MACHO MACHO MAN:
MASCULINITY IN LATIN AMERICA
AND THE QUEST FOR GENDER EQUALITY

By
Kimberley Byers

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
a Master of Arts degree
in International Development Studies

Saint Mary's University,
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Submitted: November 2010

Approved:	Dr. Theresa Ulicki
	Supervisor
Approved:	Dr. S. Ryan Isakson
	Reader
Approved:	Dr. Anupam Pandey
	External Examiner

Date: November 12, 2010

Library and Archives
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

NOTICE:

AVIS:

Canada

ABSTRACT

Macho Macho Man: Masculinity in Latin America and the Quest for Gender Equality

by Kimberley Byers

The thesis argues the gender and development (GAD) approach neglects a very important consideration, namely, that women's subordinated position in society cannot be solved solely *through* women, but rather must be done cohesively with both women and men acting as partners to attain gender equality. The common connection between Latin American men and machismo does not reflect the full breadth of male identities and impacts how men are engaged in the gender and development process. In order for GAD to remain viable, it needs to consider the experiences and voices of men. The thesis examines Program H in Brazil, Salud y Genero in Mexico, and Cantera and the Association of Men Against Violence in Nicaragua. The benefit of focusing on how to engage men, rather than to exclude them, is to identify and develop best practices for future efforts to increase the likelihood of achieving sustained gender equality.

Submitted: November 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

> With a few notable exceptions, men are rarely explicitly mentioned in gender policy
> documents. Where men do appear, they are generally seen as obstacles to women's
> development: men must surrender their positions of dominance for women to become
> empowered. The superiority of women as hard working, reliable, trustworthy, socially
> responsible, caring and cooperative is often asserted; whilst men on the other hand are
> frequently portrayed as lazy, violent, promiscuous and irresponsible drunkards, (Cleaver
> in Bannon & Correia, 2006, p. xvii).

INTRODUCTION: GENDER AND THE QUEST FOR EQUALITY

The field of gender and development contains a broad range of research, analysis
and political strategies that have evolved over the past 40 years in development thinking.
Within the field are several key theoretical frameworks that have shaped gendered
thinking since its inception in development in the early 1970s, such as women in
development (WID) to the present day gender and development (GAD) approach.
Although both approaches have often been seen as one in the same in practice, they differ
in theoretical focus. The shift in focus from women to gender arose from a concern with
women's disadvantage in development practice that could not be overcome through
focusing solely on women (Chant & Gutmann, 2000). Yet, as recent research indicates,
even though GAD has been innovative in theory it has not successfully translated into
practice. Some cite the synonymous use of gender with women as undermining the
objectives of the GAD approach thus leading to the marginalization of the entire gender
and development field. To counter this, it is believed the inclusion of men alongside the
current focus on women can reinvigorate the concept by engaging in a true understanding
of gender in the development arena. It is within this debate that I am most concerned. In

particular, I aim to address the portrayals of men in GAD and the quest to achieve gender equality in Latin America.

Looking in particular at men in Latin America, it will be shown that they are largely under-examined from a men-as-men perspective, and instead are looked at only in-so-far as they impact women's lives. The result is that Latin American men tend to be represented as a homogenous group that are usually linked to traditional negative stereotypes such as machismo. The failure of portraying Latin American men in this way is that it neglects serious consideration of the lived experiences of men and leaves an entire half of the gender equation little understood and engaged in gender equality endeavours. Such representations are prevalent in GAD literature despite the fact that GAD's core objective resides in understanding gender relations. This is disappointing given that GAD has gained support and credibility in the development world because it advocated a shift from focusing solely on women in order to understand the greater issues impacting gender equality. It was thought the shift to GAD would bring much needed focus on the concept of gender and how relations with men are socially constructed.

Given that GAD is not actively engaged in studying men as gendered beings, it is increasingly apparent that the change in focus has been in theory only, thus pointing to the growing gap between GAD theory and practice. As the thesis will demonstrate, dominant portrayals of men speak to a larger issue in GAD, namely the problems which arise when attempting to translate the theory of GAD into practice. Andrea Cornwall et al (2007) speak to these problems by emphasizing the use of gender myths that bog down the attainment of GAD in practice. The representation of men in Latin America is one

such example of a gender myth that needs to be broken down and further understood. That said, it is not my intent to discredit the existence of such portrayals because like any myth, they are based on factual realities that are simply taken out of context and often simplified to a point where they lose their close connection with reality. In the case of machismo, many Latin American scholars criticize how it has been construed by mostly White Westerners and taken out of context to the point where Latin American men are seen in an overwhelmingly negative lens (Torres et al, 2002; Stephenson, 2003; Gutmann, 1996; Ramírez, 1999; Mirandé, 1998 & 1985; Baca Zinn, 1982). As a result, the past 25 years have seen an move toward rectifying this image of Latin American men by breaking down the traditional stereotypes and exploring what it really means to be a man in Latin America.

It remains that the exclusion of men goes against the very foundation of GAD, which states that men and women are affected by many factors that influence their behaviours (i.e. class, race, etc.). By excluding men, GAD policy and programmes neglect a very important consideration, namely, that women's subordinated position in society cannot be solved solely *through* women, but rather must be done cohesively with both women and men acting as equal partners to attain gender equality (Chant, 2000). Without this consideration, gender and development efforts in Latin America risk treating the symptoms and not the core issues that lead to women and men's disadvantaged position. Therefore, it is clear that men need to be part of the discussions about gender equality in order to gain a complete picture of the problems and solutions required to create a more equitable society.

I want to be clear that my intent is not to overshadow the very legitimate concerns facing women in development, as the barriers faced by them are well understood. Rather, my intent is to shed light on the other side of the equation because without it, gender equality will be a continuous battle against unexplored issues. Therefore, it is vital to understand what is happening with the men in Latin America and why are they excluded from the gender and development process. As this thesis will argue, men are excluded for a number of reasons – not the least of which is due to a preconceived notion of who men are. If GAD is to be considered a viable approach to the study of gender in development, it is necessary to consider the challenges facing both sexes and show how the incorporation of a truly gendered perspective can be beneficial to achieving gender equality. After all, gender is a relational concept. Women and men do not exist in isolation from each other, so the actions of one quite naturally impact the behaviours and experiences of the other. Overlooking this reality has already caused growing concern among gender and development scholars, and one could argue, is one of the reasons for GAD's marginalization in development practice. Therefore, it is clear that men need to be brought into discussions about gender equality in order to gain a complete picture of the problems and solutions required to create a more egalitarian society.

In addition to this introduction, the thesis consists of four major chapters. The second chapter presents the theoretical framework for the thesis. It briefly discusses the shift from women in development (WID) to gender and development (GAD) in order to show the evolution of gender in development and thus, the current debate surrounding the inclusion of men. More time is spent on GAD given it is the ultimate focus of my

research. Following this, I engage with the debate surrounding men and masculinities and whether or not men should be included in gender and development theory, policy and practice. I consider the literature surrounding men and masculinities and look particularly at hegemonic masculinity. As the chapter argues, GAD policies are falling behind GAD principles in respect to the idea that gender is something that affects both women and men. Moreover, men are largely ignored in practice and their experiences as gendered-beings are rarely considered.

The third chapter marks the beginning of my case study on men in Latin America. In this chapter, I examine the concept of machismo since it is a unique cultural stereotype attributed to the Latin American region. Contrary to popular belief, it is a complex concept that takes different forms depending on the region, class, culture, age, race, ethnicity, and even sex. It is also interpreted differently depending on whether one is talking from within or from outside the region (i.e. whether the writer is Latin American or not), which is an important consideration for development initiatives. While the existence of machismo as representing a certain set of behaviours and attitudes is recognized, it has come to be used as a sort of slang that connotes all things negative with Latin American men. Consequently, the concept of machismo can end up furthering the marginalization of Southern men and especially those of Latin American lineage (Howe, 2007). It is this potential misuse of the term that I caution against. Therefore, my goal is to show that Latin American men are not homogeneous and do not fit the stereotype uniformly nor identify with its tenants as a whole. In general, the chapter shows how

Latin American men are portrayed in the literature in order to draw parallels for how they are treated in mainstream gender and development initiatives.

Building on this research, my fourth chapter analyses four programs operating in three different countries in Latin America: Brazil - Program H; Mexico - Salud y Genero; and, Nicaragua – Cantera, and the Association of Men Against Violence (Asociación de Hombres Contra la Violencia - AHCV). Each organization works with men to challenge hegemonic perceptions of masculinity. Program H engages men to discuss masculinity and gender equitable behaviours, and also conducts major research on men and masculinities, gender-based violence and health promotion. Salud y Género focuses on improvements to health and quality of life through gender-related educational activities and works extensively to sensitize men about the negative consequences of violence (Keijzer et al, 2003). Cantera uses a popular education methodology to transform both women and men to embrace more egalitarian behaviours and attitudes. Finally, AHCV provides an example of how working with and understanding men-as-men can transform traditional ideas of manhood based on machismo. Each of these organizations have either formed as a result of grassroots women's demands, or have responded to societal realities that demand the inclusion of men. No matter which, all have realized that in order to positively increase the likelihood of achieving gender equality, it is necessary to have both women and men involved.

Chapter five connects everything together, addressing the lessons that can be drawn from the case studies back into the greater theoretical debate. Since the programs are working with men, they provide practical examples for how their engagement lends to

the core GAD objective of gender relations. To this end, I offer several recommendations

for how GAD can rejuvenate itself by getting back to its roots and engaging both women

and men in the gender equality process and also offer areas for future research.

A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

The research focuses on masculinity in Latin America in order to understand the

current debate raging within the gender and development field. I use the gender and

development (GAD) approach as the basis of my analysis because GAD advocates the

use of gender relations to achieve gender equality. Thus, theoretically, the involvement

of men as well as women is central to the success of GAD strategies (Chant & Gutmann,

2000). Since it is well documented about the exclusion of men from GAD programmes,

the intent was to show what it is about including them that produces increased gender

equality outcomes.

The decision to use multiple case studies by focusing on four different programs

in three countries was made for two reasons. First, the analysis of masculinity in three

different Latin American countries points to the differed experiences of men in the region

thus highlighting the weakness of categorising them in one uniform definition (i.e. via

machismo). As well, it strengthens the case for multiple masculinities by analysing as

many cases as possible. Although the four programmes are well-documented success

stories for including men, there has been little research on the connection between

cultural constructions of masculinity and the inclusion of men in gender and development

programmes in general. In particular, machismo is traditionally considered to be a

7

negative form of masculinity that pits men as the oppositional 'other' in gender equality pursuits (see Bannon & Correia, 2006; Cornwall, 1997).

Second, using four different organizations provides more opportunities to draw out best practices for working with men in gender programs. By looking at how each program attracts, retains and works with men there is more data to understand how negative behaviours can be broken down and potentially used as positive and transformative tools. This would bear a lasting impact on how gender equality is approached and would alter how gender and development efforts both view and engage men.

I did not choose to conduct field research or use people focused techniques to collect my data (i.e. through interviews, surveys, focus groups or observation) because the data I required had already been collected. As well, although the thesis topic attempts to understand the ways in which machismo impacts the attainment of gender equality, it does not require direct engagement with people. More specifically, the thesis is centrally focused on examining the activities of four programmes that have worked with men. Thus, field research was not applicable to the thesis.

Validity has been ascertained through the use of multiple secondary sources. I chose to use qualitative methods to analyse the texts to identify trends, emerging themes and concepts, meaning, and purposes. This included examining programme reports, articles and academic research on masculinities in Latin America gathered from library resources, online databases and journals. When necessary, the data has been

supplemented with information taken from organization websites and direct correspondence. The data was analysed through a method of comparison.

The choice for using existing data was for two reasons. First, there already exists a sufficient amount of data on which to base the research. Second, the available data is of a quality that cannot be reasonably replicated or collected anew without investing a great deal of resources and time. For instance, the case study draws upon four programmes that have documented their work with men for over a decade. Numerous reports and statistics have been gathered throughout the time period and, thus, an equivalent depth of information could not be gained from conducting additional research in a much smaller timeframe. As well, it would require an ability to either speak Spanish or to hire a translator, both of which are not possible given time and monetary constraints.

That said, there were some difficulties faced in the gathering of data. Given the language barriers (some documents were in Spanish), some cases do not benefit from as much data as others. For example, literature on Nicaraguan masculinity has been researched extensively by only a few leading scholars who have published their work in English. However, I was able to supplement the data through direct contact with the organizations in question (i.e. Cantera and AHCV). With the help of translation services, I was also able to gain access to more documents that otherwise would have been unexamined. Although this did provide me with an increased amount of information, I was limited in the number of translations and so focused on what were seen to be key documents highlighted by several leading Latin American gender scholars.

I recognize the limitations of relying on secondary data sources. However, the information gathered proved to be sufficient to draw strong conclusions about the benefits that can be gained from including men. Although, program evaluations can sometimes be skewed by the author writing them, my intention was to observe themes and patterns. To this end, there was sufficient data from a number of sources correlating program establishment, format and evaluations to solidify the information reported.

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a theoretical foundation to including men in gender and development. It begins with a brief historical overview of the gender and development field, starting with its origins in the WID approach to show how thinking evolved to the present day GAD approach.[1] While, this is not an exhaustive review of the approaches, the objective is to provide context as to how gender and thus, men, have evolved in development thinking. The main tenants of GAD and the debates surrounding gender are considered in order to debate the inclusion of men.

Equally important to the debate is masculinity. We hear so much about feminism and femininity in gender and development, but little is actually said about masculinity. Therefore, the chapter attempts to fill this gap by contextualizing what it is and how it impacts the gender field. The concept of hegemonic masculinity is particularly interesting when contemplating masculinity in Latin America due to the concept of machismo. Following this, proposed reformations of GAD and also proposed alternatives such as men-streaming and the masculinity and development (MAD) approach are considered in turn. I argue the GAD approach provides the most potential for understanding the impacts of development on women and men, but in order for gender and the GAD approach to be viable, development scholars, policy makers and practitioners need to return to the core tenants of GAD theory. Namely, to engage both

---

[1] Although the Women and Development (WAD) approach is often discussed in the transition between WID and GAD, it continued to focus solely on women and reinforced the oppositional view that women's interests were different from men's. Since the purpose of this section is to trace the evolution of gendered thinking so as to locate men in the debate, WAD will not be discussed.

women and men in the process of development and use gender relations as the starting point for its analysis.

WID TO GAD: THE EVOLUTION OF GENDERED THINKING

Approaches to gender and development have varied much over the past many years, but in general, they have shifted from a WID to GAD focus over time. Generally speaking, WID emphasises integrating women into development, while GAD moves above 'women' as a category and instead refocuses on gender relations and roles. Despite their seemingly divergent perspectives, it is important to trace the evolution of the two approaches, and especially the fact that GAD evolved out of WID, in order to understand the current state of gender policy and the role of men therein. By examining the evolution of these approaches, the reasons for men's locations within them are better understood and more conducive to critical debate.

A WID approach to gender & development

Although gender is currently considered only a small part of modern development efforts, it was not very long ago that gender was not even considered in development at all. Looking back at early development theories of the 1950s and 1960s, development did not engage in understanding how development efforts might affect women versus men. Instead, the primary focus was on addressing economic issues through modernization approaches to development. The theory behind these approaches was that economic growth would create an abundance of benefits that would trickle down to all members of society. On the rare occasion when women were considered, it was only in

12

terms of family welfare where they were targeted in their domestic roles as passive agents in the development process. By the end of the 1960s, however, it was increasingly clear the trickle-down model of economic-focused development failed to take into account the social structures that created and maintained inequalities (Willis, 2005). Instead of improving economic outcomes, early development efforts saw poverty levels increase and the gap between the rich and poor grow larger, with women having experienced the brunt of the disparities.

While development experts debated new strategies, Ester Boserup's 1970 book *Women's Role in Economic Development* exploded on the international scene challenging the modernization approach to development and advocating the engagement of women as active economic agents in the marketplace (Willis, 2005). What was poignant about Boserup's analysis was that it was the first to show how women were effected differently from men through modernization endeavours, therefore highlighting the fact that the once supposed neutral development processes actually had different outcomes depending on whether one was a woman or a man. Boserup's critiques were quickly picked up by feminists and formed the basis for the Women in Development (WID) approach.

Commonly attributed to the Women's Committee of the Washington DC Chapter of the Society for International Development, WID advocates sought to connect Boserup's thinking with policy makers (Mosse, 1993). They asserted that existing development endeavours were gender-blind, causing women to be overlooked and even harmed by development projects that ignored their perspective (Chant & Gutmann, 2000). As the approach was heavily influenced by liberal thought, it identified women's

oppression as residing in their exclusion from the public sphere (the market) and their limited access to and control over resources (Reeves & Baden, 2000). It was thought that women's position in development could be improved through increased economic participation, which in turn would promote greater equality between women and men (Bannon & Correia, 2006).

WID advocates initiated a campaign to integrate their policy approaches with development issues starting in the United States. They saw their first success when the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) incorporated the 'WID approach' into its development policies. The idea that women represented an area for increased economic growth quickly caught fire, leading governments and development agencies to implement policies that would increase women's involvement in the development process around the world (Connelly et al, 2000). While some development agencies had already created WID offices, it was the United Nations announcement of the 1975-85 UN Decade for Women that officially put women, and the WID approach, on the international agenda. As UN officials stated, the objective behind the shift was to "address strategic gender needs by eradicating obstacles to women's advancement in the public sphere," and thereby determine how to better include women in the development process (Willis, 2005).

WID policy took many different forms throughout the 1970s and 1980s, and according to Chant and Gutmann (2000), could generally be attributed to three approaches: equality, anti-poverty, and the efficiency approach. Generally considered to be the first of the WID approaches, the equality approach sought to change the legal and

institutional frameworks that perpetuated women's subordination in order to gain equality with men in development. The anti-poverty approach followed, looking instead to poverty as the source of women's disadvantage. It sought to raise the economic situation of women through income-generating programmes. The third, efficiency approach emerged in the early 1980s with a central objective to "harness women's efforts to make development more efficient and to alleviate poverty in the wake of neo-liberal economic restructuring," (p. 7). Despite the changing directions to alter how development programs operated, the three approaches continued to focus primarily on women as an operational and analytical category.

As a result, the apparent advancements that WID aimed to contribute slowly gave way to the realization that WID did little to increase women's involvement or address the root causes of gender inequality. Improvements to women's lives were little altered by the adoption of the WID approach and, in fact, a growing number of cases showed an increase in disparities. A key concern was the tendency of WID approaches to focus exclusively on women in isolation from men. This largely ignored the relational nature of their subordination, and ignored the social divisions and relations that had commonly been seen to limit women's economic opportunities (Parpart & Marchand, 1995; Razavi & Miller, 1995). For example, WID advocates pushed a "seemingly unquestioned assumption that women would benefit by being 'slotted in' to existing (male-biased) development structures," (Chant & Gutmann, p. 7, 2000). Such actions made it seem as though the development of women was purely logistical and not something that necessitated a reassessment of gender relations and ideology. As well, the major focus on

"women's productive labour, rather than social welfare and reproductive concerns," (Razavi & Miller, 1995, p. 3) showed that WID was primarily concerned with rectifying women's subordination through an economic framework. This led to increasing uncertainty about the effectiveness of WID approaches and thereby contributed to a second shift.

A further criticism aimed at WID was that it failed to take into account differences between women, such as age, class, ethnicity, and geography and generally viewed women as a homogenous group (Parpart & Marchand, 1995). For instance, WID theorists and practitioners tended to portray Southern women as the backward "other" who needed rescue by Northern development experts. Thus, WID discourse was thought to "ignore difference(s), indigenous knowledge(s) and local expertise while legitimating foreign 'solutions' to women's problems in the South," (Parpart & Marchand, 1995 p.16). So although WID approaches had succeeded in bringing women onto the agenda, WID continued to focus on treating the symptoms and not the sources of gender inequality. With the growing concern about rising levels of poverty in the global South, it was increasingly evident that WID had some serious limitations in overcoming the difficulties faced by women.

During this time, literature began to emerge detailing the distinction between biological sex and social gender. Anne Oakley (1972) articulated gender as a social construct based on historical, cultural, and psychological determinants that were learned and based on societal perceptions of what it meant to be a man or woman. It was soon linked to development thought, according to Reddock (2000), through the work of

feminists looking to understand the complexities of women's subordination. The earliest known reference of gender in feminist theory was in the 1976 workshop on the subordination of women held at the University of Sussex in the UK. In the workshop, panellists argued that although women and men were biological beings, women's subordination was not biologically determined, but rather socially constructed. They argued that "sex" had to be identified as the biological difference between women and men and "gender" as the difference between masculinity and femininity. As the workshop participants argued, "what is biological is fixed and unchangeable, but what is social is subject to change and should be the focus of attention for feminist theorists," (p. 37).

