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1. Introduction

Transforming patriarchal masculinities and engaging men and boys in gender justice is now a visible area of work across the world. It is premised on and organised by an understanding that men and boys must be engaged in efforts to end gender inequalities.[[1]](#footnote-2) However, it is important to note that there is a difference between programmes that aim to transform masculinities and those that engage men for increased gender equality. The former focuses on transforming harmful social norms that can affect both women and men, while the latter seeks to engage men and boys in other gender equality activities as well, such as women’s economic empowerment activities.[[2]](#footnote-3) Programmes can, however, use both approaches, and often focus on: promotion of human rights for all, irrespective of gender identity and expression and sexual orientation; the prevention and reduction of gender-based violence (GBV); the promotion of sexual and reproductive health and rights; parenting and care work; and contributions to gender justice in other domains.[[3]](#footnote-4)

As the field has developed, so have ideas on what constitutes best practice for transforming patriarchal masculinities programming. This comparator study seeks to identify some examples of these emerging best practices and related to the themes and approaches of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women’s (UN Women’s) regional Middle East and North Africa (MENA) programme: ‘Men and Women for Gender Equality’ (MWGE). As such, the study focuses on the following three areas: (i) shifting behaviours of men; (ii) generating changes at institutional level and within normative frameworks; and (iii) engaging with and accountability to feminist movements. It provides concentrated analysis on three organisations – the Rwanda Men’s Resource Center (RWAMREC), Sonke Gender Justice and the MenEngage Alliance (see Section 3 for more information) – to identify the strengths and innovations of the MWGE programme, and areas where the programme can learn from best practice.

1. Methodology

This comparator study forms part of a thematic case study on social norms and behaviour change, under the regional evaluation of UN Women’s MWGE programme. It draws on a combination of key informant interviews (KIIs) and an in-depth review of documentation. In total, nine stakeholders were interviewed and 38 documents were reviewed. Data collection was conducted remotely and consisted of the following stages:

1. **Desk review:** A review of UN Women programme documents to capture the main approaches that MWGE programme is taking to masculinity programming according to the three areas above. A light-touch literature review of the core discussions relating to masculinity programming and the three areas detailed above.
2. **Scoping interviews with key stakeholders working in masculinities space** to identifying examples of best practice and programmes for deeper analysis.
3. **Programme comparison.** Based on scoping calls and document review, three organisations/programmes were selected for deeper analysis. Further background research and KIIs with comparison programme stakeholders.
4. **Report write-up.** Synthesis of findings from the MWGE programme desk review, light-touch literature review and programme comparison analysis.

**Limitations**

This study is based on a comprehensive but light-touch review of existing secondary data and a small number of KIIs. The study did not aim to review the effectiveness or impact of comparison programmes but rather to identify key learnings and recommendations from best practice examples to support UN Women in the development and strengthening of their MWGE programme. As such, all reported results are from secondary data sources.

1. Introduction to the programme deep dives

This comparator study consists of deeper analysis on three programmes related to the thematic of MWGE from around the world. The programmes were selected following scoping calls with experts in the field on their perspective of which programmes best demonstrate emerging best practices and would provide the most learning for the MWGE programme. Their suggestions were then triangulated with an initial document review to identify three programmes that would best speak to the three focus areas of this comparator study. The programmes/organisations selected were:

**RWAMREC:** A local non-governmental organisation (NGO) created in 2006 to respond to an existing need for mechanisms and strategies to fight inequalities between men and women that proved to trigger GBV.[[4]](#footnote-5) Initially conceived as exclusively a men’s organisation, it strives to reach out to other men in order to promote gender equality through promotion of positive masculinities and male engagement approaches in development programmes in Rwanda. This study focused on two of their interventions: Indashyikirwa and Bandebereho.The Indashyikirwa programme worked with couples to reduce intimate partner violence (IPV) and improve the well-being of survivors in selected communities in seven districts of rural Rwanda between 2014 and 2018. It also sought to shift beliefs and social norms that sustain IPV in communities and couples.[[5]](#footnote-6) The Bandebereho (or ‘role model’) was a three-year intervention, beginning in 2013, based on Program P and part of the global MenCare fatherhood campaign by Promundo. It aimed to promote positive fatherhood and gender equality among expectant fathers and fathers of children under five years and their partners, in order to shift gender-power imbalances and reduce IPV in the home.[[6]](#footnote-7)

**Sonke Gender Justice:** A South African-based non-profit organisation, established in 2006, that works throughout Africa. It aims to strengthen the capacity of governments, civil society, and citizens to advance gender justice and women’s rights, prevent GBV and reduce the spread of HIV and the impact of AIDS, and in this way contribute to social justice and the elimination of poverty.[[7]](#footnote-8) While Sonke does not exclusively work on transforming masculinities and engaging men and boys, it has implemented a number of projects and initiatives that are relevant for this comparator study. For example, its One Man Can (OMC) campaign’s major goal is to support men and boys to advocate for gender equality, to promote and sustain change in their personal lives, and to change the gender norms driving the rapid spread of HIV.[[8]](#footnote-9)

**The MenEngage Alliance:** A global alliance made up of several networks spread across the world, comprising NGOs as well as United Nations (UN) partners. Through its country-level and regional networks, MenEngage seeks to provide a collective voice on the need to engage men and boys in gender equality, to build and improve the field of practice around engaging men in achieving gender justice, and to advocate before policymakers at local, national, regional, and international levels.[[9]](#footnote-10)

1. Findings

   2. Best practice in shifting behaviours of men

Interventions that focus on shifting behaviours of men, whether that be in terms of fatherhood, GBV or other changes in behaviour towards women, are important aspects of the transforming masculinities field. However, a common critique of the field is that these programmes do not always bring about the most effective and enduring changes in males.[[10]](#footnote-11) This section examines how programming in shifting men’s behaviours can overcome these observations, with a focus on fatherhood and reducing GBV interventions.

