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In the wake of numerous studies, many insights on the need to work with men as well as a funding interest to work with boys in an era of several approaches and models to work with programming on masculinities, the question of why work with boys seems quite redundant and unnecessary. Yet, it is useful for us to remember that our first impetus to engage with men and boys came from watching groups of boys gather outside the rooms where peer leaders conducted sessions with girls. Boys peeping in through windows and sometimes disrupting sessions out of curiosity or jealousy was a common sight for organizations implementing community interventions with women and girls. However, they did not seem at ease with the sexual and reproductive health awareness or gender-based violence prevention sessions when they were invited into the room. It was the discord between their interest when outside and their boredom when inside that led us to rethink the way in which our curricula, facilitation and messages reached out to men and boys.

What was it that put the boys off the programmes? While young men were hugely interested in the question of mardangi kya hai? (what is masculinity?), why did they remain firmly attached to stereotypes and norms that they acknowledged as harmful to themselves as well? Why was it that even long term, in-depth interventions and self-based engagement still did not diffuse a sense of competition and macho in the room when working with young men and boys? It was this frustration as programme implementers and curiosity as a team of young people who found our own realities reflected in the lives and conversations of “participants” that led us back to young men for more conversation with and about them.

Embarking on this research in 2018 was both easy and difficult. A wealth of knowledge from ongoing and past work with men and boys, research and data became a good starting point for inquiry. In the process, we continuously assessed that knowledge against our own experience of implementing programmes on violence prevention, reflection on masculinities and the sexual reproductive health and rights of men. Some of the challenges that we hoped to tackle were around reaching adolescent boys in the face of the pressure to take up livelihoods and earn an income (often by migrating out) at an early age. Where interventions did reach men, their retention of issues, such as consent and violence, remained low, despite repeated cycles and programmes. We had to reach boys early on, before stereotypes, norms and an understanding of masculinity was set and showed up in their sense of entitlement and discriminatory attitudes. Dealing with the “masculinity” in the room while working with groups of young men was a challenge. An unspoken sense of competition and a desire to be in control and not be vulnerable repeatedly surfaced as deeply ingrained and lived attitudes among men. Working with groups often meant more peer pressure, and individual engagement seemed easily undone by mass messaging and the lack of role models of alternative masculinities.

We started more conversations with colleagues and friends in the sector. It affirmed that the challenge was not ours alone, and the process of seeking solutions also had to be collaborative. At a conclave on masculinities we organized in 2017, while all of us acknowledged the need to work on multiple aspects and identities that shape masculinities, we also understood the difficulty of doing this together. What do we address first? Gender? Caste? Religion? Nationalism? Violence? How do we design interventions that respond effectively to many other needs that men articulate while staying accountable to outcomes on violence prevention? Whom do we educate – funders, facilitators, media, communities, participants or ourselves?

This research is an attempt to find answers to some of these questions. The scope is both specific and expansive: to determine how masculinities are constructed by young men and to thus design better approaches to engaging with the kinds of young men who are part of our programmes in Uttar Pradesh. At best, we hope it expands sector knowledge and adds to the growing wealth of insights on masculinities; at the least, we hope to inform our own programmes to work better with men and boys and more effectively address their needs. As programme developers and implementers, our research must go back to where it started – to the boys at the window, looking inside, yet knowing the conversation is not really for them. The process has been insightful enough, and while we hope to speak to the relevant realities of young men and boys better, we are confident, at least in the claim, that we understand what they are saying more deeply.

We now hand over the report to others in the sector as an invitation to go back to young men as the starting point for developing programmes instead of basing them only on the panic around male privilege and the propensity for violence and entitlement. We urge the sector to give up a linear programmatic route to creating the ideal development of boys we imagine and, instead, to listen to what boys have been saying all along.

Manak Matiyani
Executive Director
The YP Foundation, New Delhi
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Approaches to interventions with men have shifted significantly since “male involvement” was adopted as a prime strategy to address reproductive and child health. Prior to this, interventions around gender-based violence merely viewed men as perpetrators and focused on engaging women alone. Ever since this shift, “male involvement” has picked up pace, with the dominant approach moving towards engaging men as partners in combating gender-based violence and ensuring women’s access to sexual and reproductive health and rights. However, many of these interventions merely reinforce men’s image as protectors. It has remained difficult to ensure deeper reflections and questioning of patriarchal norms among men. Motivated by these shortcomings, approaches to programming with men recently started engaging with masculinities that underlie men’s perceptions, attitudes and actions. The benefit of such an approach, which recognizes the plurality of masculinity, is that we are now able to engage with patriarchy as a system that stratifies the entire society, affecting outcomes across genders.

Going one step further, to transforming sexual and reproductive health and rights outcomes, requires us to understand the multiple identities that combine with gender to articulate and/or accentuate its effects of stratification.

Programming that borrows this intersectional lens stresses the importance of devising multiple nodes of action for engaging gender identities with a rights-based perspective. With the hope of informing such programming, both organizationally and within the sector, this exploratory research project asked:

**How are masculinities constituted and expressed by young college-going men in urban Uttar Pradesh?**

With that guiding question, the research thus sought to:
- explore the intersections between gender, sexuality, caste, class and religion in discussions on masculinities;
- understand the impact of social media (especially Facebook and WhatsApp) on masculinities;
- explore the value of relationships, such as friendships, love, marriage and infidelity, for men;
- probe men’s perceptions around consent, sexual health, contraception and violence.

This study was conducted with 80 young men aged 18–26 years across three urban locations in Uttar Pradesh – Lucknow, Varanasi and Aligarh – using qualitative methods of data collection (focus group discussions, personal interviews and life histories). The insights from the research can inform other programmes that seek to engage men and masculinities across a variety of issues.
ENTITLEMENTS AS OPPRESSION: MEN’S READING OF THREATS AND CONTESTATIONS

In some ways, use of social media was empowering for many respondents. Many long-distance relationships, which may end in marriage, have provided young people (women, more so) with more agency in choosing their partner. Respondents from non-heteronormative sexualities repeatedly mentioned that they were able to organize, mobilize and advocate a great deal due to social media connectivity.

Respondents belonged to minority religious groups stated that they face increasing threats to their sense of self in the current socio-political environment. Many strongly asserted their masculinities along religious lines. It is also possible that this has led many of them to rationalize inequalities that are prescribed in their religious texts. Some even antagonize masculinities emerging from other religions as a means of aggrandizing themselves.

The relationship between space and masculinities is causal in two ways. First, norms and perceptions lead to certain spaces being deemed masculine and others as feminine (such as the household or the kitchen within the household), which imposes patriarchal controls over mobility. Second, legitimacy of norms and perceptions (what is masculine and what is not) is contingent upon spaces and their meaning for individuals. This will be discussed further in a case study that tries to understand how different masculinities get legitimized as young men travel from their homes to all-male boarding schools and then to co-ed universities.

Respondents from non-heteronormative sexualities repeatedly mentioned that they were able to organize, mobilize and advocate a great deal due to social media connectivity.

Social media requires young men to undertake measures akin to social image building. Respondents articulated immense pressure to conform to this, especially in late adolescence. It emerged that several gender norms and opinions guide their online expressions.

Respondents also used caste-specific masculine images and idioms in projecting their online selves. In many ways, Facebook and WhatsApp have led to a deepening of caste-consciousness among young men because they are voluntarily or involuntarily added to caste-based groups on these platforms.

Young men from our sample reported being a major audience for all kinds of data and facts that are routinely circulated through social media platforms. The sense of competition among young men is deepened by the penetration of an information society, where being backed by facts and data is integral to preserving a strong sense of self and masculine status.
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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ENTITLEMENTS AS OPPRESSION: MEN’S READING OF THREATS AND CONTESTATIONS

• Contestations within the hierarchy of masculinities do not always challenge the patriarchal system. It emerged from the respondents’ narratives that patriarchy is reinforced through multiple masculine expressions, which may not be the hegemonic ideal. Even the ones that are routinely vilified in popular discourse (such as Muslim men) and are in constant tussle with the hegemonic ideal may deepen patriarchal oppression.

• Instead of being positive reinforcement, the pervasiveness of contemporary masculine ideals across all spaces in our respondents’ lives appeared to be an imposition on them that may lead to immense mental and emotional pressure.

• Respondents drew a strong link between preservation of status and self-image and their sexual performance. They perceived that their inability to satisfy their partner might lead to negative consequences for their relationships, which further threatens their image among their peers and selves.

• The inextricable link between caste and gender was articulated across the hierarchy of masculinities. An example of this is visible in caste-based norms that influence men’s bodies: certain castes (like Thakurs, Pathans and Jaats) emphasize physique, style of walking, etc.

• Respondents belonging to minority religious groups stated that they face increasing threats to their sense of self in the current socio-political environment. Many strongly asserted their masculinities along religious lines. It is also possible that this has led many of them to rationalize inequalities that are prescribed in their religious texts. Some even antagonize masculinities emerging from other religions as a means of aggrandizing themselves.

• The relationship between space and masculinities is causal in two ways. First, norms and perceptions lead to certain spaces being deemed masculine and others as feminine (such as the household or the kitchen within the household), which imposes patriarchal controls over mobility. Second, legitimacy of norms and perceptions (what is masculine and what is not) is contingent upon spaces and their meaning for individuals. This will be discussed further in a case study that tries to understand how different masculinities get legitimized as young men travel from their homes to all-male boarding schools and then to co-ed universities.

• Several respondents revealed that social media has become a major tool for the promotion of ideas that vilify certain men and masculinities as threats to the nation or as second-class citizens or, most violently, as “anti-nationals”.

• Respondents also explained that social media has become a space to share non-consensual videos of sexual violence. In recording videos while perpetrating sexual violence, young men continue to associate the pride and status of a community or household with female sexuality. Therefore, perpetration of sexual violence is often also a way of “getting back” at those who are considered to rank lower in men’s dominant hierarchical schema.
• Contrary to contemporary programme knowledge, respondents articulated that friendships have important roles in their lives. Male-male friendships were reported to be a stable source of information and emotional support, especially in times of intense vulnerability. This goes against the perception that men are emotionally stoic among their peers.

• The analysis reaffirms that caste is a major influencer in the formation of relationships and associations. Caste solidarity is repeatedly relied upon by respondents in their everyday lives to influence the allocation of resources and power.

• It emerged from the narratives that having a girlfriend becomes a marker of status among young men, leading to a great deal of pressure for those who are not in a romantic relationship. Women figure as important in this masculine hierarchy insofar as they elevate men’s social status.

• Respondents stated that relationships are a strong source of information and experience to understand women’s likes, dislikes, how they chose to express themselves, fashion, etc. They also recounted several pressures of being in a relationship, such as the pressure of “being a provider” and “taking girlfriends out”.

• Some men reported being wary of developing romantic relationships after having experienced dhoka (betrayal) by their romantic interest. The nature of this dhoka, however, was largely ambiguous. It emerged that partner control in romantic relationships seems to be based on a bargain that men make. It stands so long as status is maintained by having a girlfriend who is monogamous, beautiful, makes other men envious and is submissive to men’s demands. This bargain is struck off when the woman exercises her choice of not being in the relationship and their actions are deemed to be dhoka, or betrayal. It is possible that men interpret threats to their masculine status as dhoka: feelings of rejection are understood as their entitlements being taken away and have little to do with their romantic interest or their actions.

• Respondents from specific backgrounds stated that the law affects their choices and decisions around marriage in specific and direct ways. Several of them, from lower caste or working-class backgrounds, added that they would avoid getting married out of fear that the woman’s family would lodge a (fraudulent) police complaint against them to end their relationship.

• Analysis reveals that characteristics of an ideal wife for men are contingent upon their own status and traits and are in sharp contrast with the image of an ideal girlfriend. Decisions regarding whom to marry depend on how well men would be able to exert control over their wife. According to respondents, marrying “upwards” compromises their entitlement to partner control, causing threats to their masculinities. This is in contrast with the case of romance, where developing a relationship “upwards” is seen to elevate men’s status and self-image.

• Respondents’ narratives revealed that sexual behaviour and perceptions around sex need not always conform to the hegemony of heteronormativity. This also strengthens the idea that there is little correlation between sexual behaviours and sexual identities. What is needed then is to unpack the circumstances that legitimize and materialize behaviours that don’t conform to given sexual identities. Hence, there is a need for programming to move beyond identifying beneficiaries solely through identity categories or behavioural categories (such as men who have sex with men) and, instead, seek to target the complex terrain of youth sexuality in order to ensure safe and consensual sex.

• Respondents recounted multiple actors who guided their adolescent sexual knowledge and sexualities, such as older cousins, seniors from school (especially in the case of boarding school) and local CD/DVD shops, which double as suppliers of local pornographic content.

• Respondents’ ideas of safe sex was limited to ensuring secrecy and privacy. This was intimately tied to the image of a “good boy” as someone who is devoted to his family and to earning respect, status and privilege through
education and employment. Men take great precautions to preserve these social codes.

• The level of impunity in a marriage is very high, with men socialized into believing that they are entitled to ideal wives who are primarily responsible for the household and the needs of children, him and his parents’ needs. Marriage is also considered to be a “license” to have sex whenever they want, without any regard to the choice or agency of the wife.

• It was clear that many respondents did not think consent was important in the case of all sexual relations; the agency of a woman saying “no” becomes crucial for the way it is perceived by young men and their reactions to it. In these cases, consent becomes less and less important and the perception of having been rejected leads to incidences of aggression, verbal abuse and physical and mental violence.

**MEN’S READING OF VIOLENCE: ENTITLEMENT OR A TOOL TO SAFEGUARD SELF-IMAGE OR BOTH?**

• Respondents’ narratives revealed that norms around behaviour, personality and ideal gender identities entitle them to exercise violence. Violence becomes a normalized means of subjugating women, especially within the household, and as a means of dishonouring another man, community or family.

• Respondents also revealed that violence in public spaces comes from a sense of protecting your entitlements and preserving masculine hierarchies. This is true in the case of both violence perpetrated against other men or women, although it is much more amplified in the case of women. Violence against women in public spaces may be a tool to deal with rejection and a lost sense of self by “setting the hierarchy straight.”

• The persistent rise in cases of gender-based violence may have resulted in the masculinization of programme strategies to tackle violence. Some grass-roots organizations working on violence prevention have now adopted violence itself as a strategy to “knocking sense” into men and preventing future incidences.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the basis of our analysis we offer specific recommendations with the following objectives -

• to re-evaluate the role of men in SRHR programming without reducing them to conduits for gender transformation;

• to increase men’s participation within programmes and campaigns; to incorporate the lens of intersectionality while devising strategies to engage men;

• to explore a diversification of sites where men could be effectively engaged including on social media and;

• to rethink our current evaluation frameworks to measure outcomes of men in relation to their own realities in addition to attitudes around gender and patriarchy.

Programming around masculinities should integrate conversations around citizenship, political economy, employment and everyday religiosity, all of which are structural issues that have gendered implications. Similarly, all other interventions with men on these issues should be designed for men to locate themselves within these as gendered beings. Mainstreaming gender and masculinities into all programming with men would allow us to move closer towards gender transformation structurally.

Intersectional programmes need to strive towards holding both privileges and vulnerabilities in a single conversation which would open up multiple nodes of entry for addressing notions of masculinity. A step towards opening up these multiple nodes is for organisations to start exploring more cross-sectoral linkages amongst each other in order to mobilise men on multiple issues simultaneously.

For programmes to not ignore intersectionality, it would mean that many themes which routinely get left out of GBV prevention programmes such as livelihoods, caste, income,
social media expressions, self-image and failure, need to be incorporated into programme design. Moreover, while it is understood that men have greater mobility and agency, it is worthwhile to evaluate our strategies on whether they are designed to ensure that all men, despite their differing identities and masculinities, are able to exercise their agency and choice in equal degree, including queer men, men from dalit-bahujan castes, and others.

Our analysis of construction of masculinities also reveals that it is important to start interventions with young men at an early age and incorporate broader engagements with multiple stakeholders into programme design. This will ensure that harmful notions of masculinity are tackled as and when men start getting socialised into these codes and norms. In order to tackle the challenges that arise due to men’s changing sites of socialisation and the resultant behavior of quick adaptation into perspectives that surround them, programmes must diversify platforms of engaging with men including targeting men’s social media groups through positive role models and actively promoting alternate aspirational models.

To circumvent the sense of competition among male participants, programmes need to design individual engagements within collectivised spaces such that individual takeaways and reflections could be assessed more clearly.

Most importantly, in order to facilitate deviation from harmful norms that are revealed to be highly rewarding for men, programmes need to actively cultivate alternate reward systems that men can aspire to move towards. This requires a larger shift from the current reward system that is guided by norms around citizenships, nationalism and political economy. Additionally, once these processes are identified and where these have already been identified, programmes need to amplify men’s access to these.
INTRODUCTION: MASCULINITY OR MASCULINITIES?

Vikas, a final year student of Kathak studies in Lucknow University, was one of the first men we met. He identifies as a gay cisgendered man. His other gay friends routinely call him behen or aapa (sister) and hold him in regard for his oratory and debating skills. He had emerged as an articulate and outspoken respondent in the focus group discussion, making nuanced arguments on brahmanical patriarchy, toxic masculinity, gender-based violence, rape, consent and pornography. In short, he would be identified as an ideal feminist man in our interventions. After the group discussion, a few of us decided to walk to a nearby tea shop. Soon, the group discussion participants started joking around over responses that were shared. It started off as casual teasing among friends but quickly escalated to more tempered insults. Their language changed significantly and quickly as the jokes became more personal, but it was all still taken in good humour.

Here was a group of “woke” queer men chattering and calling each other some of the most caste-oriented and transphobic slang language. My discomfort must have been obvious, because Vikas told everyone to tone down the slang. “They all have the rottenest tongues,” he said to me in a tone of ill-fitting self-righteousness. It was a bit unsettling to witness this group hold both politically nuanced conversations (while in the FGD) and flippant offensive conversations while outside. Such contradictions became recurring during this research.

I inquired more about Vikas’ background in a bid to change the topic of conversation, and he told me that he hails from a strongly religious Brahmin family that has also been a long-time member of a Hindu right-wing organization. He was a junior cadet with the same organization and routinely attended the shakha, or neighbourhood camps, where he participated in prayers, debates, sports and other physical activities. “How was it growing up in that atmosphere?” I asked him sheepishly, trying to contain my disbelief at the transformation this person has been through. His friends started laughing and one even remarked, “Oh not at all. That’s his favourite place in the world, especially the night camps,” and they winked at each other while slapping high-fives.