The emergence of GAD

The criticisms weighed against WID approaches to gender and development eventually laid the groundwork for a new way of engaging in gender concerns. Drawing upon the gender research laid out by scholars such as Oakley, the Gender and Development (GAD) approach emerged in the 1980s as a result of frustration at the lack of progress achieved through WID to transform women's lives and shift the broader development agenda (Razavi & Miller, 1995). Unlike the WID approach, which was dominated by Western feminists, GAD has often been credited as arising partly from third world feminists[2], grass-roots organizational experiences and also from the work of

---

[2] Third world feminists often connected to early GAD were through the Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN) organization, which was formed out of the Nairobi international NGO forum that took place in 1985, and pushed to create an approach to women's development that recognized global and gender inequities (Connelly et al, 2000).

Western socialist feminists interested in development issues (Connelly et al, 2000). It was also linked heavily with the empowerment paradigm, which viewed the root of women's subordination as based in neo-colonial oppression and in gender relations.

In keeping with the empowerment theme, GAD uses gender relations as its key unit of analysis when examining the social relations between women and men. This is a key shift because it reflects the fact that women are no longer problematised in development thinking, but gender relations. This enabled women to re-evaluate how they were perceived in development discourse, because their positions were now understood to be based upon gender relations. This speaks to the very root of GAD, which accepts the basic theoretical premise that gender identity is a dynamic social construct. It views gender identity as influenced by many factors such as culture, mode of production, legal and political institutions, and also how women and men fit into social categories of race, class and age (Chant & Gutmann, 2000).

This is an interesting advancement in thinking, especially when considering the fact that GAD advocates believe the experiences of women and men are impacted by their position in the international economic order. However, unlike WID, GAD looks beyond economic goals to meet individual social and mental needs because it understands that development is much more complex and is not as confident as its earlier WID counterparts, that the market will effectively redistribute wealth (Visvanathan, 1997; Young, 1997). Instead, "GAD requires that strategies go much beyond concerns with economic self-sufficiency to the need for political self-reliance," (Connelly et al, 2000, p. 53). This is due to the perception that political and economic powers are intertwined.

Thus, if the objective is to advance women, then the first step is to provide the conditions for women and men to overcome poverty.

The ways in which political, social, cultural and economic factors impact women and men's relations is a key reason for why GAD is often seen as being more holistic than WID. It examines how the family, household and domestic life (i.e. private sphere) "fits" with economic and political life (i.e. public sphere). The argument made by GAD advocates is that economic development should be measured by examining "who benefits, who loses, what trade-offs have been made, [and] what is the resultant balance of rights and obligations, power and privilege between women and men, and between given social groups," (Young, 1997, p. 52). The ultimate object of development is to better individuals and society through social, economic, political and cultural avenues. Thus, GAD pushes for gendered perspectives to be included in all development planning and programmes. This means seeing, thinking and doing development from a gendered perspective, rather than simply integrating gender into pre-existing policies (Chant & Gutmann, 2000).

This points to an important tool used by GAD. Whereas WID tends to focus solely on practical needs, a central component of the GAD approach is the focus on both practical needs (such as food, shelter, health care and education) and strategic interests (the structural concerns in gender, race or class which dictate women's subordinate position in a given culture) (Connelly el al, 2000). GAD's strategic interests are long-term and push for the empowerment of women to improve their positions, and in general, attain more equal participation with men in decision-making.

Although GAD narrative tends to talk in terms of improving the situations of women, it is not without glances toward men. The understanding is that development efforts have long benefited men in general, and so GAD advocates are simply attempting to level the playing field by understanding how gender relations have caused situations of inequality. Once armed with this information, development in practice can better overcome them. However, as Young (1997) states, while GAD in theory acknowledges that "women as individuals may well be aware of their subordinate position, this doesn't necessarily lead to an understanding of the structural roots of discrimination and subordination," (p.51). At the same time, Young considers the fact that men are perhaps just as equally unaware of the social constructs that reinforce male dominance and are not necessarily working to continue such systemic inequalities. This is an important point to reflect on when grappling with the issue of including men in the gender debate. Not all men benefit from or support the systems that impede women. Nevertheless, although men are engaged as potential supporters of women through the GAD approach, it is assumed that men will not be predisposed to fight for women's advancement because of their privileged position (Young, 1997). In other words, GAD advocates remain cautious about engaging men because it is assumed that men would have to be given a powerful reason to get onboard the gender equality initiative since it would mean changes to their privileged position.

MEN & MASCULINITIES

As the previous section has shown, the reality is that GAD continues to focus

primarily on women despite the declared theoretical shift to examine gender relations between women and men. This has fuelled a debate about the viability of the approach to adequately confront the structural causes of gender inequality. A major part of this debate centres on why men and masculinities continue to be excluded from the discussion. Masculinity studies have often not been included in gender and development theory and practice despite the existence of masculinities literature dating back several decades. Although masculinity is now beginning to garner some attention in development agencies, it is predominantly limited to children's rights and fatherhood (Thomson, 2002). This is especially true in the case of Latin America, which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. As it will be shown, masculinity is not an easy concept to capture in one succinct definition. For example, debates exist within the field about whether masculinity is a singular concept, or if there are multiple masculinities. The point of delving into such discussions is to show how definitions of masculinities are linked to the engagement of men in gender and development. If there is to be any possibility of making masculinities visible in gender and development it is important to examine the different ways masculinity is understood.

Although the need to study masculinities has been recognized, much of the existing research has tended to focus on areas where the impact on gender relations is most obvious. For example, more attention is given to discrimination and violence against women and not on how boys learn to be men and the impacts this may have on gender relations when they grow up (Thomson, 2002). While the former is certainly an important issue, the latter should also be considered as it provides insight on the

experiences of men that can thus shed light on power dynamics. It remains that when we think of gender, we invariably talk about women. This is to be expected given that it was women who first discussed the concept of gender as a unit of analysis. However, as development is increasingly seen as gendered, there has been little translation to understand how men are impacted by the development process.

The fact that masculinity has remained largely invisible in development speaks volumes. As Kimmel (2001) points out, "the processes that confer privilege on one group and not another group are often invisible to those upon whom that privilege is conferred. Thus, not having to think about race is one of the luxuries of being white, just as not having to think about gender is one of the 'patriarchal dividends' of gender inequality," (p. 21). Not speaking about masculinity, then, plays a role in perpetuating systems of inequality. In order to make masculinity visible in development, it is necessary to break down the many forms that masculinity can take. While it is important to focus most of development efforts toward empowering women, it is important to consider men as well. For without changing the attitudes of men, gender equality cannot feasibly occur.

Masculinity: Laying the groundwork

Considering men in gender and development raises many questions and concerns, which necessarily require a re-conceptualization of what it means to be a woman or a man. Development efforts can be more effective by examining masculinities and understanding how it impacts both women and men and even the development process

itself. In general, men have been treated as oppressors and obstacles to the development of women (Cleaver, 2002; Cornwall, 1997). By engaging men in this way, development efforts have neglected key ingredients to achieving gender equality. Increasingly, men are now being brought in as "agents of change and not merely objects of blame" and, in the case of Latin America, analysing men and masculinities shows there are perhaps more partners than originally thought (Greig, Kimmel & Lang, 2000, p. 2).

So, what is masculinity? While defining masculinity might seem a simple task, it is not easily done. This is because it is not uniformly agreed as to what it encompasses. For instance, it might be said that masculinity describes the behaviours of men, while other might include women. Connell (2005) offers an interesting starting point stating,

> Masculinity, to the extent that the term can be briefly defined at all, is simultaneously a place
> in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender,
> and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture. (p. 71)

While cultural factors certainly play a part in the formation of masculinity, Connell advocates that there is much more. In fact, masculinity can be understood as a discourse whereby both women and men are influenced. To think that masculinity is only something that can be experienced by men is flawed for women can both contribute to and be influenced by masculinities just as much as men. As Connell states, women contain masculinities in their personalities too. So if the objective is reconfigure masculinities, women must also be considered in addition to men.

This points to the connection between masculinities and femininities. Kimmel (2001) argues masculinities are established in relation to femininities while Connell (2005) argues they are not. Horrocks (1994) believes masculinity and femininity determine each other because masculinity cannot be assumed to exist in isolation. This

23

point is backed up by French & Bliss (2007) who assert femininity and masculinity are relational categories meaning they are constructed not only in relation to each other, but also in respect to nationality, ethnicity, sexuality, race and class.

In the case of Latin America, the volatile history of the region speaks to the importance of grappling with both femininity and masculinity in order to understand political conflicts and the dynamics of social revolutions (French & Bliss, 2007). Masculinity has an important role to play in breaking through issues of power in many Latin American countries. This is because gender roles have frequently been used by collectives (i.e. 'the mothers of the disappeared') and authorities in Latin America to further their own ends. For instance, French & Bliss (2007) highlight how women have been characterized as symbols of virtue or loose in order to justify male dominance over women, and women have capitalized on their role as mothers to gain more voice in politics. Men, as well, have been the target of political games. Thus, the need to engage with both masculinity and femininity in Latin America is necessary to understand the very foundation of the nations.

To talk about masculinities, plural, is to point to the multiple masculinities approach. Since masculinity has proven difficult to define, there is a move to recognize the many forms that masculinity can take depending on class, race, ethnicity, age and sex. However, White (2000) criticizes the use of the multiple masculinities approach stating it risks creating more and more forms of masculinity in order to fit the situation at hand. Thus, there would end up being as many masculinities as there are men. Yet, there is some validity to speaking in terms of multiple masculinities. For the same reason there

are many ways of being female, there can be multiple ways of being a man. Especially relevant is recognizing that masculinity manifests itself differently depending on the geographical location and social pressures. Masculinity cannot be expected to be the same in Canada as it is in Brazil.

Bearing this in mind, it must also be recognized that masculinity can be interpreted differently on a regional level as well. Masculinity cannot be expected to be the same in Brazil as it is in Nicaragua because there are many factors that influence its formation. In general, Mara Viveros Vigoya (2001) asserts, "masculinity is not an essential or static quality, but a historical manifestation, a social construction, and a cultural creation," (p.245). Any attempts to define the male identity requires, according to Vigoya, consideration of the economic, political, social, and cultural contexts. Because masculinity can take many forms, it is important to explore how men are defined in each of these contexts and how they then relate to each other. In the case of Latin America, each country has its own history that ultimately affects the form of masculinity displayed. The general stereotype, as Vigoya outlines, indicates machismo appears to be based on the assumption of men as a series of absolutes. They don't cry, they are always the best, are competitive, strong and so on. "Although there are many ways of being a man, some are valued more than others and men experience social pressure to conform to dominant ideas about being a man," (Cornwall, 1997, p.11). Those men who do not conform may feel disadvantaged and ostracized as a result. However, as the next chapter will show, men in Latin America cannot be painted with one uniform brush because there are different factors influencing how men learn to be men.

In general, the foundations of masculinity are drawn from how men are socialized. For instance, men constantly internalize, reframe and reproduce gender norms that they receive from peer networks, society and their families (Greig, 2009). This in turn affects how men and women interact. As Connell (2005) states, "if social definitions of masculinity include being the breadwinner and being 'strong', then men may be offended by women's professional progress because it makes men seem less worthy of respect," (p.1811). This is especially true when considering masculinity in Latin America. As Matthew C. Gutmann (2007) argues, supporting one's own family and work is key to how masculinity is defined by many men in Latin America. When it becomes difficult for men to identify themselves in this manner, their identity as a man is called into question (Cleaver, 2002). Since race, culture and class also play key roles in how men form their identities, it is important to keep many factors in mind when attempting to understand the particular forms of masculinity present in a given situation.

What is also apparent is the connection between masculinity and power relations. As Carrigan, Connell and Lee (2002) contend "one of the central facts about masculinity, then, is that men in general are advantaged through the subordination of women," (p. 111). Men are also tied up in situations of dominance, subordination and alliances among themselves, so it is also important to understand the ways in which different forms of masculinity relate (Connell, 2005). This is because not all masculinities are decidedly equal. Usually there is one form of masculinity that men measure themselves against, and that is usually deemed the hegemonic form of masculinity.

Hegemonic masculinity

Hegemonic masculinity is a key theme that continues to be raised in gender and development and speaks to the issues that arise when attempting to break down power relations and gender-based hierarchies (Cleaver, 2002). It is a concept that arose out of a need to understand the relational issues in masculinity. For instance, it helps to explain the differences between men and the vulnerabilities they may experience (Cleaver, 2002). Through the concept of hegemonic masculinity, it is clear that some forms of masculinity take precedence over others and that not all men benefit equally from the patriarchal system.

The concept of hegemonic masculinity first came to the attention of development scholars when R.W. Connell (1987) linked Antonio Gramsci's analysis of hegemony with class relations. Best described in her[3] later work, Connell (2005) defines hegemonic masculinity "as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women," (p. 77). In other words, it outlines the power dimensions of gender relations. Connell uses hegemonic to explain a cultural dynamic that allows for a group to take possession of and maintain a leading social situation. When connected to masculinity, Connell suggests that at any given time a certain form of masculinity will be held in higher cultural regard than others. Since "hegemonic masculinity is always constructed in relation to various

---

[3] R.W. Connell's early work was published under the name of Bob Connell. As of 2006, R.W. Connell took on a transgender positioning and now publishes under the name Raewyn Connell.

subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women," (p.183), hegemonic masculinity shows how gender hierarchies and inequalities are reproduced.

To be clear, there is often confusion between the concepts of dominant and hegemonic forms of masculinity. Although a dominant form of masculinity might be considered hegemonic in a certain context, dominant masculinities on their own are not synonymous with hegemony. This is because dominant masculinities may not always legitimize the power of men over women and often only centre on groups of men (Messerschmidt, 2008; Beasley, 2008). Therefore, care must be taken to ensure clarity when speaking about dominant and hegemonic forms of masculinity.

Hegemonic masculinity grapples with the power issues of gender relations because, according to Connell (2005), it will most likely take root only when there is a connection between cultural ideals and institutional power. Connell stresses the fact that masculinity is ever evolving and shifting in response to pressures set against it, so hegemonic masculinity is not a static state of being. As patriarchal situations change, so too might the form of hegemonic masculinity in order to ease the conflicts with patriarchy. Thus, in order to understand the different forms of masculinity it is necessary to explore how hegemony is created and contested (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 2002).

Hegemonic masculinity is considered to contain the following characteristics: first, the ability to work and be financially independent; second, the role of husband, father and family protector; third, that manhood is achieved through actions and behaviours; finally, that men show power over women in both the public and private

sphere (Bannon & Correia, 2006). As mentioned earlier, this last point highlights the fact that all femininities are considered subordinate to the hegemonic masculinity.

The key point about hegemonic masculinity is that not all masculinities are equal. As a result, hegemonic and subordinate forms of masculinity are indicative of the different means of access to power and social privilege (Ertürk, 2004). When researching men and masculinities, it is important to take hegemonic masculinities into consideration because it provides perspective on not only how women and men interact, but how men are influenced by each other. As Connell (1987) suggests, not all men benefit equally from the patriarchal institutions. Some forms of masculinity take precedence over others at different points and places in time. So, what might be considered the dominant form of masculinity in one country or even a region within a country may not be translatable to another. This is an important point to consider in the case of Latin America where machismo has been largely painted as the hegemonic form of masculinity applicable to all Latin American men. As the case studies show in chapter four, many men in Latin America do not identify with machismo and do not even share a common definition of what it is.

Yet to be considered hegemonic does not mean a certain form of masculinity is enacted by the majority of men for whom it applies. In fact, it may only be embodied by a small number of men. But the key to being considered hegemonic is the degree of influence it has over men's lives. For example, movie stars and cartoons and play a significant role in telling men the socially accepted way of being a man and this exemplifies hegemonic masculinity. It is not necessary for men to embody it fully, it is

simply necessary for them to accept that version of manhood as the version to strive for no matter how unreasonable the attainment may be.

Therefore, it is important to recognize that not all men fit with the hegemonic form of masculinity. By assuming they do also assumes the homogeneity of men. Dominant forms of masculinity also disadvantage men and this is revealed through the power dimensions inherent in hegemonic masculinities. This point is picked up by Cornwall (1997) when she states "not all men, then, have power; and not all of those who have power are men," (p. 11). Cornwall goes on to argue that by engaging in the study of hegemonic masculinity it is possible to see the challenges faced by men and recognize that not all men correlate with the idealized forms of masculinity. This, in turn, will open the door to show how cultural assumptions on what it means to be a man leaves people in no-win situations. Therefore, when studying masculinities and the cultural manifestations, it is necessary to take lengths to understand difference.

While many men may not embody hegemonic forms of masculinity, it plays an influential and lasting impact on men's lives. As Bannon and Correia's (2006) state, "a woman performs her part by merely *being*; for the man, it requires *doing* something, accomplishing something, or performing something," (p. 247). This is a profound statement with far reaching implications. For one, it implies that women do not face any pressures to do anything in order to be considered women. Although Correia and Bannon grasp at poetic comparisons, women are, in fact, judged by what they do. But the reason as to why this is, is perhaps related to the fact that women are also influenced and affected by masculinities. The statement also indicates that men are largely defined by

their actions. This points to the large gap between the ideal and the reality of what can reasonably be attained, especially with men living in circumstances of low-income or poverty. Due to the intense pressure to exist as real men, as defined by hegemonic constructions of masculinity, many men often become destructive and violent. Thus, the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and gender relations is an important consideration.

The question must be asked whether engaging in an analysis of men through the purely hegemonic lens is adequate. Other models exist to understand masculinities, such as those proposed by Fonseca (2001). She advocates focusing on the masculine identity in order to understand how women and men interact and are affected by culturally accepted definitions of being a man. She looks specifically at the attitudes surrounding conjugal relationships in order to better understand the power relations that can be deduced from moments of transgression. The interesting conclusion drawn from her work is that mainstream methodologies that focus on hegemonic norms might overlook other variances of male/female relations. So while hegemonic masculinities certainly explains the power dynamics of masculinities, more analysis is needed to explain the other factors impacting masculinity.

One factor that has been increasingly advocated by masculinity scholars is the need to understand different cultural concepts of manliness. As White (2000) states, while feminists have argued that cultural representations of femininity only express a small part of what it means to be a woman, masculinity is increasingly seen to encompass all of men. By looking deeper into Latin American masculinities through the concept of

machismo, it will become evident that such constructions similarly only represent a small facet of what it means to be a man.

The definitions provided above speak to the need to understand the perspective of men. If some men truly feel threatened by women's advancement, this can have serious impacts on how both participate in the development process. For one, it highlights potential conflicts that may inadvertently be caused by focusing solely on women without understanding both sides of the equation. However, it also raises questions about how such definitions are considered when engaging men in gender and development. Are economic, political, social, and cultural contexts taken addressed when discussing men or are they simply categorized in a homogenous manner?

Masculinity: The problematic discussion

Masculinities can be something experienced and expressed by both women and men. As White (1997) argues, the fact that GAD fails to consider this reality constitutes a major flaw in the approach. For instance, White believes gender identity is something that impacts both women and men although men's gender identities are often not considered. To examine masculinities also means addressing issues of the cultures, institutions and practices that maintain gender, race and class inequalities. By including men and masculinities into gender issues, it will promote the understanding of power and inequality between women and men and other social relationships. This understanding, in turn, will increase the effectiveness of development initiatives. If the focus continues to reside on gender as a women's issue, it seriously impacts the theoretical underpinnings

of GAD. Therefore, in order for a change for women to be truly sustained, a complementary change for men must also occur. Reflections on masculinity provide the opportunity to examine the other aspects of social inequality.

The lack of engagement with men and masculinity in GAD, however, is not due to oversight. Many would argue that men and masculinities have purposely been left out for several reasons, not the least of which is the continued existence of gender gaps in both the private and public sphere around the world. Chant and Gutmann (2000) tap into this very debate stating that even though some gender gaps appear to have lessened over the past few decades, overall, discrepancies between the lives of women and men are glaringly apparent. They cite several examples ranging from the very low levels of women's political representation at the national level, to their low earnings compared to male counterparts. Not generally accounted for is the additional fact that women also face discrimination, violence and power inequalities in several realms that are not as easily captured in statistics. Thus, as Chant and Gutmann's research suggests, the tendency to focus on women can be attributed to the identified need to 'bridge the gap' between women and men, thereby bringing women up to the levels of wellbeing and freedom commonly experienced by men. Once this is achieved, only then will gender and development look to using their scarce resources to engage with men.