**Finding 1. During the programme design process, a participatory approach that gives adequate time for context adaptation helps build buy-in from a range of stakeholders and ensure sustainability of the programme.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Scaling up or at scale? What works for transforming patriarchal masculinities programming   For this study, it was highlighted that there is a key difference in the meaning of scaling-up interventions and doing work at scale. ‘Scaling up’ means to expand or replicate a pilot or small-scale projects to reach more people and/or broaden the effectiveness and impact of an intervention.[[11]](#footnote-12) However, ‘working at scale’ means to go beyond the particular focus on an intervention and address the underlying driver of, for example, men’s violence against women. Respondents of this study argued that masculinities programming needs to focus on the intersection of broader structural drivers, such as poverty and social exclusion, to have a real impact. They contend that to have meaningful and sustainable impact at scale impact, you have to go beyond the individual-level focus to the community and institutional levels, where these structural issues can be addressed.[[12]](#footnote-13) |

The participatory design approach of the programmes analysed in this study was found to be a key contributing factor in achieving the broad social change that is required to support sustainable behaviour change among men and boys. The Bandebereho couples’ intervention involved the Ministry of Health and district health centres from the beginning of the programme design and requested their feedback throughout the process. For RWAMREC it was key that they were not designing the programme in isolation and so they sought to include the government from the start as a way to build co-ownership.[[13]](#footnote-14) In practice this involved including the Ministry of Health and the Rwanda Biomedical Centre staff advisory group, as well as other key stakeholders, in the adaptation of Program P to improve alignment with national priorities. This helped to create buy-in and commitment from government, staff and facilitators.[[14]](#footnote-15) Early participation from government also facilitated an easier institutionalisation and scaling up of the programme, as it was already designed to be implemented through government structures.[[15]](#footnote-16) See Box 1 for an important distinction between scaling up and working at scale.

Additionally, cultivating positive masculinities and combating harmful gender norms appears to require localised solutions over a sustained period. As such, it is important that programmes are designed to integrate adequate time for development and adaptation to the local context. The Indashyikirwa programme had a one-year inception phase, which gave RWAMREC sufficient time to develop an evidence-informed theory of change and pilot the curriculum, which was tested and improved after consultations. This inception period was critical to design a strong programme, including relevant and appropriate curricula and activism activities.[[16]](#footnote-17) While substantial time for research to inform programme design (and/or adaptation) prior to implementation is essential, it is also valuable to allow for flexibility and creativity during programme delivery in order to enhance participants’ receptiveness and the overall resonance of the content.[[17]](#footnote-18) One key informant warned of the risk of trying to ‘fit square pegs into round holes’ as programmes use international, and often Western-designed, models without careful consideration of the context where the programme will be implemented.[[18]](#footnote-19) Thus, approaches appear to work best when they are based on listening to and actively adapting to the particular local needs and conditions.

Within the MWGE programme, there are examples of using participatory approaches in programme design, specifically through national adaption of IMAGES and Program P. For example, the country office in Egypt - in coordination with ROAS - and local partners Wellspring and CARE took the opportunity of Promundo withdrawing from the implementation of Program P to redesign the intervention for the Egyptian context. It included three weekend camps targeting socio-economically disadvantaged families as well as training for government partners from the Ministry of Youth and the National Council for Women to deliver the programme, leading to strong national ownership. This has proven popular with both beneficiaries and the Government of Egypt, although there are questions around the sustainability of this model[[19]](#footnote-20). additionally, the Lebanese country office, in partnership with NGO ABAAD and MOSA, used the IMAGES research findings to adapt their Gender Transformative Parenting (GTP) programme to the national context. The programme went through a lengthy process of development during Phase II, which included four closed-door stakeholder consultations, review of technical components, and pilots with men, women and children separately to ensure local buy-in and for the institutionalisation of the programme.[[20]](#footnote-21) In Morocco, the High Commission for Planning used elements of the IMAGES questionnaire to inform a survey to collect men and women’s perceptions and attitudes towards VAW.

**Finding 2. At implementation level there appear to be several factors that facilitate programme success. These include space for reflection in a non-judgemental environment; peer education and support networks; including both men and women; and public acknowledgement of changes in behaviour.**

This study found that there were a number of key factors in programme implementation that, when combined together, can led to successes in shifting adverse social norms and behaviours in men. Firstly, it was important for programmes to provide men with safe spaces to discuss their personal experiences, including vulnerabilities and the struggles they may have with meeting – or defying – role expectations in the face of structural and societal constraints.[[21]](#footnote-22) Sonke Gender Justice Network’s fathers-to-fathers support groups and workshops provided safe spaces for men to discuss sensitive issues and to receive peer support as they implemented new behaviours in their lives.[[22]](#footnote-23) In these workshops, it was also important that facilitators had a non-judgemental style to help to prompt openness and comfort during the shared reflection process. While encouraging positive masculinities, such as positive fatherhood, are important aspects of shifting behaviours of men, best practice also finds ways to acknowledge the various vulnerabilities experienced by men and provide spaces for them to explore these feelings.

Moreover, these safe spaces and group training programmes encouraged a network of peer support that often extended beyond the end of a programme. As highlighted in an evaluation of the Indashyikirwa programme, there was a strong bonding capital among the activists who had participated in the curriculum, and this led to a large network of peer support. The importance of feeling supported was key for activists when dealing with resistance and backlash from the community as well as when reflecting on dominant patriarchal ideologies.[[23]](#footnote-24) The Sonke fathers-to-fathers support groups also highlighted that as men became more confident in their new roles and better able to handle disparaging comments, they were able to serve as models and support for other men.[[24]](#footnote-25) An Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report also found peer networks to be important aspect in the success of the ‘Ugandan Role Model Men’ and Burundian ‘Abatangamuco’ models.[[25]](#footnote-26) Acting in a way that is different to the prevailing norms and values within your community requires courage and support, and so best approaches include programmes that aim to foster these peer networks.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Factors to facilitate success in patriarchal masculinities programming   This study found a number of key implementation elements that, when combined together, helped facilitate success in programming. These included:   * space for reflection in a non-judgemental environment * peer education and support networks * including both men and women * public acknowledgement of changes in behaviour. |

However, interventions that engaged both men and women were found to be more successful than men-only interventions in sustaining fathers’ participation and shifting their behaviours in the household.[[26]](#footnote-27) The success of the Bandebereho programme was perceived to be its ability to create a structured space for men and women ‘to question and critically reflect on gender norms and how these shapes their lives; rehearse equitable and non-violent attitudes and behaviours in a comfortable space with supportive peers; and internalise these new gender attitudes and behaviours and apply them in their own lives and relationships’.[[27]](#footnote-28) Men engaging in programme curricula with their partners were made to feel supported by them, and the couples were able to have open discussions and put the learnings into practice together. Again, approaches that encourage supportive environments for change are perceived to achieve the most success.