Vikas retorted nonchalantly, “If I think about it now, it was [an environment of] toxic masculinity, but I had my fun as well. I was in the shakha with many hot boys all around me, shirtless and sometimes naked. My family was happy, because according to them, I was following exactly in their footsteps. I was made fun of because of my femininity, but no one dared [to pick fights with me] because of how heavy I am. But I had sexual experiences with many boys over there…and dropping out of it wasn’t very difficult. My college is very far from home, so after [graduating from] school, my visits to the shakha reduced drastically. In college, I came in touch with a lot of feminist literature in Hindi. I read and volunteered to work at several organizations, which helped me gain more perspectives…. And of course, I no longer subscribe to those ideals – but I still have a fetish for shakha men. They’re all so aggressive and ignorant, but it’s easy to get laid with them. I just go to them sometimes when I want to have easy sex.” Upon hearing this, his friend walking alongside us remarked, “Oh god. This one is the horniest of all! God only knows she’s stolen the essence of how many poor men.” Vikas and I laughed out loud, and he spanked his friend’s behind. “Don’t touch me like that,” the friend retorted angrily, to which Vikas winked again and responded, “I’m just getting started, darling. I have eaten up boys like you.” The friend groaned at him and walked ahead. I took this opportunity to ask him, “So [earlier in the group discussion] you told me you knew all about safe sex and consent. Have all your sexual experiences so far been safe?” He looked down for a second, a bit embarrassed, and then said, “Not really. Of course, I know safe sex is important, but it doesn’t happen like that always. Some men I sleep with don’t want to use condoms, and

1 Cisgender relates to a person whose sense of personal identity and gender corresponds to the sex assigned at birth.
sometimes even I don’t have the energy to argue. Sometimes, you’re just horny.” This reiterated to me the earlier point of contradictions that arise as young men constantly negotiate between identities, spaces and masculinities on a daily basis. Often interventions imagine men having a linear journey from being perpetrators to partners or changemakers without taking into account all these kinds of negotiations that all men must do in order to consolidate their masculinities and power across spaces that they inhabit.

Vikas’ case highlights some of the issues that masculinities programming has grappled with over the past decade or so. Current programmes on masculinity are largely focused on such issues as gender-based violence, early and child marriages, safe sex and contraception use. In many of these programmes, men like Vikas would not be identified as potential beneficiaries because they have already undergone several trainings on gender and violence sensitization. Vikas seemed to know all the “right” and politically correct examples while in the group discussion. In other words, their baseline results would indicate no need for intervention because traditional programming has located men under a binary – perpetrators who need to be transformed to partners. Vikas would already be a partner or changemaker under the existing monitoring and evaluation frameworks used in masculinities programming. But does his performance of the programming ideal of masculinity remain consistent? Why do men with full information and full consciousness of their actions, make contradictory choices and how do we deal with this conundrum as programmes? Even his practices around safe sex, like most men from our sample, depends on who the partner is, where he has sex and when. The contrast between men’s beliefs and practices inside and outside the group discussion suggest the frictions and tensions in determining or creating “ideal” men and the need for a multi-focal strategy to effectively warrant changes in attitudes. Another recurring theme while sifting through men’s narratives pointed towards the ways in which men articulate and use the various privileges that they have, including the privilege of being seen as victims. Most men from our sample held multiple positions of privilege and vulnerabilities, similar to Vikas. How, then, do we develop nuanced indicators that are able to capture changes in attitudes, perceptions and, in turn, practices more accurately? In such a scenario, we attempted to understand how men engage with these multiple positions.

Traditionally, masculinity is defined as a set of practices including actions, traits, ideas, beliefs and norms that underline “maleness” and the performance of “being a man” in a given society. But is there such a defined set of practices? If so, how do we hold together Vikas’ contradictory yet co-existent experiences that shape his beliefs, practices and performance? Different opinions, perceptions and performances are adopted at different points in his life, based on context, relationships and networks. In masculinities-based programming, however, the focus has remained on a particular set of (masculine) practices that are deemed to be most oppressive: hegemonic masculinity. Australian sociologist R. W. Connell associates masculinities with hegemony, stating that across cultures, patriarchies tend to value certain qualities and practices of “manhood” more highly than others (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). Such a hierarchical valuation of qualities and traits leads to certain masculinities attaining dominance and social legitimacy over others.

While it is true that Connell’s theorization has been particularly useful for imagining social change across contexts in the realm of masculinity studies, this remains a challenge (Duncanson, 2015; Beasley, 2005). Owing to Connell’s characterization, programming on masculinity has also concentrated more heavily towards sexuality and gender as the dominant axes for determining hegemonic ideals. It is no happenstance that most masculinity-based interventions in India are in the masculinity is defined as a set of practices including actions, traits, ideas, beliefs and norms that underline “maleness” and the performance of “being a man” in a given society.

2. A thorough review of some important conceptual milestones have been summarized in an edited volume on masculinities by Kimmel et al., 2004.
3. Note the use of singular here. According to Connell, even though articulations and processes of creating this ideal varied across societies, a dominant influence over masculine performances was through the cultural (re)production of the “white heteronormative male” ideal, which they termed as hegemonic masculinity. Sexuality and gender remained the dominant axes for analysing “the” masculine ideal.
sexual and reproductive health sector or in gender-based programming. However, it gets more complicated once we factor in other identity positions that individuals hold (as in Vikas’ case). Masculinities are constructed and performed along several identity positions such as caste, religion, economic class, and ethnicity. Addressing these complexities involves revisiting the concept of hegemonic masculinity and asking ourselves whether it is always possible to identify what becomes hegemonic when and why. Even in cases where we assume heteropatriarchal masculinity (or toxic masculinity in colloquial terms) to be hegemonic and most oppressive, it becomes imperative to ask ourselves what exactly makes masculinity ‘toxic’? There are indeed many channels through which expressions of masculinity lead to gender unjust outcomes and we attempt in this research to understand some of these. Although there are certain ideals, such as the "breadwinner", expressions of masculinities are so diverse that the hegemonic ideal (the “numero uno” masculinity) is not always idolized.

Again, throughout their lives and in everyday interactions, most men express several contrasting perceptions and performances that do not fit into any hegemonic box. In fact, the fluidity in performance of gender identities makes it difficult for us to pinpoint which ideal becomes hegemonic when and why. For instance, it was difficult in this research to extricate which position men are coming from when they speak about their experiences - gender or caste or religion or all or something else? Men engage with these multiple positions at all times and their expressions and (re)actions need to be understood simultaneously along all of these different axes.

Masculinities can then be reconceptualized as a hierarchy that is rendered dynamic and fluid due to the many pathways across which men contest for not just superiority but also to be recognized and valued as ‘true men’.

Scholars in masculinity studies have noted several everyday contestations between masculine ideals along caste lines (Chowdhry, 2015). Therefore, it is more important to understand the processes and the frictions between multiple masculinities that create such contestations.

If we do need to look beyond gender and sexualities, then in the Indian context, we cannot ignore caste. Understanding the links between caste and masculinities also becomes an important point of critique towards Connell’s framework. Caste-based hierarchies in India are far from static and universal, unlike race in Connell’s theorization. Caste hierarchies that affect everyday lives and experiences have been rendered increasingly dynamic by new opportunities and inequalities fuelled by transformations in capitalism and class (Jeffrey, Jeffrey and Jeffrey, 2008). Several scholars have noted examples of differential social dominance and legitimacy to different castes across location and time. Silent acts of resistance by previous generations of Dalit men are, in some instances, subverted by younger generations, who rework hierarchies through assertion and violence against upper-caste men and women (Anandhi and Vijaybhaskar, 2013). Anandhi documented increasing instances of confrontations, such as the refusal by Dalit men to work for people of upper castes, with these becoming normalized tropes of masculinity across the caste hierarchy (Anandhi, Jeyaranjan and Krishnan, 2002). Therefore, Connell’s unilateral frame of hegemonic oppressors and non-hegemonic oppressed does not hold true in the light of the dynamism of caste-based hierarchies (Singh, 2017).

This raises other questions: Is the hegemonic ideal the only one that needs to be challenged to foster more equal gender relations? How can programmes be intersectional, in a way that it becomes possible to hold both privileges and vulnerabilities of men together? How can we capture the multiplicity therein and the resulting implications for outcomes on violence prevention, early, child and forced marriages or sexual and reproductive health and rights? This research attempts to answer these questions.
1.1. HEGEMONIC ARCHETYPES OF MASCULINITY IN INDIA

Historical analyses of masculinities in India reveal the influence of several social structures over the construction of hegemonic archetypes. This section details some of these as formulated through colonialism (savage Oriental man or the brown babu), sexuality (brahmacharya, anushilan, perpetrators, risk groups, such as men who have sex with men) and religion (Hanuman as the ideal man).

• Colonialism brought about the development of two archetypes, both justifying the Empire’s presence in different ways. On one side was the image of the “Oriental savages”, incapable of governing themselves into modernity without the intervention of colonial masters (Cohn, 1996). On the other side, was the “brown babu”, a class of English-educated Indians who served as tools to smoothen the colonial bureaucracy (Chatterjee, 1993). These seemingly contrasting archetypes justified the feminization of an entire population, which was then perpetuated for dominance (Sinha, 1995; Nandy, 1983).

• Celibacy and semen anxiety have been constantly reinforced as aspects of the masculine ideal in Indian societies (Bose, 2008; Chakravarti, 1998). In the writings of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, one finds the concept of anushilan, which posits control and training towards asceticism and mercy as the true ideal of Hindu masculinity (Sreenivas, 2010). Gandhian masculinity also espouses controls over body and desire through methods of brahmacharya and swarajya to be the spiritually modern citizen. Population and poverty issues that plagued independent India led to the development of sexual swarajya, which espoused eugenics and controlling sexuality for the nation’s progress (Menon, 2007).

• Sexuality has also been drawn upon as a tool of governance to regulate “proper” sexual behaviour (Narrain and Chandra, 2015). Sexual politics are most apparent in legislation, such as Section 377, which accorded severe trial and punishment for sexual behaviours considered to be “against the order of nature”. Due to this, inquiries into multiple sexualities and the processes that grant them (il)legitimacy have been few (John and Nair, 1998). The impact has been exclusionary and discriminatory in the sense that male sexuality remained to be investigated in the realms of heteronormativity (except in the case of and HIV), only to be challenged by the queer movement.

• Hindu religious iconography has also influenced universal ideals of “the Indian man”. For instance, the image of Hanuman has been worshipped and venerated for possessing strength, bravery, obedience, devotion and brahmacharya (Alter, 1992). The popularity of Hanuman coincided with the consolidation of the new Indian middle-class identity due to his complete surrender and devotion to duty, an ideal that was looked up to by young working-class men (Alter, 2004; Jaffrelot, 1998). But recently, this image of a calm, genial, serene-looking monkey-God figure has masculinized into that of an angry aggressive warrior or killer symbolizing a macho, young, aggressive nation (Pande, 2018). It is not a coincidence that this masculinization was accompanied by a rise in nationalist sentiments that vilified several “other” men as insurgent and “outsiders”.

For a long time, these archetypes dictated academic discussions around Indian masculinities, and there was little programmatic inquiry to open up the black box of “the ideal man” and unpack the contestations among multiple masculine expressions. To understand and evaluate the efficacy of programming that would be targeting such multiple expressions (as detailed in the findings), there is a need to move beyond such generalizations. Hegemonic masculinity has been so popular that it has even been adopted by many organizations in India working towards combating gender-based violence by working with men: While investigating masculinities, they fail to engage with the image of men outside of binaries, such as “perpetrators of violence” (which is seen to be the “hegemonic ideal”) or changemakers (once the socialization process into creating this hegemonic ideal is “reversed” through campaigns or programmes) (Mogford, Irby and Das, 2015; Dasgupta and Gokulsing, 2013). In such a context, it would be worthwhile to critically trace the history of men in gender-oriented programming to identify gaps in approaches and how then we may design interventions aimed at gender transformation.
SHIFTS IN APPROACHES TO
MALE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN
HEALTH-BASED INTERVENTIONS

1970s

GENDER BLIND
PROGRAMMING

Designed and targeted irrespective of gender.

1980s

VIEWING MEN AS
PERPETRATORS

Alarming global and national statistics on the status of women within workplace, domestic violence, harassment and multiple crimes against women.

EG. Early family planning initiatives in the 1970s and early 80s

Gender incorporated into programming as a lens owing to conventions such as CEDAW, but still a binary

Focus shifted to women in RCH (Reproductive and Child Health), economic empowerment, violence prevention, dowry related issues

However:
- Did not lead to gender neutral outcomes
- Using coercion and force that led to violation of rights, particularly of women from marginalised backgrounds

Limited male engagement

1990s

MALE INVOLVEMENT
IN RCH

Outcomes on Early and Child Marriage, Gender Based Violence, sex ratio and dowry remain alarming and even witness a steady rise in some states

EG. PassionWorks poster series by MenEngage on contraception, abortion, HIV, sexual politics and homophobia

ICPD Cairo 1994 and the Beijing Declaration in 1995 called for the need to involve men within RCH

SUTRA in Himachal Pradesh

Two sides of the debate:
- Will engaging men lead to more power imbalances?
- Should the burden of transforming gendered outcomes fall on women alone?

Sporadic male engagement; outcomes towards ECM, GBV, still remain low

1990s

MEN AS
PARTNERS

From viewing men as perpetrators the approach slowly shifted to engaging men as partners in achieving positive outcomes for women

Popular strategies adopted were - quantitative research, media campaigns, collectivisation, sensitisation

More concerted efforts to involve men with the setting up of MASIWA in 2002 and MenEngage Global in 2004

2000s

GENDER TRANSFORMATIVE
PROGRAMMING

Criticism:
- Positive outcomes but limited as to men's attitudes towards women and not themselves and gender at large
- Reinforce men's role as protectors without leading to larger reflections on gender hierarchies and patriarchal notions of masculinity
- Essentializing gender as a binary
1.3. TRANSFORMING GENDER FRAMEWORKS: MAINSTREAMING INTERSECTIONALITIES

To break down the dichotomous view of men as either perpetrators or partners, feminist programmers have asserted on the need to engage with patriarchy as a system that stratifies society as a whole, including men and women. Moreover, patriarchal stratification brings together hierarchies emerging from positions apart from gender, such as caste, religion and sexual identity. This is the thesis for even Connell, who wants to weave together gender, race and class in the analysis of patriarchy and masculinities. Following this is the fact that patriarchal stratification is contingent upon context (for instance, the diversity in caste-based hierarchies as mentioned previously) and that there cannot be one universally accepted framework for bargaining with patriarchal systems that are so diverse (Kandiyoti, 1988).

Gender-based programming faced the challenge of identifying multiple context-specific modes of action to help women make such bargains. This led to a shift in the general perspective towards a gender-transformative approach that focuses on engaging with gender stereotypes and questions hierarchies of all forms (even within men) (Peacock and Barker, 2014). A major step in this direction was the incorporation of the Forum to Engage Men in India in 2007, which started out as a coalition of grass-roots and non-government organizations that shared this common principle of engaging masculinities (see Appendix 1).

Transforming gender outcomes, however, requires us to understand the multiple positions that combine with gender to articulate and/or accentuate its effects of stratification. Such an integration and synergistic understanding of gender hierarchies with other institutional factors has been absent in programmatic spaces, especially around masculinities. This challenge was articulated even at “an ideal boy” conclave on masculinities organized by The YP Foundation. In that dialogue, several organizations engaging men reflected on the lack of information and analysis on the intersectional nature of masculinities, especially in relation to caste and religion, which seemed to be deeply ingrained in young men’s psyche in cities of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. Adopting an intersectional lens to understand the synchronicity between gender and other intersections means that we begin probing men’s experiences related to caste, religion and sexualities that are shaped by space, networks, personal histories and individual agency.

Organizations participating in the conclave articulated a collective need to unpack the black boxes of “man” and “women” and to understand the multitude of gender roles, constraints and bargaining positions that were long subsumed under this binary. Additionally, we need to unpack the spaces (both physical, digital and relational) in men’s lives that constitute multiple, sometimes contesting, masculinities. Several scholars have lamented about the need to undertake an investigation of the social media space, owing to its ubiquitous presence in the lives of young men. Particularly of interest is the relationship between social media performances of masculinity and sexual behaviours. Scholars have pointed to the association between masculinity themes on social networking sites, such as misogyny, sex, coolness, toughness, material status and social status, and their relationship with sexual risk behaviours among young men (Genter, 2014). Our approach in this research was to unpack such constructions of masculinities contingent upon identity, networks and spaces (including social media) and how they relate to outcomes pertaining to sexual and reproductive health and gender-based violence programming.

Programming that borrows from this approach stresses the importance of devising multiple nodes of action for engaging gender identities from a rights-based perspective. With a hope to inform such programming, this research project is a step towards probing the same plurality in masculinities and asked the following broad question: How are masculinities constituted and expressed by young college-going men in urban Uttar Pradesh?

The broader insights from this research are intended to inform future programmes that seek to engage men and masculinities on issues pertaining to sexual and reproductive health and rights and to violence. Hence, the research was guided by the following objectives:

- explore the intersections between gender, sexuality, caste, class and religion into discussions around masculinities;
- understand the impact of social media (especially Facebook and WhatsApp) on masculinities;
- explore the value of relationships, such as friendships, love, marriage and infidelity, for men and their implications for gender-based violence;
- probe men’s perceptions around consent, sexual health, contraception and sex.

4. Detailed review of the gender transformative framework can be found in Barker, Ricardo and Nascimento, 2007. An adaptation of this framework has been developed for work in India by organizations, such as International Center for Research on Women, which sought to incorporate a gendered analysis into inequality and differential development outcomes. 5. For more details, refer to the concept note prepared by MenEngage (2014) on men and sexual and reproductive health and rights. 6. Synchronicity refers to processes that are concurrent and co-produced. It has been most used as a concept by feminist geographers, such as Doreen Massey (2000), to stress the need to adopt an intersectional and synchronous approach towards reading the production of gender hierarchies in space. 7. Deepak Mehro (2006) conceptualizes the relationship between masculinities and violence to be constituted across three discursive levels – nation state and violence; civil violence and public order; and domestic violence and intimacy – each of which share commonalities in the fact that masculine articulations are responses to an enemy.
2.1. CONTEXTUALIZING THE INVESTIGATION: WHY UTTAR PRADESH?

• There are approximately 121 million young men in India, of which 17.94% are in Uttar Pradesh.

• The 2011 Census points out that Uttar Pradesh has the highest number of gender-critical districts (60, 80% of total number of districts) on the basis of poor outcomes around child sex ratio, girls’ education, and female workforce participation rates. Bihar with 28 gender-critical districts (73% of total number of districts) stands behind UP in the second spot.

• The sex ratio at birth in UP has increased by only one percentage point in the past year and it continues to be far lower than the national average (Nanda et al, 2014).