This highlights another major concern within the gender and development field. As Chant and Gutmann (2000) discuss, funding (or lack thereof) is another key reason men are left off the agenda. Because funding is limited, many are wary of engaging men and masculinities since it might further dilute the number of projects that work

specifically to improve women's lives. If men and masculinities were to garner increased attention, it would increase competition for an already small pool of resources. However, as Chant and Gutmann aptly point out, this creates a vicious cycle whereby gender continues to be equated with women. As a result, any possibilities to ascertain increased funds are limited because of the continued unilateral focus on women.

The continued connection with women is intuitive given GAD's historical connection with WID. Simply because WID was largely replaced by GAD as the primary theoretical approach in some gender and development circles does not mean the basic tenants were thereby dropped. As Chant and Gutmann (2000) contend, the shift in terminology from women to gender did not cause the earlier focus on women to cease, so it is important to recognize the lasting impact of WID and its role in keeping men outside the scope of current gender practices. In this vein, it remains that WID oriented approaches have tended to be more popular with development agencies. Part of this is due to the fact that GAD approaches are often seen as more complex and would necessitate an increased amount of resources in order to deal with the structural causes of inequality. So, as Harrison (1997) points out, development agencies prefer to keep it simple with simple principles and methodological tools.

Yet, such practices create more difficulties on the path to achieve gender equality. As Cornwall, Harrison & Whitehead (2007b) discuss, the problem with 'simplifying the message' is that myths[4] become prevalent in gender discussions. When development

---

[4] Cornwall, Harrison and Whitehead (2007) state that "myths work for development by encoding 'truths' in narratives that nourish and sustain convictions. And development's myths gain their purchase because they speak about the world in ways that lend political convictions the sense of direction that's needed to inspire action," (p. 5).

agencies ask for an easy, accessible message it is little wonder that women come to be represented through terminologies ranging from heroine to victim. Although such conceptions have long lasting resonance, they do not accurately represent the complexity of women's and men's lives. For example, women are often caught up in gender myth's through essentialised images of who they are (i.e. women are inherently more peaceful than men and women are passive victims). Similar essentialist discourses exist about men too, such as men are more prone to violence or actively work to oppress women. While such myths are based on truths, they tend to over-generalize reality and thus, fail those they purport to help. As well, the very act of generalizing causes the homogenization of experiences therefore limiting the impact of interventions. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, generalizing men in Latin America through the machismo stereotype causes the varied experiences and identities of men to be lost. Although machismo is certainly a trait that influences male and female behaviours in Latin America, not all men buy into it.

Anne Marie Goetz (2007) takes up the case for how generalizations may be based on misplaced assumptions. Using the example of women's seeming incorruptability, she believes it is perhaps more the result of opportunity than a reflection of actual womanly virtue. More important is to consider how gender relations impact the ability to engage in corrupt behaviour. If women do not have access to positions that would be prone to corruption, then that would explain why they do not often engage in such behaviours. Thus, it is important to remember how "gender myths arise when commentators ignore the context-specific nature of gender relations" (Cornwall et al, 2007, p. 11).

The fact of the matter is discussions about including men in GAD practice are akin to walking in a mine zone. There are fears, not without legitimacy, that bringing men in could unleash some very unwelcome consequences. Chant and Gutmann (2000) point out many cases where including men with women has lead to conflicts. For example, men have been documented as 'taking-over' projects aimed at empowering women, therefore negating any real change to the structural imbalances the project sought to address. Other examples indicate how some men manipulate projects that appear to be supporting women, while in reality the men maintain ultimate control. Finally, it is common to hear about abuses of micro-credit projects where some men manoeuvre control over the loans given to women. Once aware of such incidences, it is little wonder that many programs aiming to improve gender equality feel there is no choice but to work specifically with women until such point that women can adequately challenge the structures that bind them.

However, by avoiding the man-issue, gender and development programs are doing a disservice to gender equality overall. Yes, it is very true that some men may hamper the efforts to improve women's lives. But it must also be recognized that, similar to women, existing gender structures do not benefit all men equally. Thus, if men are not included or understood there can be little hope of altering how men and women interact on a daily basis. Real change in gendered relations requires that gender and development efforts confront the uncomfortable in order to make the necessary structural changes.

GAD: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Although it is understandable why men and masculinities have been previously excluded from GAD in practice, it is important to understand why GAD should move beyond its limited focus on women and embrace a truly gendered approach – both in theory and practice. Chant and Gutmann (2000) are two scholars who push for the inclusion of men and masculinities in GAD arguing it is conceptually inappropriate to focus on women alone because it undermines the transformative potential of gender interventions. When looking to change aspects of women's lives, it must be understood that change is also necessary with men because long term sustainability demands a structural shift in male-female relations. Chant (2000) states the principles of GAD imply that men should be included in gender and development projects, although this often does not happen in practice. She argues gender has come to be seen as an oppositional standpoint where it is men versus women. By focusing only on women, it assumes the problem can only be dealt with *through* them. This causes women to carry a heavier burden alone rather than sharing it equally.

Some scholars see men as the gatekeepers to gender equality because they control the majority of society's resources. For this reason, R.W. Connell (2005) claims men should be included in gender and development efforts. But while Connell makes a good point, her emphasis on resources would make it seem that gender equality can only result from levelling the economic playing field. What is perhaps more interesting to note is that men are arguably the gatekeepers to more than just resources, but also the structural

issues of gender inequality. For that reason, it is imperative that they be included in the analysis.

However, according to Connell (2005), men are often excluded from policy and program discussions and subsequent formations despite their key role. For example, a major document discussing gender equality, the *UN Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women* (CEDAW), which was entered into force in 1980, does not explicitly mention men, treating them only as a background issue. Such practices should sound familiar to feminist scholars who echoed similar sentiments about early development policy in respect to women. It was not until the 1995 Beijing Conference for Women that the issue of including men in the development of women was brought to the forefront. Paragraph 25 of the resulting *Beijing Declaration* encouraged men to engage fully in equality programs, and the Conference's *Platform for Action* stated that "women's concerns could be addressed only 'in partnership with men' toward gender equality," (p. 1807). In 2000, the UN General Assembly reaffirmed this statement, saying that men had to be jointly responsible with women to promote gender equality.

Such exclusions of men and masculinities, argues Michael S. Kimmel (2001), have the consequence of rendering them invisible leaving the impact of development on men as an area that is little understood or explored. The practice of ignoring masculinity to the point of invisibility perpetuates gender inequality because it does not address the concerns of one half of the population. If the solution is to improve women's situations because they live at levels far below their male counterparts, then men must be included

or projects will be destined to fail. Thus, in order to make masculinity visible in development, it is necessary to recognize the different ways masculinity is defined and how men are portrayed.

Yet, much of the writings within GAD show divergences in how men are discussed. While many speak of the need to understand men as gendered beings, at the same time men are often portrayed as the enemy or "other" (Correia & Bannon, 2006; Kimmel, 2001; Connelly et al, 2000; Chant & Gutmann, 2000; Cornwall, 1997). Cornwall (1997) says this "othering" of men can be related to their exclusion from gender and development initiatives. It is only by bringing men in and understanding difference that the original premise of the gender and development framework would finally be realised. If it assumed that one side has more power than the other, than it is necessary to break it down. As Cornwall states, "gender relations are power relations" (p. 8). Further, by examining the gender issues faced by men it would be revealed that "not all men, then, have power; and not all of those who have power are men," (p. 10). Recognizing such possibilities would completely alter how men and women are both discussed and engaged in gender and development, and provide much needed depth and scope to GAD analysis and the programs therein.

In a similar vein, men are often portrayed in negative language that views them as oppressors of women. As will be discussed in later chapters, a poignant example is the generalization of Latin American men with the concept of machismo. Often linked back to the time of the Spanish Conquistadores, machismo is a Spanish word used to describe an extreme form of masculinity that, in truth, is difficult to define. This is because *any*

male trait in Latin America is often attributed to machismo, especially if it relates to power or sexuality (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank & Tracey, 2008; Hardin, 2002). Although machismo can have both positive and negative attributes, it is most popular to link machismo with negative traits of manliness, chauvinism, male pride, sexism, and virility (Arciniega et al, 2008; Gutmann, 2007; Forrest, 2002). As Hardin (2002) warns, the danger of defining machismo in such negative terms is that it smacks of colonial connotations of 'the other'. For example, by claiming it is only Latin American men who strut their heterosexuality in such a way is to ignore the reality of male behaviours in many other areas of the world including North America. As well, Hardin argues the cultural stereotype of machismo actually points to Western imperialism because it has been interpreted as an indicator of underdevelopment linked with the lower class that could not, therefore, be experienced in Western culture.

Such representations of men as the 'other' or oppressor do little to build understandings about the male gender. As Cleaver (2002) states, defining "men as the oppressors and women as the oppressed" is not helpful when exploring the issues faced by men in development (p.7). If development programs continue to exclude the experiences of men and categorize them as the perpetrators while continuing to see women as victims, the programs will miss meeting their goals of equality and empowerment (Cornwall, 1997). Similarly, Correia and Bannon (2006) believe the conventional gender and development paradigm has perpetuated the oppositional perspective of women as victim, men as problem stereotype. As Cornwall (2003) so eloquently states, to now admit men have gender issues and bring them into the gender

domain would undermine "the most sacred of all cows: the oppositional categories 'women' and 'men' that are so potent a framing device for development intervention in the name of 'gender'," (p. 6 in Correia & Bannon).

So why is it that men continue to be portrayed in this way? Cleaver (2002) argues it is because there is an assumption that "women can only become empowered by men giving up power," (p. 1). When men are discussed, it is only to the extent that they are obstacles to women's development leaving little consideration for how women-focused programs and development efforts may impact men. Research shows that men have a profound impact on the outcomes of women-only programs, especially since men can influence women's abilities to participate. Similarly, White (1997) argues men should be included from an empowerment point of view since men have been shown to have a direct impact on the sustainability of such endeavours. For example, White highlights cases in the Grameen Bank where participant women experienced increased violence in the home. What exactly is causing such occurrences is not entirely known, but it could be related to ideas of loss of power and identity, each of which constitutes a gender issue. By considering masculinity, it can be shown how gender may play a part in perpetuating systems of inequality in society. Thus, White argues including men would not only deepen our understanding of men's issues, but would also help us to understand power and inequality.

What must be acknowledged in mainstream gender and development thought is the numerous studies indicating the desire of men to break free of their traditional roles. Such debates have been ongoing for several years, as can be indicated by the concerns

raised by Barry Underwood (1991). Underwood argued against the assumption that feminism and gender and development are one in the same thing. In particular, he challenged the debate about the inclusion of men versus women, arguing that those who explicitly talk about the need to "include" men into women's projects perpetuate the idea that men have ultimate power over women. Further, the very suggestion of needing to include men in women's projects does not address why women have not been identified as having to be integrated in men's. Instead, Underwood asserts it should not be a question of seeking the approval of women or men, but rather should be about attaining equality. Therefore, all development projects should be examined from the gender perspective and not refer to "projects for women", for example, because it represents a compartmentalized view of a gender problem.

Underwood raises an important concern that arguably speaks to the growing unrest with how GAD has played out in practice. While the original tenants of GAD claimed to move the agenda from that of women to gender, in reality it continued to talk only about women. To counter such discussions, many scholars discussed the need to include men. However, instead of framing the discussion in such a way as including women or men, it is more powerful to talk about *gender relations*, thus bringing GAD back to its original purpose. Yet, as the next section will show, some scholars believe it is time to explore other avenues to understand the perspectives and experiences of women and men in development.

Proposed alternatives: The move toward men-streaming or MAD approach to development

As the previous discussion highlighted, proposals to refocus gender and development to include men and masculinities brings with it a considerable amount of anxiety from some feminists. Many fear that such a refocus could cause the gains to women's rights over the past few decades to be lost, while others worry that bringing men in risks them taking over entirely, thus negating any hope to achieve gender equality. Several scholars advocate the engagement of men, even where relations between women and men are not equal, in order to break down inequalities and make men more responsible for change. This line of thinking has brought out advocates for a new framework in order to ensure equal participation and inclusion takes place in the development arena - masculinity and development (MAD). Many of those who advocate this shift are the same who lobbied for the burial of WID and the emergence of GAD. As Forrest (2002) asserts, there is a growing body of researchers who are increasingly disturbed at the lack of attention to men within gender and development theory and practice, leading many to push for men to become the latest group to be recognized.

Some scholars, such as Correia and Bannon (2006), believe the exclusion of men in gender and development can only be rectified by "men-streaming" the development agenda. They acknowledge that resistance comes from both women and men, but the utmost priority is to recognize that men have gender issues too, and that they should be integrated into policy, programs and initiatives. They criticise current practices of redressing women's disadvantages before engaging men, stating interventions directed solely at women are often unsustainable if men are not brought in as well. Also, such

practices do not consider the potential disempowerment and loss of livelihood that may result for men and the implications this could have on women. At the very least, it is proposed by scholars such as Chant (2000) that a "de-feminization" of gender planning and projects be considered in order to bring in more funding and resources to gender equality initiatives. This would make it more worthwhile to engage men in gender policies and programming over the long-term.

However, before jumping onboard a men and masculinities approach, it is important to consider the potential ramifications of such a move. Although White (2000) is a proponent of including men, she outlines several areas of caution. First, the inclusion of men and masculinities to gender discussions will inevitably change how gender analysis occurs. White recognizes this can be a good thing, but it can also perpetuate existing systems of patriarchy. Second, because masculinity is difficult to define, it is difficult to adequately represent. Not knowing where it is or is not and what accurately constitutes masculinity can cause issues to be misrepresented to suit dominant interests. As stated earlier, White points to the fact that masculinity is not something that belongs only to men, so representing it as such can lead to the exclusion of women. Due to its tricky definition, White believes the multiple masculinities approach (prevalent in much masculinities literature) has evolved to explain many different behaviours exhibited by men (attributable to race, class, age, etc). White critiques this approach arguing that it ends up creating as many versions of masculinity as there are men. The key to studying men and masculinities, according to White, is to really understand how sexual difference is socially constructed. "Gender is thus not only about *persons*, but also very importantly

about values; not only about social *inequality*, but also social *meaning*. In both aspects it is critically concerned with *power*." (p. 38). In this way, masculinity and femininity can be identity options for both men and women.

White's concerns will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter on masculinities in Latin America; however, it is important to be aware of her concerns in relation to the greater gender and development debate. Would MAD or men-streaming cause more engagement in men's issues? Clearly, it would for the same reason WID brought more focus and attention to women. Yet, for the same reasons WID failed to improve women's lives, a MAD approach should raise some flags of caution. As it will be argued in the following section, the purpose is not to simply talk about men, but rather to understand women and men in relation to each other. This is the reason why GAD offers the most potential to transforming the structural causes of gender inequality.

FINDING COMMON GROUND: TAKING GAD BACK TO THE BASICS

As was highlighted earlier, the problem facing GAD right now is how both women and men are engaged. GAD in practice has followed in the footsteps of WID by focusing predominantly on women, thus leaving men's gender concerns marginalized and little understood. While it is important to bring both women and men into GAD practice, it is more important to come back to the original intent of GAD to understand gender relations. As Underwood (1991) cautions, to talk of inclusion of men means they have some level of superiority that should be considered. Since the objective is to level the

playing field, discussions which begin at the level of gender relations is more equitable and conducive to increasing understanding of the experiences of women and men.

In examining the field of gender and development, Cornwall et al (2007a) argue that although the changing definitions of gender have impacted how the concept has been debated and used in GAD, overall, GAD narratives have benefited from the attainment of resources, policy spaces, people and organizations dedicated to gender issues. The generalizations found in GAD are not always a bad thing, but rather represent successes for getting gender on the development agenda. However, the extent to which gender is included on the agenda has not translated into practice. Similarly, linking women with poverty has not made significant progress in reducing women's poverty. What is happening is that gender is not carrying the same weight it once did. It has become an issue that organizations know they should consider but the concept has lost its panache.

In light of such trends, Cecilia Sardenberg (2007) argues for a reclaiming of the category of women because it would draw attention to women's issues and also revitalize the gendered perspective in development. The problem, according to Sardenberg, is that each term "gender" and "development" do not have fixed definitions, but rather are characterised differently from one organization and scholar to the next. As a result, gender has itself become a contested concept. Moreover, the term has come to be seen as a tool that avoids having to directly focus on women and dealing with policy issues that would confront barriers faced by women. This sentiment is shared by Razavi and Miller (1995) when they argue that gender is sometimes used to avoid a focus on women. They assert that gender became a panacea concept in development despite the fact that little

analysis has been done on how gender has been applied in policy and planning. In general, Razavi and Miller claim gender has been reinterpreted by actors in the development process to fit their institutional needs. Thus, the popularization of the term has lead to its simplification and improper use, even though the original intent was to highlight the power relation issues between women and men.

Using the example of Brazil, Sardenberg (2007) shows how gender has been compromised to meet conflicting needs and interests among Brazilian institutions and actors. The consequence has been a gradual elimination of gender's more radical tenants, leaving women's issues more prone to invisibility once again. This is why, according to Sardenberg, many feminists are calling for a return to women as an analytical category, recognizing that women in feminist practice needs to be reconceptualized. For instance, it cannot be seen as a simplistic process since women and gender are not interchangeable concepts. Rather, gender is a larger category that outlines the social construction of the biological sexes. Therefore, women are simply a category of gender and cannot continue to be substituted as if they were representing the same body of issues.

Sardenberg has a point, and there is perhaps room to accommodate such reconceptualizations within the gender and development realm. It is true that gender has been eroded by the interchangeable use with women, and reclaiming the category of women may alleviate this. However, such movements should be made with caution. If GAD can begin analysis from the point of understanding gender relations, then discussions about women and men would be welcome and necessary. However, reframing discussions to centre on women and men should not be taken to understand

that gender as a concept is unnecessary. As Marchand (2009) argues, gender is far from being a dead concept. Instead, she believes it can provide a major point of interpretation in this new post-9/11 world. She acknowledges that the application of GAD has generally failed to correlate with its theoretical tenants because it tends to focus solely on women and not on gender relations. Thus, she argues the growing marginalization of GAD is due in part to the myths created when attempting to translate feminist development issues into concrete development policies.

Referring to the myths outlined by Cornwall et al (see 2007b), Marchand (2009) states women have been portrayed as less corrupt than men, more peaceful than men, more at risk economically to provide for their families, more often victims of violence and that women headed households are more apt to be poor. To this list Marchand (2009) claims two more: the existence of a global sisterhood or solidarity and that gender and development is solely about women. These myths are exemplified in the writings of GAD scholars such as Mosse (1993) when she states:

> The pattern of development pursued in recent years, with priority given to economic growth, export orientation, high levels of defence-spending, has been in a very literal sense of the word, a 'man-made' agenda. If it had been women – poor women – who had set the priorities of national development, perhaps fewer of them would be suffering now (p. 151).

Although Mosse makes a valid point about how development has long focused predominantly on men, she makes sweeping generalizations about women. Such simplistic views are prevalent in GAD literature and speak to many of the myths indicated by Cornwall et al (2007b) and Marchand (2009). Mosse assumes in this brief statement that not only are poor women ultimately altruistic, but that they would be united in a common cause to benefit a collegial sisterhood. Thus, the points raised by

48

Marchand and Cornwall et al bring us back to the discussion raised earlier which claimed GAD had lost credibility when it was trying to increase support.

Marchand (2009) states that when gender and development is translated into practical projects, more often than not, it is translated and simplified to mean women and rarely to address women in relation to men or femininities and masculinities. Thus, as both Cornwall (2007b) and Marchand (2009) state, it is necessary to rethink how feminism can and must engage with development. The hegemonic influence of feminism is no more relevant to gender than masculinity can and should be and this is a consideration that can no longer be ignored.

As Chant and Gutmann (2000) so aptly state:

> Involving men in GAD entails reflecting on, and incorporating, the understanding that women are themselves integrally involved in recreating and renegotiating masculinities. Men, and ideas of what it means to be a male, impact on women's lives, and therefore the outcome of GAD work, but the reverse is also true: women and female identities affect men and societal norms of masculinity (p. 42)

CONCLUSION

The field of gender and development has certainly had it share of critics over its 40-year history, and the latest phase is no exception. Although GAD has been hailed as the solution to gender equality, divergence between theory and practice and an overall tendency to favour women cast the viability of the approach into doubt. A large part of the GAD debates continues to revolve around the concept of gender and whether or not to include men in the GAD approach. As many scholars have argued for and against, the point remains that if one is truly interested in discussing gender, then men and

masculinities must be considered. If men are not, then it not only undermines the concept of gender but the GAD approach overall.