Reviews of transforming patriarchal masculinities programming also found that public acknowledgement of the change in behaviour, and positive publicity in general surrounding a programme, helped to ensure sustainability of results.[[28]](#footnote-29) In Rwanda and South Africa, positive programme branding helped participants feel part of a wider movement and encouraged them to uphold new attitudes and behaviours, as they were known to be part of the programmes within their communities.[[29]](#footnote-30) As informants highlighted, gender equality is a specific focus of the Rwandan government agenda, so participating in these programmes came with a certain prestige.[[30]](#footnote-31) However, this also needed to be coupled with accountability, to ensure participants maintain the lessons learned. Additionally, an evaluation of the Young Men Initiative in the Balkans[[31]](#footnote-32) found youth-focused branding to have played an important role in encouraging participants to identify with more gender-equitable norms. This finding was similar to other initiatives, such as Voices for Change in Nigeria and Girl Effect programmes worldwide.[[32]](#footnote-33) However, it is important to note that the level of branding is important, and what seemed to work well in these contexts is that the programmes had branding from local NGOs rather than from international organisations.

The positive deviance approach adopted by the MWGE programme included most of the factors mentioned above – to different degrees across the countries – and was found to be effective in contributing to behavioural change. The approach was particularly effective in Palestine where the identified ‘positive deviants’ included both men and women in Phase II and were trained to visit couples in their own homes to promote sharing of household duties and childcare, providing practical advice and guidance. Similarly, to the Bandebereho programme, this gave participants a chance to have discussions with positive models, and to listen to their experiences, and thus creating a safe space for reflection on their behaviour towards the topics and messages of gender equality.[[33]](#footnote-34) However, the evaluation team did not find examples of public recognition in Palestine, or the other countries, which could also help encourage supportive environments for change. Although this needs to be carefully managed in terms of branding, as seen in Palestine where CBOs reported that donor visibility – for example through logos – was at times detrimental to the willingness of intended beneficiaries to engage with, let alone accept key messages on equality. This was especially the case in some of the more socially conservative communities in Palestine, including those where there has been ‘anti-CEDAW’ mobilisation.[[34]](#footnote-35)

**Finding 3. There is a risk that programmes aiming to shift the behaviour of men works in isolation, but best practice takes an integrated approach to address broader issues surrounding patriarchal masculinities, encompassing other structural issues such as power, privilege and economic constraints.**

In terms of best practice in shifting behaviours of men, one approach is ensuring that programmes understand the complex and dynamic ways in which inequitable norms and the other stressors underpin the behaviour of men. These can include mental health issues (e.g. frustrations, shame, stigma), economic hardships and food insecurity.[[35]](#footnote-36) Informants of this study highlighted the importance that work in this field does not take place in isolation of these stressors but rather that programmes should aim to alleviate some of the pressure men and boys experience.[[36]](#footnote-37) This can include a consideration of a range of social norm changes, providing economic incentives to participants and facilitating links to other relevant service providers.[[37]](#footnote-38) The Indashyikirwa programme, for example, provided a stipend to couples, which helped participants to save the money and put into practice some of the learning on economic empowerment from the curriculum. The project also had links to safe spaces created by the Rwandan Women’s Network, where couples could continue to discuss issues once they had finished the curriculum.[[38]](#footnote-39) There are other examples of this approach, such as the South African ‘Stepping Stones/Creating Futures’ model, which explicitly seeks to link change in gender norms with livelihoods training and to alleviate the economic constraints of participants.[[39]](#footnote-40) As such, best approaches consider the external environment in which men and boys exist and seek to work in a holistic manner to address some of the pressures they experience, as well as shifting their behaviour in a specific area such as fatherhood.

However, it is important to also focus on men’s privileges, in order to avoid discourses of men as ‘victims’ of societal power imbalances and risks of dismissing inequalities faced by women.[[40]](#footnote-41) RWAMREC recognise these power imbalances in its programming and highlights the utility of the ‘4 types of power’[[41]](#footnote-42) as a frame for broaching the subject of violence and encouraging power-sharing in relationships.[[42]](#footnote-43) Similarly, the evaluation of the Indashyikirwa programme found that the fundamental concept of positive types of power (power within, power to, power with) and negative types of power (power over) helped couples identify multiple forms of IPV to move beyond the binary of ‘men = perpetrators; women = victims’ of IPV.[[43]](#footnote-44) In terms of best practice in transforming patriarchal masculinities programming, interventions should apply an integrated approach that considers the political, economic and sociocultural forces shaping gender hierarchies and relations of power more generally, and the opportunities and constraints produced by these forces.[[44]](#footnote-45)

The best example of taking a holistic approach in the MWGE programme was found in Lebanon where extensive resources were dedicated to anti-sexual harassment campaigns. At the community level, the programme used community-based initiatives to grow awareness among men and women about sexual harassment and then at the policy level, worked with local advoacy organisations to influence the issuance of the Anti-Sexual Harassment Law (discussed further under Finding 5).[[45]](#footnote-46) However, addressing structural issues such as power and privilege within the MWGE programme has been difficult, with country offices perceiving the need to tread carefully to avoid alienating men. While fatherhood interventions have been successful in overcoming resistance and bringing men into the programme, it may have limited the ability of the programme to challenge male power over women, for example in relation to IPV and ideas of ‘guardianship’[[46]](#footnote-47) Unlike the use of the ‘4 types of power’ by the Indashyikirwa programme, the MWGE programme has not established a clear frame to discuss and challenge patriarchal power structures.