• For this reason, development work around gender has continued to concentrate on UP. In our study, we focussed on three urban districts across UP for our field work - Lucknow, Benaras, Aligarh (reasons for this will be detailed later).
MARRIAGE

As per the 2011 census findings, around 2 million adolescent girls in Uttar Pradesh – which translates to 9.2 per cent of all girls aged 10–19 years – were married. An even more alarming figure is that around one million children were born to these adolescent girls in Uttar Pradesh and 10.1 per cent of those babies died. While the incidence of early marriage among adolescent girls aged 10–14 years was low in Uttar Pradesh, the percentage rose significantly in the 15–19 age group. The proportion of married adolescent females aged 15–19 years among Scheduled Caste communities ranged from 19 per cent to 33 per cent, while the same range among non-Scheduled Caste communities ranged from 17 per cent to 24 per cent. This age group also coincides with the onset of puberty.

A study on early marriage in seven districts of Uttar Pradesh found that 302 of 469 (64.4 per cent) married girls and 206 of 222 (92.8 per cent) married boys aged 11–22 years were married before the legal age (18 years for girls and 21 years for boys). Varanasi, at an average of 20 per cent, had the highest prevalence of married adolescent females in Uttar Pradesh (NRMC, 2016).

SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

PARTNER CONTROL

A study conducted in Delhi and Vijayawada, India, by the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), found that three-fifths of the 9,197 men in the sample reported having excessive control over their partner or wife, whereas only 13 per cent exercised little control (Nanda et al., 2014). The proportion of men expressing rigid attitudes towards gender equality and having much control over their partner was largest in Uttar Pradesh (at 53.8 per cent from a sample of 1,650 men), compared with the average of men with much control across all states, at 32 per cent. In Uttar Pradesh, only 14 percent of men and a little less than one third of women (31 per cent) held positive attitudes towards gender equality, and others were either moderately or highly negative.
As per the 2011 census findings, around 2 million adolescent girls in Uttar Pradesh – which translates into 9.2 per cent of all girls aged 10-19 years – were married. An even more alarming figure is that around one million children were born to these adolescent girls in Uttar Pradesh and 10.1 per cent of those babies died. While the incidence of early marriage among adolescent girls aged 10–14 years was low in Uttar Pradesh, the percentage rose significantly in the 15–19 age group. The proportion of married adolescent females aged 15–19 years among Scheduled Caste communities ranged from 19 per cent to 33 per cent, while the same range among non-Scheduled Caste communities ranged from 17 per cent to 24 percent. This age group also coincides with the onset of puberty. A study on early marriage in seven districts of Uttar Pradesh found that 302 of 469 (64.4 per cent) married girls and 206 of 222 (92.8 per cent) married boys aged 11–22 years were married before the legal age (18 years for girls and 21 years for boys). Varanasi, at an average of 20 per cent, had the highest prevalence of married adolescent females in Uttar Pradesh (NRMC, 2016).

Respondents from the ICRW IMAGES survey stated that among those who had had sex in the previous 12 months, only 1 per cent of women and 9 per cent of men reported having had high-risk sex during the previous 12 months. Few respondents said that they had multiple sex partners in the previous 12 months (0.3 per cent of women and 3 per cent of men). The ICRW report stated that 1 per cent of men from the Uttar Pradesh sample (1,650 men) said they had paid for sex in the previous year. The percentage of men who had had high-risk sexual intercourse in the previous 12 months was somewhat higher (at 11 per cent) in urban areas than in rural areas (at 9 per cent). More than one fourth of men (26 per cent) who had had high-risk sex in the previous 12 months reported using a condom the last time they had high-risk sex. Among men who had had higher-risk sex in the previous 12 months, the proportion who reported using a condom the last time they had high-risk intercourse was larger in urban areas (at 33 per cent) than in rural areas (at 22 per cent).
CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN

The Uttar Pradesh share of all India crimes against women fell from about 17 per cent (1.8 million cases) to 14 per cent (1.55 million cases) between 2001 and 2015 (Dasgupta, 2017).

RAPE

In addition to being a populous state, Uttar Pradesh also has some of the poorest indicators with regard to gender-based violence. Although there has been progress in recent years, the situation remains bleak. In 2001, out of every 100 rapes reported in India, 12.3 occurred in Uttar Pradesh. By 2015, the state had reduced its share to 8.7 rapes per 100 cases. Conviction of rape rose by about 29 per cent between 2001 and 2015 in Uttar Pradesh (Gaiha, Dang and Kulkarni, 2017).

SPOUSAL PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL ABUSE

Spousal physical and sexual abuse: There has been an improvement in Uttar Pradesh in the incidence of rape, but the situation has worsened in the case of intimate-partner violence and dowry deaths. According to the NFHS 4 (2015–16), among those women in Uttar Pradesh who had experienced physical violence since age 15, the most common perpetrator for ever-married women was the husband. Thirty-three per cent of ever-married women reported having been slapped by their husband, while between 11 per cent and 17 per cent reported being pushed, shaken or having something thrown at them; having their arm twisted or hair pulled; being punched; or being kicked, dragged or beaten up. And 2 percent reported being choked or burnt on purpose, while 1 per cent said they had been threatened or attacked with a knife, gun or other weapon. Six per cent reported that their husband had physically forced them to have sex, and 4 per cent said their husband had forced them with threats or other ways to perform sexual acts they did not want to perform. Overall, 37 per cent of ever-married women had experienced physical or sexual violence from their current husband or, if not currently married, from their most recent husband. And 14 per cent reported spousal emotional violence.
REPORTS OF VIOLENCE, PERCEPTION OF EXPERIENCE WITH VIOLENCE

According to the NFHS 4, only 4 percent of abused women in Uttar Pradesh sought help from the police against intimate-partner violence. Nearly half of the men in the ICRW sample reported perpetrating violence, and 45 per cent of the women reported experiencing any form of violence in previous 12 months. The highest prevalence of violence reported by men and women in Uttar Pradesh was physical violence, with nearly two-fifths of the women (39 per cent) said they had experienced intimate-partner violence and nearly one third of the men (27 per cent) said they had been physically violent against an intimate partner in the past year. Interestingly, a greater number of men reported perpetrating all forms of violence, except economic and physical, than the number of women who reported experiencing these forms of violence. About 30 per cent of the men said they had perpetrated sexual violence in an intimate relationship, while less than 10 per cent women had reported experiencing such violence. The difference in their reporting may be because of the stigma women might associate with sexual violence or a perception that non-consensual sex with a husband is not considered to be violence.

- 4% of abused Women sought help from the police against intimate-partner violence
- 45% of the women reported experiencing any form of violence in previous 12 months
- 39% of women had experienced intimate-partner violence
- 27% of men had been physically violent against an intimate partner
- 30% of the men said they had perpetrated sexual violence
- 10% of women had reported experiencing such violence
2.2. LOCATIONS OF RESEARCH

This research study was conducted across three urban locations in Uttar Pradesh – Lucknow, Varanasi and Aligarh. Since 2013, Lucknow has been a centre of operation for The YP Foundation for its outreach to other districts in the Awadh region. Previous research undertaken by The YP Foundation in Lucknow indicated that access to sexual and reproductive health services and information remained weak. In 2015, only two adolescent-friendly health centres existed in Lucknow – one each for boys and girls (TYPF, 2014). The YP Foundation’s Mardon Waali Baatein programme, which specifically works with young men in building their feminist leadership and questioning patriarchal norms of masculinity, has finished a cycle of implementation in Lucknow over a period of 15 months. Insights from this research will thus directly inform the next cycle of this programme as well as future sexual and reproductive health work that we undertake with men. The YP Foundation has been expanding its presence in Varanasi District through partnerships with grass-roots organizations, such as Men’s Action to Stop Violence Against Women and Asian Bridge India. In the future, we aim to undertake more programmatic work in Varanasi, which motivated its selection as a site for research. Aligarh, being the only tier-2 city in our sample, was selected because of how its cultural institutions and norms varied in comparison with the other locations. While variation was sought out, the analysis also looks for trends or similarities across the three sites as well as the contextual differences in the trends.
2.3. METHODOLOGY AND RATIONALE FOR SAMPLING

Respondents were selected through a combination of purposive and snowball sampling methods. Because many of the programmes at The YP Foundation involve engagement of young college-going or working men, effort was made to involve respondents (aged 18–26 years) from university and college spaces in all three locations. We also reached out to men from marginalized communities (including Dalit men) and those embodying non-heteronormative sexualities. All the respondents were self-identified cisgendered men. We recognize the limits of arriving at multiplicities within masculinities through a singular and limiting categorization of “men”. However, this decision was made to focus on engaging the population who frequently participates in our programmes. The YP Foundation’s partner organizations in each location were crucial in the process of locating and engaging with the respondents in the research.

Qualitative tools such as focus group discussions, personal interviews and life histories among young college-going men were utilised. Both the tools used for conducting FGDs and personal interviews have been reviewed for ethical clearance by the research advisory board of experts in the field of masculinities. Written and verbal consent was taken from every respondent after clearly detailing the purpose of data collection and objectives of this research. Each respondent was given support and time to understand their role in the process.

FGDs were conducted with 9 groups of young men within the age group of 18-26 years (each group comprising not more than 10 members) across each of these three sites. The researchers for personal interviews and life histories were identified from the same set of respondents who participated in the FGDs. The researcher conducted approximately 30 personal interviews with men in each of the three sites using a semi-structured interview guide (annexures 1 and 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Focus Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Description of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>FGD 1: conducted in Lucknow with a group of queer young men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FGD 2: conducted with a group of young men from low-income communities in Daliganj, Lucknow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>FGD 3: conducted in Lucknow with young women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FGD 4: conducted with a group of boys from the Social Work Department at Shakuntala Devi Memorial Rehabilitation University in Lucknow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varanasi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FGD 5: conducted in Banaras with a group of undergraduate students from the Banaras Hindu University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FGD 6: conducted in Banaras with young men from Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapeeth University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FGD 7: conducted with post-graduate and doctoral scholars from BHU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligarh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>FGD 8 &amp; 9: conducted with a group of post-graduate students in Aligarh Muslim University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study applies the analytical tool of intersectionality, first developed to unpack inequality and discrimination across race, class and gender (Crenshaw, 1989; Davis, 1981). Scholars in India have also used it repeatedly to analyse the combined effects of caste and gender. In recent years, masculinities scholars have utilized intersectionality to understand men’s multiple positions that influence hierarchies among them (Christensen and Jensen, 2014). Using this paradigm allowed us to investigate the rules (norms and ideals) that may guide performance of masculine acts in the contexts we studied. These rules may be contingent not just upon caste, class and religion but also on individual agency in the making of self, which may be guided by networks, capabilities and space. We thus must analyse masculinities not just relationally, as a product of intersectional identities, but also as being self-constituted.
3. FINDINGS
One of the FGDs for this research was conducted in a low-income settlement in Daliganj, Lucknow. The participants included three Muslim OBC respondents, three Hindu upper caste respondents, one Muslim SC respondent and me as a facilitator. We were all seated over mats laid out on the floor in exactly these groupings. Since the beginning of the FGD, the Muslim SC respondent remained largely silent. Despite several assurances about the FGD being a safe non-judgmental space for everyone to voice their opinions equally, it was getting extremely difficult for this respondent to open and share. Finally, in the middle of the FGD this participant hurriedly left after offering a silent apology. But the others decided to continue the discussion. At one point in the FGD, right before our chai break, I posed a simple probe around caste – “Do you think men of different castes behave differently?” And the discussion which followed divided the respondents into two sides. On one side were the three Muslim men, of which one quickly began narrating many instances of discrimination he had faced at the hands of family members of his Hindu friends, which according to him became a primary reason to have mostly Muslim friends. The other two, who were not as articulate as this respondent, were at most times during his narration patting him on the back, passing encouraging smiles at him and peering at the other three respondents. Once his narration was over, one of the Hindu respondents quickly stepped in to point out the ways in which Muslim people discriminate against Hindus. It started turning into a competition between the two groups (seemed to be led by two men who remained the primary speakers during this conversation) as to who shares the most convincing instance of discrimination. For a while during this banter, I was intrigued that a simple question around caste has spiralled down to such confrontations albeit mild, around religious identity! When I realised that the discussion may quickly digress to a point of no return, I tactically changed the topic and announced tea break.

What started out as a question on caste quickly ended up spiralling into a heated discussion along the lines of religious identity. Of course, the respondents understood caste, then why did the conversation drift to religion so quickly? Did it have anything to do with the fact that there was a clear divide among our respondents’ identities along religion, owing to which, each group felt the need to bolster their image in front of the other and protect the same when it felt threatened due to opposing anecdotes? The two groups were clearly competing with each other as to who would be able to make the point strongest and turn the tide of the discussion to their favor. This sense of competition among men along multiple lines is a recurring theme in our findings. Men constantly compete with each other along the lines of identities, material resources, symbolic resources, social status and many others. This has been observed routinely during our sessions with men as well. How can this sense of competition be used to foster deeper reflections among men, especially when it could arise automatically as in the above case where the respondents started competing along religious lines without any mention of religion in the FGD up until then?

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Scholars have asserted the need to probe men not only in relation to women but also with other men and their own selves over time and space (Srivastava, 2012). Even in analysing patterns across our respondents’ narratives, it became clear that masculinities are inflected not only by intersections in identity but also by spaces that young men frequent, people they are connected to and their specific capacities and level of agency. Young men’s decision-making and perspectives thus were studied by adapting an intersectional analytical framework along the following aspects:

- structural factors – social institutions and instruments of normative control, such as gender norms, caste, religion, law and kinship;
- networks and relationships – gendered relationships, such as friendships, romantic relationships, local and community networks and marriage;
- individual agency – determined by education, health, income, consumption, life histories and mobility;
- ideals of masculinity – masculine behaviours, perceptions and notions, which are collectively and individually held to be ideal; and
- spaces – lived spaces, such as homes, neighbourhoods, universities, workplaces and even social media.
ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

IDEALS OF MASCULINITY (hegemony)

Structural Factors
Networks and Relationships
Threats and Contestations
Social Media
Individual Agency

MEN’S PERCEPTIONS, ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS (Multiple Masculine Expressions and Dynamics)

- Information and beliefs about sex
- Sexual behaviours
- ‘Safe sex’
- Access to contraception
- Value of consent
- Perpetration of violence
- Decisions around marriage
and a strong sense of alienation due to continuously having to strive to prove themselves and their expressions of masculinity. The implications of such pressure can be mental and emotional stress, lack of empathy and self-awareness and, in extreme cases, perpetration of violence. For programmes, the task of facilitating reflections around privilege becomes that much harder due to the same reason. Furthermore, contestations around masculinities may sometimes even lead to several masculine expressions (across gender, caste or religious lines) to reinforce discriminatory patriarchal notions. Our analysis revealed that one can be both vulnerable and oppressive at the same time, and it is within this paradox that interventions need to locate themselves. This is important considering that, until now, programming has focused on hegemonic masculinity as being “the oppressive”. While it is true that in most contexts, hetero-patriarchal models of masculinity which attain hegemony tend to be oppressive, there is a need to investigate masculinities as a continuum where each expression embodies certain privileges as well as vulnerabilities. In order to understand what processes can lead to multiple masculinities being oppressive there is a need to unpack these multiple sets of privileges and vulnerabilities across diverse masculinities. That each of these masculinities exists points to the fact that they find legitimacy in some space.

The second section, ‘gendering of space: implications on masculinities’ probes the strong link between masculinities and space to understand how men’s behaviours may find legitimacy in one context but not in another. Respondents frequently referenced the household in pointing out the distinction between “masculinity” and “femininity” – from their narratives, it was clear that parts of the household and the meanings they hold for individuals (for example, kitchen vs living room) guide what is masculine for them, when and why.

Spaces are not static; they are also constituted through the connections between the people in them and the relations between them. This is precisely what lends dynamism to a space. Thus, the third section on ‘spatializing men’s relationships: young men’s sites of socialisation influencing notions of masculinities’ focuses on men’s relationships with each other and with women (friendships, romance or marriage). Male-male relationships are strongly guided by context; for instance, if they go to boarding school instead of day school, where they go to university or their hometown. When it comes to women, men’s friendships are still, by and large, shrouded in shyness and physical distancing that continues from
adolescence, despite the benefits of the relationships. This is radically different when sex is considered: Respondents’ valuation of these relationships was guided by their sense of entitlement and the corresponding level of impunity they feel. Girlfriends are valued insofar as the status they confer on men, while wives are less so. Still, romantic relationships (especially non-marital ones) also cause great stress for many respondents, which further affects how they are valued.

Expressions of masculinities and men’s networks are seldom explored in the online space. The fourth section, ‘expressing maleness online: from profile pictures to whatsapp forwards’ details men’s performance of masculinities on applications such as Facebook and WhatsApp. The findings indicate that the constitution of masculinities in the online world is also influenced by intersections of caste, gender and class and networks that we see offline. The section also present data on the ways in which identity guides associations online and also the content which is shared within these group associations. Social media gives an increased space for dissent and contestation due to the greater degree of anonymity conferred on the user. This may also lead to an increased capacity to exercise agency or reinforce sexist, hyper-nationalist, coercive and often violent expressions of aggression and superiority without restraint.

The ensuing two sections bring together these themes of social media, space, networks (relationships) and threats to understand their influence over sexual and reproductive health-related decision-making. The fifth section on sexual behaviours and perceptions details the sources of information on sex for young men, fears and pressures of being in sexual relationships, what “safe sex” means for them and the elaborate ecosystem of sex around young men. We present analytical commentary on the value men place on consent, the way these get determined by men’s understanding of rejection and how they chose to handle rejection; as well as how men’s differential impunities in different relationships guides their valuation of consent. The sixth section presents discussion on men’s reading of violence: entitlement or as a tool to safeguard self image? Violence with an intimate partner (especially within the household) is normalized due to young men’s socialization into masculine expressions that accrue certain entitlements. However, several cases across sections also indicate men’s vulnerability towards violence. In the case of public violence, young men seemed to be pressured by a need to preserve their sense of entitlement (and the self-image thereof) publicly. Many men agreed that the perpetration of violence among men depends on the power hierarchies around caste, religion, gender and age.
3.1. ENTITLEMENTS AS OPPRESSION: MEN’S READING OF THREATS AND CONTESTATIONS

“...mardaangi is connected to everything, this threat, that incites us to be men....[It] starts at the house only.... Ever since we are born, we are told that men don’t feel pain, men are not supposed to cry like girls, men are supposed to eat more than girls, men go out a lot more than girls.... Our family plays a big role in this.... And it always tells us that you have to be a certain kind of man to be successful in the eyes of society....”

The pervasiveness of masculine ideals across all spaces in our respondents’ lives privileged them, though not to the same degree. Often, it appeared to be an imposition on the young men with whom we spoke. As a consequence, many of them seemed to see these pervasive hegemonic ideals as threats that oppressed them rather than positive characteristics towards which they must strive. Men’s response to such hegemonic threats led to several expressions of masculinities. The case study at the end of this section demonstrates how these can be combined in a complex web that may have contradicting implications for men’s perceptions.