Those scholars who push against the inclusion of men do so with valid points that women face a considerable amount of disadvantage, but the point of discussing men is not to negate this reality. A truly gendered lens should be interested in how development impacts the lives of both women and men. It is not simply a matter of adding men to women and vice versa, but rather of understanding that gender is relational. Looking at one without the other leaves half the picture unexamined, and this can only result in development policies and programs that address only half the problem.

CHAPTER 3: MEN & MASCULINITY IN LATIN AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

The subject of men and masculinity is a relatively new debate in gender and development studies. As my previous chapter has shown, the inclusion of men in gender and development continues to be contentious despite evidence showing the positive outcomes including men can bring. Many scholars believe the inclusion of men is a move in the right direction since we cannot expect to change gender relations without them (Bannon & Correia, 2006; Cleaver, 2002; Thomson, 2002; Greig, Kimmel & Lang, 2000; Cornwall, 1997; Connell, 1995). However, in order to include men, it is necessary to begin to understand them. What experiences do men have and how does this impact their behaviours and by extension, gender relations? Understanding masculinity is a key part of answering this question. Once gender and masculinity is brought into attention, there is more opportunity to challenge the existence and perpetuation of power relations and thereby bring about more opportunities for gender equality.

When considering gender equality, machismo is commonly considered to be a negative form of masculinity that runs counter to gender equality objectives because of its association with gender-based violence and male superiority. Yet, emergent research suggests the complexity of machismo is overlooked in such definitions and leaves many issues unexplored when it comes to Latin American masculinity. For instance, machismo can also represent positive characteristics that can serve to re-cast how machismo is both understood and utilized in the quest to achieve gender equality in the region.

Analysis shows that machismo, like masculinities everywhere, can take on different forms and meanings depending on the person, region, ethnicity, race, sex, age and class. Therefore, simply classifying Latin American men as macho oversimplifies them and overlooks their experiences as men. Such generalizations of men walks a dangerous line of falling into the same trap that feminist studies once did - which is to describe Latin American men as a homogenous group with similar experiences and needs. Southern feminists have fought against their being represented in a homogeneous fashion by Western affluent women, so we must be wary not to go down the same road with men. That said, while machismo may not accurately represent the identities of Latin American men, the question remains whether machismo continues to impact men (and women's) behaviours in the region. By wading through the origins, definitions and use of the concept, this chapter will shed light on the relevance of machismo to Latin American masculinity.

The chapter will begin with a brief overview of how masculinity studies evolved in Latin America ending with a discussion of the cultural construction of machismo. While this chapter does not debate the existence of machismo, it does question the uniform characterisation of all Latin American men.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: GENDER AND MASCULINITY IN LATIN AMERICA

Latin America has been a land laden with strife over the past fifty years as many countries have moved through dictatorships, military regimes, civil war and economic upheaval. In the midst of political discord has been a continued struggle for gender

equality. Similar to many areas of the world, Latin American research on gender began to take hold in the 1970s and was dominated by and for women (Chant & Crask, 2003). However, the crises that rocked the region in the 1980s (due in part to modernization efforts) increased class divides and pressures on women and men as they struggled to find work and survive in difficult circumstances. The subsequent effect on traditional roles and values was termed by some as the "erosion of machismo," because men were increasingly finding themselves in the home while women became more involved in paid work (Gutmann & Viveros, 2005; Viveros, 2003). At the same time, as gender and development approaches slowly shifted from WID to the Gender and Development (GAD) paradigm, it not only brought about a change in focus theoretically from women to gender, but it also highlighted the need to discuss masculinities.

Masculinities research took hold in Latin America by the end of the 1980s. It arose partly through the work of feminists who saw men as an integral part of achieving gender equality, and also due to the growth of men's groups interested in changing their gender relations with women since they recognized the negative effects traditional norms had on themselves and those around them (Gutmann & Viveros Vigoya, 2005). While many applauded the acknowledgment of men as having gender, critics argued against feminist writings because it was believed women who theorized about the behaviours of men arguably generated stereotypical, narrow and misinformed representations (Chant & Crask, 2003; Gutmann, 1996). This was reinforced by the fact that early studies about men used machismo to describe how men were controlling of women and domineering in general (Chant & Crask, 2003). This led to many studies throughout the 1990s grappling

with dominant stereotypes such as machismo and arguing against homogenous representations of men in Latin America (see Gutmann, 1996; Lancaster, 1992). For example, many of the studies focused on reframing men from that of irresponsible husbands and fathers in order to show how men considered family and children to be an important aspect of their identity (Chant & Crask, 2003).

As the subject of masculinities continued to gain more attention, research was directed at understanding men-as-men. The result was a growing recognition that the image of the brash macho man had to be revisited as study after study showed many other forms of masculinity existing in Latin American society. The attention to masculinities has also contributed to a greater understanding of power relations between and among women and men in the region. Unlike many other areas of the world, class has remained a key part of the research given the political history of the region (Guttman & Viveros, 2005).

Yet, despite such gains masculinity continues to be marginalized in the development domain. When looking at Latin America, even though there have been studies depicting alternate forms of masculinity, machismo continues to be heralded as the prevalent ideology. What machismo is and how it influences men will be considered in detail in the following section.

MACHISMO

The continued use of machismo to describe Latin American men is the subject of recent debate. With masculinity studies on the rise, it is important to untangle the reality

from the myth and determine the extent to which certain characteristics truly represent the lived experiences of men. In Latin America, the behaviours of men are popularly imbued with negative connotations while the same qualities are often exalted in White/European American men (Torres et al, 2002). For example, when socially accepted Western traits of strength, toughness and protection of women are translated to Latino's, they are interpreted through the lens of machismo. Broadly speaking, machismo is depicted as an extreme form of masculinity that remains difficult to define since *any* male trait in Latin America is often linked to it, especially if related to power or sexuality (Arciniega et al, 2008; Hardin, 2002). Thus, it is important to grapple with questions about how men are represented in order to break down power relations – both from a gender and a development perspective – and also to understand the lived experiences of men. While the purpose is not to discount the existence of machismo, the reality is there are many forms of masculinity present in Latin American and this has serious implications for how Latin American men are represented in development.

Machismo is thought to derive from the term *macho*, meaning man or male, and is often used interchangeably with masculinity (Melhuus, 1996). The term is used in many different ways ranging from describing a set of attitudes, behaviours, or setting it out as a syndrome (Ramírez, 1999). In each of these, machismo tends to be interpreted from the individual perspective. Although machismo can include both positive and negative aspects, the most popular interpretations cast machismo in negative terms. Through this lens, machismo is defined in multiple ways and is often closely connected to stereotypical displays of manliness, chauvinism, male pride, sexism, and virility (Arciniega et al, 2008;

Gutmann, 2007; Forrest, 2002). For example, Sternberg (2000) defines machismo as "a heady mixture of paternalism, aggression, systematic subordination of women, fetishism of women's bodies, and idolisation of their reproductive and nurturing capacities, coupled with a rejection of homosexuality," (p.91). Robert McNicoll (in Hardin, 2002) believes courage is an essential component but only when it is coupled with the "successful pursuit of women," (p.2). As well, machismo is also commonly exemplified through drunkenness, abusive conduct, and alcoholism (Arciniega et al, 2008).

A more thorough description of machismo comes from Melhuus (1996) who outlines several points:

1. *Machismo* underpins the continuous evaluation of men, and rests on the discrete categorization of women.
2. *Machismo* has men as its reference group: it is in the eyes of other men that a man's manhood is confirmed, but it though women that it is reflected and enacted. Thus, men are socially and emotionally vulnerable to other men, through the behaviour and moral evaluation of women.
3. The very articulation of *machismo* not only points to the precariousness of being a man but also underscores the ambiguity of being a woman, showing how women's sexuality is an ambivalent source of virtue. (p. 241)

In general, Melhuus points to the importance of honour and shame as reference points for machismo. What is apparent through the description offered by Melhuus is the interconnectedness of women and men. While machismo clearly describes men, it also affects the portrayals and behaviours of women. Thus, breaking down machismo is more than simply a project for men, it is also an exercise in understanding women in Latin America.

The history behind the above mentioned form of machismo is laden with contradictions and is most often linked to the Aztec's and / or the Spanish Conquistadores. The common belief is that machismo is the result of the Spanish

Conquest, which imported and imposed *conquistador* cultural values on the local indigenous populations (Mirandé, 2008; Hardin, 2002). Mirandé (2008) states the *conquistadores* portrayed "the seven deadly sins of machismo"[5] - extreme pride, wrath, lust, anxiety, callousness towards women, an obsession with the number of conquests, and a belief in male hypersexuality. This perspective is referred to as the benevolent sexism ideology because men were seen as strong warriors and also protectors of women (Torres et al, 2002). In general, the Spanish connection is based on two elements: "the Hispanic sense of dignity of the individual...and the Spanish point of pride or vanity," (McNicoll in Hardin, 2002, p.4).

Machismo is thought to have evolved among the indigenous men in the New World who were humiliated by their own defeat and the rape of their women at the hands of the conquering Spaniards (Chant & Crask, 2003). The result was a compensatory increase in aggressiveness and masculine behaviour to overcome their feelings of powerlessness and weakness. In this view, machismo serves as an illusion to cover the "profound sense of impotence, powerlessness and ineptitude, an expression of weakness and a sense of inferiority," (Mirande in Chant & Crask, 2003, p. 15).

Another perspective on the roots of machismo is linked to the Aztec culture. Aztec society was focused on military actions and men were dominant over women (Chant & Crask, 2003). It is thought that while machismo is often correlated to the Spanish word 'macho' (meaning male), it is also the possible that it derives from the Nahautl language where 'macho' means 'image' or 'reflection of myself' (Chant & Crask, 2003). However, Aztec society did not comprise the whole of Latin America, so

---

[5] *The seven deadly sins of machismo* was a term introduced by Evelyn P. Stevens (1973).

it cannot be assumed their values were reflected elsewhere. What may be more accurate is that machismo grew out of a combination of the above factors (and perhaps others not mentioned).

A contrasting point of view holds that machismo is simply a folkloric concept that originated with the Mexican middle-class in reaction to American meddling and sense of cultural superiority (Peña, 1991). While the latter interpretation of machismo is gaining more support, scholars such as Peña (1991) modify it slightly to state that machismo most likely emerged among the lower, working class than with the middle class. This is because the traits commonly associated with machismo, such as the degradation of women and vulgar language, are considered to be more indicative of lower class behaviours.

Reflections on the evolution of machismo highlight some troubling connotations about the ideas surrounding Latin American masculinity. The images presented by the evolutionary theories are quite negative of men and prompt serious consideration about who wrote them. Mirandé (1997) argues these depictions have been developed by "culturally insensitive and linguistically limited outsiders," (p. 5-6) causing machismo to be seen as a "culturally pathological entity reflecting maladaptive manifestations of societal and family dysfunction among Latino men," (Torres et al, 2002, p. 166). This has resulted in Latin American men being represented in less than flattering terms by people who are not necessarily from Latin America.

Echoing the sentiments of Hardin (2002), the danger of defining machismo in such negative terms is that it denotes a colonial connotation of the 'other'. The concept

of the 'other' emerges from post-modern and post-colonial ideas about marginalization. In development discourse, people not from Western 'modern' society are deemed 'other' since they embody all negative traits (i.e. primitive, backward, etc). These traits are supposedly no longer existent in Western society and the thinking perpetuates Northern ideas of superiority and belief in Western values, institutions and modernization (Parpart, 1995). By stating Latin American men are the only men to display their heterosexuality in such a way is to ignore the reality of male behaviours in many other areas of the world including North America. For example, Mirandé (1997) argues the socially accepted Western traits of masculinity such as strength, toughness, and protecting women and the family do not tend to translate positively when applied to Latin American men. Instead, these same behaviours are cast in a negative light.

So why are Latin American men continually discussed in this way? Ramírez (1999) believes all modern thinking about machismo evolved from the approaches of Bermúdez (1955) and Stycos (1955). Bermúdez defined machismo as "a typical case of unconscious compensation against feminist tendencies hidden in the Mexican man," (in Ramírez, 1999, p. 8). Describing Latin American men and machismo like this meant there was a disassociation from the socio-historical roots. Stycos, on the other hand, connected machismo with the need for men to express their virility. Although later research by Stycos refuted his original claims, subsequent definitions and understandings of machismo continue to make this connection (Ramírez, 1999). As Ramírez states, such interpretations of machismo ignore the "historical processes, social structures, and

cultural categories," that need to be considered when attempting to understand Latin American masculinity (p. 8).

Increasingly, however, the positive aspects of machismo are being brought to light and bringing with it questions about how the concept has previously been conceived (see Arciniega et al, 2008; Mirandé, 2008; Torres et al, 2002; Casas et al, 1994). This line of thinking draws from a socio-cultural perspective because it considers the historical, social and economic factors that may influence the evolution of machismo (Ramírez, 1999). While negative characteristics are acknowledged, there is also attention paid to the positive attributes such as "nurturance, protection of the family and its honour, dignity, wisdom, hard work, responsibility, spirituality, and emotional connectedness," (Archiniega et al, 2008, p.20). Historically, the positive traits of machismo have been linked with the word *caballerismo*, a Spanish word referring to a chivalrous code of masculine conduct. In this perspective, men act in a proper and respectful way while standing up for those less fortunate (Archiniega et al, 2008). By showing how machismo can positively work with family and chivalry points to the complexity of the concept and, by extension, indicates the flawed representations that could exist in prevalent machismo interpretations.

Such complexity was revealed in a study conducted by Mirandé (2008) to understand how Latin American men perceived machismo, masculinity and fatherhood. His aim was to get past the negative stereotype and discover, from a neutral position, the images men presented of their lives. He found that many of the men he researched did not identify with the term macho. In these cases, the men viewed machismo as a negative

form of masculinity that could be identified through feelings of inferiority, male dominance, and subordination or denigration of women. The minority of those who did identify with the term did so thinking of machismo in a positive manner. Seen positively, machismo was characterised as adhering to a certain code of ethics, such as honesty, loyalty, respect and modesty. In this interpretation, men would be expected to stand up for what they believed in and thus, the measure of the man was not in his physical strength, but in his strength of character. However, the men who correlated themselves with the positive form of machismo were careful to point out that being macho was distinct from being machista (sexist). What was interesting is that those men who acted in the stereotypical macho fashion of aggressive, loud-mouthed, women abusers were not considered by participants to be macho at all since they did not embody the positive characteristics thought to define machismo. In the positive interpretation, the true testament of being macho was having confidence in one's sense of self and in one's masculinity without feeling compelled to prove it to anyone, including himself.

Similarly, Torres et al (2002) conducted a study of machismo among Latin American men in order to determine the extent to which men identified with various forms of machismo, masculinity and gender role identity. What they found was that only 10% of the men interviewed had identified with the traditional machismo stereotype (i.e. authoritarian, emotionally restrictive, and controlling). As a result, Torres et al suggested the stereotype of machismo had to be changed to reflect the multidimensional aspect of Latin American male identities.

The connection between traditional machismo and men has long been a serious issue of contention among a small group of scholars. For instance, Baca Zinn (1982) first broke down the commonly held historical connection between male dominance and Latin American men stating male dominance existed in most areas of the world so should not be considered a defining characteristic of the Latin American region alone. What's more, Baca Zinn argued that machismo was not so much culturally or ethnically based, but rather indicative of socioeconomic status. She claimed looking at machismo only from a cultural or ethnic perspective missed the other issues that could affect the forms of masculinity in a given situation, such as race and class.

The class-based analysis is a common feature of machismo research. Several early scholars point to studies that showed lower classes are more apt to have authoritarian families and lower class males are more likely to display their feelings of inferiority by subordinating women and acting out (*see* Ingolds, 1985; Kinzer, 1973; Stycos, 1965; Rainwater, 1964; Ramos, 1951). Yet, while mainstream research has generally linked machismo to the lower classes within Latin America, little research has been conducted among the upper classes since machismo is considered less likely to be present (Peña, 1991; Ingolds, 1985). This leaves statements about the lower class connection inadequately verified in scholastic research.

Hardin (2002) believes these cultural stereotypes of machismo actually indicate a Western imperialism because such studies describe Latin American men in a way that further disempowers them. "By being both 'lower class' and 'exotic,' machismo is removed from the realm of the Latin American elite – who tend to be the most 'white' or

Spanish – and from the United States," (p.3). Since machismo was interpreted as an indicator of underdevelopment, it was something that could not be experienced in Western culture. Hardin's perceptions are further strengthened when it is considered non-Latin Americans wrote much of the original research on machismo (Gutmann & Viveros, 2005).

The point raised by Hardin is important to consider while wading through the literature surrounding machismo. Socioeconomic issues certainly play heavily into the experiences of women and men and it is realistic that this would have an effect on the forms of masculinity in a given location. In fact, the study conducted by Torres et al (2002) found a connection between machismo and the socioeconomic and historical aspects of the society, stating men's behaviours are more likely the result of their experiences than they are a pathological or deficient aspect of their character. Therefore, they argue, generalizing the concept of machismo causes factors such as culture, ethnicity, politics, gender, class, poverty, racism, and employment status to be overlooked and consequently the pressures put on gender role identities are not considered. More recently, scholars have engaged these criticisms claiming the simplicity and possible bias in contextualizing machismo in a negative way lends to North American stereotypes (Stephenson, 2003; DeSouza, Baldwin, Koller, & Narvaz, 2004). What is more important is recognizing the complexity of masculinity in Latin America and that not all men can be considered to embody machismo.

Consider Stephens (1973) argument differentiating machismo between men of Spanish and indigenous backgrounds. Contrary to American writers, Stephens argues

that machismo is not necessarily a class-based phenomenon but rather indicative of the culture of the area. Stephens (1973) claims indigenous men who have had limited contact with "outside" cultures, show very little machista (sexist) traits. For example, those living in the highlands of Peru, Bolivia, Columbia, Ecuador and some areas of Mexico would fall into the machismo-free category. Interestingly, some indigenous communities matrilineal family structures appear to be the norm where women carry much more prestige than in other areas of Latin America. Similarly, Stephens asserts those countries primarily inhabited by Europeans and / or their descendants have much more subtle displays of machismo. This is a curious finding in light of the many theories that trace machismo back to the Mediterranean region. Stephens asserts the most prevalent forms of machista-based machismo seems to be most acute is in countries where two or more influential cultures have combined (i.e. Brazil, Venezuela, Cuba, and Puerto Rico).

The contradictions associated with machismo is not to say that Latin American men either subscribe to machismo or not, but rather, they represent the dilemma's faced by men in the region as to which identity to buy into (Mirandé, 2008). As Ramírez (1999) states, it is paramount that a distinction be made between ideology and behaviour because "although there is one ideology [masculinity], there are various behaviours; they vary according to the power and privileges that each man possesses," (p. 16). Recognizing the various interpretations about the term machismo is paramount. If a term can mean so many things and be influenced by so many factors, then it is not a viable tool to completely understand and discuss Latin American men.

Although the argument that all Latin American men demonstrate machismo is losing strength, it continues to creep up in scholarly literature about the region.[6] Gutmann & Viveros (2005) argue this is because of the differences that arise between studies conducted *from* as opposed to *about* Latin America. Within the region, Latin American scholars are more interested in developing theories for different parts of the region, rather than on a whole. For example, hegemonic concepts of masculinity, such as machismo, have arisen from European and US historical and cultural contexts, and the reality is Latin American scholars are reluctant to embrace such theories. This is a telling fact about the nature of machismo and whether it is a useful concept to continue to use in development work.

While the subject and definition of machismo is often debated, it is important to note the stereotype is linked to practiced behaviours. As such, it is not the intent to discredit the existence of an exaggerated form of masculinity in Latin America because in truth, it exists. For example, there are men who practice domination and subordination of women and aggrandize their sexual conquests among other men. As well, women and men in Latin America engage in the language of machismo to discuss certain characteristics of male behaviour. However, what is considered machismo varies from person to person and place to place, making it a problematic concept to use when describing Latin American men.

Expanding for a moment on the participation of women in macho behaviours, it is important to consider how machismo impacts their lives as well. Interestingly, women

---

[6] For example, refer to Archinega et al (2008); Hernandez (2003); Hardin (2002); Gimore (1987); Baca Zinn (1982); Stephens (1973).

do not feature heavily in the research on machismo although it certainly affects their lives. What is available through some of the writings is the culpability sometimes put upon them for perpetuating such stereotypes. For example, Forrest (2002) claims Cuban woman often point to other women as the main perpetrators of machismo stating female machistas (chauvinists) encourage their husbands, sons and brothers to act in ways congruent with traditional forms of machismo (i.e. aggression, male dominance, etc). Forrest does not explain why women would engage in this behaviour, only stating that it is a "stubborn leftover from an inglorious past," (p. 94). Similarly, Melhuus (1996) claims that while women blame machismo for all their troubles, they also do not want a "soft husband". Instead, they actively seek "real men" who display some of the positive attributes of machismo such as being hard working, responsible and respectable. Like Forrest, Melhuus does not delve into why women act this way and this leaves many questions unanswered. In truth, both authors only speak anecdotally about women and it points to an area that would benefit from further analysis and research.