**Finding 4. While fatherhood programming can be a good entry point for working with men and boys, interventions with the most success moved beyond individual level to focus also on the community and wider society.**

As alluded to above, there is a risk that masculinities programmes focus on specific social norm changes without a clear understanding on the wider changes needed within the whole community to challenge patriarchal ideologies. To mitigate against this, RWAMREC uses the social ecological model[[47]](#footnote-48) to ensure that their interventions consider the complex relationship between individual, relationship, community, and societal levels and the power structures that underpin them.[[48]](#footnote-49) They highlight that for sustained change it is essential that community leaders, in their roles as gatekeepers and agents of culture and religion, are engaged and on board with RWAMREC’s gender transformative work. In practical terms, RWAMREC trained around 40 Opinion Leaders per intervention sector at the beginning of the Indashyikirwa programme to ensure an enabling environment for community change. The quarterly meetings established with opinion leaders were found to be critical in supporting the work of community activists and enhancing their credibility.[[49]](#footnote-50) Working across the social ecological model but also within different sectors appears to be key in achieving sustained change as multiple spheres of influence in a man’s life become more encouraging and open to their behaviour change.

Additionally, Sonke’s ‘spectrum of change’ approach[[50]](#footnote-51) simultaneously targets individuals, communities, local organisations and government to change ideas of masculinity and expectations around male behaviour, encouraging a more accepting environment of new attitudes and practices.[[51]](#footnote-52) Their approach promotes a gradual shift away from the status quo through a cycle of incremental steps that, when taken together, begin the process of a much larger change and, ultimately, a revised set of cultural norms and practices. Sonke’s OMC campaign was based on the belief that change starts at individual level before moving to community spheres. It combined participatory workshops, conducted with men and boys as well as in mixed groups with women and couples, with longer-term community engagement in the form of community action teams (CATs). These CATs were used to strengthen community mobilisation and conduct public awareness activities. A 10-year review of Sonke’s work found that community mobilisation work, and particularly the establishment of CATs, has resulted in changes in community understandings of masculinity and beliefs and practices in relationships.[[52]](#footnote-53)As one informant commented: ‘the success of the OMC campaign was that it really became “we all can” rather than “one man can”’.[[53]](#footnote-54) Consequently, programmes that combine activities on a range of levels within a specific area can create an effective enabling environment to facilitate sustainable behaviour change in men and boys.

The MWGE‘s GTP programme in Egypt has attempted to move beyond the individual level by introducing an alternative model looking at the family as a whole instead of just fatherhood. Through the intervention, a parenting manual was developed, and a training of trainers took place in August 2021, followed by 24 rollout camps for parents who attended the sessions together. The inclusion of the whole family, rather than just fathers, was key to creating an enabling environment for change.[[54]](#footnote-55) The importance of this approach was underscored by FGD participants who shared stories of backlash and resistance from other relatives, such as the mother-in-law, who are influential in family decisions around girls’ education, FGM, early marriage and discrimination, along with men’s roles within the household. As such, and as highlighted in the RWAMREC interventions, there is a need to target gatekeepers and agents of culture within the community as well as the individual. However, the evaluation team found there is a need to ensure that the various interventions within the MWGE programme actively and strategically support each other at individual, community, national and regional levels.[[55]](#footnote-56)

* 1. Best practice in generating changes at institutional level and within normative frameworks

Within the transforming masculinities field, there are concerns that programmes tend to focus too heavily on the individual as the site and agent of change. While the individual level has a part to play, the overemphasis at this level is perceived to have led to a gap in programming working at the institutional and ideological levels that are key to achieving sustainable change.[[56]](#footnote-57) This section considers emerging best practice in generating changes at institutional level and within normative frameworks.

**Finding 5. Community activism and capacity building as a mechanism to hold government accountable is perceived as an effective way** **to generate changes at policy level, which then lead to changes at institutional level.**

As seen in the above section, approaches that encompass the community as well as the individual work well to generate changes within the wider society, and this study found that community mobilisation and capacity building are important factors in achieving changes at policy and institutional levels. A key aspect of Sonke’s approach to achieving sustained change was mobilising communities to hold institutions and officials to account for their roles in perpetuating harmful gender stereotypes and promoting prejudiced views.[[57]](#footnote-58) Sonke often focused on a specific event, such as high-profile cases of GBV, to mobilise the community into social action and call for accountability and justice within the court proceedings.[[58]](#footnote-59) They also used community activists to mobilise around national-level issues such as parental leave for fathers, which in 2019 was increased from three days to 10.[[59]](#footnote-60) An evaluation of Sonke’s work found that community activism has had a real impact on changing policies and also plays an important role in supporting institutions to implement their mandates.[[60]](#footnote-61)

Similarly, at a global and regional level, MenEngage is working to build the capacities of activists and leaders within its membership through formal training, such as the MenEngage Africa Training Initiative, as well as convening spaces such as their global symposiums, with the view to generating changes at both the policy and institutional level. Through providing opportunities to gain knowledge and network with other alliance members and partners, MenEngage facilitate activists to share experiences, evidence and insights in how to effectively generate changes at global policy level as well as within institutions. For example, during MenEngage’s 2021 Ubuntu Symposium, activists came together to discuss the best ways to address militarism and its associated militarist cultures and militarised masculinities, and there is a need for a clear strategy on how to hold men in military positions of power accountable and require them to take institutional responsibility for their roles and responsibilities in transforming patriarchal and militarised masculinities.[[61]](#footnote-62) While there is no one specific institution that MenEngage has targeted, its facilitates spaces for community activists to mobilise around and link to regional and global-level issues and put out a joint call to all institutions involved in the work on transforming patriarchal masculinities and engaging men and boys in gender justice to commit towards a systems change agenda.