GENDER NORMS

Even though norms around gender typically give great privilege to young men, many respondents chose to assert that these norms lead to immense mental and emotional pressures. For example, respondents reaffirmed ideals, such as those of the “head of the household”. As one person explained, “Once you’re 20–23, then there is pressure from society as to how much more will you study, when will you start earning?” Criticism upon not achieving these expectations is quick and often reinforced by targeting their masculinity: “What kind of man are you?”

The respondents reaffirmed the understanding that patriarchal gender norms create a rigid and oppressive hierarchy of masculinities that furthers a perennial sense of competition among young men. Men compete because the rewards to competition are real: jobs, income, sex, pleasure, wealth, social...
Stereotypical notions regarding women’s libido were echoed by several respondents. “We have heard that women have seven to eight times more sexual desire than men,” said one person. Such notions as well as the need to demonstrate masculinity through sexual performance (the sense of competition as to who is more masculine) lead to several insecurities among men. Respondents asserted that they often face the pressure to sexually perform, and an inability to do so is taken as a blow to their selfhood. Therefore, men want to know how to pleasure their partner, not out of love, but because image of the sexually virile man needs to be maintained in front of the partner who will further bolster this image in front of his peers. An inability to do so leaves men with the threat of losing out of the race. Faced with this threat many men may chose to exaggerate their feelings of insecurity in a bid to bolster their own image in front of their peers with statements such as these - “…for a guy, 15–20 minutes is more than enough, but for a girl it starts to feel good after 15–20 minutes… [so a guy would have sex with her] once, twice, thrice, but after his fourth [orgasm when she still hasn’t had one] she says, “Are you not a mard [man]? You couldn’t even satisfy me [once].””

Sentiments like these, were echoed in the accounts of several respondents, some of whom added that their biggest fear was not being able to satisfy their partner. The need for being the provider of pleasure comes with the need for preserving status and self-image. Men understand that the inability to satisfy their partner may have negative consequences on the relationship, which then threatens their image among peers and their own self. According to one respondent, “[They are thinking about power and status when] they think that I want to satisfy my girl so much, that she will only want to be with me. Many men have this fear that if you can’t satisfy the girl in the first time, then she will never be yours. So maybe before sex, during sex and even after sex, you get stuck wondering, ‘How do you satisfy them?’ Therefore, in pre-marital relationships, the sense of masculinity comes both from getting what you want (“hot girlfriend” and “masti”) but also from being seen as a satisfying partner. This could be expanded in programme discussions to unpack the emotional parts of male sexuality.

Many of the quotes given here were spoken in third person. This suggests the respondents’ inability to publicly relate such stories to themselves for fear of ridicule and loss of status.

Caste becomes a dominant axis of determining masculine hierarchies, so much so that sometimes norms around caste and gender combine to articulate masculine hierarchies (Chakravarti, 2003). Ridiculing and policing “unmasculine” behaviors is done along the same intertwined lines of caste and gender. Caste hierarchies among men exist irrespective of their religious status. On being asked about caste identities that they have heard of in their neighbourhoods and villages, capital, dowry in marriage, marital partners, etc. When the odds are so high and the competition fierce (with women increasingly joining the race for these rewards in urban areas), men increasingly perceive threats to their personhood that may even lead to violence. The oppressiveness of these norms is revealed to be so heavy by the respondents that many of them even read their privileges as vulnerabilities. This is probably the reason why conversations with men in programming, that routinely focus on de-mystifying male privilege with an aim to reduce violence, do not work as well as we hope they would. When men are continuously reading even their privileges as vulnerabilities due to the fierce sense of competition that pervades all of their spaces, how should interventions encourage men to share their power, rewards and resources?

PLEASURE AND SEX

Stereotypical notions regarding women’s libido were echoed by several respondents. “We have heard that women have seven to eight times more sexual desire than men,” said one person. Such notions as well as the need to demonstrate masculinity through sexual performance (the sense of competition as to who is more masculine) lead to several insecurities among men. Respondents asserted that they often face the pressure to sexually perform, and an inability to do so is taken as a blow to their selfhood. Therefore, men want to know how to pleasure their partner, not out of love, but because image of the sexually virile man needs to be maintained in front of the partner who will further bolster this image in front of his peers. An inability to do so leaves men with the threat of losing out of the race. Faced with this threat many men may chose to exaggerate their feelings of insecurity in a bid to bolster their own image in front of their peers with statements such as these - “…for a guy, 15–20 minutes is more than enough, but for a girl it starts to feel good after 15–20 minutes… [so a guy would have sex with her] once, twice, thrice, but after his fourth [orgasm when she still hasn’t had one] she says, “Are you not a mard [man]? You couldn’t even satisfy me [once].””

Sentiments like these, were echoed in the accounts of several respondents, some of whom added that their biggest fear was not being able to satisfy their partner. The need for being the provider of pleasure comes with the need for preserving status and self-image. Men understand that the inability to satisfy their partner may have negative consequences on the relationship, which then threatens their image among peers and their own self. According to one respondent, “[They are thinking about power and status when] they think that I want to satisfy my girl so much, that she will only want to be with me. Many men have this fear that if you can’t satisfy the girl in the first time, then she will never be yours. So maybe before sex, during sex and even after sex, you get stuck wondering, ‘How do you satisfy them?’ Therefore, in pre-marital relationships, the sense of masculinity comes both from getting what you want (“hot girlfriend” and “masti”) but also from being seen as a satisfying partner. This could be expanded in programme discussions to unpack the emotional parts of male sexuality.

Many of the quotes given here were spoken in third person. This suggests the respondents’ inability to publicly relate such stories to themselves for fear of ridicule and loss of status.

Caste becomes a dominant axis of determining masculine hierarchies, so much so that sometimes norms around caste and gender combine to articulate masculine hierarchies (Chakravarti, 2003). Ridiculing and policing “unmasculine” behaviors is done along the same intertwined lines of caste and gender. Caste hierarchies among men exist irrespective of their religious status. On being asked about caste identities that they have heard of in their neighbourhoods and villages, capital, dowry in marriage, marital partners, etc. When the odds are so high and the competition fierce (with women increasingly joining the race for these rewards in urban areas), men increasingly perceive threats to their personhood that may even lead to violence. The oppressiveness of these norms is revealed to be so heavy by the respondents that many of them even read their privileges as vulnerabilities. This is probably the reason why conversations with men in programming, that routinely focus on de-mystifying male privilege with an aim to reduce violence, do not work as well as we hope they would. When men are continuously reading even their privileges as vulnerabilities due to the fierce sense of competition that pervades all of their spaces, how should interventions encourage men to share their power, rewards and resources?
Hindu respondents were quick to recount caste groups such as Rajputs, Thakurs, Chamars and Bhumihars, while Muslim men mentioned several others such as Pathan, Qureshi and Nayi. Norms around caste confer significant privileges to men who occupy higher positions in the caste hierarchy which need to be constantly negotiated and reproduced. For instance, respondents from a university in Varanasi recounted how everyday privileges are conferred on the basis of caste status such as shorter waiting times in queues, more agency in choosing their supervisors, caste-based allocation of supervisors, etc. However, several respondents revealed that caste-based norms are also not always beneficial to even men from upper castes, owing to dominant models of masculinities. Not being able to respond to violence perpetrated by someone lower in the caste (masculine) hierarchy poses a threat to the self-image of young men. Such enforcement of caste-appropriate behaviour and entitlements puts a definite strain on men across the caste hierarchy. As one respondent reported (but a sentiment echoed by others), “An upper-caste man borrowing money is seen to be a blot on his manhood, [and] no lower-caste man is expected to refuse money or food or hospitality to an upper-caste man when demanded.” Needless to say, oppression and violent attacks on men’s selfhood ascend downward in the caste hierarchies.

The most intimate implication of the association between gender and caste is in terms of controls exerted over the body and an individual’s right to bodily expression and mobility. Several respondents revealed that men’s body image and personality are expected to be in congruence with the ideals held by their caste groups. This often leads to an oppressive idea of physical appearance along caste lines as indicated by the above quote. In this particular situation, the sense of family honour is perceived to be lost more by the fact that gender performance and sexual identity do not fit with the status accorded to a young man by virtue of the caste-based norms. Perceptions of “proper” masculinity among men of such castes tend to stress physique, fitness, personality, style of walking, etc. This emerged in remarks from several respondents belonging to the Thakur caste.

But most importantly, caste norms and hierarchies dictate masculinities through controls that are extended to women’s bodies and their autonomy. It is commonplace to hear men speaking about how “women should remain within the household once married... should look after the family and children and be mostly responsible for domestic chores...”. This is because masculinities are upheld by controlling female expressions of agency and female sexuality. The need to control women’s mobility arises out of the need to strengthen endogamy, a practice that is intimately linked to the reproduction of caste norms. Caste also influence perceptions about body image in gendered ways. For instance, during the discussions of having a fair skin vs dark skin, a respondent stated, “Boys like to show off a lot more than girls.... Because, in showing off, they’d rather show off their physique. Skin colour doesn’t matter much for them. Even if they are a little dark skinned, they are okay with that. In girls, what happens is that their skin should be fair only. They don’t like it when they’re a little dark.”

The respondents were also familiar with fair-skin advertising. These are some of the predominant ways in which caste exerts control over body, expressions and ideals of beauty for both women and men. Parallels to this are also found in other studies that highlight how skin colour becomes a physical marker of caste-based gender identities, especially in the case of women (Menon, 2012; Devika, 2009).

“When I complained about [the fight] to the director, he first asked me what my caste is. So I told him that I am Rajput. And the person who hit me was a Baniya. So he asked me why, being a Rajput, I did not hit him back. He told me that I’m useless!”
Explained another respondent, “Islam, unlike other religions, prescribes equal status for men and women… both have a right to education… a father may send his daughter to get educated in purdah…. There are some provisions that clearly define their rights and duties, but these should not be considered as inequalities… It is the way God prescribed the world to be… everyone has their equal role and status.”

Many respondents, in the process of asserting their religious identities, rationalized inequalities and hierarchies that are religiously prescribed. For instance, in the previous quote, a girl may get educated if she practices the purdah, but adopting the purdah is less about the woman expressing her agency in exercising and embodying her religious identity and more about adherence to prescribed religious codes. In some instances, it has led to assertions made at the cost of putting down other masculinities. For example, as one respondent noted, “In Hindu religion, [masculinity is] about beating up women and other things…but in our religion, such things are strictly banned…”

Patriarchy, then, is reinforced not just through hegemonic masculinity (that of the Hindu upper-caste man) but also by non-hegemonic masculinities that may be equally discriminatory. Contestations around masculinities could therefore also be spaces for deepening patriarchal oppression. Interventions around masculinities should then locate themselves not just at hegemonic sites but also in instances in which these are challenged.

“I belong to a Thakur family, so my parents say that my personality is not a Thakur’s…. you don’t look like a Thakur…. They say things like, Thakur men eat more food…. When I revealed my sexuality, they say that I’m becoming a hijra because of the way I walk and my preferences….”
CASE STUDY 1

GAPS IN INTERSECTIONAL INTERVENTIONS: HOW FAR DO WE NEED TO AND CAN GO?

One respondent from Lucknow was part of a religious sect that propounds spirituality: “Our religion teaches us to be truly spiritual human beings and reinvent us from the inside…. The true meaning of the Vedas is being revealed to us by our guru, and they teach us to live our lives on the principles and rules dictated to us by Shiva, the supreme being.” The respondent stated that financial and personal turmoil in his extended family motivated him and his parents to join the religious sect, following which, they overcame many of their hurdles. In many ways, the respondent seemed to fit the hegemonic ideal of Indian masculinity: His sect propounds strict control over what they consume (“which God will tell you to eat another of his creation for your own satisfaction…which religion will tell you to put harmful substances into your body?”), a strong intolerance towards other religions (“all these people are living in falsehood and they do not know the true God and meaning of religion”) and that the caste system is religiously and scientifically ordained (“the caste system is…based on one’s knowledge and intellect”). Someone who is knowledgeable, articulates well and is composed and sympathetic is a Brahmin…. I am proud to say that I am a true Brahmin as I try to hold true to all of these ideals…but it is true that some people are Brahmin in name only and not by their actions.”

This individual also identified as a gay man who enjoys wearing makeup. His religious beliefs strongly influenced how he sees himself and how he understands homosexuality, leading to arbitrary rules that justify his actions while simultaneously denigrating homosexuality, which in turn leads to guilt and lack of empathy towards other gay people.

As he explained, “I can only have sex with straight boys…I don’t like feminine men…. In any case, I would never get married because according to our scriptures, marriage is a special bond only between a man and woman…. I understand that my addiction to having sex with men needs to be controlled…. I want to be truly spiritual and not care about bodily needs…. But I always fail to restrain myself…. I am preparing to be a true sanyasi.”

The respondent also recounted severe arguments with his queer friends: “I sometimes feel angry at other queer men because I feel that they are a bit too much. I mean, you can express yourself but there are some limits to our actions. I also like mild crossdressing, but I cannot understand completely transforming oneself, wearing women’s clothes… Even though I wear lipstick, but I would never wear women’s clothes.”

This case highlights how the components of the framework used for the analysis come together to shape the understanding, identification with and performance of masculinities for young men. At the outset, this may seem like a rare example but it exemplifies well the kind of complexities that determine masculinities and their expressions. For young men, in many instances, realising their selves also happens in the context of complex masculine perceptions around caste, physical appearance, misogyny and stigma around femininities (even in queer circles) which leads to many contradictions in the way selfhood is constituted. While it is unrealistic to expect programmatic interventions to address such complex experiences, to what degree must interventions build consciousness of this complexity in their design and approach and in what ways? And also, how much responsibility should programmes assume to build awareness of this for all participants, whether or not they identify with such experiences?

We are therefore left with the following questions: When there are such inherent and complex contestations that determine men’s perceptions, what programme strategies can imagine changes and shifts?

While there has been a recognition to have an intersectional approach to working with men and masculinities, this is not always possible within a narrow outcome-oriented framework of gender-based violence prevention. This also shows up in the limited scope of curricula that can take up caste, gender or livelihoods and not all together as fundamentally interrelated issues. If so, how are these to be translated into actions and interventions? The challenge of intersectional programming is then to encourage critical reflection and re-examination of gendered attitudes not just towards women, but also between men.
Contestations across norms of gender, caste and religion lead to several expressions of masculinities, some of which can be highly conflicting and contradictory (as in case study 1). Using the lens of hegemonic masculinity may result in missing out on “other” non-hegemonic masculine expressions and how these rationalize patriarchal power. To probe the question of how these multiple expressions find legitimacy, it becomes important to understand the relationship between masculinities and space. The relationship between space and masculinities is causal in two ways – norms and perceptions lead to certain spaces being deemed masculine and others as feminine (such as the household), which imposes patriarchal controls over mobility.

As mentioned previously, the perception of the household as a feminine space is encouraged from an early age. Many respondents mentioned that they enjoy much more freedom outdoors than their sisters. This leads to the creation of many gender stereotypes around productivity, the right to work and mobility, with the most predominant one of these being that of the “housewife” (Mies, 1980). As one respondent noted, “When a girl gets married and has children and if she wants to continue working, then who will take responsibility of the child? The man...”

10. Space here refers to physical space. The idea of space as constituted by relationships and networks (lived space) is discussed in the next section.
shouldn’t worry about it as he has to earn and he will obviously share his income with his wife…. But if she continues to work without devoting time for her child’s future, then their upbringing will get affected...”

The idea of a “female breadwinner” may lead to intense social stigma for men who have working wives or partners. We thus see that masculinities are tied not only to men’s own mobility but also their ability to control women’s mobility (both socially and physically) [Osella and Osella, 2006].

Similar to this description, gendered notions are contingent upon space in other ways, such as that of the “city girl” vs “village girl”. As one respondent explained: “I have seen that girls from urban areas do not have patience…. They start arguing and want freedom in every way…. They are very smart, and they just want to make fools of their boyfriend, friends and even their parents…. They just want to achieve their goal, and they can do anything for that...”

The kitchen is considered an exclusively feminine space. And while it is generally considered to be masculine to do “hard physical labour” within the household, all activities pertaining to care and domestic responsibilities, whether arduous or not, are undertaken by women. As one of the respondents pointed out: “When the man comes to deliver the cylinder, brother will take the cylinder from the veranda to the store room. But when my mother is taking that same cylinder from the store room to the kitchen, then my brother won’t help because the work of the kitchen is mother’s.”

Therefore, the same work may become masculine or feminine, depending on where in the house it is undertaken. The legitimacy of norms and perceptions (what is masculine and what is not) is contingent upon spaces and their meanings for individuals. The narratives from our respondents revealed that what may be considered normalised masculine behaviour in one space can be quickly altered as men migrate to other spaces. The clearest example of this is in the life histories of respondents who moved from being in an all-male boarding school to a university in Varanasi (as detailed in case study 2). As noted in this case study, many respondents noted that there was a marked change in the way they socialize amongst themselves while they were in the boarding school versus when they moved to the university.

“When the man comes to deliver the cylinder, brother will take the cylinder from the veranda to the store room. But when my mother is taking that same cylinder from the store room to the kitchen, then my brother won’t help because the work of the kitchen is mother’s.”
As I enter Benaras Hindu University (BHU), I am led straight to the famous temple grounds inside surrounded by lush green gardens and food stalls where numerous students congregate every hour to discuss university politics, sport teams, examination woes, and many such conversations. I am told by one of the respondents, “…this is the heart of BHU. We come here whenever we want to relax with our friends and some couples even go deep into the gardens for privacy, especially in the evenings… everyone is aware of it…”.

Glancing through the groups of men closing into each other, joking around, slapping high-fives, swooning at mobile phones delicately placed to ensure visibility to the ten different heads peering at it from different directions, one is left wondering about the specific dynamics of men’s relationships with each other. Are they as close as they appear to be or not close at all (as how norms dictate their behavior to be)? What else are their conversations about except politics, girls, games, clothes, etc. In order to answer these questions, one must layer their responses about friendships with the spaces that they inhabit because each space (BHU particularly) has its own way of ordering individuals and the relations between them. Space must then be understood not simply as a static physical entity but also as constituted by the networks and relationships among its inhabitants.

“I have come here from my village to achieve something, and the more friends I have the more distracted I will become…. One should always be goal oriented… I only make friends with those people who I feel would be beneficial to me academically or in pursuing a career....”
which are guided by identities that they hold; identities which become central in the governance of spaces. For instance, friendships and relationships held by men in BHU are heavily governed by caste norms and this section details the implications of this claim. But before addressing that, we return to the questions posed before – how close are men with each other?