Most popular, is to talk of women through the framework of marianismo. Depicted as the opposite to machismo, the term was first coined by Evelyn Stephens (1973) to describe women as semi-divine, and spiritually and morally stronger than men. Marianismo is referred to as the "cult of femininity" or the "cult of the Virgin Mother" due to its connections with the Catholic Church and expectations for women to emulate the characteristics of Mary. Since the Church influences much of Latin America, women in Latin American society are pressured to conform to the Virgin standards: chastity, obedience, submission, and purity (Hernandez, 2003). Hernandez (2003) argues that

marianismo together with machismo, pressures women to accept much of what traditional machismo asks of them, leaving women negatively affected by the social norms surrounding them. For example, traditional ideas of machismo view women as sexual objects and social pressures cause women to have little say over their own sexuality, future, or whether or not to have children. Instead, the intent is to keep women in politically, economically and socially disadvantaged positions whereby the patriarchal system remains the status quo.

While Hernandez certainly describes how women may be affected by machismo, her description relies heavily on one interpretation of how women and men engage. As well, it does not consider how women either endorse or fight against such behaviours – overtly or otherwise (that is, it does not address women's agency). The truth of the matter is there are a growing number of women and women's groups actively pushing for the engagement of men in gender and development efforts (*see* Chapter four). This is because women have realized through their own self-explorations in development programs how gender impacts their lives and have learned different ways of being women. However, women have realised that such transformations are for naught if men do not also undergo the same. So, although there is some indication of how machismo connects with women's lives, the lack of in-depth research is a gap that certainly needs to be addressed in order to show the relational aspects of masculinity.

CONCLUSION

The perpetuation of the machismo stereotype is a major consideration in gender and development. If it does not adequately capture the lived experiences of men, the

question remains as to whether it should be considered the means of understanding them. In borrowing from Cornwall's (2007) discussion about gender myths, as discussed in Chapter Two, machismo contains the necessary components to be considered a gender myth itself. While it is based upon elements of truth, closer investigation shows it has been simplified to the point where it no longer resembles the reality. As Baca Zinn (1982) states, the traditional view of machismo is a stereotypical myth since it assumes relations between women and men are one-sided. The reality is decision making in Latin American homes are more egalitarian than is traditionally represented in the literature. It is thus important to deconstruct the structural roots of machismo to reveal the basis for the modern myth in order to break down the harmful results of oversimplifying men in a large region.

Understanding masculinity in its various forms is the first process to bringing men into gender discussions. When considering Latin American masculinity, machismo certainly plays a role in shaping men's behaviours although the meaning of the concept itself is contested. While it is often used to imply negative male behaviour traits, machismo is a complex concept that cannot be easily used to understand the experiences of men as a whole. As Ramírez (1999) points out, the continued uncritical use of machismo as an analytical starting point to understand Latin American men only leads to misunderstandings and misconstrues the experiences of men. Such methods essentially present men as homogenous beings and do not consider the complexity of masculinity and the many forms it can take. Homogeneity has been a recognized fault by feminists theorising about women, so the same should be considered when studying men.

In order to move past the stereotypes and begin to understand masculinity in Latin America it is necessary to understand the complete picture of gender relations. To this end, more analysis of race, class, culture, age and sex is a necessary starting point. As well, complementary studies on women and machismo would provide much needed analysis from a gender relation's perspective and thereby increase the possibility for change.

By reviewing masculinity in Brazil, Nicaragua, and Mexico, the next chapter will show how masculinity is influenced by many factors and result in different manifestations. For example, even though young men in low-income Brazilian neighbourhoods do not identify with traditional male gender roles, the same cannot be said of young men living in Rio de Janeiro's favelas (DeSouza et al, 2004). In Nicaragua, it is thought that relations between women and men are dictated by the patriarchal system of machismo, and in Mexico, machismo is thought to represent a means of reclaiming power for a disempowered group (Lancaster, 2002). Although machismo is generally construed to represent negative behaviours, more positive and alternate forms of being a man are already recognized and encouraged to exist in each country. However, it is also clear that machismo is a problematic concept of analysis because of its tendency to homogenize the experiences of men. By wading through the various displays and interpretations in each country, the case studies will also show how masculinity has been engaged to transform gender relations and increase gender equality.

CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

Although mainstream gender and development programs have tended to focus primarily on women, there is an increasing recognition of the need to understand men as well. Men in Latin America are generally understood through the concept of machismo. Despite the relevance of machismo as one element of analysis in masculinity studies, as discussed in the previous chapter, it is often used in a way that homogenises Latin American men without allowing for understanding the complexities of their lives. Overwhelmingly, masculinity studies in Latin America are discussed at the continental level. The problem with such an approach is that it cannot expect to accurately capture the men within the regions or even within the countries themselves. One only needs to think about generalizing men in Africa as a whole to understand that such methods would not work.

There is a very real need to delve into the experiences of men-as-men and understand the structural causes of inequality, both of which cannot be examined through machismo alone. Likewise, if gender analyses only consider women, we neglect the structural causes for certain gender behaviours. Gender inequality is a systemic issue requiring further analysis of historical, environmental, political, economic, cultural and gender issues. Including men in discussions is one way to begin to produce a complete picture of what is happening in gender relations and a step toward sustainable gender equality.

Within Latin America there have been many programs working to engage men in order to increase gender equality. This chapter focuses on four programs in three different countries: Brazil - Program H; Mexico - Salud y Genero; and, Nicaragua – Cantera, and the Association of Men Against Violence (Asociación de Hombres Contra la Violencia - AHCV). The purpose of discussing these particular case studies is twofold: first, they show the nuances in the forms of masculinity between each country, which is to be expected given the differences between their histories, politics, and cultural practices. Second, the programs show the possibilities that arise from including men, such as increased gender equality and men's willingness to reconsider negative and destructive forms of interaction. Each case begins at the country level providing a brief historical context of masculinity, and is followed by a description of the programs working with men. The cases are then analysed and discussed in order to draw lessons for future programs that aim to address gender equality.

BRAZIL

Brazil is a large country with many regional, ethnic and cultural differences and is burdened with widespread regional and socioeconomic inequalities (Nascimento et al, 2010). Although masculinity in Brazil is often described through the concept of machismo, the manner in which it is constructed is reliant on many factors such as class, ethnicity, race, region and sex. The history of Brazil has played a large part in the evolution of its sexuality. Like so many other countries in Latin America, Brazilian sexuality is closely connected to the European conquest. Brazil was first discovered and

colonized by the Portuguese in the 1500s bringing with it colonization, politics, religion, literature and law which impacted modern day gender roles (Baldwin & DeSouza, 2001). Under colonization, Brazil suffered slavery, religious domination by the Catholic Church and decimation. This history has left long lasting values that have not only defined Brazilians, but has also deeply affected cultural behaviours and identities (De Oliveira, 2000).

Following colonization, Latin America on a whole experienced constant military, economic and political intervention from the United States dating back to the mid-19th century. The result was the evolution of highly politicized studies that blamed US and European meddling for current affairs. Masculinity studies are no different given the most prevalent analysis of masculinity is connected to the Spanish and Portuguese colonization (Strasser & Tinsman, 2010). Gender identities have been further connected to the military coups that occurred all over Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s, including Brazil (Chant & Crask, 2003).

Unlike other areas of the world, questions about masculinity emerged almost concurrently with gender studies in Latin America. The debate about Brazilian men and masculinity began in the 1970s having evolved out of feminist movements in the 1960s (Medrado et al, 2001). Since that time, gender roles have evolved rapidly according to age, class, race and ethnicity (Baldwin & DeSouza, 2001).

In Brazil, class is a major determinant of gender behaviours and is closely connected to other factors, such as age and ethnicity. For instance, young, middle class couples have been shown to be more egalitarian, casting aside the idea that women

should be subordinate to men (Baldwin & DeSouza, 2001). On the other hand, young men and low-income men in Brazil often do not enjoy the same privileges as wealthier classes because the patriarchal hierarchy dictates that adult and upper-middle class men are the unquestionable authority figures (Nolasco in Barker & Loewenstein, 1997). However, despite one's class position, the reality is all men face pressures to conform to social norms and systems that dictate acceptable means of behaviour (Barker & Loewenstein, 1997).

Class is intertwined with ethnicity insofar as opportunities available to some are not available to others. Studies have shown that African-descendent males attain the lowest levels of education in the country and education, in turn, affects attitudes and behaviours. For instance, higher levels of education are generally considered to correlate to more egalitarian perspectives (Nascimento et al, 2010). When comparing those in the favela's to people living elsewhere in Brazil, studies have shown that men living inside the favela's feel more pressure to conform to traditional forms of masculinity exemplified by machismo (Barker & Loewenstein, 1997). The favela's are low-income areas usually constructed on the hillsides in Rio de Janeiro and are renown for their poor housing, inadequate sanitation, security and overall living conditions. It is thought that men living within them are more apt to engage in traditional male behaviours because of the presence of *comandos* – drug trafficking gangs that essentially act as the leading social and political force in the community (Barker & Loewenstein, 1997). Comandos exert a strong influence over men in the favela's and promote an image of masculinity that is both patriarchal and machista (sexist). Given the tight knit nature of the favela's, many

people give in to their leadership even though they may be opposed to their presence. There is a sense among residents that their behaviours are always being watched, and any engagement to alternate behaviours may result in unwanted attention from the comandos (Barker & Loewenstein, 1997).

Alternatively, low-income men living outside the favela are more open to question their gender roles and engage in equitable behaviours because they do not receive the same amount of pressure to conform to certain gender norms (Barker & Loewenstein, 1997). This is because they are free from the watchful eye of the comandos present in the favela's and are thus not pressured to conform to an idea of masculinity enforced by them. Recognizing how class, ethnicity and age play into masculinity is important to factor in when addressing men in different cultural contexts. The favela's provide a unique example for how a generic masculinity policy may not work in that context simply because the issues faced there are not the same as outside the favela's.

Delving more deeply into the masculinity question in Brazil, it is clear that machismo plays an integral role in how Brazilian masculinity is understood. Like many areas of Latin America, machismo is invoked to explain women and men's activities through sexuality. For instance, women are expected to be more passive and men more active (Gilmore, 1990). Barker and Loewenstein (1997) trace these ideas back to the Latin-Mediterranean lineage of machismo where manhood was measured through the number of sexual conquests and the ability to control the women around him (i.e. mother, wife, sister, daughter). While these forms of manhood certainly exist in Brazil, such perspectives are decidedly negative in nature and neglect consideration of the more

positive attributes of machismo discussed in Chapter Three. Further, as Baldwin & DeSouza (2001) warn, framing Brazilian culture as machista (sexist) limits gender discussions to male perspectives only because sexism derives from men. It is necessary to look at both women and men to best understand what is going on.

Machismo is considered by some to be more prevalent in Brazil than in other areas with larger indigenous populations simply because of the role colonialism played in the country (Neuhouser, 1989). In this context, sexual relations in Brazil began based upon a slave-owning system where women of colour were under the power and authority of white men. However, the strength of this argument depends on whether machismo is the result of colonialism or other, more recent, factors such as those mentioned in Chapter Two (i.e. political and economic unrest, compensation for US interference, etc). Further, it is interesting to note that in each of the countries examined, at least one scholar believed machismo was most prevalent in that particular country. Thus, it only serves to show that even in debating machismo, there remains a subtle competition for who can lay claim to it the most.

Despite the existence of machismo, Brazilian attitudes toward gender norms have seen a major evolution over the past 30 years where women are no longer held to strict codes of conduct. For example, in urban Brazil, sexual attitudes are more liberal and pre-marital sex is more acceptable for women than it once was (Barker & Loewenstein, 1997). Yet, even with these changing attitudes, Barker & Loewenstein (1997) note that women's sexual conquests cannot equal that of men. Men still expect to have the upper hand when it comes to experience and information related to sexuality. This is a key

factor in Brazilian relationships, which organizations such as Promundo (discussed below) seek to address. Specifically, research indicates that men and in particular, young men in Brazil, play major roles in deciding when and how women's sexual activity may occur (Barker et al, 2003). Given that men hold more power, engage in more promiscuous activities at earlier ages, and are pressured to conform to certain masculine forms of behaviour, Promundo believes it is imperative that men be included in gender-focused programs in order to improve not only their own lives, but that of women as well (Barker et al, 2003).

With all that said, although there is considerable research about the existence and impacts of machismo in Brazil, it tends to be based on the assumption that machismo is inherently negative in nature. There is a real need to dig deeper and understand the many different forms of masculinity present in Brazil and not take for granted that men who associate with machismo are necessarily embodying a certain set of traits. There has been very little research on the evolution of Brazilian masculinity the consequence is that little attention has been paid to the historical roots of men's behaviours – an essential component of understanding men as men. Given the size of Brazil and the many cultural and ethnic groups within, it is even more essential to delve into such analysis.

Despite the lack of historical analysis into Brazilian masculinity, there remains considerable momentum to understand and engage men in gender equality initiatives. A major leader in this regard is Promundo, a Brazilian-based NGO committed to gender equality and the reduction of violence against women and children. Founded in 1997, it has developed a tremendous amount of work on men and masculinities in its 13 short

years of operation. Recognized at the international level by the United Nations as a leader in gender equality initiatives, it has led the way with research, advocacy and programs that include men in the debate (Promundo, 2010a). Most notable is Program H – a program that engages men and their communities in questioning the traditional ideas about masculinity (Promundo, 2010b). While Promundo actively engages men in its programs, it is careful to point out that it does not aim to solely focus on men, but work with men alongside women in the quest to achieve gender equality.

Program H

Overview

The internationally recognized Program H – "H" for Homens and Hombres, meaning men in Portuguese and Spanish respectively - was developed in 1999 to confront issues such as gender-based violence, fatherhood, and health education (Barker, 2003).[7] It aims to help young men redefine what it means to be a man by promoting positive behaviours already in existence in the community and exploring why negative male actions such as violence are not beneficial to the community as a whole (Barker, 2003). In other words, the program examines the downsides of traditional forms of masculinity and promotes the benefits of more gender equitable behaviours (Pulerwitz, Barker & Segundo, 2004). It is an important program to consider because it exemplifies

---

[7] Gary Barker is one of the founding members and former Executive Director of Promundo. He continues to play a prominent role in the organization and currently sits as the Vice-President of the Board of Directors. He is one of the leading scholars on men and masculinities and founding co-chair for MenEngage, a global alliance of organizations working to engage men and boys in gender equality.

the ability to successfully include men in initiatives related to gender equality, such as the prevention of gender-based violence.

Program Establishment

Located in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Program H was developed by Promundo in collaboration with three other Latin American NGOs, Ecos (São Paulo, Brazil), PAPAI (Recife, Brazil) and Salud y Genero (México) in order to promote changes in community and individual conceptions of manhood (Barker, 2007). Program H emerged based on research examining gender-based violence and sexual activities among young Brazilian men (Nascimento, 2006). The research showed that male behaviours often formed during adolescence and usually continued into adulthood. This pointed to the need to engage men early in transforming their attitudes around gender equality and sexuality. If young men learned more equitable attitudes early in life, these were likely to continue for the rest of their lives (Nascimento, 2006).

Program H is also based upon research that seeks to understand the discrepancies in male behaviours. While there are certainly many men who engage in negative behaviours, there are others who question those norms and ask why it is necessary to engage in such activities in order to be considered men (Barker, 2007). Research suggests that men who are more self-aware and able to self-reflect are generally more apt to display more gender equitable attitudes (Barker, 2007). Usually, these men had witnessed gender equitable attitudes and behaviours either among family members, in their peer group, or from another adult male. What this research showed was that not all

men, in fact, condoned negative and destructive male behaviour and there were many who welcomed the opportunity to act in more gender equitable ways. In this regard, it cast doubt on the prevailing idea that all men were machista. As well, it highlighted the fact that male behaviours were not static and changed in response to attitudes around them, whether it was family, friends, other men in their communities and / or the larger community norms (Barker, 2001).

Program Format

Recognizing these trends, the founders of Program H created an integrated intervention strategy to promote changes about masculinity at the individual and community level. The strategy includes conducting community campaigns, group education activities, and impact evaluations in order to determine the extent to which attitudes have evolved (Barker, 2007). A key factor in men's attitudes, especially as it relates to traditional ideas of masculinity, is machismo. Program H recognizes the use of machismo to describe and influence traditional male behaviours and beliefs. For example, how men approach sexual activities may range from refusal to use condoms, not taking responsibility for sexual health concerns, not participating as fathers, and keeping multiple partners (Nascimento, 2006). However, Program H recognizes there are also positive ways to being a man and, as such, grapples with how negative constructions of machismo can influence the behaviours of men. As a solution, Program H advocates working with younger men so as to prevent the adoption and entrenchment of negative constructions of masculinity and promote positive attributes already in existence. To

further encourage the adoption of alternate ideas of masculinity, Program H recognizes that men's attitudes needed to be confronted not only on an individual basis, but also at the community level.

At the community level, intervention activities include initiating a lifestyle social marketing campaign with the aim of changing community/social norms about what it means to be a man (Pulerwitz, Barker & Segundo, 2004). This involves engaging parents, service providers, community and religious leaders, the media, and others who play a part in propagating certain attitudes and behaviours (Barker, 2007). The objective is to encourage the development of social and community norms that are more conducive to gender equality. This component was developed in cooperation with male participants to determine their main sources of information and cultural connections in the community and to ensure the messages were properly tuned to reach the most people (Pulerwitz et al, 2004).

At the individual level, the program brings together groups of men often led by male facilitators to use group educational activities that move through role playing, brainstorming, and individual reflection exercises (Barker, 2006). The rationale for only focusing on men is because men are more apt to participate and speak more freely among members of the same sex than in mixed groups. Activities include a manual and educational video to help encourage attitude and behaviour changes among men with 18 exercises in total. The program is held for two hours, once a week over six months. The purpose is to reflect on how boys and men are socialized to act the way they do. Both positive and negative behaviours are discussed and participants reflect on how certain

behaviours impact both themselves and those around them and determine how some behaviours may be more beneficial than others (Pulerwitz et al, 2004).

The program is further benefited by the concurrent use of Program M – "M" standing for Mulheres and Mujeres, meaning women in Portuguese and Spanish respectively. Constructed in a similar manner to Program H, Program M aims to empower young women by critically assessing gender, rights and health (Promundo, 2010c). Like Program H, it uses educational workshops, community outreach and program evaluations to encourage more gender equitable attitudes. By breaking down perceived gender roles with both women and men, Promundo recognizes the relational aspects of how gender roles form. Thus, by acting in concert, Program H and Program M show the possibilities of how engaging both women and men can instigate change.

Program Evaluation and Outcomes

Program H measures changes in social norms and men's attitudes around masculinity through the GEM Scale - Gender Equitable Attitudes in Men Scale (Barker, 2003). The GEM Scale was developed specifically for Program H to reflect the developing country realities and to measure attitudes related to certain gender norms, such as those related to intimate relationships, sexual and reproductive health, and disease and violence prevention (Pulerwitz & Barker, 2008). The aim of the GEM Scale is to meet the following objectives:

(a) be multifaceted and measure multiple domains within the construct of gender norms, with a focus on support for equitable or inequitable gender norms; (b) address program goals related to sexual and intimate relationships and sexual and reproductive health and disease prevention; (c) be broadly applicable yet culturally sensitive, so indicators can be applied in and compared across varied settings and be sufficiently relevant for specific

cultural contexts; and (d) be easily administered, so that a number of actors—including the organizations that are implementing interventions—can take on this type of evaluation, (Pulerwitz & Barker, 2008, p. 324).

As well, it is anticipated that the GEM scale will enable similar programs to measure changes in gender equity.

The GEM Scale includes 17 items that measure traditional attitudes about gender roles on issues such as HIV/AIDS, violence, domestic responsibilities, caregiving, and sexual and reproductive health (Pulerwitz et al, 2004). The GEM was tested and validated through a random community-based sample of 749 men ranging from 15 to 60 years of age and living in low and middle income areas of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It provided the baseline for measurements of gender equitable attitudes after administering Program H (Pulerwitz et al, 2004).