Furthermore, Sonke’s work has aimed to build active and empowered local communities through capacity building in order to hold governments and institutions accountable. For example, through their ‘Rights, Action and Accountability’ project, Sonke empowered communities held governments accountable for the implementation of legislation and policies aimed at preventing and responding to GBV and promoting gender equality. The success of the project was reported to be in the recruitment and skill-building of CAT members, who use the knowledge and skills learned within the project to lead awareness raising activities in their communities and to engage with mechanisms aimed at holding local government accountable for their mandate.[[62]](#footnote-63) Sonke has also focused their capacity building efforts on community and religious leaders, under the leadership of a MenEngage Africa project. Through the training of community and religious leaders, the development of toolkits, community-based outreach programmes and ongoing additional technical support provided by in-country MENA members and partners, Sonke aimed to raise awareness about gender, sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), GBV and human rights; to strengthen community and religious leaders’ willingness to engage and their capacity; and to mobilise them to take action against gender inequality, violence and social injustice.[[63]](#footnote-64) As such, gender-equitable policy advocacy, coupled with community organising and public education campaigns and mechanism for macro-level accountability, are therefore considered core elements of achieving the societal change needed to transform adverse patriarchal norms.[[64]](#footnote-65)

Community activism and capacity building as a mechanism to hold government accountable has also featured in the MWGE programme, notably the Lebanon anti-sexual harassment law and attempts to change parental leave legislation in Egypt, Morocco, Palestine. In Egypt, three CBOs were able to influence local institutions and official structures through community advocacy campaigns. The campaigns employed several strategies, such as training and awareness-raising activities, forming a community committee, review committees and consultations, focusing on different issues of concern to the local communities, such as domestic violence caused by inheritance, and women and girls’ protection. For example, the country office campaigned to change the parental leave law alongside the El Shabab CBO in Qalyoubia governorate. El Shabab, supported by a parliamentarian and five other CBOs, united efforts to propose the provision of six days’ leave for fathers at the time of childbirth, to support their wives and help in the registration of the newborn. The campaign did not achieve the anticipated change within the short time frame of the community initiative, but it has provided a positive example of a unified advocacy campaign and holding institutions to account.[[65]](#footnote-66) However, it’s important to note that not all governments within the MENA region have a positive view of community activism so UN Women has needed to be careful to ensure there is no negative backlash on using this method as a means to achieve institutional change.

**Finding 6. In programming on transforming patriarchal masculinities, working with the media can be a valuable method in engaging men and boys, highlighting gender injustices and generating public discussion on gender equality.**

For sustained change to be achieved there needs to be a shift in adverse gender norms at societal level and using media as a tool as well as engaging with it as an institution can play an important role in ensuring these changes. Since its establishment, Sonke has regularly used the media to generate conversation within the public around gender equality. It has issued many press statements to condemn public officials, forced public apologies, and put others on alert that they would be challenged by other men if they undermined gender equality.[[66]](#footnote-67) For example, Sonke was successful in taking Julius Malema, the then leader of the African National Congress youth league, to court over hate speech that perpetuated GBV, leading to a public retraction and apology.[[67]](#footnote-68) Sonke’s public approach of holding officials to account has led to widespread media coverage, with hundreds of radio and television interviews generating a national conversation about the roles and responsibilities of male political leaders.[[68]](#footnote-69) Through this, Sonke has raised awareness and created opportunities for national-level conversations about gender equality and human rights. RWAMREC has also used the media as a way to raise awareness and tackle harmful social norms within the wider community. For example, they launched a social media campaign to reach out to young people and discuss the key lessons from the Indashyikirwa programme, and hosted radio shows for student debates on feminism and how to behave in a feminist way.[[69]](#footnote-70) Organisations, therefore, that aim to transform patriarchal masculinities at societal level should consider how to use the media as an opportunity to highlight adverse social norms and gender inequalities.

Furthermore, Sonke has worked with the media as institution to build their capacities in reporting on gender injustices. They held training for journalists, developed guides for reporting on GBV, and created spaces for the different media outlets to come together to reflect and discuss on their reporting. Sonke’s approach was to ensure that the media were equipped with better knowledge and awareness of gender, and as such would not perpetuate harmful gender norms in their framing of reporting on GBV.[[70]](#footnote-71) Part of this work also involved continuing to build relationships and dialogue with journalists and media outlets, to enlist their support in countering misogyny and patriarchal masculinities. Informants of the study highlighted that it was helpful to have a full-time media communications officer to ensure these relationships were maintained.[[71]](#footnote-72) However, they also highlighted that each organisation had their own risk appetite, and Sonke’s was relatively high, which might not be the case for other organisation, especially those operating in more restricted settings.

Using the media has been a large part of the MWGE programme, particularly through social media and the Because I am a Man (BIAM) campaign.[[72]](#footnote-73) BIAM has reached a huge number of people and generated considerable engagement in terms of likes, comments and shares, and many of the locally produced materials were used by CBOs to generate debate in communities and raise awareness of gender equality. However, BIAM is not only the campaign name but also intended to be a brand which should unite the campaign, giving it a consistent image, visual appearance, tone of voice and personality[[73]](#footnote-74). However, the evaluation team found that the regional campaign, national campaign, and the community-based activities were not always connected to each other which has limited the impact of the regionally produced materials.[[74]](#footnote-75) Moreover, the brief review of the BIAM campaign suggests that brand identity is not consistently implemented across the range of BIAM communications. As such the BIAM campaign has more likely been more effective in raising awareness rather than affecting change.[[75]](#footnote-76) However, as seen with the examples from Sonke, there is scope to build on this awareness raising with the media to tackle harmful social norms within the region. There are examples of this within MWGE such as the production of a code of conduct for journalists in Palestine.[[76]](#footnote-77)