It seems likely that the sense of competition that pervades all aspects of men’s lives due to multiple and competing masculine expressions, also colours men’s perceptions about friendship, such that friends are considered necessary so long as they help one get ahead in the race, as the quote at the beginning of this section points out. While some respondents reaffirmed the dominant view that masculinity is showcased by being emotionally stoic and not publicly sharing emotions, even within a peer group, several respondents revealed the opposite to be true. Friendships have an important role in young men’s lives for multiple reasons. The respondents described friendships as a stable source of information and emotional support, especially in times of intense vulnerability. As one young man described, “My friend recently broke up with his girlfriend after a long relationship, and he was in a state of depression for almost three months after that…. He did not tell anyone as he thought that people would make fun of him and would not understand him…. He only told me, and I helped him consult a counsellor and get help…."

Therefore, we cannot make claims about men’s relationships being devoid of emotional care. This also brings into question norms around men’s closeness in friendships and ability to share emotions with each other - both of which are routinely considered to be limited. Norms exist but young men’s individual behavior and relationships are not always guarded by these norms. It is often in the private realm of friendships and romantic relationships that these norms become more flexible for individual expression. It is the task of interventions to foster reflections around when they had such departures, how they felt at those times and what the implications of upholding such norms could be.

Monetary support is also an important aspect of close friendships. Several of the respondents stated that their first source of small loans was their friends, which is significant, given the emphatic glorification of the “resourceful masculine breadwinner” archetype. This goes against a widely held perception that men are incapable of sharing emotions and experiences with each other and hence the perennial difficulty in creating safe spaces for men.

But, men’s perceptions of friendships must be qualified based on the spaces where these relationships are constituted. For instance, in the above quote, the respondent describes his notions towards friendships in university spaces. The respondent here is a postgraduate student from Aligarh Muslim University (AMU) and it seems likely that due to being in a space of immense competition (in gaining admission to AMU, constantly outperforming others to create a niche for oneself in the university) he feels that making friends in such a situation will jeopardize his abilities to outperform others and stand out in the crowd. The same feelings are not held towards friends outside of AMU, whom the same respondent describes as being long term friends. He explains, “I have few friends from childhood, one or two, who are extremely close to me…. and they are enough…. I don’t think I need more friends.”

Friendships between men also have other boundaries that depend on dominant masculine norms. Even though men stated that they could share everything with their friends, on further probing, several of them revealed that when it comes to family matters, they choose to not discuss with anyone, including their closest friends. The public-private dichotomy dominates here, with matters concerning the household or family needing to be
university or college campus, where young men typically start forming long-term relationships and associations. Many of the respondents had migrated to Lucknow, Varanasi and Aligarh for tertiary education and/or work. As they move into spaces that bring together people from multiple cultural and social backgrounds (such as universities), young men tend to look out for individuals and groups that share similarities with them.

Often space itself is organised to sift out diversity and this was evident from many accounts of respondents from Banaras who stated that caste consciousness within university spaces lead to homogenous group formation. It probably was for this reason that the Muslim SC respondent described in the anecdote narrated at the start of the findings section could not participate in the FGD. During the tea break after we stepped out to catch some air and out in the gali (lane) was this respondent who had walked out, surrounded by men who seemed like his friends, and him nonchalantly laughing and cracking loud jokes amongst them. The FGD space with men from other caste identities (and especially an urban English-educated upper caste facilitator) failed to be a safe space for this respondent to open up.

I was a bit unsure of whether I should go and heckle him again with questions as to why he couldn’t participate in the FGD, considering the fact that he was reluctant in answering me earlier. I decided to leave him be as he most certainly wouldn’t want an upper caste privileged man asking him why he couldn’t participate in a discussion on caste initiated by upper caste men. But it left with me many questions - Should I have spoken to him again and tried to understand the reasons as to why he felt uncomfortable so that his experiences could feed directly into making our programmes and facilitation to be more inclusive? Are our interventions currently designed to articulate and integrate the positionalities of those lowest in the oppressive caste hierarchy without resorting to vanguardism and/or appropriation? If not, then what can programmes do for this? Do facilitators require special training to address such intersectional vulnerabilities that may hinder the inclusivity of programmes? When most researches, programmes and evaluation mechanisms are conceived, designed and implemented by savarna (those ranking high in the caste hierarchy) people, how do we develop strategies institutionally that give much more voice and control to people from the most vulnerable sections? It is a larger structural question, which then needs to be addressed by the development sector as large and such strategies require the synergetic collusion of actors working across sectors and locations.

Respondents reported having a wide array of conversations with their friends regarding sexual relations and sexual practices, especially around pleasure and satisfaction (rarely around safety). Men routinely brag about their sexual relationships and acts performed with partners as a way of establishing status and “showing off” in front of their friends. However, men feel reluctant to share problems related to sex, sexual health problems and sexuality with even close friends. Men risk threats to their sense of self through ridicule if they are perceived as being “not ready” for sexual relations, either physically and emotionally. As one respondent explained, speaking in the third person, “He will share everything, saying that ‘I did this with her, I did it for so much time,’ and try to act cool in front of his friends…. But he will never tell about his own mistakes or failures as he would risk being ridiculed for the rest of his life by his friends....”

The data from this research indicate that closeness in male groups is not merely a function of gender identity but also other markers, such as common personal histories of mobility/migration, caste or religious background. The influence of identities over male relationships is more obvious in such spaces as a university or college campus, where young men typically start forming long-term relationships and associations.

“He will share everything, saying that ‘I did this with her, I did it for so much time,’ and try to act cool in front of his friends.... But he will never tell about his own mistakes or failures as he would risk being ridiculed for the rest of his life by his friends....”
Identity thus becomes a strong cohesive force that guides the formation of relationships and associations. For instance, the experience of caste is every day eventful, according to one respondent: “Slowly, I began to realize that caste is everywhere here. Even if you are standing in a queue at the admin block or even when it comes to choosing your guides, caste impacts all these opportunities....”

Many lower-caste young men stated that caste associations are a source of confidence for them because they can be called upon in instances of upper-caste domination. Caste solidarity is therefore repeatedly relied upon by men from different castes in their everyday life to influence the allocation of resources and power. As one respondent recalled, “If there is a fight, then everybody expects all the Thakurs or all the Chamars to stand on similar sides....”

Such associations based on caste often lead to violent expressions and clashes around masculinities. According to one respondent from Varanasi, “I know a lot of groups that have people of only one caste.... They want that people of their caste should be on their side, that they should only talk to them and, that they don’t speak to other people.... The consequence of this is that good people distance themselves from you.”

Furthermore, men sharing identity markers group together due to their shared understanding of power hierarchies and their implications. This is important so that they are able to preserve their sense of self while facing new confrontations and conflicts in the everyday that threaten their positionalities. Hence, men from different castes form caste-based groups or associations to collectively advocate for their rights and perceived entitlements while also functioning as a social shield against threats to their masculinities. However, different identity markers dominate different spaces. For instance, in Banaras Hindu University, confrontations between student groups are based predominantly on caste status; caste-based preferences and discrimination still linger large in the university. Whereas in Aligarh Muslim University, student respondents from there mentioned that friendships and associations between young men were more strongly motivated by place of origin.

MEN’S FRIENDSHIPS WITH WOMEN

Due to gender-segregated socialization at home, in schools and until college, many men’s closest friends remained men. Masculine ideals of socialization police even the friendships that men form as they grow up. Male-female friendships are routinely scrutinized after adolescence. Among the respondents who had female friendships, it was common for them to hear challenges to their masculinity, such as “What kind of a man are you!” and “Can’t you hang out with boys rather than playing with girls?” Respondents stated that there are many things they feel more comfortable discussing with male friends than with women. They also reported feeling much more pressured to subscribe to ideals of a “good boy” when they form friendships with girls. This includes changing their everyday language to not include slang or discuss intimacy, sex or sexuality, as well as controlling bad habits, such as smoking or consumption of alcohol. “What [kind of man] will the girls think I am!” expressed one respondent.

Apart from this, gender also guided notions about friendships, such that male-male friendships were reported to be stronger when compared with friendships between girls. According to one respondent, “Girls have more jealousy between themselves.... Between us, there is no such thing.... If my friend is looking good and wearing a good shirt, I will feel good for him and compliment him, but girls will become jealous....” The perception that girls are more prone to jealousy

“I know a lot of groups that have people of only one caste.... They want that people of their caste should be on their side, that they don’t speak to other people.... The consequence of this is that good people distance themselves from you.”
CASE STUDY 2

MEN’S MOBILITY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERVENTION DESIGN

One group of young men in our discussions described changes in their perceptions around gender and relationships based on their location and migration histories. These men were native to districts of eastern Uttar Pradesh and Bihar and were raised in a typical rural context with deep-seated patriarchal norms that divided roles, entitlements and mobility based on markers of gender and caste. Several of them described the continued prevalence of such discriminatory norms within their natal home. However, when they entered high school, all of them attended a military residential boarding school in Dholpur, Rajasthan, where they met each other. “We feel that if you want to remove all these caste and religious discriminations, you should send all the boys to boarding school. Nobody talks about all these things there, and we also learned to let go of the prejudices that we had grown up listening to,” explained one respondent. As per these young men, their experience of community living in the boarding schools has rendered discriminatory norms inconsequential for many of them. But many of them did note that back at home they still follow caste and gender-based norms in order to fit in. “Boarding school has made us tough. We also have made lifetime [male] friends here.... Your batchmates are like your family members and your seniors are your guardians.... You look up to your friends for everything – food, beds, clothes, everything is shared.... It is just like a family,” he added.

The level of closeness among men in boarding schools can take various forms, with many times the space guiding the rationalization of non-heteronormative masculine expressions. “In our hostels, we used to have these senior-junior pairs.... Some seniors supported certain junior boys more...you know, boys who are more chikna and fair skinned.... They would get gifts for them, protect them from being ragged or bullied and even be partial towards them.... We all knew about these special friendships....”

After four years of socialization in an all-male and, by many accounts, hyper-masculine environment, this group of young men graduated to pursue undergraduate courses in Banaras Hindu University. The change of space to a university encompassed shifts from past notions around gender due to the possibility of socializing with young women, something that up to then was severely restricted (except on social media, such as Facebook). The ones who had female friends mentioned several benefits of these relationships. “Till now, I had only male friends, so I understood only one side of every debate or issue,” reported one young man. “When you form friendships with girls, you gain more perspective on a lot of things, you are able to understand the pressures that they deal with, and you also learn to understand and talk to women. These are important social skills that nobody ever teaches us.... We were always told as adolescents that boys and girls should hang out separately....”

Many of the men also recounted changes in attitudes and discriminatory practices regarding women. However, the former rationalization of strongly homoerotic behaviour held less strongly in such a space. Although several of these respondents still share a room with each other and remain single, none reported any non-heteronormative expressions similar to the ones mentioned previously in the boarding school.

This brings to light two points: One, sexual identity as a broad category remains insufficient to capture the diverse sexual practices among men. And two, space governs the meanings that people ascribe to relationships which may seem similar from a bird’s eye view across spaces but are understood and internalized very differently based on where they are. These are worthwhile to stress upon for sexual health programming that is typically aspatial and utilizes broad sexual identities as target populations. The questions to stress upon here would be – where should programmes be located considering the high rate of mobility among men such that they hold different, often conflicting perceptions based on where they are, along with the fact that once they move, impacts of previous participation in interventions might get nullified?

In other words, as this case shows, men’s perceptions are shaped by the spaces they inhabit. But also, men actively mould their attitudes and notions based on the spaces they are in, in order to gain greater currency for themselves. Therefore, men’s perceptions are not just shaped by intersections between identities but also intersections between the various spaces they occupy and their particular experiences in each of these spaces. So how can programmes factor these in while designing sessions or indicators to evaluate impact? This would mean that programmes need to both contextual enough to take into account specific intersections in any given space, but also de-contextualised to an extent that messages and learnings can hold strong in the face of changing sites of socialisation. This is, of course, a big challenge.
or a sense of competition was held to by the respondents who had mentioned not having female friends. However, the respondents’ outlook on friendships with women was coloured (as the quote at the beginning of this subsection shows) due to gender-segregated socialization as well as the pressure to quickly form romantic relationships to prove manhood.

**ROMANCE AND PROVING MANHOOD**

Having a girlfriend becomes a marker of status among young men, and this leads to a great deal of pressure for men who are unable to foster romantic relationships. Several respondents mentioned instances of severe competition, even among friends, to form romantic relationships. As said by one respondent, “In college, there is a race as to who can get a girlfriend the fastest. If you can get one in high school, then your luck is extremely good.” Women also figure in this masculine hierarchy, based on characteristics that are held to boost the man’s status. Establishing a relationship with a woman does not boost your status uniformly, however.

“Everybody wants their girlfriend to be fair, slim, having long hair and being extremely beautiful…. They want others to be jealous of them for having found such a girl,” reported one respondent.

Families of the respondents seemed to be accepting of men having romantic relationships with women, although the woman’s identity determined the level of acceptance and tolerance from family members. One respondent explained, “Before I started college, my father told me to not get into any such [relationships] and focus on studies, but later he became more understanding as he also saw that it is not possible to completely ignore girls when they are your classmates or friends. So one day he told me, ‘You can have a girlfriend but remember two things – don’t run away and get married…make sure she is from our caste.’”

Relationships remain a strong source of information and experience for the young men who stated that they led to personal fulfilment and growth as an individual. “Having a girlfriend would make you more comfortable in interacting with girls…. You start taking care of yourself and start paying attention to grooming and the way you present yourself,” commented one respondent. However, men also recounted several pressures of being in a relationship. Men’s role in a relationship is often guided by their role as providers who have to take charge of every situation independently. Spending time with a partner seemed to be ritualized into another ideal practice of masculinity, that is, “taking your girlfriend out”. This includes having to arrange for money for spending “quality time”, arranging transport, finding “safe places” away from the eye of relatives and family friends and managing all other “logistics and operations”. As one respondent illustrated, “Sometimes, she’ll ask for something, and I don’t have money. Where will I get it for her? She wants to go somewhere, but I don’t have a bike, where will I get a bike from? It’s just tension on top of tension… so for me, it’s not very important to have a girlfriend.”

Some men recounted instances of having experienced betrayal, or dhoka, at some point in their life at the hands of a romantic partner, which led to scepticism in fostering such relations in the future. However, the nature of this dhoka remained largely ambiguous in the discussions, ranging from infidelity to strenuous arguments to termination of relationship by their partner or even petty fights. It is possible that these men interpreted anything that threatened their masculine status as dhoka. For instance, a feeling of being rejected was articulated as a betrayal of their entitlements, whether or not there was actual cheating, infidelity or dishonesty involved.

“Before I started college, my father told me to not get into any such [relationships] and focus on studies, but later he became more understanding as he also saw that it is not possible to completely ignore girls when they are your classmates or friends. So one day he told me, ‘You can have a girlfriend but remember two things – don’t run away and get married… make sure she is from our caste.’”
Marriage as a life event has a huge bearing on perceptions around masculinities, as the above quote depicts. Men’s self-image is intimately linked to the image of “the ideal wife”. Men’s family has a huge role in decisions around marriage. Many respondents stated that they have little control over their marital decisions, including choice of partner, because they are guided by the norms of their family and community. Some even recounted instances in which their friends wanted to get married to a partner of their choice but were either threatened or excommunicated by their family members due to differences in caste or religious status between them and the woman of their choosing.

The law affects men’s choices and decisions around marriage in specific and direct ways, based on their background. Several respondents from lower-caste or working-class backgrounds stated that they remain afraid to get married out of fear that the woman’s family would lodge a (fraudulent) police complaint against them to end their relationship. Noted one respondent, “If her family lodges a case against us, then my family will get into trouble. Then, when the restrictions start coming, the boy will back down. Nobody thinks of all this when they first start.” This is typically the case when a woman belongs to an upper-caste community, and the complaints may range from abduction and kidnapping to outraging a woman’s modesty or trafficking. Analysis of the enforcement of these laws reveals that both the number of cases registered as well as convictions remain skewed against men from lower-caste backgrounds, especially Dalit and tribal men (Kumar, 2018; Mahapatra, 2013; Sunny, 2016). This is one way in which the law governs masculine hierarchies and presents a distinct set of borders for the expressions of certain men.

Traditionally held dichotomous opinions of a wife and girlfriend were strongly present among the respondents.

“We make girlfriend to show others…. We just see how fair the girl is when we approach her, but when we look for a wife we see if she is understanding, whether she can manage household things and if she can cook…. She should be able to leave all her former habits, and after marriage she should take responsibility of the family compromise with things…. We all want that our girlfriend should be superb and everyone should compliment her, but nobody cares if she cooks or can manage things easily…. All this comes when we look for a wife, and then our parents will check for everything before deciding for us.”

These notions and preferences indicate a deep-seated patriarchal hierarchization of women based on their utility for men and masculinities. The notion of an ideal wife is also contingent upon the man’s own status and traits. For respondents from working-class and lower-caste backgrounds, decisions regarding whom to marry depended on how well they would be able to exert control over their wife. Therefore, marrying someone from an upper strata of social hierarchy meant that they would be able to exert little control and hence their masculinities would be under constant threat and pressure. This is illustrated in the comments of one respondent from an Other Backward Class working-class background who stated: “If a rich girl is married to a lower-or middle-class man, then she will overpower the man. Because of her economic background, she would dominate him and do whatever she wants.” Therefore, men place different markers for different relations that they have with women, and these are also guided by the privileges and entitlements born out of ideals around masculinities.

“...if early marriage has taken place, then there is usually a gauna ceremony before which the bride continues to live with her natal family…. Only after gauna are the couple allowed to consummate their marriage and then the girl moves into the marital home…. After the gauna, the boy is considered to have matured to a man....”
Another form of space that Social media with its specific forms of expression has had a definitive impact on the way people choose to express themselves is social media with its specific forms of expression and pathways that people choose to do so. The construction of online expressions of masculinities are ridden within the same power dynamics that were discussed in earlier sections. However, the pathways of expression and modes are quite different in an online space. Respondents in our sample started using smartphones around age 15–19 years. They primarily used Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Snapchat, Messenger, Musically and TikTok and such gaming apps as PUBG or CandyCrush.

In some ways, use of social media can be empowering for many young men. Many long-distance relationships that now end in marriage have provided young people (women, more so) with much more agency in making decisions around choosing their own partner. Many respondents recounted experiences of forging friendships online that have grown to more long-term romantic relationships. Men from non-heteronormative sexualities presented narratives of social media and their connections online as a huge part of their emotional support system, especially in times of strain in personal or familial relations. The internet and

“I am so thankful to Facebook…. Earlier, so many guys used to text on dating websites, but there was no sure way of ensuring whether the person is real or fake…. Now I straight away ask for Facebook and Instagram ID…. From there [I am] able to judge whether the person I am talking to is actually who he says he is…. Basically, you can learn the history and geography of a person through this, and then judge for yourself whether you want to meet him or not.”
social media also present young men with opportunities to confidently express their sexualities and even develop sexual relationships in a more safe and empowered way. As stated by one gay respondent, “I am so thankful to Facebook…. Earlier, so many guys used to text on dating websites, but there was no sure way of ensuring whether the person is real or fake…. Now I straight away ask for Facebook and Instagram ID…. From there [I am] able to judge whether the person I am talking to is actually who he says he is…. Basically, you can learn the history and geography of a person through this, and then judge for yourself whether you want to meet him or not.”