Following the development of the GEM scale, Promundo underwent a two-year impact evaluation study to measure the impact of the program components (namely, the manuals and videos). They included 750 young men between ages 15 to 24 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (Nascimento, 2006). The results showed significant changes in gender norm attitudes and confirmed the positive impact of the program on gender attitudes. For example, more men were showing increased involvement as fathers and incidences of violence in the home was decreasing (Barker, 2003). It also affirmed the GEM scale could be used as a means of measuring such changes since it correlated with key behavioural outcome variables (i.e. use of condoms and incidences of domestic violence) (Nascimento, 2006). However, since behaviours cannot and do not change quickly, the GEM scale is limited in its ability to measure short-term change. Despite this, the GEM scale does provide the ability to track movements or changes in the direction of gender

equity, thus providing useful information about areas or attitudes that need to be addressed in trainings with men (Nascimento, 2006).

Although the program began in Latin America, it is now working around the world in places such as India, Vietnam, the Balkans, and Sub-Saharan Africa. Program H has received international attention for its work with men and boys and in 2008 was recognized by the UNFPA in its State of the Population Report for its effective work engaging young men in promoting sexual and reproductive health (Promundo, 2010b). What it shows is that interventions that focus on positive aspects of masculinity can successfully impact men's attitudes about gender roles. Gender equality initiatives would be well served to consider such interventions, not only when dealing with men, but also with women since gender norms are propagated by members of both sexes and the greater community overall.

MEXICO

Similar to other Latin American countries, Mexico has experienced a tumultuous history laden with colonialism, civil war, economic strife and political interference. Masculinity studies in Mexico are especially interesting given the strong association with the term machismo. While many men in Latin America are linked to the term, no country is connected more than Mexico where Mexican men are often represented as the epitome of the Latin American man. This is intriguing given the widely different histories and experiences between countries in Latin America, yet the stereotype continues.

While there are a growing number of studies examining Mexican men and their connection to the present day machismo stereotype, there are few studies that trace the

evolution of modern day conceptions of Mexican masculinity and the variances within the country. This leaves unanswered questions about how men came to embody certain behaviours, beliefs and expectations. It is widely accepted that Mexican men are described as macho, but what led to this and what does Mexican machismo mean? Also, how does Mexican machismo differ from its Latin American neighbours?

One of the most widely recognized insights into Mexican men comes from the work of Matthew C. Gutmann (1996) in his book *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Using an anthropological perspective, Gutmann examines the current state of men in order to measure their behaviours against prevailing machismo stereotypes. What his research shows is that men in Mexico do not necessary identify or act in ways that support the prevailing opinions of Mexican men. For example, men of different ages had different ideas of what machismo actually was, thus preventing it from being representative since there was not a universally understood definition. While Gutmann's analysis is groundbreaking, it does not provide a complete picture of how men in Mexico came to embody the masculine roles seen today.

However, Gutmann's (1996) historical account of machismo does give some indication about the recent use of the term to describe Mexican men. In searching for the roots of machismo in Mexico, Gutmann (1996) found it is a relatively recent concept. In fact, prior to the 1930s and 1940s, the words macho and machismo were not widely used in Mexican society. While macho certainly existed, it was generally used as an obscenity in much the same way that machismo has now come to be known – to describe men who are vulgar, promiscuous and aggressive. It was more common to hear terms such as

hombrismo, muy hombre and muy valiente (referring to courage) in common Mexican language. Interestingly, the term muy hombre was applicable to both women and men during the Mexican Revolution. It was only after 1940 that machismo came to be a term associated with Mexico, and by extension, Mexican men.

Looking at how Mexican masculinity is described, traditional (negative) machismo stereotypes pervade the literature. For example, Carrier (1995) states the division between women and men must be clearly defined to show that things active are male and all things passive equal female. The large body of work focusing on sexuality and Mexican men, as well, captures the macho ideal. Men are described as being more sexually promiscuous than women and also as aggressively heterosexual (Connell, 2005). Gay men have played important roles in challenging heterosexual expressions of masculinity (de Keijzer 2004). Since heterosexuality is one of the key determinants of masculinity in Mexico, de Keijzer states it is very radical for those who go against the grain. Yet, as work with men has shown, not all men endorse machismo behaviours. As Gutmann (1996) asserts, there are multiple ways of being a man in Mexico and men and women take on many different masculine and feminine identities at any one time.

Recognizing the impacts of machismo on Mexican men's lives is an important consideration; however, it is necessary to move beyond cultural phenomenon and examine other factors influencing men and women's lives. The past fifty years in particular points to several factors. One of the biggest impacts has been the women's movement for gender equality (de Keijzer, 2004). This is linked to the increasing numbers of women leaving the home to pursue work causing men to deal with growing

responsibilities in the home (Latapí, 2003). These changes in the labour force have seriously affected men, not only because women are moving into the public sector, but also because their role as exclusive provider and head of the household is slowly eroding (de Keijzer, 2004).

As men take on greater responsibilities in childrearing, there are still many men who resist rethinking established gender norms. Organizations such as Salud y Genero are working with men in order to challenge these behaviours. As founder and Executive Director Benno de Keijzer (2004) states, many men are largely ignorant of how their masculine traits also negatively affect their own lives. By questioning why men act the way they do, lives of both women and men are largely improved.

Salud y Genero

Overview

Salud y Género was one of the first organizations in Latin America to make the move toward engaging men in their efforts to increase gender equality. It aims to improve the health and quality of life for men and women by addressing mental, sexual and reproductive health. Salud y Genero believes gender is a form of social inequality (similar to class or ethnic inequality) that explains the power relations between women and men (Salud y Genero, 2010). The organization works to transform gender relations in order to encourage the empowerment of women and increase men's awareness. To this end, it has integrated masculinity into its work because it believes masculinity is a risk factor that impacts men's health and general well-being (AVSC et al, 1999)

Program Establishment

Initially started by health care workers responding to the aftermath of the Mexico City earthquake in 1985, the organization began work in 1992 with a focus on health promotion with women (Barker, 1998; Chant & Gutmann, 2002). As work progressed, the need to discuss men became increasingly necessary due to the realities faced in low-income rural and urban Mexico. For example, in one of Salud y Genero's early community workshops, the negative effects of alcoholism was discussed by both women and men. Interestingly, it was the men who spoke about the difficulties they faced when attempting to express emotion and deal with life issues stating alcohol helped alleviate this need. However, at the same time both women and men saw how alcoholism was not a viable alternative since it was harmful to men themselves and on families (AVSC et al, 1999).

Recognizing the gap faced by men to discuss the pressures in their lives, Salud y Genero began to develop programming that directly addressed masculinity and men's roles. The result was the official formation of Salud y Genero in 1995 with a mission to contribute to better health and quality of life through gender-based educational activities (de Keijzer et al, 2003). The organization operates all over Mexico with its two main offices located in Veracruz and Querétaro (de Keijzer et al, 2003).

Founding member de Keijzer has been a major supporter of the inclusion of men and highlights the concept of "masculinity as a risk factor." Specifically, he advocates the examination of how traditional forms of masculinity can be harmful to men's health,

whether psychological or in general (AVSC et al, 1999). When working on issues related to alcoholism and domestic violence, the organization really came to understand how women and men's situation were closely connected and merited the inclusion of both.

Program Format

Salud y Genero uses a participatory methodology whereby the experience of the individual is used as the starting point in the programs. Within this, it integrates theory and the thoughts and feelings of the participants (Salud y Genero, 2010). The program is often directed at men experiencing poverty, social discrimination or unemployment including male prisoners, community practitioners, rural development programs and young men in secondary school (Barker, 1998; AVSC et al, 1999). When operating the program in new areas, Salud y Genero has found success initiating discussion around fatherhood. This is perceived as less threatening to outright discussions on masculinity (AVSC et al, 1999).

They use dialogues, self-reflection and experience sharing to confront the negative effects of male socialization (de Keijzer, 2004). Workshops confront issues related to alcoholism, fatherhood, human rights, and mental health and centre around sensitizing men to the realities of violence in their lives, showing how it is both harmful to themselves and those around them (de Keijzer et al, 2003). In addition, activities break down preconceived gender roles and discuss how men express emotion and the issues surrounding this (AVSC et al, 1999).

Workshops vary in length, but are generally held over one to three days and are sometimes followed up with a second workshop three months after the first. This is because it has been found the first workshop sometimes bring up issues that cannot be easily covered in only a few days (AVSC et al, 1999).

Although there continue to be programs directed at solely men, it is equally important for Salud y Genero to work with women (Barker, 1998). They recognize women have less access to and control to make decisions on issues related to sexuality, reproduction, work, and social and political participation (de Keijzer et al, 2003). By continuing to work with women alongside men, Salud y Genero is encouraging both sides to re-imagine gender roles and relationships. Whenever possible Salud y Genero brings women and men together for two to three day workshops in order to discuss how gender and masculinity affects their personal lives, workplaces, and communities (Barker, 1998). Before bringing them together, however, the organization has found it integral for men to have their own space to start the dialogue process about masculinity. For even though men will talk in the combined workshops, they have a difficult time opening up about their feelings and personal histories (de Keijzer et al, 2003).

Program Evaluation and Outcomes

Salud y Genero has learned many lessons over its years working with men. Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, work with men needs to extend beyond workshops and include organizations and society in general in the reformation of masculinities (AVSC et al, 1999). This can have a profound on men since change would start at the

individual level and be supported by organizations and society in general (de Keijzer et al, 2003). To this end, Salud y Genero recognizes the need to hold more than one workshop with men to really instigate changes in behaviours and attitudes. It is then hoped that participants will take back all that they have learned to their workplaces and communities (AVSC et al, 1999).

Second, Salud y Genero has learned that framing masculinity as a risk factor is an important starting point for discussion among men. This allows men to cease being defensive and engage in talks about how masculinity shapes their lives (AVSC et al, 1999). However, in order to attract and retain men to Salud y Genero's programs, it is recognized that women are instrumental allies to keep involved in such efforts.

After many years of working with men and women, Salud y Genero notes two main forces for change - understanding power dynamics in relationships and contact with emotions (de Keijzer, 2004). Working with men is not easy and Salud y Genero has found that the emotions and experiences in men's pasts can be difficult for them to discuss. As a result, dropouts tend to be quite common in voluntary programs (de Keijzer, 2004). Yet, by continued work with women, men and the larger community, attitudes begin to shift and can lead men to return to the program. As de Keijzer (2004) notes, peers can be both a major obstacle and influence for men attending the programs. If a man is trying to change the way he approaches life, he can sometimes face ridicule and jeers in order to maintain the gender order. However, there are other men who come by the program as a result of peers who have already participated. This makes change easier as the participant has a growing peer group supporting the same values. The

objective of Salud y Genero is to keep this body of men growing so change becomes easier.

That said, Salud y Genero has not produced measured evaluations of its programs to date. While it recognizes the need to monitor the program, most evaluations have been in the form of feedback from program participants and were not conducted in a systematic way (de Keijzer et al, 2003). As of 2003, the program was beginning the process of developing baseline data to reflect the areas where it expects change to take place. This information has not been thus far translated into a published document nor has any data been made available on their website.

NICARAGUA

Masculinity in Nicaragua has received a growing amount of attention over the past twenty years, and with it, the concept of machismo. In order to study masculinity in Nicaragua it is imperative to understand the factors influencing masculinity and gender relations. The long and complicated history of Nicaragua plays a big role in the masculinity debate. Colonialism, exploitation, corruption, underdevelopment, poverty and revolution dot the historical landscape of Nicaragua and it directly affects the gender relations we see today.

Similar to many other Latin American countries, Nicaraguan culture has been deeply impacted by the Spanish conquest (Sternberg et al, 2008). Since that time, it has experienced successive waves of oppression and occupation as it has moved through dictators and presidents and neo-colonialism through the interference of Western

countries over its political direction (Lancaster, 1992). In its more recent history, Nicaragua experienced the pressures of patriarchy[8] through the Somoza dictatorship that held power for most of the twentieth century (1936-1979). During this time, the country was run as if it were the sole property of the Somoza family whereby the head of the family acted as the head of the state (Sternberg et al, 2008). It is because of this tumultuous past that there is little wonder why gender inequality figures high in Nicaragua.

With the revolution, however, came new prospects especially in the area of gender relations. The end of the Samoza dictatorship came about through the 1979 Sandinista revolution. Initially, the Sandinista revolution was not interested to confront gender issues since much of the Sandinista position was based upon religious doctrine through the Catholic Church. Although there were elements of the Church that supported the Sandinistan Revolution, in general, changes to gender structures were not considered a primary concern (Sternberg et al, 2008). However, gender equality issues were not easily pushed aside. There was a large faction of the Sandinista's who believed gender equality was an important part of the revolution (Sternberg et al, 2008). In fact, one of the Sandinista objectives following the revolution was to create more equitable families and ensure equal rights for women within the constitution (Lancaster, 1992).

Women had played prominent roles in the revolution and were able to translate many of their demands into much needed legal changes. For example, the Association of

---

[8] Patriarchy is a social system in which men control virtually all aspects of the public and private sector (Cudd & Andreasen, 2005). It is a system that guarantees (or is expected to guarantee) the dominance of men and the subordination of women (Connell, 2001). Since machismo is traditionally understood to endorse the dominance of men over women, it is considered a form of patriarchy.

Nicaraguan Women "Luisa Amanda Espinosa" (AMNLAE – Asociasión de Mujeres Nicaragüenses "Luisa Amanda Espinosa") successfully lobbied for the legal abolishment of discrimination against women and established gender equality rights (Lancaster, 1992). However, the electoral defeat of the Sandinista's in 1990 halted any progress to transform these legal guarantees into social change leaving much of the existing patriarchal behaviours intact.

Despite the seeming failure, the benefit from the Sandinista revolution was that it brought with it the possibility of change. Sandinista discussions about gender relations and AMLAE's work to raise public consciousness increased national awareness about gender. Masculinity was increasingly featured as a key issue for consideration in the gender debate. Men were more open to considering not only social change, but also personal change (Jones, 2006). Within this, machismo was singled out as a key cultural barrier to overcome on the path to a more egalitarian society (Howe, 2007).

Throughout Nicaragua's history, constructs of masculinity have been based upon the concept of machismo. In general, machismo in Nicaragua is negatively associated with the brash, alcoholic, womanizing, abusive man. While there are many factors that play into the formation of such a man, such displays of machismo are often thought to be the result of the widespread economic concerns that have plagued the country over the past century (Jones, 2006). According to Nicaraguan feminist Sofía Montenegro, male identities and roles in Nicaragua have been particularly influenced by the capitalist modernization of agriculture after World War II. In this analysis, machismo is displayed

when economically stretched and stressed men take their frustrations out by drinking, fighting each other, and abusing their family members.

However, in Nicaragua, machismo is not simply the result of economics. As Cymene Howe (2007) states, Nicaraguan machismo "operates in political, social and cultural processes as a day-to-day dynamic and on a conceptual level, to inform the way people speak and think about masculinity, gender, and power," (p. 233). Part of the political situation in Nicaragua has included war and revolution, both of which have also directly shaped the identities of men. For instance, Welsh (2007) claims the Sandinista revolution gave men "a 'special' sense of belonging and self-importance," which gave men a sense of power (p. 1). However, that power was directed toward creating a just and equitable society in order to free Nicaragua from "capitalist imperialism," (p. 1). With the electoral defeat of the Sandinista's in 1990, that power diminished with the revolution. The advent of neo-liberal economic policies did little to restore men's position in the society, especially since the reforms further burdened the fragile economy of Nicaragua and led to increased poverty and widespread unemployment. The consequence on men was increased anger, frustration and incidences of violence (Welsh, 2007).

As Welsh (2001) asserts, machismo in Nicaragua is a socio-cultural model of masculinity that influences the attitudes, behaviours and values that many men feel they need to adopt in order to be considered real men. It affects how men perceive themselves, how they relate to each other and especially how they interact with women. In Nicaragua, Welsh states machismo is essentially about power because it represents an

important point of male identities. As David Whisnant (1995) explains, machismo is part of the prevalent hegemonic order that was created to serve men's interests. Any attempts, therefore, to overturn male dominance come up against this force and are hard to break down. So, although machismo is not the sole form of masculinity present in Nicaragua, it plays a strong influential role.

In this way, machismo is interpreted as embodying a certain set of negative behaviours. Given the many issues faced by men over the past century, solely using machismo to explain the behaviour of Nicaraguan men is flawed because the cultural values and situation of men have been in constant flux. A more productive method to engage men is to help them understand themselves. This includes engaging with the ways in which machismo impacts their lives and also understanding the root causes for their behaviours. This, in turn, might help men buy into changing the structures that perpetuate oppression and gender inequality (Sternberg, 2000).

The growing importance of masculinity in Nicaragua points to the unique example it presents in Latin America. Having fought together in the revolution, women and men were given the opportunity to see each other in a different light. Since women had played significant roles in the revolution, many men had been exposed to the potential of a different society. What's more, the revolution had given people the opportunity to think more critically about their situations and this led many to question the unjustifiable gender hierarchy.

While the other countries included in this chapter discuss only one organization, it is difficult to do the same for Nicaragua. This is because many of the organizations

working with men in Nicaragua were formed in partnership or in coordination with each other. In a way, the move toward addressing men and masculinities in Nicaragua swept like a wave across the landscape and has resulted in many movements and organizations moving toward the same purpose – to unlearn negative forms of machismo in order to promote more gender equitable relations between women and men. The following section will focus on two organizations, Cantera and AHCV, in order to show how engaging men can be both transformative for the men and for those around them.

Cantera – Centre of Communication and Popular Education

Overview

One of the first organizations to begin work with men in Latin America was the feminist-based organization Cantera - Centre of Communication and Popular Education. The mission of Cantera is to create a more just, sustainable and equitable society by combining popular education, gender perspectives, spirituality, agro-ecology and ethics (Cantera, 2010a). Their objective is to provide more sensitive and participatory alternatives that will not only transform how individuals interact, but also society at large in both rural and urban areas. Cantera works with both women and men by examining social attitudes, values, and behaviours. Their work with men entails examining the social construction of masculinity in order to break down the contradictions and injustices inherent in existing gender structures. The overall goal is for men to generate their own directives for change and take the responsibility to instil these changes in themselves and the larger community (UNIFEM, 2009).

Program Establishment

When Cantera formed in 1988, it was initially only focused on empowering women. Through this initial mandate, Cantera developed and delivered hundreds of workshops based on a popular education framework where women analysed themselves. The expectation was for women to understand the social construction of their gender identities and articulate concrete proposals to improve their practical and strategic gender needs (Welsh, 2001). However, as more and more women participated in the programs, it was increasingly identified that men and patriarchal attitudes, values and norms remained a structural stumbling block to achieving gender equality (Welsh, 2001). Women demanded that men be included in the programming because otherwise women were expected to transform patriarchal relationships alone. As one woman stated, "not only with us do you need to speak; you also have to convince the men that they have to change," (personal communications, Juan Carlos Arce Campos, Cantera, 2010).

At the same time, the organization of Cantera was discussing the links between gender and popular education, leading to questions about masculinity (Welsh, 2001). The argument made by the women within the organization was that social justice could not be achieved without a commitment to gender justice (CIIR, 2002). The women challenged their male colleagues to come to terms with their masculinity and existing ideas about gender and feminism. The first step in this process was for men to begin to unlearn machismo (Welsh, 2001). In this sense, machismo was interpreted as representing undefined negative male behaviours.

The first outcome of these discussions was a national conference on men in 1994, bringing together men from all over the country to reflect upon gender and masculinity (CIIR, 2002; Welsh, 2001). The result was the development of the course "Masculinity and Popular Education" which began operation in 1995. Based on the success of the program, it was officially added to Cantera's curriculum and thereby changed the mandate of the organization from only focusing on women to bringing both women and men together to achieve gender equality (Welsh, 2001).

Program Format

Cantera's programs with men use the same methodologies and lessons learned from working with women. The objective is to encourage men to examine their social attitudes, values and behaviours in order to identify the impacts of social constructs of masculinity (White et al, 2003). By reflecting and recognizing the contradictions and injustices present in existing gender roles, the program encourages men to develop methods for change and take steps to turn them into reality (UNIFEM, 2009).

Cantera uses a unique approach to engage men in the analysis of their own masculinity including reflecting on past personal experiences in order to re-examine and potentially reinterpret the event. The program takes place over the course of one year and includes five 3 ½ day workshops that focus on the following: (1) identity, masculine communication and power; (2) gender, power, and violence; (3) affectivity and sexuality; (4) creating just relationships (includes women and men); and (5) application of the perspective of gender (Cantera, 2010b). The workshops are spaced about two to three

months apart to facilitate the unlearning of negative behaviours and give time for changes to occur. They are designed to feed into each other, growing more in-depth with each level.