**Finding 7. There is a need to focus on alliance building and collective action across organisations, activist networks and services to achieve sustained change** **at institutional level.**

This study found that work with men and boys in transforming patriarchal masculinities should involve greater efforts to build movements for social change, strengthen civil society organisations and coalitions and contribute as one holistic approach to broader social justice struggles. Critiques argue that there should be more engagement in ‘movement’ and less ‘field’,[[77]](#footnote-78) which was an opinion supported by informants of this study as well. In practice, this means that organisations should aim to broaden the focus of their interventions (as highlighted above) but also build stronger partnerships with other social issue groups. MenEngage highlight the need for partnerships and consistent dialogue with, among others, feminist movements, anti-racist movements and indigenous people’s struggles, to address adverse social norms at institutional level. Also, survey respondents and key informants from a GAGE (Gender and Adolescence: Global Evidence research programme) evidence review on masculinities urged organisations to a move beyond ‘one-off partnerships’ towards ‘long-term collaborations for sustainable, scalable change’.[[78]](#footnote-79)

Furthermore, partnerships are key for exchanging knowledge and best practices in achieving sustained change. A review of the Bandebereho project found that fostering regular opportunities for exchange and collaboration among activists and key stakeholders, including local leaders and civil society organisations, was important in order to achieve institutional changes. However, it also noted that this required consistent efforts to maintain these relationships as well as more attention on establishing strategic partnerships with other organisations.[[79]](#footnote-80) Additionally, many contributors to a MenEngage study highlighted the importance of increased knowledge and resource sharing, as well as the creation of spaces, both online and offline, to share best practices and lessons learned to advance goals at institutional level. They noted that networks provide important links between local, national and regional actors and facilitate this sharing of knowledge and information that was seen as key for achieving common goals within the field.[[80]](#footnote-81)

The MWGE programme has some good examples of alliance building and collective action, particularly in Lebanon with the work on the Anti-Sexual Harassment Law. To avoid duplication of efforts, the country office, through Jumanneh, co-funded an advocacy campaign so that two organisations, the Centre for Inclusive Business and Leadership for Women and National Commission for Lebanese Women, could cooperate to submit one law rather than different proposals. The programme was also able to mobilise all efforts of local and national partners to raise awareness and launch advocacy campaigns around the law. Through this united advocacy effort, and the government’s desire to change its negative public perception, the law was passed. The partnership created through the programme was able to generate change at the policy level and lead to further developments such as a study on sexual harassment by taxi-drivers, conducted by Mosawat CBO who also trained male taxi drivers on the new law.[[81]](#footnote-82)

* 1. Best practice in engaging with and accountability to feminist movements

One of the main critiques of the work engaging men and boys is that it often disconnected from women’s groups and feminist movements. The Coalition of Feminists for Social Change (COFEM) cautions that ‘a parallel system’ is emerging, of ‘male engagement campaigns, programmes, organisations and networks that, although allied theoretically to feminist principles, stand largely independent of the women’s movement’.[[82]](#footnote-83) This section examines what should be considered as best practice on engaging with and accountability to women’s groups and feminist movements.

**Finding 8. For organisations working to transform patriarchal masculinities, best practice is to first define what is meant by accountability and to whom it applies, and then to adhere to clear accountability standards and guidelines.**

This study found that a crucial first step for organisations wanting to engage with and be accountable to feminist movements is to define what is meant by accountability and to whom it applies. The MenEngage Alliance, which since 2014 has focused a good deal of its work on this issue, defines accountability as: (i) being critically aware of one’s own power and privilege, and being open to criticism; (ii) taking action to address personal and institutional practices that go against our principles of gender equality and human rights, acknowledging any harm caused and making amends; (iii) respecting and promoting women’s leadership in the gender equality movement; and (iv) creating structures of consultation and partnerships with women’s rights organisations.[[83]](#footnote-84) This definition highlights that being accountable is a proactive and intentional process, rather than just an outcome in itself. MenEngage note that ensuring accountability is not only a reactive ‘calling out’ of bad behaviour but is also about creating spaces where people are able to safely reflect, learn and do better.[[84]](#footnote-85) This definition also highlights the need for self-reflection and analysis of structural power relations which this study found as key in being accountable to feminist movements (see below for more information).

It is also important to consider the question of to whom, and even to what, to be accountable. Women’s groups and feminist movements are not homogenous and so organisations and programmes should be responsive and adaptive to different contexts, acknowledging that local contexts and women’s movements – locally, regionally and globally – are different and have diverse sets of needs.[[85]](#footnote-86) Additionally there are questions around whether best practice approaches should consider accountability not only to feminist movements but also to a wider range of social issue movements, such as anti-racist groups. For example, the MenEngage accountability standards specify their aim to be accountable to feminist and women’s movements, but in a review of these standards informants highlighted that there was also a need to be accountable to multiple groups.[[86]](#footnote-87) Additionally, this study found that accountability to feminist movements did not always mean following the priorities of women groups but rather that after consultations there is scope to disagree and follow another direction.[[87]](#footnote-88) For example, Sonke’s women partnerships did not agree with them taking Julius Malema to court, as they worried about the consequences of losing. Informants highlighted that it was important to take up the case despite the risks and disagreement with women’s groups. They highlighted that, as a social justice organisation, they are accountable to multiple groups and so need to carefully unpack their accountability commitments when intersectional issues are at play.[[88]](#footnote-89) In terms of emerging best practices, therefore, it is key to clearly define an organisation’s understanding of accountability and to whom it applies.