This is another interesting relationship between online and offline selves – often one has to vouch for the other – the online self, which is self-created, has become a major way of hierarchizing offline identities as well. Hence, all the more reason that young men, and young people in general, are increasingly drawn towards social media for revolutionizing the possibilities for individual expression and image-building that can lead to social mobility.

**MEN’S ONLINE “SELVES”**

Many of the social media apps (Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram) require an elaborate process of creation of an online self. Everything from putting up a profile picture to the status to content liked and shared make a difference for this online self. Social media seems to require young men, especially those in the study sample, to undertake measures akin to social-image building. Respondents articulated immense pressure to conform to this, especially in late adolescence. In this process, several gender norms and opinions guided their actions. For instance, when asked to compare how they use Facebook with how girls their age use Facebook, one respondent explained, “Girls want to show off their hotness, even boys do it, but not as much…. Boys post their pictures with a car or a bike or a big car…. If they’re in a good location or in a party or in a big WagonR. Girls usually want to show their beauty to increase their followers and likes.”

In discussing social media with respondents, it emerged that respondents used caste-specific masculine images and idioms in projecting their online selves. Many respondents revealed that profiles of Jaat and Gujjar men are filled with caste-specific phrases, such as asli mard (real man), jaat launda (lad), kattar gujar (dyed-in-the-wool gujar) and sher (tiger), which reinforces their upper-caste model of masculinities. In many ways, Facebook and WhatsApp have led to a deepening of caste-consciousness among young men as they are voluntarily or involuntarily added to caste-based groups on these platforms. As one respondent stated, “The more social media has come up, the more casteism is increasing. Nowadays, there are groups being formed for different castes. So nowadays caste is getting more developed…. There are so many groups like Rajput Sangh and all…."

This quote points towards a trend that requires separate investigation. Many respondents reaffirmed the fact that there are several all-male groups on social media that are sites for sharing views, perceptions and different forms of information. The next section details some of these and their implications for masculine expression.

“Girls want to show off their hotness, even boys do it, but not as much…. Boys post their pictures with a car or a bike or a big car…. If they’re in a good location or in a party or in a big WagonR. Girls usually want to show their beauty to increase their followers and likes.”

11. Jaats or Jatts are a caste group spread across different states of India but most predominantly in Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan. Jaats who follow Sikhism (primarily found in parts of Punjab and north-western Pakistan) colloquially use the latter pronunciation.

12. Gujjars or gurjars are an ethnic pastoral or agricultural caste group found predominantly in Northern India (in the states of Rajasthan, Haryana, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh), Pakistan and Afghanistan.
The penetration of the information society has fundamentally transformed the way people interact, counter and socialize with each other. It is important to be backed by data and facts in an argument, and this is surely emerging as a marker of masculine status, especially in universities and colleges. Young men, having always lived with a sense of competition as previously discussed, also adapt this into other domains of their life. “Today our society is changing so fast that it is important to get information as fast as possible,” said one respondent, adding, “whoever has information [about jobs, fashion trends, games] gets to show off a lot, and we also like to have such friends… it makes you popular.”

Many narratives from our sample point to the internalization of such “facts” and information in order to stand out in an argument and also as a way of asserting masculinities. “Someone in America [has] scientifically proven [those who] went to gender-segregated schools… have better knowledge and learning outcomes,” contended one respondent. This reveals an important trend that was reiterated across group discussions – young men in conversations always need to be backed by facts. The sense of competition among young men is deepened by the penetration of an information society in which being backed by facts and data is integral to preserving a strong sense of self and masculine status. The verifiability of these facts does not become important so long as they are able to fulfill the purpose of elevating their status in an argument or discussion. There is a push for many young men’s continued presence on these platforms and groups, despite them not always being appreciative of what is shared. Young men, therefore, become a major audience for all kinds of data and facts that are routinely circulated through social media websites (Srivastava, 2015).

The dynamics of such a society obsessed with the empowering qualities of facts and numbers when juxtaposed with masculinity, religious and caste discrimination and nationalism leads to results that can now be seen across urban North India. As mentioned previously (see section 1 on threats and contestations), a shift towards neoliberal right-leaning political ideologies has also been accompanied by an increase in Islamophobia. Social media has become a major tool for the promotion of ideas that vilify certain men and masculinities as threats to the nation or as second-class citizens or, most violently, as “anti-nationals”. The tactics are easily identifiable and immediately convincing symbols, such as the use of “World Bank study”, “UNESCO” or “100 per cent-verified fact”, which appeal to moral codes over self, such as “if you are a true Indian, share this” (Roy, 2018).

The penetration of information and data is used to manufacture mass consent and participation towards particular ideologies based on unverifiable and often unscientific information treated as “fact”. Therefore, many such “facts” are continuously circulated via doctored videos and images on social media that are shared most predominantly among male groups. This has been labelled by journalists as the “WhatsApp university”, a parallel institution that now has the most significant role in shaping youth ideologies and perspectives. Islamophobia, therefore, finds its way into WhatsApp groups of many young men and reinforces prejudices through myths, unscientific and arbitrary data and political rhetoric. The following quote illustrates the conflicts and pressures that young men have to undergo due to the promotion of such ideologies on social media.

“If you’re Hindu, that is, if your name sounds Hindu, then you will be added to these groups that you have to do this and do that and they share photos like some Muslim kicking the idol of a god, and instructions that if you ever see him, beat him up. It’s like, there is a lot of nonsense.”
They also share blue films. This is what we call kattarpanti mardaangi. No matter how much you tell them not to send this sort of messages on these groups, no matter how much you try, they won’t stop. And the problem is that the people who added you are officials you work with so you can’t even leave it. But, at least what WhatsApp did was that if you switch the option off, you won’t automatically download all the media. But, you can still see all the messages.”

All-male Facebook and WhatsApp groups are also frequently used to share “all kinds of photos and videos, cursing or if there was ever a fight, [a message so that] everyone would show up to fight,” as one respondent explained. Most disturbingly, they become spaces to share non-consensual videos of sexual violence. In recording videos while perpetrating sexual violence, young men continue to associate the pride and status of a community or household with female sexuality. Therefore, an attack on women’s sexual integrity and perpetration of sexual violence are often ways of “getting back” at either her or, by extension, her household or community, all of whom are considered to rank lower in men’s dominant hierarchical schema. However, the man sharing the video repeatedly on multiple social media platforms need not be the perpetrator himself. It can be anyone. The perception that because you’re a man (of a certain caste or economic class) you ought to display ready willingness and participation in matters of sex holds true. Men continue to share such videos across multiple platforms all the while constructing these as masti, masala, etc. essentials in satiating their everyday masculine selves. Here again, we see the deeply ingrained connections between online sexual violence driven by variations of endogamous attitudes and practices that signify the complex interplay between gender and caste.

“If you’re Hindu, that is, if your name sounds Hindu, then you will be added to these groups that you have to do this and do that and they share photos like some Muslim kicking the idol of a god, and instructions that if you ever see him, beat him up. It’s like, there is a lot of nonsense. They also share blue films. This is what we call kattarpanti mardaangi. No matter how much you tell them not to send this sort of messages on these groups, no matter how much you try, they won’t stop. And the problem is that the people who added you are officials you work with so you can’t even leave it. But, at least what WhatsApp did was that if you switch the option off, you won’t automatically download all the media. But, you can still see all the messages.”
3.5. MEN’S SEXUAL PRACTICES AND SEXUAL HEALTH

Men’s perceptions regarding sexual behaviours, rights and health are influenced by the same sense of competition as described in the first section, the spaces they are in, the sources of information (city, village, boarding school, university) and by men’s networks and relationships, both offline and online. This section weaves together elements from the previous four themes into an analysis of men’s sexual practices, where men find information, services and legitimacy of their sexual behaviours.

Young men from the study sample reported talking about sex with their friends beginning around the age of 10–15 years. The image of an elder adolescent, usually a cousin (in extended families) or a senior from school, was omnipresent across all narratives as the one who initiated conversations around sex and was the first source of information. Almost all men shared that their first information about sex came from some form of pornographic material (print or film) that was shared by elders or, at times, even stolen from a senior. These activities are largely guarded, and utmost secrecy is to be maintained to ensure that “nobody else hears all this”, which would spoil the ideal image of “the good boy”. This has been another frequently appearing archetype in many narratives (see section 2 on men’s friendships with women).

“Sex is a biological need and everyone has it.”

“There are some people who know about it since childhood, so they asked the headmaster how to masturbate. Does it have any side effects? So, the teacher said, ‘Yes, you have to burn this much blood to do it, you will lose your memory.’ So, we thought that we should not do it. If we lose our memory, then there would be no point in being alive.”
Several myths related to sex and masturbation prevailed among the young men, such as those representing the classic semen-loss anxiety. But unlike in the Gandhian case, in which semen loss is represented by loss of control and command over one’s actions and lack of strength in character, here men regarded the loss of semen as leading to malnutrition, low muscle growth and lack of physical strength. As one respondent stated, “It diverts the person’s attention, and if sperm and hormones come out of your body, it affects your growth and also affects certain parts of your body. It can cause impotence. These negative things don’t go easily, so if you get addicted to [masturbation], you only suffer.”

The source of such misconceptions may be family members or even teachers, as the account by one respondent illustrated: “There are some people who know about it since childhood, so they asked the headmaster how to masturbate. Does it have any side effects? So, the teacher said, ‘Yes, you have to burn this much blood to do it, you will lose your memory.’ So, we thought that we should not do it. If we lose our memory, then there would be no point in being alive.”

Men have several other misconceptions about female sexuality. As one respondent claimed, “Women have seven times the sexual desire of men.... We’ve only heard about it from friends and all that the girls have seven times the sexual feelings that boys do. So the mentality that they have about sex, that after 14 or 15, they start wanting to be in a sexual relationship.”

Men hold on to several of these myths throughout their adult life, which often leads to tensions in their sexual relationships and emotional stress.

The distancing of young boys and girls beginning at puberty influences safe and open conversations around sex. As remarked by one respondent, “Even with girls who are close friends, we are scared of talking about sex...what will they think? What kind of a boy I am who talks about all these things even in front of girls without any shame!” Ideals of proper masculine conduct also govern the ability of men to talk about sex and actively seek out information regarding sex during adolescence and youth. Men risk losing their status and respect when actively demanding public conversations about sex even within friends and classmates.

As illustrated in case study 2, many respondents shared that they had had experiences of mutual masturbation and group masturbation with friends. As one respondent stated, “It is a very small thing. And it’s not important, it’s a village, so there are a lot of fields, farms. So, if two men or two boys are watching the video together, then they masturbate together as well. It is common, but it isn’t very open, people don’t find out.” This indicates that sexual behaviour and perceptions around sex need not always conform to the hegemony of heteronormativity. This also strengthens the idea that there is little correlation between sexual practices and sexual identities (Katyal, 2016; Khanna, 2016).

What is needed then is to unpack the circumstances that legitimize and materialize behaviours that don’t conform to sexual identity (John and Nair, 1998). Hence, there is a need for programming to move beyond identifying beneficiaries solely through categories, such as “sexual identity”, and instead seek to target factors that influence the entire terrain of youth sexuality (such as identities, spaces, networks) to ensure safe and consensual sex.

“Women have seven times the sexual desire of men.... We’ve only heard about it from friends and all that the girls have seven times the sexual feelings that boys do. So the mentality that they have about sex, that after 14 or 15, they start wanting to be in a sexual relationship.”
CASE STUDY 3

MASALA SHOPS: YOUNG MEN’S SPACES FOR SEX

The ecosystem that guides men’s youth and adolescent sexual knowledge and sexualities represents multiple actors who become important sources of information and content, such as older cousins, seniors from school (especially in the case of boarding school) and local CD/DVD shops that double as suppliers of pornographic content under closed shutters. There are many code words devised for transactions of such information and material, such as masala, vaise vaali picture, angrezi film and blue movie. In cases in which mobile phones or TVs are unavailable or out of access due to competing demands from other household members, young men rely on pornographic literature from magazines, such as Saral Salil or Mastaram, which are sold in railway or bus stations, inside trains and in other “footpath pornographic shops” for prices ranging from 5 rupees to 20 rupees.

Erotica of this variety is freely available and intentionally made to look nondescript. “It is a thin book and you will find it easily anywhere,” explained one respondent. “Nobody looks at the text as one cannot understand what is written… the language is so bad, and even in Hindi, they mostly write incorrectly…. Even if you try reading it you won’t understand anything…so it has only one use…. You just look at the pictures and scroll through…. Sometimes, they have pictures of foreigners and all…everybody likes that.” Ideals of beauty and erotica are abundant in these magazines. More interesting are the ways in which certain male-female relations are eroticized, such as the figure of an elder woman, elder relative, almost always fair skinned and epitomizing dominant ideals of upper-caste femininity. While the image of the woman remains perpetually set in upper-caste, upper-class, feminine ideals (a “housewife”, typically the unattainable wife of the older brother, or bhabhi), she is shown to be engaging in sexual relations with men from diverse backgrounds and profile. These could be shopkeepers, milk vendors, neighbours and mostly younger men. The audience of these magazines could be any of these men, but all of them are socialized into epitomizing only certain feminine ideals of beauty and sexuality. The suppliers of such street pornography are also usually makeshift publishers and street video shops.

Sanjay Srivastava (2007) documented sex clinics and footpath pornographic sites populated by migrant men in Indian cities where performance of sexuality and masculinities are intricately linked to class, consumption practices and the statuses that they accord. Footloose capitalism coupled with masculine subjectivities contingent upon age and economic class thus lead to the cultural production of models of femininities and beauty that become dominant. Erotica has become an instrument that materializes male objectification of bodies around patriarchal norms of pleasure and sex.

“Sex is safe when you don’t get caught.”

Men’s idea of safety in sexual relations is limited to ensuring secrecy and privacy. This is also intimately tied to the image of a “good boy” as someone who is devoted to his family and towards earning respect, status and privilege through education and employment. Men take great precautions to preserve these social codes. Contraception is also understood to be important primarily to avoid pregnancy and less so as a way of ensuring safety from infections. Many men mentioned that they prefer to travel to medical shops for condoms that are at least 5–10 kilometres away from their home and neighbourhood to ensure privacy and confidentiality. If anyone in their family or neighbourhood finds out, then men risk losing their status of a “good boy”, which translates to men who are solely focused on their studies or getting good jobs without having any distraction. Moreover, men feel most comfortable buying condoms from shops where the vendors are young men of similar age. According to one respondent, “If there is a lady at the counter then we don’t even go closer and we dare not ask for condoms… what will she think? What kind of a man I am that I can shamelessly talk about such things in the presence of women?” The reason for this caution, as mentioned previously, is that men fear the risk of sabotaging the image of “good boy” as there are real material gains that men receive by maintaining this image. If perceived otherwise, men risk losing out on support networks from their families, neighbourhood and relatives who are otherwise instrumental in searching for jobs, educational opportunities and several other material rewards.
Respondents stated that many of them might understand consent through a girl’s body language (“if she smiles then she has said yes” or “even in a girl’s ‘no’ there is ‘yes’... girls are trained to shy away and say ‘no’”). Consent is valued more in romantic relationships and less so in marriage. “Having a girlfriend” connotes a particular status that men actively seek out, and this status is also contingent on the identity of the woman (fair, rich, slim, etc).

In a romantic relationship, the level of impunity for men is low because the result of “not keeping your girlfriend happy” could mean a loss in masculine status in front of peers. Again, risking your status and image among peer groups translates to risks in losing out on material rewards such as jobs, loans and social capital. Hence, men seem to put more effort and thought into the preference for and choice of a partner in a romantic relationship (they even think about pleasure from their partner’s perspective because an inability to satisfy the partner sexually again poses a threat to masculinity). This is akin to a bargain that men make in their minds — consent is valued so long as status is maintained by having a girlfriend who is monogamous, “beautiful”, makes other men envious and is submissive to men’s demands. Such a bargain also secures the above material returns in the long run. This bargain is struck off when the woman exercises her choice of not being in the relationship and her actions are deemed to be dhoka (betrayal). This, in men’s minds, may actually be a betrayal of the same bargain that they perceive women to implicitly make when they enter a romantic relationship. So, in men’s minds, dhoka amounts to the fact that while they kept their side of the bargain by valuing their partner’s agency and consent, their partner did not hold up to their side of the bargain.

The level of impunity in a marriage is very high because men are socialized into believing that they are entitled to an ideal wife who is “primarily responsible for the household, and the needs of children, him and his parents’ needs”. Marriage is also considered to be a “license” to have sex whenever they want, without any regard to the choices or agency of the wife. Men also maintain stringent control over the mobility of their wife and many household decisions pertaining to sexual and reproductive health and rights. Such a patriarchal and unequal construction of the marital relationship is perpetuated among male peer groups and kin networks, which makes it difficult to create a perspective shift among men in valuing consent and their partner’s agency. Opposing these patriarchal norms, even in cases where they are conscious of unequal implications, would mean that they stand in opposition to the norms which are collectively prescribed as sacrosanct by their peers and family members. Such an opposition again poses threats to the security of their social capital which are integral for men to ‘get ahead in the race’. This came up in multiple testimonies, such as, “We get to hear from a young age that once you are married, you get the licence, and if you want to have sex you just have to prepare your wife. [To prepare your wife] you don’t have to read books or anything, it has to depend on each other’s mood.” Therefore, for men, marriage is an institution that solidifies their entitlement for sex (license) from their partner, and hence, a wife saying “no” may not be understood by many young men.

But it was clear that many respondents did not think consent was important in the case of all sexual relations; the agency of the woman saying “no” becomes crucial for the way it is perceived by young men and their reactions to it. Men are socialized into believing that pleasure, especially from women, is their entitlement. Therefore, the feeling of being rejected that accompanies a “no” threatens the ideas of status, respect and the sense of entitlements (privileges) that are routinely attached to masculinities (even the ones which are non-hegemonic).

More so, if the woman saying no belongs to a lower stratum of social hierarchy, such as wives, Dalit women, younger women or women from working-class backgrounds. In these cases, consent becomes less and less important, and the perception of having been rejected leads to incidence of aggression, verbal abuse and physical and mental violence. For men to understand and appreciate consent in sexual relationships, they must be supported in dealing with rejection and the perceived loss of selfhood and respect that is associated with rejection, owing to ideals of masculinities.

“We get to hear from a young age that once you are married, you get the licence, and if you want to have sex you just have to prepare your wife. [To prepare your wife] you don’t have to read books or anything, it has to depend on each other’s mood.”
3.6. MEN’S READING OF VIOLENCE: ENTITLEMENT OR A TOOL TO SAFEGUARD SELF-IMAGE?