The first workshop begins the process of deconstructing men's behaviours and the social construction of men's identities with the purpose of shedding light on power relations and masculine "superiority" (Cantera, 2010b). The second workshop builds from this and looks at how power and violence affects men's lives. For example, it examines the family and the socioeconomic situation in Nicaragua and asks men to come up with ways to reduce violence in their lives. The third workshop addresses the affective process of sexuality in order for participants to identify processes of change (Cantera, 2010b). Here, men articulate clear visions of how to alter their behaviours and attitudes to be more gender equal. This is then used as the basis of a methodology that male participants can use to train other men. The fourth workshop brings women and men together to discuss what each has learned in their respective workshops (as women participate in a parallel course) in order to build mutual understandings and dialogue (White et al, 2003). Finally, the last workshop is intended to take the lessons learned from the previous four workshops and implement them in all aspects of men's lives. A special focus is placed on translating the methodologies to the workplace, but it also aims to translate the newfound knowledge on gender to an institutional and social level (Cantera, 2010b).

The training offered to women is very similar in scope to the men. Its overall objective is to breakdown gender identities as they relate to power and examine the

processes of communication in the family, community and society at large (Cantera, 2010b). There are four workshops offered to women that follow much the same description as those discussed above: (1) identities and conditions of women; (2) women and their relationship to power; (3) affectivity, communication and sexuality; and (4) creating just relationships (a workshop where women and men jointly participate).

As the course progresses, men begin to realise how hegemonic forms of masculinity have affected and influenced their lives. This realization enables men to understand how their behaviours are based on ideas of their masculinity (namely, negative forms of machismo) and the learned nature of their actions. This awakening leads men to understand that their behaviours can be unlearned and recast in more positive ways (Welsh, 2001). The process is not easy. As Welsh (2001) states "unlearning machismo is the conscious and systematic stripping down of the internal and external manifestations of patriarchal power and the assimilation of new attributes and values: tenderness, affection, compassion, co-operation, communication," (p. 187).

A key component of Cantera's popular educational model is that participants set their own learning agenda. This is important because machismo and other negative behaviours are directly linked to each individual's own experiences with masculinity. To identify what men hope to gain from the workshops, Cantera uses "commitments" where participants decide how they want to be and commit themselves to accomplishing that identity (personal communications, Juan Carlos Arce Campos, Cantera, 2010). What is critical to the process is that each man takes responsibility for his own self-evaluation and be as open and honest with themselves as possible (Welsh, 2001).

Another key element is the inclusion of women in the process of unlearning machismo. In the fourth and final workshop, Cantera uses *Creating Just Relationships* in order for women and men to safely discuss lessons learned, fears, doubts, aspirations, expectations, proposals and strategies to live and work together (Cantera, 2010b; Welsh, 2001). The objective is for participants to determine methods that will help create and sustain equitable relations between women and men (Cantera, 2010b). For many, this is the first time they have expressed their gender needs in the presence of members of the opposite sex.

The methodological format of the course is unique in the sense that men and women are taught about gender, masculinity and violence in non-traditional ways. Participants learn to critically assess the socialization processes that impact the creation of their identities and they are encouraged to reflect upon incidences in their lives where they felt pushed to act in certain ways (Welsh, 2001). To encourage continued learning, Cantera has included methodological and educational tools in the course content so that male participants can replicate the course for their communities or organizations and thereby increase the process of gender transformation (Welsh, 2001).

Program Evaluation and Outcomes

As of 2001, Cantera had trained approximately 450 men on issues of masculinity (Welsh, 2001). An impact study conducted by Cantera in 1998 showed the benefits of engaging men in such programming. The study was directed at 112 of the original 250 men who had participated in their programs between September 1994 and September

1997, and their close female relatives (i.e. wives, partners, mothers, daughters and colleagues). The results showed that both the women and men had witnessed changes in how men perceived their masculinity, how men engaged with women, and their participation in household activities (Welsh, 2010; White et al, 2003). In particular, men were seen to behave in less stereotypical macho ways, display reduced discrimination, and acted more equitable with women (White et al, 2003). Many men reported feeling more patience and were able to better critically self-reflect. As well, they reported increased abilities to express their emotions and show affection to those around them (CIIR, 2002).

The study also pointed to the reduction of violence among those men predisposed to hurt their partners. For example, the number of psychological acts of violence dropped by 36% and physical violence reduced by 56% (Welsh, 2010; Cantera, 1999). Two-thirds of women respondents said their partners were less violent than before taking the course. In some areas, women credited men with greater change than men themselves claimed. This was seen in areas related to paternal responsibility and in relations within the community (Welsh, 2007).

While the evaluation highlighted some encouraging trends, it was limited by a lack of baseline data and was not representative of the general population (UNIFEM, 2009; White et al, 2003). Thus, it could not be said conclusively that the program was making significant headway in country trends overall.

Also, it must be noted that while participants did show changed behaviours, machismo continued to be an influential force. As Welsh (2001) states, gender-based

violence was not eliminated outright since some male participants continued to use violence against their partners. While such news is disheartening, it does not discredit the work of Cantera entirely. Rather it shows that men are indeed attempting to alter the ways in which they behave, but it is a long process requiring support – especially among the community to embrace alternate and acceptable ways for men to act (CIIR, 2002).

Cantera has recently undergone a new impact evaluation tracing the success of the program over the past eight years of operation. Unfortunately, the study will not be released until January 2011. However, the organization hopes the lessons learned and progress they uncover will serve as a learning tool for other organizations working to increase gender equality and gender justice in the region (personal communications, J.C. Arce Campos, Cantera, 2010).

Association of Men Against Violence (AHCV)

Overview

The Association of Men Against Violence (Asociación de Hombres Contra la Violencia - AHCV) is also playing a key role in changing attitudes in Nicaragua. Operating under the slogan *Learning new ways to be human*, AHCV was created to find ways for women and men to relate to one another in an equitable and respectful way, and specifically works toward reducing and preventing gender-based violence (Gonzales, 2010). It strategically aims to make men aware of issues related to gender equality, masculinity, power and gender-based violence and promotes change in the patriarchal

attitudes, values, and behaviours of men (Welsh, 2007). In particular, AHCV addresses the concept of machismo and its connection to violence.

Beyond that, however, AHCV also works to promote a National Network of Men Against Violence and initiates, strengthens and supports local networks and campaigns to change public opinion (CIIR, 2002).

Program Establishment

The roots of AHCV date back to 1993 when some men from Nicaragua's non-governmental organizations got together to discuss gender-based violence. Over the course of a few years, the group shared their experiences working with men since many came from organizations, such as Cantera, that had started to offer programs on issues related to masculinity (Reyes, 2001). This earlier organization was known as the Group of Men Against Violence (GMAV) and was based solely out of Managua.

However, despite the growing awareness of men and masculinity, many feminist organizations were not satisfied with the efforts being made. In 1999, a public debate was held to discuss men's roles in preventing gender-based violence. The result was a call for men to become more politically organized in the fight to stop gender-based violence (Welsh, 2007). At the urging of these women's groups and building upon the earlier efforts by GMAV, it was decided to take the initiative nation-wide. AHCV was legally signed into effect in May 2000 and lost no time attracting members (Welsh, 2007; Reyes, 2001). In fact, it had already attracted 100 members (80 men and 20 women) by the time of its inauguration four months after inception (Welsh, 2001).

Program Format

Since many of the founding members had previously participated in Cantera's popular education programs for men, many of the components were translated to the work of AHCV. What AHCV does differently, however, is emphasise engaging communities since it was recognized that individual change is not enough to transform embedded patriarchal structures and norms (Welsh, 2007).

The course consists of four modules that each takes place over four days. The modules are spaced two to three months apart with the idea that men can translate the knowledge they gained in the courses back into their personal, professional and public lives (Swedish Cooperative Centre, 2009). Each module addresses themes related to the social construction of masculinity: male gender identities (i.e. what makes me a man), gender-based violence (i.e. feelings surrounding the use of violence), male sexuality, health, and reproductive rights (Gonzales, 2010). It also considers common perceptions about female gender roles.

Like Cantera, AHCV uses men's own experiences and realities as the starting point for self-analysis. Men do not learn about gender, masculinity or violence in a traditional way through the programs, but are rather guided through a critical analysis on how social and cultural values and practices impact their lives (Welsh, 2007). This means that men not only learn about masculinities and gender in a much different way, but they also delve into the myths and prejudices that surround them. This allows for

participants to understand the negative and destructive forms of behaviour and develop new concepts, attitudes and behaviours (Welsh, 2007).

However, getting men involved is not always easy despite the growing attention on men and masculinities in Nicaragua. As Wilber Antonio Gonzales Gutierrez (2010), Manager of the Children's Program for AHCV notes, many men who first hear about AHCV's work believe it is an association set out to protect other *men* from violence. Thus, Gonzales says a lot of AHCV's work goes into educating the public about their true mission – to protect and prevent violence against women.

The public education campaign is also part of AHCV's community intervention strategy. The strategy is an integrated approach that includes training for men, raising awareness in communities, encouraging the development and growth of groups and networks of men against violence across the country at all levels, and actively engaging men in advocacy and lobbying (Welsh, 2007). Each year new communities are chosen to be the focus of the intervention strategy. The selection is usually based upon the existence of a women's organization already engaged in gender training so that alliances can be easily formed (Welsh, 2007; Gonzales, 2010). AHCV identifies 20 to 30 men in the chosen communities to participate in the training sessions, and these people are then expected to take the knowledge back to their communities and work on developing advocacy activities for the rest of the year (Gonzales, 2010).

The purpose of the advocacy activities is to create a level of awareness about AHCV's work and create activities that will contribute to the dismantling of the patriarchal system. Strategies for advocacy revolve around education, organizational and

strategic partnerships with other organizations (especially with women's organizations), and a social communications strategy (Swedish Cooperative Centre, 2009).

Program Evaluation and Outcomes

The key to AHCV's success appears to lie in the fact that it is a men's organization addressing men's issues. In other words, it approaches masculinity from a men-as-men perspective. As Gonzales (2010) states, much of the work on violence against women is conducted by other women's organizations. Having had a violent past himself, he said he did not feel comfortable disclosing his violent actions towards women with these organizations. Instead he told them what he believed they wanted or expected to hear. Thus, he did not really benefit from the programs. However, as an organization by men for men, Gonzales believes the men cannot get away with the same thing. He states the men really challenge other men to recognize their actions and understand that the woman facing the abuse could be their own sister or mother. In sum, Gonzales states that because men are part of the violence, they are also part of the solution. Thus, by addressing men, AHCV is helping to transform negative forms of masculinity such as machismo, into more positive and equitable ways of being.

Yet, despite the seeming success, AHCV has not produced any published evaluation results. The only results recorded are those of men's perceptions of the program. While AHCV appears to be making great strides to changing men's perceptions about machismo and masculinity, the organization would be better served to publish data highlighting its record after ten years in operation.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The point of using these cases has been to show that while machismo has been used as a holistic concept to describe Latin American men, the experiences and pressures faced by men are different. Consequently, the forms of masculinity and the methods employed to overcome them must take these into account. For instance, it is interesting to note that each case tended to construe machismo as representing a certain pre-defined set of negative traits. Although each organization recognized the positive attributes of masculinity, they were not usually connected to the machismo concept. This was also apparent in the masculinity literature in each of the profiled countries. While I do not seek to discredit the existence of machismo and the fact that it has traditional been used to represent negative male behaviours, the problem is that machismo is used as an analytical tool to define and represent men. This harkens back to my premise in Chapter Three that there is a need for further examinations of masculinity since the majority of information available tends to portray men in one uniform way. While such characterisations may well represent the majority of men in each country, it neglects consideration of those men who do not accept mainstream norms and behaviours. The latter men are left marginalized and little understood. Due to the difficulties in defining machismo and the homogeneity implied, it cannot be seen a viable concept to use analytically. It is instead more useful to discuss men in much the same way as women and recognizing how contextual differences (i.e. culture, region, ethnicity, age, etc) can alter the form of masculinity in a given situation.

What is important to note, however, is the encouragement of positive forms of masculinity already recognized to exist in the community. For example, Program H was developed out of research that found more gender equitable attitudes among men in Brazil. Once it was known that more egalitarian views were possible among men, it discredited arguments that men could only be one way (i.e. oppressive, violent, etc). Therefore, it was already recognized that there were alternate models of being men, yet little questioning was directed at the viability of machismo as a conceptual starting point.

The case studies also show that contrary to popular opinion, men are interested to talk about their issues and want to change those things that bring negativity to their lives. Since machismo (here meant to represent negative masculine attributes) was a leading form of masculinity against which Latin American men feel pressured to conform, participants in these programs are learning ways of overcoming it.

Looking more closely at the organizations, it is clear that many have considered the cultural and regional context of the country in which they work. For instance, Brazilian NGO Promundo has conducted numerous studies about masculinity in Brazil and has even delved into the differences between class, ethnicity and region. This is exemplified through the research on the favela's versus those men living outside of them. Nicaragua has taken into consideration its politically and socially turbulent past and credits the Sandinista revolution as being the catalyst to changing gender norms in the country.

Overall, the programs examined shared some key characteristics that lend to their successful engagement in transforming negative forms of masculinity. First, each

program uses a participatory methodology whereby analysis begins from the perspective of the individual participant. Men are asked to look inside themselves and start the process of breaking down how dominant images of masculinity impact their lives.

Second, each program has an intimate connection to women's rights. While some organizations actually began work focusing on women (i.e. Cantera and Salud y Genero), all recognized the need to include them in their programs. For Cantera, this means offering a parallel course to women where the fourth and final workshop is shared with men. Although Salud y Genero has not formally built co-ed workshops into their program, they do offer it when possible recognizing the need for women and men to discuss their gender concerns. In other programs, such as Program H and AHCV, women are included through the community outreach component or in the planning and development of the programs.

Community outreach is yet another common characteristic that warrants consideration. Transforming gender behaviours, attitudes and norms is difficult and each organization has developed methods to increase the likelihood of success through the engagement of the wider community. Program H and Cantera have built-in community intervention strategies that work alongside their training programs, and AHCV was actually developed with outreach being their primary objective. As well, Salud y Genero has recognized the need to include the community and especially peers because they can make or break the program's success. By having a supportive and engaged community, the likelihood of transforming traditional male behaviours is much more likely to succeed.

The one thing that separates the organizations is a coherent evaluation strategy. Although Program H and Cantera have developed the most comprehensive means to track changes in gender equality, the other organizations such as AHCV and Salud y Genero have depended on participant feedback to judge their success. This is especially surprising given Salud y Genero's involvement in the development of Program H. That said, Salud y Genero has stated it is in the development stage of producing evaluation results and this will lend greater credibility to its work with men.

The truth of the matter is that numbers talk. If there is to be any hope of making gender equality a project for all and by all, then there needs to be statistical evidence showing how programs directed at men can improve the situation of women. While many feminists have been hesitant to address men in the gender equality initiative, these programs point to the benefits that can be made when men are involved. However, the attention paid to men should not be at the expense of women. Rather, care should be taken to ensure women are involved in the planning and development of these programs in order to ensure gender equality continues to be the overarching principle.

CONCLUSION

Although it is often argued that men already receive a great deal of development attention, it is not generally through gender and development programs. By examining the programs above, it is clear that working with men is key to confronting the structural causes of gender inequality. If we do not include men, we continue to perpetuate a system whereby the onus is on women to solve the problems of domestic violence and

reproductive health. This is a fact argued by many of the women who pushed for the creation of these programs in the first place.

It is important to recognize, overall, that the stimulus for talking to men often comes from women. By listening to their needs, these four programs have reported increased gender equality and growing understanding between women and men about each other's life pressures. Also, by bringing women and men together, these programs have provided examples of how women and men *can* work in concert. Gender equality cannot happen by focusing on one side alone. It is only through communication and understanding can we begin to bring about change.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

> Without an approach to difference... men will continue to be left on the sidelines and remain 'the problem', (Cornwall, 1997, p.11).

The absence of men in gender and development is an on-going reality despite the growing evidence of the benefits their inclusion can bring. The first step to bringing men into the debate is to understand who they are and the pressures they face. There is an abundant amount of information claiming to understand men but it is clear that it is based on preconceived ideas of who they are. As the preceding chapters have shown, men are not easily categorised into one succinct definition. In Latin America, men are often described through the concept of machismo. While it certainly exists, the difficulty lies in the fact there is not a central definition of what machismo actually is. For instance, it can represent positive traits of honour and chivalry or, more popularly, negatively embody alcoholism, abuse and womanizing. It is further hampered by the fact that many men in Latin America do not even identify with the term. What this leaves is a large body of men who are either misrepresented or ignored.

While this thesis focused on masculinity in Latin America, the premises could easily be translated to other areas of the world. For example, men and masculinities in India are equally imbued with negative images of men and exclude them from the process[9]. Since women in India face numerous injustices in their lives it is understandable that programs are primarily interested in providing opportunities where previously there were none. However, a major obstacle to women's empowerment and

---

[9] Based on personal work experience in Bangalore, India with a women's micro-credit organization in 2006.

equality is patriarchy. Consequently, programs that solely direct efforts at women without addressing the masculinity question leave women burdened with the extra challenge of being responsible for changing their gender circumstances. In a nutshell, like many areas of the world, we are expecting to change gender relations *through* women instead of bringing both women and men together to challenge structural norms that perpetuate inequality.

In order to get back to the basics of GAD, it is important to fully embrace the notion of gender relations. It is clear that understanding men and masculinities is an important piece of the puzzle in development work. Since many men do not identify with idealised forms of masculinity, it is important that policy makers recognize this and reflect upon how existing programs and policies may marginalise or disempower men. As Cornwall states, "by deconstructing cultural assumptions about being a man, awareness can be raised about the ways in which some of these assumptions leave people in a no-win situation," (Cornwall, 1997, p. 12).

However, changes to gender relations cannot occur by focusing on one side alone. It is important to consider men and masculinities in gender planning if there is to be any hope in achieving gender equality. This is because gender identities play a huge part in relationships. Women centred programs leave men off the agenda and this can have a self-fulfilling prophesy to get men to act in negative ways (i.e. increased violence toward women, aggression, etc). As the Program H and Cantera programs demonstrate, involving men can ensure that initiatives originally intended for women benefit the entire community in a more effective and sustainable manner. Further, all the programs

discussed in Chapter Four show how harmful masculine norms can be challenged and changed. While the programs are still quite small in scale, their progress with the target communities have uncovered new possibilities in the quest to achieve gender equality. However, if the programs are to have any hope of transforming gender relations on a large-scale, then they need to be translated to a larger audience (Ringheim & Feldman-Jacobs, 2009).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although much work has started in the field of masculinity studies in Latin America, there are still some areas that merit further examination and can be translated to masculinities work the world over. The following is a list of recommendations.

- *Recognize that men have gender issues too.* While this may seem like a redundant statement, the reality is that mainstream gender and development tends to ignore the gendered aspect of men and forgets that they, like women, face pressures based on their sex. If we want to confront these pressures, then it is necessary to engage with the gender issues. One possible starting point would include explicitly discussing males in gender policies, with their roles and well being taken into account.

- *Conduct more research on men as gendered beings, or men-as-men and not simply in terms of how men impact women.* An accurate picture cannot be formed

when simply analysing men through one framework (i.e. feminism). It would be useful to explore and demonstrate the different forms of masculinity that may be present in a given society to determine how individual behaviour plays out in these situations (Viveros, 2001). It is vitally important to show that masculinity is a fluid concept – the forms present in any given context are dependent upon the culture, region, age, ethnicity, sex, history, and social and political factors. Simply framing discussions of men in terms of stereotypes such as machismo can misrepresent the experiences and values of men and leave them little understood.

- *Connect with men as individuals, rather than as obstacles.* If policy continues to be created under the assumption of "men as the perpetrator, woman as the victim," then the other pressures and experiences of men are ignored. Connell (2005) warns that men are likely to have diverse reactions to gender equality issues because men's experiences differ. Nevertheless, there are a lot of men who would see their circumstances as very similar to women in their communities. So although men have a great deal more to lose if gender equality is accomplished, it is possible to encourage a form of masculinity that is more conducive to gender equality. As Connell points out, men have been big supporters of programs aimed at gender reform with boys and men though there are some who are resistant to gender change. Therefore, it is important to include men and boys in discussions about breaking down or reforming traditional ideas of masculinity. Although men may be hesitant to become involved in gender equality initiatives, the programs

discussed in chapter four found many ways to start dialogue with men. For instance, AHCV recognized men were more willing to engage when they were appealed to as fathers. This dropped their guard against the initiatives and they saw that the programs were interested in them as individuals and not simply in terms of how they impacted women.

