement of the field and its clients, though it is not a move to be taken lightly.

Conclusion

In this thesis I have discussed whether or not an increased focus on masculinities and men as gendered beings is beneficial for international development as well as the fight for gender equality. I have looked at the implications for both women and men, as the two groups do not necessarily share the same values. It's arguably even a stretch to assume that women or men as an analytical group share the same general interests and needs. The whole argument is primarily situated within gender and development, an international development sub-field that focuses on gender. It's obvious that on a global scale, women's gendered vulnerabilities are more severe than those of men. For a long time, women's issues received little to no attention in anthropology and academia in general. There was, however, a massive shift in the early 1970s, with theories about women's subordinated status and gender relations entering the spotlight. Quite a few anthropological theories on that matter appeared in the early 1970s. Michelle Rosaldo's public vs. private theory explains women's subordinate status in that society places women in the "domestic" sphere and men in an opposing extra-domestic or "public" sphere, where power is more accessible. Sherry Ortner seeks to explain women's subordination by symbolically connecting women with nature and men with culture. Around that time the Women in Development movement began to take shape. Before WID entered the scene, women's issues were of little importance in development thought. WID evolved into gender and development, as it had not been as successful a project as was originally hoped for.

The transition involved a theoretical change, where women were no longer considered a homogenous group with the same needs and interest. The focus was meant to be on gender relations, as well as encompass the crosscutting differences of people. This involved a change from looking at women as one analytical group with the same needs, to a broader view that respects the different and often complex needs of women based on their various positions in life, such as age, ethnicity, and social status. GAD emerged as the sub-field within international development that focuses on gender relations. In the last years a debate over whether an increased focus on men as gendered beings and masculinities should be adapted. In theory, men should not be excluded from GAD, and many voices have emerged that argue an increased focus on men within GAD is well-deserved.

I look at the argument of including men in GAD from both the standpoint of how it can affect men and how it can affect women. Francis Cleaver argues that the inclusion of men in GAD thought can have positive effects on women through strategic gender partnerships. The inclusion of men in GAD is argued by many to have great potential, both on an institutional level as well as on the grassroots level. Men are arguably more likely to listen to other men, and on an institutional level the inclusion of men in GAD can potentially lead to an increase in gender-sensitive men on the grassroots level. More gender-sensitive men on the grassroots level are furthermore believed to have great potential for a positive change in gender equality. R.W. Connell argues that men are the 'gatekeepers' to gender equality. Men are far more likely to hold positions of power and consequently often have the influence to either make positive changes or stand in the way of them. There are further benefits, as the inclusion of men on an operational level could potentially mean increased funding as well as increased attention for the discipline. Viewing men as gendered beings further offers a viewpoint that has historically been ignored. Although women's gendered vulnerabilities are believed to far outnumber those of men's, a close look at men's gendered lives suggests that many men suffer greatly due to their gender. Work and health are two areas where men are believed to be excessively vulnerable. Those two are of course often connected, as men's socially acceptable work often leads to health risks. I've argued that with the numerous benefits granted to the masculine identities most men subscribe to come various side effects. The good news is that an increased focus on men's gendered lives has been argued to further the overall state of GAD and lead to positive changes not only in the lives of men, but women as well. The inclusion of men in gender-focused development projects is believed to lead to a decrease in overburdening women with work. Furthermore, an active move away from traditional gender socialization that depicts men as breadwinners and women as naturally better suited to take care of the domestic activities can only be made possible with the help of both men and women. I hence argue that the inclusion of men in GAD is detrimental for gender equality. I don't take that stance lightly, as there is much to be lost if that move goes sideways.

It is essential to consider how implementing men in GAD work and policy can affect the work being done to improve women's lives. The field was founded by feminist development practitioners who saw a need to focus explicitly on women's

needs, which had previously received little to no attention. A move away from a women-only focus has hence raised some concerns. There is also a need to consider the risk that the field might be taken over by men. An increased focus on men's gendered lives is therefore something that must not be taken lightly. Many have however argued that the implementation of men in GAD policy is right in line with its theoretical standpoint, that an emphasis on the mechanisms of gender relations be put the forefront.