INTIMATE-PARTNER VIOLENCE

Violence against women is a function of men’s socialization into believing that the right to violence is but another one of their entitlements. For instance, as several respondents across group discussions explained: “When it is said that women are less violent, it is because of their nurturing qualities.” “They are known to be more peace loving and closer to nature.” “They have mothering qualities.” “Boys tend to express their anger by fighting and girls do it by crying.”

In these ways, norms around behaviour, personality and ideal gender identities entitle men to exercise violence every day. This is true both in the case of intimate-partner violence and violence in public spaces. Respondents across group discussions re-affirmed the existing ideas of violence, masculinity and gender – violence as a normalized means of subjugating women, especially within the household, and violence upon women as a means of dishonouring another man, community or family. “According to societal norms, a man should not hit women and they generally don’t; they only hit their wives,” explained one respondent, adding, “Men usually get angry with their wives or sisters because they feel that they love them and hence will not react to their anger…. Men do not get angry with women who are more...”
powerful than them...nobody gets angry with someone like Smriti Irani...."

Furthermore, men’s honour and masculine status are embodied by the wife so much so that only he is perceived to have the right over her autonomy. Any act of violence against a woman is first perceived as an attack on the masculinity of “her guardian” (usually a husband or father). Therefore, women become doubly vulnerable to violence, not just on accord of their own status in the masculine hierarchy but also due to the perception that they embody another man’s masculine status. “A man is violent towards his woman, not towards someone else’s woman. He knows he cannot touch someone else’s woman,” said one respondent.

PUBLIC VIOLENCE

Violence in public spaces comes from a sense of protecting your entitlements and preserving masculine hierarchies. “In the university, I have beaten the most boys. I have beaten some boys because I don’t like their faces. If I have two buttons open and someone with two buttons open ignored me, I would go after them, then beat them up. When someone doesn’t agree with us or doesn’t do what we say, then we get violent with them,” reported one respondent.

And because men are continuously faced with such hierarchies that undermine their sense of self, it also feeds into their normalization of violence. These hierarchies may be situated around identities of caste, religion or age. “The Yadavs, Patels, a little better section of Other Backward Classes...if you see the crime rate, these upper castes are in larger numbers, and they perpetrate crimes against their inferiors,” noted another respondent.

Many respondents stated that men are not violent towards everyone. Explained one young man, “If someone is strong and we are not, then we will not react towards him.... Men only stop in this situation when they think they don’t have the strength, when they feel this man can beat me up.” This connects well to the point made earlier in the findings about graded masculinities which have multiple levels of privileges and vulnerabilities attached to them. Such gradations also influence the quantum of entitlements that different men hold. Therefore, if violence stems from a need to protect entitlements it follows that those holding more entitlements would be more violent. Except, we also know from the previous discussion that there are immense contestations and a strong sense of competition within masculinities such that the gradations remain dynamic and fluid based on contest. So, public violence may also emerge from such contestations and assertions made by individuals occupying different positions.

This need to protect your entitlement and status is true in the case of both violence perpetrated against other men or women, although it is much more amplified in the case of women. Violence against women in public spaces may be a tool to dealing with rejection and a lost sense of self by “setting the hierarchy straight.” As described by one respondent, “There are so many boys who propose [to] girls, and if they reject them, they are attacked by acid. We keep reading this in the newspaper...because they cannot accept rejection, so they either try to kill them or they try to spoil their face by acid.”

Such acts of violence are perpetrated against a specific part of a woman’s body (the face and by extension, her beauty and femininity) and points to the notion that the ultimate act of revenge against a woman who rejects a man is by reducing her to an outcast in the patriarchal heteronormative hierarchy.

“In the university, I have beaten the most boys. I have beaten some boys because I don’t like their faces. If I have two buttons open and someone with two buttons open ignored me, I would go after them, then beat them up. When someone doesn’t agree with us or doesn’t do what we say, then we get violent with them,”
CASE STUDY 4

MASCULINIZATION OF VIOLENCE PREVENTION

In one of the group discussions, conducted with young women from a grass-roots organization in Lucknow, the predominant view was that violence is a result of men’s internalization of the notion that they are entitled to violence owing to their greater strength, and women must remain subdued, being their weaker and lesser counterparts. Therefore, their strategy for dismantling this patriarchal notion is to insist on a woman’s right to her own body by showcasing their physical strength and prowess over men. According to one respondent, “Once they understand that even we can be violent, even we can raise our hands and hit them harder than they ever could, they would stop harassing or violating any woman...so I tell all my friends that if he is hitting you once, you hit him back harder four times.... All women should start learning martial arts and fighting.”

This organization provides many young women with training in self-defence and martial arts courses, and while it is commendable that they advocate for women’s agency and control over their own bodies, they fail to realize that masculinity is not something that is embodied only among men. By adopting this strategy, they are merely locating the association between masculinities and violence in a woman’s body. They are not challenging the practice of adopting violence as a tool towards setting hierarchies straight; instead, they are simply saying that if a man is violent, you have to be more violent than him. This strategy does not lead to men questioning their position and perpetration of violence and instead goes on to normalize the perpetration of violence within the society in general. The implications of adopting such a strategy may also prove to be counterproductive, as is indicated by the following quote by a male respondent: “Everyone is supporting girls, so what will a boy do in this situation...he will obviously get more aggressive.”

The persistent rise in cases of gender-based violence and the Nirbhaya case that shook our complacency towards addressing these comprehensively has resulted in the masculinization of programme strategies to tackle violence. Many grass-roots organizations working on violence prevention have now adopted violence as a strategy to “knocking sense” into men and preventing future incidences. In situations such as above, it becomes imperative to ask what route interventions should take? We cannot simply pass a value judgment against women’s adoption of violence as a strategy because we are unable to empathize fully with the reasons that lead them to do so. But the flipside is that such strategies alone do not lead to questioning of male entitlements over violence and the pervasiveness of different forms of violence in our society. So, what can programmers do is a question we are left grappling with and there is a need to arrive at action steps soon. The following section presents some recommendations on forward action for programmers based on the discussion so far.

“Once they understand that even we can be violent, even we can raise our hands and hit them harder than they ever could, they would stop harassing or violating any woman... so I tell all my friends that if he is hitting you once, you hit him back harder four times.... All women should start learning martial arts and fighting.”

13. The 2012 Delhi gang-rape was an incident of extreme sexual violence perpetrated by six men on December 16, 2012. The case attracted worldwide media attention and public outcry over the state of women’s safety and rights in India and even led to the revision of rape laws to bolster the position of victims and their ability to attain judicial justice.
RECOMMENDATIONS
Summary of recommendations for programming

• Address the intersections between masculinities and caste, religion, nationalism to make gender-based programme content more relevant for young men

• Build in the centrality of caste to programmes that seek to influence perceptions around relationships and sexuality. Mainstream critical reflections on caste-based hierarchies that are often most definitive in guiding young men’s choices

• Change the instrumentalist approach to engaging men as perpetrators or partners by addressing men’s attitudes not just in relation to women and women’s outcomes but also in relation to their own selves and other men

• Advocate for a masculinities lens in all programmes with men (on livelihoods, health, housing, etc) in order to structurally move towards gender transformation

• Develop cross-sectoral partnerships between CSOs to create programmes that address gender-based privilege along with vulnerabilities

• Clearly contextualize programmes while recognizing the need for dynamism in platforms for messaging in order to tackle the challenge of young men’s ever-changing sites of socialisation.

• Start interventions early with young men and engage multiple stakeholders to raise sensitization as they get socialised into patriarchal notions and practices

• Create spaces and avenues for collective mobilisation as well as for individual expression and reflection without the pressure and need for navigating exclusionary group dynamics

• Build young men’s critical perspectives towards the current neoliberal capitalist reward system that encourages the proliferation of harmful notions of masculinity; create and mainstream alternate reward systems for young men to aspire towards

• Identify pathways that enable young men to challenge hegemonic ideals while providing platforms for the expression of alternate masculinities

• Shift from teaching consent to building critical perspectives around masculinities and men’s ability to deal with rejection. Provide young men with alternate ways of understanding, processing and dealing with rejection

This research aims to develop insights for designing more efficient and relevant programmes on masculinities. The findings indicate a need to review our strategies while designing, implementing and evaluating programmes that engage men. This section collates recommendations within these areas of programming.

Overall, the findings suggest the need to re-evaluate the role of men in SRHR programming without reducing them to conduits for gender transformation; to increase men’s participation within programmes and campaigns; to incorporate the lens of intersectionality while devising strategies to engage men; to explore a diversification of sites where men could be effectively engaged including on social media and; to rethink our current evaluation frameworks to measure outcomes of men in relation to their own realities in addition to attitudes around gender and patriarchy. Through the discussions below we seek to provide alternate strategies/approaches that could guide programme development in the face of routine challenges that emerge while working with men.
FROM ENGAGING MEN TO EXAMINING MASCULINITIES

ADDRESSING MEN’S RELEVANT REALITIES

Most programming with men seems to be geared to address understanding and experience of gender and improve gender equitable attitudes among men. This aspect tends to become the only critical focus of the work with men in SRHR and GBV interventions. The research indicates that in many contexts, perceptions around masculinities and violence depend much more on other intersections such as caste, religion and notions of nationalism than on gender roles and norms. Even within the realm of gender, the focus remains on power hierarchies between men and women, and does not always address multiple hierarchies among men.

Each intervention should then identify the most contextually relevant factor that governs masculinities for the audience and address the same. This could mean a greater focus on caste within gender-based programming, or having employment and labour issues as a key facet of the work with men. Such a shift would also make programme content more relevant for men thereby sparking greater interest and participation. It would also comprehensively address the multiple power relations that men in that intervention negotiate directly. This will allow programmes to achieve and evaluate gender transformation to its fullest potential by envisioning change in perceptions and attitudes across identity groups, including men.

EVALUATING SELF CONSTITUTIVE ASPECTS OF MASCULINITIES

Most SRHR programmes measure success of male engagement by relating it solely to violence prevention outcomes or outcomes pertaining to condom use or SRH information. Men’s roles within these interventions solely relate them to women (fathers, brothers, husbands, etc) rather than understanding men in relation to their own selves and other men. However, notions of masculinity not just guide men’s perceptions and behavior towards women, but also towards other men and their own selves. These perceptions and behaviors have a clear implication on SRH outcomes for both men and women as is discussed in the framework above. Increasing the efficacy of programmatic outcomes while working with men requires moving beyond an instrumentalist approach to engaging men as perpetrators or partners.

Programme design, implementation and evaluation should address changes in men’s attitudes not just in relation to women and women’s outcomes but also in relation to their own selves and other men. Towards this, indicators that map the changes in the way men think about women’s roles, mobility, responsibilities, etc must be complemented with those that map changes in the way men think about themselves, their roles, responsibilities and aspirations.
**“MASCULINITIES” AS A CROSS CUTTING LENS AND NOT ONE PROGRAMME**

Norms and performance of masculinity affect men’s choices and decisions across a wide range of topics over and above SRH, including livelihoods, social media and citizenship. Many of these are intimately connected to men’s sexual practices and their ability to access SRH services and information. Young men also mobilise along collective fears of conflict and vulnerabilities, especially owing to the larger shifts around political economy and citizenship that have rendered greater insecurities among young men from minority backgrounds. While the trend of vulnerable groups collectivising to challenge these processes is not new; it is precisely the exclusionary political economy that has become ever more glaring in the last few years.

In this context, programming around masculinities should integrate conversations around citizenship, political economy, employment and everyday religiosity, all of which are structural issues that have gendered implications. Similarly, all interventions with men across these spaces should enable men to locate themselves within these as gendered beings. In addition to programming with men directly, masculinities work must reach out to other arenas across sectors to improve the potential of any space that collectivises men towards gender transformation. Simply put, programming can no longer be straight-jacketed and there should be real efforts to draw out synergies cross-sectorally such that SRH programming can be supported through community-based interventions on housing, sanitation, livelihoods and transit, and vice versa.

**INCREASING MEN’S PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMMES**

**CHALLENGES IN GENERATING INTEREST AMONG MEN**

Collectivising men to address violence prevention necessitates addressing male privilege as a central experience and facet of masculinities. However, men express even privileges as threats and vulnerabilities due to the constant bid for power within your group, community and context.

This could also be the reason why men are unable to relate to curricula and messages the same way that women do. However, as pointed out in the findings above, intersectional programmes need to strive towards holding both privileges and vulnerabilities in a single conversation which would open up multiple nodes of entry for addressing notions of masculinity. A step towards opening up these multiple nodes is for organisations to start exploring more cross-sectoral linkages amongst each other in order to mobilise men on multiple issues simultaneously.

**CHALLENGES DUE TO MIGRATION AND CHANGING SITES OF SOCIALIZATION**

The challenges of high attrition rates, low reflectivity and retention are also compounded due to high rates of migration among young men, such that locating programmes that could effectively mobilise and reach out to men remains a challenge. The findings reflect on the fact that due to high rates of migration among young men for work, education and several other purposes, their sites of socialisation remain highly dynamic. Since the markers of masculinity and what allocated power privilege and vulnerability in a single conversation which would open up multiple nodes of entry for addressing notions of masculinity. A step towards opening up these multiple nodes is for organisations to start exploring more cross-sectoral linkages amongst each other in order to mobilise men on multiple issues simultaneously.

If men’s perceptions fluctuate based on the space that they find themselves in, it remains a challenge for programmers to accurately locate their interventions. Is there a way to contextualize programme content based on the background of participants and still retain sufficient dynamism to ensure that even those men who move out of programming carry their perspectives even to spaces that they move to, without negating the impact of programming? This requires programmes to actively engage with sites on social media such as men’s groups on WhatsApp, Facebook and even TikTok. Programmes must diversify platforms of engaging with men including targeting men’s social media groups through positive role models and actively promoting alternate aspirational models.
STARTING INTERVENTIONS EARLY TO TACKLE THE PROCESS OF EARLY SOCIALIZATION OF MEN INTO HARMFUL NOTIONS OF MASCULINITIES

It is clear that socialisation into norms around gender and masculinity begins quite early and involves multiple actors within and outside the household. It is therefore important to start interventions with young men at an early age and incorporate broader engagements with multiple stakeholders into programme design. While this has been articulated as a key need in the sector even earlier, this research also highlighted the need for early interventions alongside ongoing work with communities and groupings of older men in their roles as fathers, or partners. This will ensure that harmful notions of masculinity are tackled as and when men start getting socialised into these codes and norms. Such an approach would also provide a greater opportunity for programmes to legitimize processes that allow men to challenge harmful norms. These are integral to ensuring longevity of programmatic outcomes even after men transition out of interventions.

TACKLING THE SENSE OF COMPETITION AMONG MEN BY ALLOWING FOR INDIVIDUAL SPACES OF REFLECTION WITHIN COLLECTIVISED SPACES

A sense of competition that seeps into male participants while in programme spaces is also an expressions of masculinities that leads to difficulties in creating safe, non-threatening and open spaces for men to share and reflect collectively. Individual engagements within collectivised spaces would enable assessing individual takeaways and reflections more clearly. Interventions often address men in a group. Even within a group of men that seem homogenous, experiential differences may relate differently to the other and compete for more space. The reasons for this have been discussed in the findings. In such a scenario, programmers need to brainstorm on ways in which intervention spaces, while remaining spaces of collective mobilisation, could provide space for individual expression and reflection to a larger degree.

LEGITIMIZING SAFE SPACES FOR MEN BY ADDRESSING MATERIAL REWARDS TO MASCULINITIES AND CREATING/AMPLIFYING ALTERNATE REWARD SYSTEMS

An important question for programmers is to think about how safe spaces could be legitimized for all young men in general. Men are unable/unwilling to dislocate themselves from dominant notions and practices around masculinity because there are real rewards to being considered a “real man.” These come in the form of greater social capital, greater propensity to find jobs, enhanced social status. In such a scenario, programmers need to assess whether interventions are being designed to change the aspiration levels of young men as to what they considered to be success markers of being a man. Programmes do create alternate narratives around “ideal men” but as stated earlier, men’s success stories are recorded in so far as their roles relate to women - ideal fathers, ideal husbands, ideal brothers, etc. Are programmes creating avenues for men to actively deviate from norms, or at least, are we adequately capturing the processes which facilitate men’s navigation around norms? Programmes need to actively cultivate alternate reward systems that men can aspire to move towards. This requires a larger shift from the current reward system that is guided by norms around citizenships, nationalism and political economy. Additionally, once these processes are identified and where these have already been identified, programmes need to amplify men’s access to these.
DESIGNING INTERSECTIONAL PROGRAMMES FOR MEN BY DIVERSIFYING THEMES OF ENGAGEMENT

The findings point out that masculine hierarchies are constructed across intersections of caste, class, religion and age, among other factors. Therefore, male participants in any intervention on gender are engaging not just as men but also as people holding other identities. The findings present a good case towards intersectional programming that addresses masculinities as a hierarchy with a constant tussle to aggravate privileges and diminish vulnerabilities. For programmes to not ignore intersectionality, it would mean that many themes which routinely get left out of GBV prevention programmes such as livelihoods, caste, income, social media expressions, self-image and failure, need to be incorporated into programme design. Moreover, while it is understood that men have greater mobility and agency, it is worthwhile to evaluate our strategies on whether they are designed to ensure that all men, despite their differing identities and masculinities, are able to exercise their agency and choice in equal degree, including queer men, men from dalit-bahujan castes, and others. If not, who are the men who are left behind and what are the areas in which men’s agency is not legitimized, are questions that programmes should grapple with.

The findings section often reflects on the deeply embedded association of caste with many notions and perceptions that construct masculinities. Caste governs men’s perceptions about beauty, ideal bodies, ideal friendships, ideal relationships, ideal safe spaces and social media expressions. Therefore, it would no longer be possible for an intervention on gender or sexual and reproductive health to be holistic or effective without addressing caste-based influences. On many occasions, caste might be integral to governing success in mobilizing men for interventions and success in achieving shifts in attitudes or perspectives. The strongest recommendation is to mainstream a framework that integrates caste along with gender and other intersections in devising programme strategies. This study could provide a useful first step in this process, and therefore we also put out a strong call for other organizations and individuals to undertake research that brings out the intersections between caste and gender more clearly.