Once this step has been taken, it is important that organisations develop clear guidelines on how to put accountability into practice. The MenEngage Accountability Standards and Guidelines and the Accountability Training Toolkit help guide their members towards accountability in programmatic, advocacy and partnership efforts. These documents provide guidelines on how work with men and boys can be done effectively while holding central the rights and leadership of women and girls. The guidelines include: allocating a certain number of board seats to members of women’s rights organisations; creating ‘advisory councils’ of women’s organisations; and contributing in solidarity to women’s rights organisations through joint advocacy or activism.[[89]](#footnote-90) Sonke, for example, has been through several changes to address accountability and the perpetuation of ‘yet another men’s club’, such as a 50/50 staff component of men and women, and women in senior management positions.[[90]](#footnote-91) Informants highlight that if organisations are serious about accountability, then they first need to ‘have their own house in check’.[[91]](#footnote-92)

The evaluation team did not find a clearly defined understanding of accountability and to whom it applies within the MWGE programme. However, there were some practical examples of how the programme has attempted to be accountable to feminist movements (See Finding 9 below).

**Finding 9. It is important that engagement with feminist movements and women’s groups is not tokenistic and that meaningful partnerships are formed so that programmes engaging with men and boys are truly accountable to feminist agendas.**

Within the literature on engaging with men and boys in gender justice, there is a call to rethink the framing of it as a separate field rather than as one of many ‘tools’ within women’s/feminist movements.[[92]](#footnote-93) In this vein, best practice is understood to incorporate a focus on building strong partnerships and alignment with feminist movements. MenEngage, for example, has built partnerships and undertaken joint activities with a range of key women’s rights and social justice organisations and networks, and has contributed in-solidarity actions to efforts at global, regional and local levels. As informants highlighted, they have stopped representing themselves separately as ‘MenEngage’ in conversations with donors and multilaterals and are working within coalitions of women’s groups to present a solidarity voice.[[93]](#footnote-94) Multiple respondents from women’s organisations in an evaluation of MenEngage’s activities noted that they were increasingly willing to work with the Alliance because of this commitment to accountability. The evaluation reported that these partnerships have been instrumental in the Alliance’s ability to take forward advocacy and other actions.[[94]](#footnote-95) Similarly, one of Sonke’s main strategies when engaging men and boys has been to work in partnership with other organisations that focus mostly on woman’s empowerment initiatives. However, they warn that it is an ongoing, meaningful and collaborative process, and not a ‘tick-the-box exercise’.[[95]](#footnote-96) Meaningful partnerships require open and transparent dialogue with a range of women’s/feminist movements, and organisations should be careful not to invite their ‘friends’ who they can influence easily. As one informant highlighted, for accountability to matter, you need people in the room who you disagree with, and to give space to listen to them and involve them in ongoing decision-making processes.[[96]](#footnote-97)

* Meaningful partnerships also help to address the issue of resources and concerns that small NGOs, especially women’s rights groups, are being squeezed out of the already limited funding for gender equality programming.[[97]](#footnote-98) Informants of this study suggest that partnering from the very beginning of programme design is a key aspect in ensuring that funds are not diverted away from other gender equality programmes. They highlight that advocating together with women’s organisations in fundraising efforts and delivering of projects can raise awareness to donors about how projects on masculinity can work alongside and complement existing feminist initiatives.[[98]](#footnote-99) There is also a risk that working with men and boys appears to be a new innovative approach that attracts more donor funding, and so it is important to reduce competition among people working on gender justice through partnerships. However, contributors of a MenEngage evaluation agreed that partnerships are more positive when they are organic, rather than instigated by donors. They identified making time for getting to know each other, defining expectations and boundaries, and reflecting and learning from each other as important factors to be built into partnerships to make them mutually accountable.[[99]](#footnote-100)

There is evidence of how UN Women are trying to increase accountability towards the feminist movement within the MWGE programme. For example, in Phase II, the country office in Lebanon decided to engage with a Lebanese feminist NGO, Kafa, as the umbrella organization rather than an INGO, like Save the Children, as they did in Phase I. Through Kafa, local CBOs involved in the programme became members of gender and feminist networks, which familiarised them with the wider picture of gender equality issues and forms of discrimination at national level.[[100]](#footnote-101) MWGE also helped to unify the voices of feminist groups by playing a key role in establishing a feminist platform in the aftermath of the August 2020 Beirut Port Blast as well as supporting the production of a gender responsive reform plan for Lebanon - a *Feminist Charter of Demands[[101]](#footnote-102)*. However, the success in Lebanon in terms of partnering with feminist organisation has not been replicated to the same extent in other countries.[[102]](#footnote-103)

**Finding 10. Feminist principles of critical self-reflection and analysis of power structures and intersecting forms of oppression should be adhered to within programming on transforming patriarchal masculinities and engaging men and boys in gender justice.**

One suggestion made by women’s groups and feminist movements on engaging with men and masculinities is to have meaningful consultations with women’s rights organisations at different stages of the project cycle to facilitate open and critical discussions between different stakeholders.[[103]](#footnote-104) This requires a willingness to accept criticism, mechanisms to gather feedback and opportunities for self-reflection. For MenEngage this has meant a commitment to being transparent, seeking regular feedback from feminist organisations and taking seriously any complaints from women groups about the behaviours of leaders of member organisations.[[104]](#footnote-105) Informants highlight that timely response to critiques is also key to ensuring that women’s rights organisations understand that their concerns are taken seriously.[[105]](#footnote-106)

A gender-power analysis[[106]](#footnote-107) is another key factor in accountability for transforming patriarchal masculinities programming**.** COFEM highlights that taking a feminist approach to accountability also means recognising and actively challenging patriarchal systems and structures that privilege men across all levels (e.g. individual, community, societal and systemic).[[107]](#footnote-108) When asked to identify the most important elements of accountability when engaging men and boys in gender equality, the number one response of participants to a MenEngage survey was ‘being critically aware of one’s own power and privilege’.[[108]](#footnote-109) In their accountability standards, MenEngage highlight that work on accountability should include the individual level and members’ self-reflection on how they use power, and then be filtered up to the organisational level.[[109]](#footnote-110) It is important to also consider the privilege that programmes working with men and boys may have above work with women/marginalised groups, especially with donors (as highlighted above). Informants highlight that this puts even more importance on reflecting on the ways in which privilege plays out and upholding accountability to feminist agendas.[[110]](#footnote-111)

Furthermore, feminism offers a critical examination of how intersectional inequalities of gender, race, ethnicity, ability, colour and sexuality impact on power and identity. As with multiple accountabilities, it is important that programmes also consider multiple intersecting forms of oppression and develop tailored approaches that take these intersectional concerns into account. Informants to this study emphasised that programming working with men and boys should also be careful not to reinforce binaries of ‘men vs women’ and patriarchal structures.[[111]](#footnote-112) There is a risk that a lack of accountability to these feminist principles results in privileging men who already benefit from patriarchy, rather than dismantling various and intersecting forms of oppression.[[112]](#footnote-113) In terms of emerging best practices on engaging with and accountability to feminist movements, one key approach, therefore, is ensuring that programmes adopt an intersectional lens when designing and implementing activities engaging with men and boys.