- *Use gender relations as the analytical starting point.* Engaging men does not mean we should develop a parallel field for men in development. Rather, it is important to get back to the GAD principle of invoking a gender relational lens in gender issues. As Bannon & Correia (2006) state, " in the same way that it is short-sighted to try to empower women without engaging men, it is similarly inadequate to try to change male gender roles and the construction of manhood without engaging women," (p. 257). While women may be considered irrelevant to masculinity studies, it needs to be recognized that both women and men are impacted by the actions and identities of the other (Viveros, 2003). Thus, gender policies need to be more integrated rather than focusing on gender groups as separate entities. The programs assessed in Chapter Four support this premise as each were not only born out of demands from local women, but were conducted with their support and inclusion. This ensures development efforts were more responsive to entire communities instead of only one facet. After all, development affects everyone and attention to both men and women together creates more holistic outcomes.

- *Work with women's rights organizations on policy and program initiatives.* This ensures a backbone of support while working toward common goals of gender equality (Ringheim et al, 2009). Such actions have been taken by each of the programs analysed, showing the importance of buy-in to program success.

- *Develop sound program evaluation tools.* As stated in the previous chapter, the reality is that numbers paint clearer pictures than words alone. Without effective and timely evaluations about the benefits of male involvement, organizations will be slow to take up the challenge. While Program H and Cantera have developed the most comprehensive evaluations, the other two programs have little more than personal impact statements to show how their programs have impacted men. To this end, program evaluations need to also show the impact on gender equality. Once armed with this data, programs are better equipped to see gaps in delivery and can amend their approaches to be more effective to local needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2008). Toward a fuller conception of machismo: Development of a traditional machismo and caballerismo scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55* (1), 19-33.

AVSC International & IPPF, Western Hemisphere. (1999). Five case studies for the symposium *on male participation in sexual and reproductive health: New paradigms.* New York: AVSC International.

Baca Zinn, Maxine. (1982). Chicano men and masculinity. *Journal of Ethnic Studies, 10* (2), 29-44.

Baldwin, John & Eros DeSouza. (2001). Modelo María and machismo: The social construction of gender in Brazil. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 35* (1), 9-29.

Bannon, Ian & Correia, Maria C, (2006). *The other half of gender: Men's issues in development.* Washington: The World Bank.

Barker, Gary. (2007). *The Instudo Promundo story.* Retrieved September 2, 2010 from www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/innovations/data/InstitutoPromundoStory#Note s

Barker, Gary. (2003). *How do we know if men have changed? Promoting and measuring attitude change with young men. Lessons from Program H in Latin America.* United Nations Expert Group Meeting on The Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality. Brasilia, Brazil.

Barker, Gary. (2001). 'Cool your head, man': Preventing gender based violence in favelas. *Development, 44* (3), 94-98.

Barker, Gary. (1998). Salud y Género (Mexico): Participatory workshops on masculinity and male involvement. In Gary Barker, *Five case studies for the symposium on male participation in sexual and reproductive health: New paradigms* (pp. 45-52). New York: AVSC International.

Barker, G. & I. Loewenstein. (1997). Where the boys are: Attitudes related to masculinity, fatherhood and violence toward women among low income adolescent and young adult males in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Youth and Society, 29* (2), 166-196.

Barker, G., Nascimento, M., Oliveria, S., Cordova, D., Fernandes, E., & B. Ni Dhonail.

(2003). *Guy to guy project: Engaging young men in violence prevention and in sexual and reproductive health*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Instiudo Promundo.

Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world. *Men and Masculinities, 11* (1), 86-103.

Boserup, Ester. (1970). *Women's role in economic development*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cantera. (2010a). *Who are we?* Retrieved August 30, 2010 from www.canteranicaragua.org/en_cantera.html

Cantera. (2010b). *Workshops*. Retrieved September 2, 2010 from www.canteranicaragua.org/en_oferta.html#g_hombres

Cantera. (1999). *Hacia una nueva masculinidad: Impacto de los cursos metodológicos de masculinidad y educatión popular 1994-1997*. Managua, Nicaragua.

Carrier, James. (1995). *De los otros: Intimacy and homosexuality among Mexican men*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Carrigan, T., Connell, B. & J. Lee. (2002). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. In Rachel Adams & David Savran (Eds.), *The masculinity studies reader* (pp. 99-118). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Casas, J. M., Wagenheim, B. R., Banchero, R., & Mendoza-Romero, J. (1994). Hispanic masculinity: Myth or psychological schema meriting clinical consideration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 16*, 315-331.

Chant, Sylvia. (2000). From 'woman blind' to 'man-kind'. Should men have more space in gender and development? *IDS Bulletin, 31* (2), pp. 7-17.

Chant, Sylvia & Matthew C. Gutmann. (2002). 'Men-streaming' gender? Questions for gender and development policy in the twenty-first century. *Progress in Development Studies, 2* (4), 269-282.

Chant, Sylvia & Matthew C. Gutmann. (2000). *Mainstreaming men into gender and development: Debates, reflections and experiences*. Oxford, UK: Oxfam Publishing.

Chant, S. H., & N. Crask. (2003). *Gender in Latin America*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

CIIR. (2002). Men changing: power, masculinities and non-violence from Latin America

to Europe. London: CIIR (now Progressio). Retrieved August 26, 2010 from www.aidsportal.org/repos/Men%20Changing-%20Progressio.pdf

Cleaver, Francis. (2002). *Masculinities matter: Men, gender and development.* New York: Zed Books.

Connell, R.W. (2005). Change among the gatekeepers: Men, masculinities, and gender equality in the global arena. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30* (3), 1801-1825.

Connell, R.W. (2001). The social organization of masculinity. In S.M. Whitehead & F.J. Barrett (Eds.), *The masculinities reader* (pp. 30-50). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19* (6), 829-859.

Connelly, M.P., Li, T.M., MacDonald, M., & J.L. Parpart. (2000) Feminism and development: Theoretical perspectives. In J.L. Parpart, M.P. Connelly & V. E. Barriteau (Eds.), *Theoretical perspectives on gender and development* (pp. 51-160). Ottawa: IDRC.

Cornwall, A., Harrison, E., & A. Whitehead (2007a). *Feminisms in development: Contradictions, contestations and challenges.* New York: Zed Books.

Cornwall, A., Harrison, E., & A. Whitehead (2007b). Gender myths and feminist fables: The struggle for interpretive power in gender and development. *Development and Change, 38* (1), 1-20.

Cornwall, Andrea. (1997). Men, masculinity and 'gender in development'. *Gender and Development, 5* (2), 8-13.

Correia, Maria C. & Bannon, Ian. (2006). Gender and its discontents: Moving to men-streaming development. In Ian Bannon & Maria C. Correia (Eds.), *The other half of gender* (pp. 245-260). Washington: The World Bank.

Cudd, A.E. & R.O. Andreason. (2005). *Feminist theory: A philosophical anthology.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

de Keijzer, Benno. (2004). Masculinities: Resistance and change. In Sandy Ruxton (Ed.) *Gender equality and men: Learning from practice* (pp. 28-49). Oxford, UK: Oxfam GB.

de Keijzer, B., Reyes, E.M., Aguilar, O., Sánchez, G., & Ayala, G. (2003). Constructing new, gender-equitable identities: Salud y Género's work in Mexico. In, US Aid Interagency Gender Working Group, Subcommittee on Men and Reproductive Health, *Three case studies: Involving men to address gender inequities.* Available online via www.prb.org/igwg_media/InvolvMenToAddressGendr.pdf

De Oliveira, José Batista Loureiro. (2000, March 16-18). *Deconstructing machismo: Victims of machismo ideology dominating in Brazil.* Paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association, Miami, USA.

DeSouza, E. R., Baldwin, J., Koller, S. H., & Narvaz, M. (2004). A Latin American perspective on the study of gender (pp. 41-67). *Praeger guide to the psychology of gender.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Ertürk, Yakin (2004). Considering the role of men in gender agenda setting: Conceptual and policy issues. *Feminist review, 78,* 3-21.

Fonseca, Claudia. (2001). Philanderers, cuckolds, and wily women: A re-examination of gender relations in a Brazilian working-class neighbourhood. *Men & Masculinities, 3* (3), 261-277.

Forrest, David (2002). Lenin, the Pinguero, and Cuban imaginings of maleness in times of scarcity. In Francis Cleaver (Ed.), *Masculinities matter: Men, gender and development* (pp. 84-111). New York: Zed Books.

French, W. E. & Bliss, K. E. (2007). *Gender, sexuality, and power in Latin America since independence.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Goetz, Anne Marie. (2007). Political cleaners: Women as the new anti-corruption force? *Development and Change, 38* (1), 87-105.

Gonzales Gutierres, Wiber Antonio. (2010, June 19). *Linkages between gender, culture, women's rights: Focusing on engaging men.* Address at the Oxfam Gender Justice Summit, Ryerson University, Toronto, ON.

Greig, Allan. (2009). Troublesome masculinities: Masculinity in trouble. *IDS Bulletin, 40* (1), 69-76.

Greig, A., Kimmel, M., & Lang, J. (2000). *Men, masculinities & development: Broadening our work towards gender equality.* New York: UNDP.

Gutmann, Matthew C. (1996 & 2007). *The meaning of macho: Being a man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gutmann, Matthew C. & Viveros Vigoya, Mara. (2005). Masculinities in Latin America. In Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, & R.W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 114-125). London: Sage Publications.

Hardin, Michael. (2002). Altering masculinities: The Spanish conquest and the evolution of the Latin American machismo. *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies, 7* (1), 1-22.

Harrison, Elizabeth. (1997). Fish, feminists and the FAO: Translating 'gender' through different institutions in the development process. In Anne Marie Goetz (Ed.), *Getting institutions right for women in development* (pp. 61-74). London: Zed Books.

Hernandez, Patricia M. (2003). The myth of machismo: An everyday reality for Latin American women. *St. Thomas Law Review, 15* (4), 859-882.

Horrocks, Roger. (1994). *Masculinities in crisis: Myths, fantasies and realities*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Howe, Cymene. (2007). Gender, sexuality, and revolution: Making histories and cultural politics in Nicaragua, 1979-2001. In W.E. French & K.E. Bliss (Eds.), *Gender, sexuality, and power in Latin America since independence* (pp. 230-260). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Ltd.

Ingolds, B.B. (1985, Nov 4-8). *A theory for the development of machismo*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Dallas, TX.

Jones, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Men of the global south: A reader*. London: Zed Books.

Kabeer, Naila. (1994). *Reversed realities: Gender hierarchies in development thought*. London, UK: Verso Books.

Kimmel, Michael S. (2001). Global masculinities: Restoration and resistance. In Bob Pease & Pringle (Eds.), *A man's world? Changing men's practices in a globalized world* (pp. 21-37). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kinzer, N. S. (1973). Priests, machos and babies: Or, Latin American women and the manichaen heresy. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35*, 300-311.

Lancaster, Roger N. (1992). *Life is hard: Machismo, danger, and the intimacy of power in Nicaragua.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Latapí, Agustín Escobar. (2003). Men and their histories: Restructuring, gender inequality and life transitions in Urban Mexico. In Matthew C. Gutmann (Ed), *Changing men and masculinities in Latin America* (pp. 84-114). Durham: Duke University Press.

Marchand, Marianne H. (2009). The future of gender and development after 9/11: Insights from postcolonial feminism and transnationalism. *Third World Quarterly, 30* (5), 921-935.

Medrado, B., Lyra, J., & M. Monteiro. (2001). Masculinities in Brazil: The case of Brazilian television advertisements. In B. Pease and K. Pringle (Eds.), *A man's world? Changing men's practices in a globalized world.* London: Zed Books.

Melhuus, Marit. (1996). Power, value and the ambiguous meanings of gender. In M. Melhuus & K. A. Stølen (Eds.), *Machos, mistresses, madonnas: Contesting the power of Latin American gender imagery* (pp. 230-259). London: Verso.

Messerschmidt, James W. (2008). And now, the rest of the story...A commentary on Christine Beasley's 'Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world.' *Men and Masculinities, 11* (1), 104-108.

Mirandé, Alfredo. (2008). Hombres y machos. In Shira Tarrant (Ed.), *Men speak out: Views on gender, sex, and power* (pp. 47-55). New York: Routledge.

Mirandé, Alfredo. (1997). *Hombres, y machos: Masculinity and Latino culture.* Westview Press.

Mosse, Julia Cleves. (1993). *Half the world, half a chance: An introduction to gender and development.* Oxford: Oxfam.

Nascimento, M. (2006). *Working with young men to promote gender equality: An experience in Brazil and Latin America.* Retrieved April 22, 2010 from www.siyanda.org/docs/nascimento_youngmen.doc

Nascimento, M., Segundo, M. & G. Barker. (2010). Brazil. In Promundo & International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW), *What men have to do with it: Public policies to promote gender equality* (pp. 36-41). Retrieved August 23, 2010 from www.icrw.org/files/publications/What-Men-Have-to-Do-With-It.pdf

Neuhouser, K. (1989). Sources of women's power and status among the urban poor in contemporary Brazil. *Signs, 14,* 685-702.

Oakley, Anne. (1972). *Sex, gender and society.* New York: Harper & Row.

Parpart, Jane L. (1995). Post-modernism, gender and development. In Jonathan Crush (Ed.), *The power of development.* London: Routledge.

Parpart, J.L., Connelly, M.P. & V. E. Barriteau. (2000). *Theoretical perspectives on gender and development.* Ottawa: IDRC.

Parpart, Jane L. & Marchand, Marianne H. (1995). Exploding the canon: An introduction conclusion. In J. Parpart & M. Marchand (Eds.), *Feminism postmodernism development.* London: Routledge.

Pearson, Ruth & Jackson, Cecile. (1998). Introduction: Interrogating development: Feminism, gender and policy. In C. Jackson & R. Pearson (Eds.), *Feminist visions of development: Gender analysis and policy* (pp. 1-16). London: Routledge.

Peña, Manuel. (1991). Class, gender, and machismo: The "treacherous-woman" folklore of Mexican male workers. *Gender and Society, 5* (1), 30-46.

Porter, Marilyn. (1999). Introduction: Caught in the web? Feminists doing development. In M. Porter & E.R. Judd (Eds.), *Feminists doing development: A practical critique.* New York: Zed Books.

Promundo. (2010a). *Introduction.* Retrieved September 8, 2010 from www.promundo.org.br/en/about-us/introduction/

Promundo. (2010b). *Program H: Engaging men in gender equality.* Retrieved September 8, 2010 from www.promundo.org.br/en/activities/activities-posts/program-h/

Promundo. (2010c). *Program M.* Retrieved October 18, 2010 from www.promundo.org.br/en/activities/activities-posts/program-m/

Pulerwitz, Julie & Gary Barker. (2008). Measuring attitudes toward gender norms among young men in Brazil: Development and psychometric evaluation of the GEM scale. *Men and Masculinities, 10* (3), 322-338.

Pulerwitz, J., Barker, G. & M. Segundo. (2004). *Promoting healthy relationships and HIV/STI Prevention for young men: Positive findings from an intervention study in Brazil.* Washington, DC: US Aid, Population Council

Rainwater, L. (1964). Marital sexuality in four cultures of poverty. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 4,* 457-466.

Ramírez, Rafael L. (1999). *What it means to be a man: Reflections on Puerto Rican masculinity.* New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Ramos, S. (1951). *El perfil del hombre y la cultura en Mexico.* Buenos Aires.

Razavi, S. & Miller, C. (1995). *From WID to GAD: Conceptual shifts in the women and development discourse.* UNRISD.

Reddock, R. (2000). Why gender? Why development? In J.L. Parpart, M.P. Connelly & V. E. Barriteau (Eds.), *Theoretical Perspectives on gender and development* (pp. 23-50). Ottawa: IDRC.

Reeves, H. & Baden, S. (2000). *Gender and development: Concepts and definitions.* BRIDGE Report No 55, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Reyes, Ruben. (2001, Oct 8-12). *The Association of Men Against Violence: Working with select groups of men or boys around socialization/sensitization issues.* Address at the Rockefeller Study and Conference Centre, Bellagio, Italy. Retrieved August 10, 2010 from http://toolkit.endabuse.org/Resources/TheAssociation.html

Ringheim, K. & C. Feldman-Jacobs. (2009). *Engaging men for gender equality and improved reproductive health.* Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau. Available online via www.igwg.org.

Salud y Genero. (2010). *Misión y objetivos.* Retrieved September 23, 2010 from www.saludygenero.org.mx/mision.html

Sardenberg, Cecilia M. B. (2007). Back to women? Translations, resignifications and myths of gender in policy and practice in Brazil. In A. Cornwall, E. Harrison, & A. Whitehead (Eds), *Feminisms in development: Contradictions, contestations and challenges* (pp. 48-64). New York: Zed Books.

Stephenson. (2003). *Understanding Spanish-speaking South Americans: Bridging hemispheres.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Sternberg, P. (2000). Challenging machismo: Promoting sexual and reproductive health with Nicaraguan men. *Gender & Development, 8* (1), 89-99.

Sternberg, P., White, A., & J. H. Hubley. (2008). Damned if they do, damned if they don't: Tensions in Nicaraguan masculinities as barriers to sexual and reproductive health promotion. *Men and masculinities, 10* (5), 538-556.

Stevens, Evelyn P. (1973). Machismo and marianismo. *Society, 10* (6), 57-63.

Strasser, Ulrike & Heidi Tinsman. (2010). It's a man's world? World history meets the history of masculinity, in Latin American studies, for instance. *Journal of World History, 21* (1), 75-96.

Stycos, J.M. (1965). Female employment and fertility in Lima, Peru. *Milbank Fund Quarterly, 43*, 42-54.

Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC). (2009, July 20). *Nicaragua: Hombres contra violencia abren escuela de formación.* Retrieved September 27, 2010 from www.sccportal.org/Paises/Nicaragua.aspx?M=News&PID=1612&NewsID=2787

Thompson, Marilyn. (2002). Boys will be boys: Addressing the social construction of gender. In F. Cleaver (Ed.), *Masculinities matter: Men, gender and development* (pp. 166-185). New York: Zed Books.

Torres, J.B.; Solberg, S.H; & A.H. Carlstrom. (2002). The myth of sameness among Latino men and their machismo. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 72* (2), 163-181.

Underwood, Barry. (1991). Gender and development and feminism: Related but separate issues. In T. Wallace & C. March (Eds.), *Changing perceptions: Writings on gender and development* (pp. 295-298). Oxford: Oxfam.

UNIFEM. (2009). *Cantera case study.* Retrieved September 17, 2010 from www.endvawnow.org/pampa/v0.1/library/filemanager/v1/files/Cantera%20Case%20study.pdf

Visvanathan, Nalini. (1997). Introduction to part one. In N. Visvanathan, L. Duggan, L. Nisonoff & N. Wiegersma (Eds.), *The women, gender & development reader* (p. 17-32). London: Zed Books.

Visvanathan, N., Duggan, L., Nisonoff, L. & N. Wiegersma. (1997). *The women, gender & development reader.* London: Zed Books.

Viveros Vigoya, Mara. (2001). Contemporary Latin American perspectives on masculinity. *Men and Masculinities, 3* (3), 237-260.

Welsh, Patrick. (2010). Community development: A gendered activism? The masculinities question. *Community Development Journal, 45* (3), 297-306.

Welsh, Patrick. (2007, Oct 15-18). *Changing masculinities in Nicaragua: A community based approach.* Paper presented at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS)

symposium on Politicising Masculinities, Dakar, Senegal. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from www.siyanda.org/docs/Welsh_nicaragua.doc

Welsh, Patrick. (2001). Unlearning machismo: Men changing men in post-revolutionary Nicaragua. In B. Pease & K. Pringle (Eds.), *A man's world: changing men's practices in a globalized world* (pp. 177-190). London: Zed Books.

Whisnant, David. (1995). *Rascally signs in sacred places: The politics of culture in Nicaragua*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

White, Sarah C. (2000). 'Did the earth move?' The hazards of bringing men and masculinities into gender and development. *IDS Bulletin, 31* (2), 33-41.

White, Sarah C. (1997). Men, masculinities, and the politics of development. *Gender and Development, 5* (2), 14-22.

White, V., Greene, M., & E. Murphy. (2003). *Men and reproductive health programs: Influencing gender norms*. Washington, DC: US Aid. Retrieved September 18, 2010 from www.usaid.gov/our_work/global_health/pop/news/gendernorms.doc

Willis, Katie. (2005). *Theories and practices of development*. London: Routledge.

Young, Kate. (1997). Gender and development. In N. Visvanathan, L. Duggan, L. Nisonoff & N. Wiegersma (Eds.), *The women, gender & development reader* (pp. 51-54). London: Zed Books.