Bibliography

- White, S. C. (2000). 'Did the Earth Move?' The Hazards of Bringing Men and Masculinities into Gender and Development. *IDS Bulletin* , 31, 33-41.
- White, S. C. (1997). Men, masculinities, and the politics of development. *Gender and Development* , 14-22.
- Whitehead, A. (2000). Continuities and Discontinuities in Political Constructions of the Working Man in Rural Sub-Saharan Africa: The 'Lazy' Man in African Agriculture. *European Journal of Development Research* , 23-52.
- Udry, J. R. (1994). The Nature of Gender. *Demography* , 651-573.
- Adair, M. (1992). Will the Real Men's Movement Please Stand Up. In K. L. Hagan, *Women Respond to the Men's Movement* (pp. 55-68). New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Der Spiegel. (2013, August 26). "Third Gender" Official in Germany from November. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/third-gender-option-to-become-available-on-german-birth-certificates-a-916940.html>
- Chant, S. (2007). Dangerous Equations? how Female-headed Households Became the Poorest of the Poor: Causes Consequences and Cautions. In A. Cornwall, E. Harrison, & A. Whitehead, *Feminisms in Development: Contradictions, Contestations & Challenges* (pp. 35-47). London: Zed Books.
- Chant, S., & Guttman, M. C. (2002). 'Men-streaming' gender? Questions for gender and development policy in the twenty-first century. *Progress in Development Studies* , 269-282.
- Chant, S., & Guttman, M. (2000). *Mainstreaming Men into Gender and Development: Debates, reflections, and experiences*. Retrieved from <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/mainstreaming-men-into-gender-and-development-debates-reflections-and-experienc-121166>
- Cleaver, F. (2002). Men and Masculinities: New Directions in Gender and Development. In F. Cleaver, *Masculinities Matter* (pp. 1-27). New York: Zed Books.
- Connell, R. (2000). *The Men And The Boys*. Los Angeles: University of california Press.

- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 829-859.
- Connell, R. (2005). Change among the Gatekeepers: Men, Masculinities, and Gender Equality in the Global Arena. *Signs*, 1801-1825.
- Conti, J. A., & O'Neil, M. (2007). Studying Power: Qualitative methods and the global elite. *Qualitative Research*, 63-82.
- Cornwall, A. (1998). Gender, participation and the politics of difference. In I. Gujit, & M. K. Shah, *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development* (pp. 46-57). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Cornwall, A. (1997). Men, masculinity and 'gender in development'. *Gender and Development*, 8-13.
- Cornwall, A. (2000). Missing Men? Reflections on Men, Masculinities and Gender in GAD. *IDS Bulletin*, 18-27.
- Cornwall, A. (2007). Revisiting the 'Gender Agenda'. *IDS Bulletin*, 38 (2), 69-78.
- Cornwall, A., & White, S. C. (2000). Men, Masculinities and Development: Politics, Policies and Practice. *IDS Bulletin*, 1-6.
- Cornwall, A., & Eade, D. (2010). *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*. Bourton on Dunsmore: Practical Action Publishing.
- Eade, D. (2010). Preface. In A. Cornwall, & D. Eade, *Deconstructing Development: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (pp. Vii-X). Bourton on Dunsmore: Practical Action Publishing.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making And Unmaking Of The Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Farmer, P. (2004). An Anthropology of Structural Violence. *Current Anthropology*, 305-325.
- Foreman, M. (1999). *AIDS and Men: Taking Risks or Taking Responsibility?* London: Zed Books.
- Haig, D. (2004). The inexorable rise of gender and the decline of sex: social change in academic titles, 1945-2001. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 87-96.
- Hendra, J., FitzGerald, I., & Seymour, D. (2013). Towards a New Transformative Development Agenda: The Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality. *Journal of International Affairs*, 105-122.

- Herd, G. (1996). *Third Sex, Third Gender - Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. New York: Zone Books.
- Jackson, C. (2002). Disciplining Gender? *World Development* , 497-509.
- Kimmel, M. (2002). Foreword. In F. Cleaver, *Masculinities Matter* (pp. xi-xiv). New York: Zed Books.
- Lorber, J., & Farrel, S. A. (1991). Preface. In *The Social Construction of Gender* (pp. 1-7). London: Sage Publications.
- Moore, H. L. (1988). *Feminism and Anthropology*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Odame, H. H. (2002). Men in Women's Groups: a Gender and Agency Analysis of Local Institutions. In F. Cleaver, *Masculinities Matter! Men, Gender and Development* (pp. 138-163). London: Zed Books.
- Oca, J. M. (2012). Deconstructing Men & Masculinities (review). *Histoire sociale/Social history* , 421-423.
- Ortner, S. B. (1974). Is Female to Male as nature Is to Culture? In M. Z. Rosaldo, & L. Lamphere, *Woman, Culture, and Society* (pp. 67-87). Stanford University Press.
- Pieterse, J. N. (2010). *Development Theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ramet, S. P. (1996). *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures*. London: Routledge.
- Rist, G. (1997). *The History of Development: from Western Origins to Global Faith*. London: Zed Books.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. (1974). Women, Culture and Society: A Theoretical Overview. In M. Z. Rosaldo, & L. Lamphere, *Women, Culture and Society* (pp. 17-42). Stanford University Press.
- Smyth, I. (2010). Talking of gender: words and meanings in development organisations. In A. Cornwall, & D. Eade, *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (pp. 143-152). Bourton on Dunsmore: Practical Action Publishing.
- Thompson, M. (2002). Boys will be Boys: Addressing the Social Construction of Gender. In F. Cleaver, *Masculinities Matter!* (pp. 166-185). London: Zed Books.