Within the MWGE programme, the evaluation team found that efforts had been made to broaden the human rights framework in Phase II IMAGES in Jordan and Tunisia, which has incorporated voices of persons with disabilities, refugees and LGBTIQ+.[[113]](#footnote-114) Additionally, there is some anecdotal evidence that CBOs have been effective in considering power structures and intersecting forms of oppression. However, the other country programmes have not consistently considered such intersections of discrimination in the programming. Moreover, in terms of communications and messaging, the evaluation found the need for more adherence by all COs for ensuring accountability to core feminist principles. For instance, in Morocco, there has been some unintended negative pushback from women’s rights organisations, in particular against some of the media products published in Morocco (in Phase II) which were seen as undermining key feminist messages.[[114]](#footnote-115)

1. Conclusions

Transforming patriarchal masculinities programming is a promising strategy towards women’s rights and gender equality. This comparator study has identified some examples of emerging best practices within this field, in comparison with the UN MWGE programme.

In terms of best practice in shifting men’s behaviours, there are a number of key approaches in programme design and implementation that help to sustain change. **Conclusion 1:** A clear

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Key takeaways for transforming patriarchal masculinities programming   Across the three focus areas, this study found that emerging best practices for transforming patriarchal masculinities programming includes:   * Have a participatory programme design phase that helps to ensure buy-in from a range of stakeholders * Address a wider range of societal issues faced by men, through an intersectional lens * Acknowledgement of the structural power imbalances and inclusion of gender and power analysis in programming * Work across and at all levels of the social ecological model * Form meaningful partnerships with women rights groups and other social issues organisations * Adhere to the feminist principles of critical self-reflection |

understanding of the local context, achieved through a participatory programme design phase, can help to build ownership with a range of stakeholders. In particular, early engagement with the government helps to ensure institutional buy-in, and programmes are more likely to be – and can be more easily – scaled up through existing structures.

**Conclusion 2:** Best practice also means that programmes do not work in isolation but rather seek to address a wider range of societal issues faced by men. It also requires an acknowledgement of the structural power imbalances experienced in the communities in which these men exist.

**Conclusion 3**: For sustainable change, it is important that transforming patriarchal masculinities programmes create spaces for men to discuss their experiences and vulnerabilities but also facilitate peer networks, so that they feel support outside the programmes.

**Conclusion 4**: Working across the social ecological model can help create an enabling environment where men’s behaviour changes are supported. Acting differently from dominant social norms takes courage, and so best practice examples incorporate a range of activities across individual, community, and societal levels within a geographical space to facilitate change and help sustain the shift of men’s behaviours.

**Conclusion 5**: At institutional level there appears to be a need for more focused effort in the field of transforming masculinities. However, there are some good examples of how organisation and programmes can generate change at this level, for example mobilising community actors to advocate for stronger governmental responses and policy changes, which can then feed into changes within institutions.

**Conclusion 6**: The media is a key institution in achieving change, as it can help to highlight gender injustices and generate public discussion on gender equality. However, organisations can also work with the media as an institution to ensure that journalists and media outlets do not reinforce dominant patriarchal ideologies. Approaches work well when they aim to build the capacities and awareness of gender equality within institutions. To support these goals, it is also key that strong partnerships are formed with other social issue groups. These networks can help form a holistic approach to system changes as well as fostering opportunities for knowledge sharing, which are key to effective engagement at institutional level.

**Conclusion 7:** With regard to engaging with and accountability to feminist movements, best practice approaches start with ensuring an organisation is clear on what they mean by accountability and to whom it applies. However, it is important to note that this does not mean that programmes engaging with men and boys always need to agree with feminist agendas, but there needs to be a clear understanding and alignment to their work. One way of achieving this is through meaningful partnerships with women’s groups and feminist movements as well as with other social issue groups. These partnerships should foster open and critical dialogue and ensure that women’s rights organisation have power in decision-making processes. When engaging in this work, it is also important that organisations and programmes adhere to the feminist principles of critical self-reflection and power structure analyses. These principles, coupled with an intersectional lens to programming, offer key approaches to ensuring accountability to feminist movements.

1. Recommendations for UN Women and MWGE programme

* Based on the above findings and conclusions, the following implications for UN Women and the MWGE programme have been identified:
* **Recommendation 1**: Consider using a socioecological model to ensure coordination of interventions across all levels (individual, relationship, community, and societal)[[115]](#footnote-116)
* **Recommendation 2**: Reflect on the ‘4 types of power’ framing, as used by RWAMREC, as an approach for broaching the subject of violence and encouraging power-sharing in relationships and to mitigate risks of alienating men and boys in the work of gender equality
* **Recommendation 3:** Continue efforts to build networks and alliances as well as fostering opportunities for knowledge sharing, building on experiences in Lebanon, to create a more holistic approach to institutional change
* **Recommendation 4**: Capitalise on awareness raising efforts, such as through the BIAM campaign, but consider how branding and public recognition could be used to achieve sustained behaviour change
* **Recommendation 5:** Foster meaningful partnerships with women’s groups and feminist movements as well as with other social issue groups, such as Kafa in Lebanon, to guide interventions according to feminist agendas at the regional and national level
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