ENGAGING MEN ON CONSENT BY ADDRESSING MASCULINITIES AND DEALING WITH REJECTION

As pointed out previously, it has been difficult for interventions to understand the complexities that guide men’s valuation of consent. Very often, the lack of these nuances lead to a blanket acceptance that men do not value consent, and it is difficult to make them do so. However, as was argued in the section on consent, it is not always the case that men universally fail to understand the importance of consensual sex. Men’s valuation of consent is a function of the level of impunity that they have in relationships. These impunities vary, based on whether men are in friendships, romantic relationships or marriage. Furthermore, while most men understood what consent means, it was clear that their valuation of consent was also intricately linked to the identity of women (the “good girl” vs “bad girl” dichotomy). As a strategic shift, interventions need to address the nuances of consent in different relationships, discuss grey zones which men find difficult to navigate, integrate conversations around consent with strategies of dealing with rejection. Conversations about consent need to start with reflections on the oppressive hierarchy of masculinities and how it connects to their inability to deal with “No”. Programming should move from teaching consent to building perspectives around consent that are linked to masculinities and men’s ability to deal with rejection.
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## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1 - Table A: Demonstrating the shift in programmatic approaches of engaging with men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches in Engagement of Men</th>
<th>Programmes/Campaigns</th>
<th>Objectives and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach 1: Interventionism of engaging with law and implementation mechanisms; viewing men often as perpetrators</strong></td>
<td>Jaago Re Campaign by MASVAV Uttarakhand, Oxfam and CARE</td>
<td>To increase awareness of PWDVA (prevention of women against domestic violence Act) and partnering for implementation, monitoring and evaluation. To increase state accountability towards the implementation of PWDVA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ab To Jaago Campaign by Humsafar, MASVAV and AMAN</td>
<td>Facilitating implementation of PWDVA by partnering with state authorities and media. Organising neighbourhood level watch groups and dialogues, comprising of even men, to stop and report instances of violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach 2: Collectivising men as partners/patrons in programming for gender equality and justice</strong></td>
<td>Parivartan Programme for Youth by MASVAV in Lucknow</td>
<td>Curriculum-based engagement of young adolescent boys and girls towards the existence and forms of violence, particularly facilitating young men’s potential in campaigning for eliminating GBV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) - research study by International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) in partnership with Promundo</td>
<td>Curriculum-based engagement of young adolescent boys and girls towards the existence and forms of violence, particularly facilitating young men’s potential in campaigning for eliminating GBV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parivartan Programme by ICRW</td>
<td>Engaging men in reducing GBV through cricket based on the Coaching Boys into Men approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches in Engagement of Men</th>
<th>Programmes/Campaigns</th>
<th>Objectives and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach 2: Collectivising men as partners/patrons in programming for gender equality and justice</strong></td>
<td>Yaari Doati Programme and Gender Equity Movement in Schools by Oxfam India</td>
<td>Curriculum-based programmes on developing critical thinking among young adolescents towards gender justice and equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Addition Curriculum on Gender Equality and Social Responsibility by Women Empowerment (WE) in Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>Gender sensitization programmes for various grassroots organisations and directly with men in communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naye Mard Ki Nayi Soch Campaign by MASVAV in Orissa</td>
<td>Mobilization of men and campaign initiatives in partnership with grassroots organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parivartan Programme by ICRW</td>
<td>Engaging men in reducing GBV through cricket based on the Coaching Boys into Men approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men Engage through Women’s Empowerment - Society for Women’s Action and Training Initiatives (SWATI)</td>
<td>Bringing together diverse stakeholders including men to form a network that could combat VAW in five districts of Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender sensitization programmes for men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1 - Table A: Demonstrating the shift in programmatic approaches of engaging with men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches in Engagement of Men</th>
<th>Programmes/Campaigns</th>
<th>Objectives and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach 1:</strong> Engaging men and masculinities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Human Rights (CHR) - Savitribai Phule Mahila Mandal (SPMM)</td>
<td>Engaging men and illuminating the role of caste in shaping GBV and VAW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuppi Todi Hinsa Rako - MASVAW 2005</td>
<td>Data dissemination media campaign towards increasing awareness among men on GBV and domestic violence (DV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-level campaigns in BHU by Dr. Sanjay Singh</td>
<td>Sensitizing young men towards violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be that Boy and Bell Bajoo Campaign - Breakthrough</td>
<td>Mobilizing men to combat incidence of VAW and domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on engaging with men as partners in four districts of Gujarat - SWATI</td>
<td>Identifying the potential and limits of engaging with men as mere partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach 3:</strong> Engaging men and masculinities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling seminar on masculinities by Aakar supported by UNIFEM in 2002</td>
<td>Increasing public discourse on masculinities among young men and women in university spaces and thereby building knowledge towards better programming. Apart from this Aakar also involves in research on masculinities using film or visual/audio art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 days activism campaign onPWDVA by Forum to Engage Men 2008</td>
<td>Engaging with men and masculinities and creating awareness on its linkages with IPV and DV. Training and facilitating village level discussions on masculinities and incidence of violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmes/Campaigns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives and Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational intervention towards masculinities, migration and HIV-risk - SAHAYOG, CHSJ and MASVAW</td>
<td>Using situational analysis of the links between migration patterns, masculinities and HIV-related outcomes of risk, incidence and safety; designing interventions to measure HIV knowledge, threat perception and effect of attitudinal variables among men in Southern and Eastern UP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum on engaging with men and masculinities by understanding intersections with gender and sexuality</td>
<td>Devise a curriculum which could be run as a campaign to train volunteers on engaging with masculinities and men (released very recently)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing communication material for men, masculinities and risk-taking behavior in the context of HIV-AIDS - FEM in partnership with SAMYAK</td>
<td>Production, design and dissemination of newsletters and posters at regional, national and international forum to address the issues that link masculinities and unsafe sexual practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: FGD Guide

This survey tool is divided into several themes under which open-ended questions have been placed to facilitate focused discussions and understand how each theme relates to the constructions of masculinities. It is not necessary for the facilitator to ask each question. Rather, the questions are designed to facilitate and guide the discussion through the main points on the agenda, but without impeding the flow of conversations. The responses are also expected to be specific to age and location and hence must be evaluated keeping these factors in mind. Depending on the responses from the FGDs further insight can be made into select themes which emerge more strongly from the discussion along with adding more context.

Introduction (10 minutes)

Good morning everyone. I am ………… from the YP Foundation and I will be facilitating our discussion today. We are currently conducting a research study to better inform future programmes and interventions designed for young men. This discussion is planned to understand better the perceptions held by men of our age on few selected topics. Before we begin it would be great to introduce ourselves.

(Ice breaker)

Confidentiality: Please note that any information that you share here will be held in strictest confidence. Under no circumstances would your identity, and any information that you share here, be disclosed to a third party. From this instant the discussion is being audio recorded. If anyone has any objection against this now, or at any point in the discussion, they are free to raise it. The audio recording would be stopped in instances of such objections and hand-written notes would be taken for those intervals. This is strictly intended to be a safe space where the expression of all personal opinions and perceptions is desired and encouraged. You are free to speak, remain silent, or raise objections on any theme or topic that would be covered in the course of this discussion. I also appeal to you to maintain civility while expressing disagreements or discomfort. Respondents remain informed that harassment of any form against fellow discussants including threats, intimidations or aggression towards anyone, would be severely discouraged.

CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH ON ENGAGING WITH MEN AND MASCULINITIES

I agree to participate in the focus group discussion held on ……………… in the role of a discussant. I have had the objectives of the project as well as the group discussion explained to me.

I understand that any information I provide in the course of this discussion is confidential including my personal information, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports on the project, either by the YP Foundation or by any other party.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and informed, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the discussion, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the discussion without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I consent that my statements can be used in research and data analysis as well as reports and written outputs published during the course of this research, as long as my name and contact information is removed before it is passed on.

I consent to my statements being transcribed in real time and my audio being recorded during the group discussions for the purposes of transcription and research by the YP Foundation and its facilitators for this discussion.

Name:
Signature:
Date:
Venue:
SECTION 1: Gender, Caste and Religion (20 mins maximum)

This section contains questions which make probes on gender roles, gender performances, roles, responsibilities and social positions which affect how masculinities get constituted. Enquiries would be made on what masculine ideals are men socialised into, how these change as they age and, how masculinities other than the hegemonic ideal are constituted contextually.

(distribute copies of the scenario given below to the respondents and give them 5 minutes to read it. Guide the discussion on the scenario using the questions given below. Write down adjectives/qualities/roles/responsibilities/rights/duties used to describe and distinguish boys from girls on a board. These could be used to start discussions on following themes.)

**Scenario 1:** ‘X’ and ‘A’ are classmates belonging to opposite sexes. ‘X’ is very good in studies, especially Mathematics and Physics and also represents the school in inter-state basketballs tournaments. ‘X’ is the best basketball player in their batch and everyone believes that it is because of ‘X’’s tall frame that ‘X’ has an unfair advantage over others. ‘A’ is a gifted dancer and enjoys reading history and English literature. ‘A’ has never enjoyed playing sports and used to hate sports lessons in school. ‘A’ is a very shy person and does not talk to lot of people whereas ‘X’ is wildly popular in the class. In addition to this ‘A’’s father is the local MLA so everyone including teachers are a little wary of interacting with ‘A’. One day ‘X’ and ‘A’ have an argument where they get violent. ‘A’ slaps ‘X’ twice and ‘X’ starts crying. After the argument all the other classmates have become scared of ‘A’. Students now consider ‘A’ to be a bully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Who would be identified as a girl and who would be identified as a boy in our society, in this scenario? Why?</td>
<td>what are the noticeable differences between X and Y, is it difficult to decide who the girl is and who the boy is, which instances in the scenario are confusing, how would you decide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>In our society, is there any difference between being a man of our age and being a woman of our age?</td>
<td>What are the differences? What are the similarities? Should the differences exist? What are the advantages and disadvantages of these for them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>When was the first time you heard about mardaangi?</td>
<td>where did you hear it, who did you hear it, did you think differently about mardaangi when you were younger, where do you hear this term being used in our society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>What do you think is gender equality?</td>
<td>what it includes, does not include, where have they heard it before, who has spoken about it, what are the advantages and disadvantages of this for men of our age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Are men more violent than women in our society?</td>
<td>Why do men of our age act violently, how do young men behave when they are violent, who are young men generally violent towards and why, when are young men violent towards other young men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>What do you think about caste? Is it relevant in our society today?</td>
<td>When and where is it relevant and irrelevant, how is it relevant for young men, is it relevant in your city, discrimination faced by young men based on caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>How would our society react towards the relationship between the man and the woman in the clip? Why?</td>
<td>Have you ever faced a similar situation where you couldn’t make friends because of your caste identity, what would you do if you ever face such a situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Do young men of different castes behave differently?</td>
<td>What are the differences, what are the similarities, how is mardaangi different among young men of different castes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Is caste important to you? Should it be a part of our society?</td>
<td>How is it important to you, when did you realise this importance, has your perception about caste changed as you grew up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2: Friendships, Relationships and Romance (20 minutes maximum)

This section has been designed to explore the value of relationships such as friendships, love, marriage and infidelity and the different ways in which men engage in these relationships, the utility they derive from each of these and the purpose of these in their lives. Relationships have a bearing on the sense of self and these would be reflective of self-constituted as well as relational aspects of masculinities.

Tell the respondents that now we are going to discuss about friendships and relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>Do men of our age think it is important to have friends? Why/why not?</td>
<td>How do young men make friends, how many friends can men have, do young men treat all of them equally, how do you value friendships differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>What are the different names young men use for their friends?</td>
<td>What is the difference between yaar, dost, bhai, etc., when does a friend become a bhai, when does a friend stop being a friend, what triggers the loss of friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td>Have you ever heard this phrase, ek ladka aur ladki sirf dost nahi reh sakte? If yes, what do you think about this?</td>
<td>Can a man and woman be as good friends as two men or two women, is there a difference in the way young men behave with male friends and female friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tell the respondents that now we are going to discuss about friendships and relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.</td>
<td>Do young men think it is important to have a girlfriend/boyfriend? Why/why not?</td>
<td>What is the difference between how young men value friendships and romantic relationships, are they equally important, what is more important and when, is being in a relationship a status symbol?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.</td>
<td>What qualities do young men seek in a partner? Why these?</td>
<td>What are young men’s expectations from romantic relationships, how would they define a satisfactory relationship, are the expectations different for young women and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.</td>
<td>In our society do you think it is easy for young men to be in a romantic relationship with whoever they want?</td>
<td>What are the hindrances, who raises what objections to men being in romantic relationships, why do you think society reacts this way to young men being in romantic relationships, how is this different for young women?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section has been designed to probe into idioms of desire, erotic and masti and highlight the mechanisms through which these get integrated into performances of masculinities. Furthermore, enquiries would be made to understand how men value consent, sexual health, contraception and sex, what meanings do they attach to these in different relationships. Tell the respondents that we are now going to discuss about sex and what young men like us think about sex.

Tell the respondents that now we would be discussing a bit more on consent, contraception and risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>In our society when do young men start hearing about sex? When do they start talking about sex and with whom?</td>
<td>When and how do they understand what sex is, does the meaning of sex change as they age and how, common names through which young men talk about sex, with whom do they talk about sex and why, when is it comfortable and when is it uncomfortable for young men to talk about sex and why, what about sex do young men discuss in their peer groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>In our society do young men think it is important to have sexual relationships?</td>
<td>How important is it, when does it become more or less important and why, is it equally important for women, what do men think about women’s perceptions on sexual relationships, are there different perceptions among young men regarding sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.</td>
<td>When young men have sex with someone who all do they consider to be necessary and important?</td>
<td>Emotions, consent, contraception, risk attached to STIs, what all do they enjoy about sex and what all do they not enjoy and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.</td>
<td>If the above situation was read out in our society who would be considered the man and who would be considered the woman? Why?</td>
<td>Would ‘A’ be considered justified in fighting with ‘M’, who would be considered to be in the wrong and why, do young men value consent of their partners, do all men do this equally, who does and who doesn’t and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.</td>
<td>If you were in this situation would you have behaved differently? How and why?</td>
<td>Discussing with partners freely about likes and dislikes, how do they recognize consent, is consent always verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.</td>
<td>Do young men consider any sexual act to be risky? Why? / why not?</td>
<td>How is risk decided, how do they try to reduce the risk, do men engage in riskier sexual acts than women, what forms of contraception do young men use, when and why would men not use contraception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario 2: ‘A’ and ‘M’ are a couple. They have been dating for two years and have been waiting for their second anniversary to have sex. Both of them are equally excited about it and keep discussing their desires, likes and dislikes while planning for it. They talk and fantasize all the details about having sex. On the day of their anniversary, they go out for dinner and take a long walk on the banks of Gomti river before reaching A’s house who used to live alone. They enter A’s room which ‘A’ had decorated with flowers and candles as ‘M’ likes. They embraced each other and shared a kiss. As they continued ‘A’ started getting a bit aggressive which made ‘M’ uncomfortable who asked ‘A’ to stop. ‘A’ apologized and persuaded ‘M’ not to spoil their mood and started forcing on ‘M’ while they were discussing this. ‘M’ started getting very uncomfortable and sternly told ‘A’ to stop. At this point ‘A’ started fighting with ‘M’, saying that after discussing every detail about sex how can ‘M’ spoil the whole mood now and ask ‘A’ to stop abruptly.
SECTION 3: Sex, Sexuality and the Erotic
(20 minutes maximum)

Scenario 3: ‘T’ and ‘P’ have been very close friends since they were toddlers. They are neighbours and of the same age and their families are pretty close to each other as well. ‘T’ had a computer at his house where they used to play video games for hours. As they grew up conversations changed and both started discussing about the girls in their class, about sex, about their dicks, the bodily changes they are experiencing and even compared the few hairs that had started growing on their chest to see who gets more hair. They still used to play video games on T’s computer but one day ‘T’ told ‘P’ about this porn site he had found on the internet and persuaded him to check it out. They decided on a safe time where they could watch undisturbed and both landed up at T’s house at the decided day and time. As they scrolled through the porn site they were commenting about the videos, the women and even the men. They laughed and joked about the website and agreed that they both could watch porn at T’s house when there was no one at his house. They regularly started watching porn together and sometimes even imitated the video by dry humping each other and joking about each other’s’ penises and commenting on the bodies of both men and women in the video. They even started masturbating together on rare occasions.

SECTION 4: Technology
(20 minutes maximum)

This section has been designed to understand the impact of technology (television, personal computers, radio, smartphones and the internet) in the way masculinities are performed and realigned to newer meanings and expressions. Tell the respondents that now we would be discussing about technology.

Activity 2: Spread out a large chart paper on a board and ask them for responses on – what different technological devices do they use (like TV, radio, smartphones, laptops, personal computers, etc), for what purposes do they use which of these the most and where.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7.</td>
<td>Is the above situation common in our society? How do you think society would react to this situation?</td>
<td>What is ordinary or extra-ordinary about this scenario, sharing of feelings, sexual desires and sexual tastes among men, can we imagine two women in this scenario in our society and why, would they label this as homosexuality, how would young men talk about this scenario?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.</td>
<td>Is there anything erotic in the above situation? Why/why not?</td>
<td>Would it be erotic if one of them was a girl, what is erotic, how do young men express erotic feelings and where</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.</td>
<td>In our society do young men watch TV a lot? What do we watch on TV? When do we watch TV?</td>
<td>What did we watch when we were young, is there a difference between what young men watch and what young women watch, what do we watch when we watch TV alone, what do we feel about content on TV, what is liked/disliked and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.</td>
<td>In our society do young men watch movies a lot? What kinds of movies do young men in your city watch?</td>
<td>How do young men decide what movie to watch and what not to watch, what is the best part about movies and what is the worst, who is the favourite hero and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.</td>
<td>Do young men use their phones a lot? What do they do on phones?</td>
<td>How is using smartphones different from using regular phones for men, what apps they use on phone, why do young men use passwords and how important are passwords, when are they comfortable with not having a password, what do they think about internet and its importance, what all is internet used for, what is internet not used for and why, does internet usage change as young men grow older, is there a difference between how young men and young women use internet, what will you do if a lot of websites are blocked by the government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4.</td>
<td>Do young men watch a lot of porn? Why?</td>
<td>Where do they watch porn and what are the sources, what do they like about porn and what do they not like, is porn different from real sex and how, how is privacy ensured while watching porn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.</td>
<td>Do young men use Facebook a lot? When do young men start using it and why?</td>
<td>What do they like about Facebook and what do they not like, who are their friends and are their more male friends, how do they decide who's friend request to accept/reject, is there a difference between the profiles of young men and young women, what do profile pictures and status mean to young men, when and why do men update statuses and profile pictures, how does facebook affect friendships and relationships among young men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.</td>
<td>Do young men use whatsapp a lot? When and why do young men use whatsapp?</td>
<td>How does whatsapp affect friendships and relationships, is it easier to express on these apps, how do men chat with men and women, do men have all male groups, what are these whatsapp groups used for and what kind of content is shared here, what is most important about whatsapp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tell the respondents that we have finished the discussion with this section an apologize for taking so much of their time. Thank everyone for participating in the discussion and sharing all their perceptions and ideas. Ask if anyone has any questions from the organization or about the project. Invite everyone for tea or refreshments if provided.

### Appendix 3: Interview Guide

#### General Information
*(to be filled in by the interviewer)*

This section is designed to survey the information regarding personal and social variables including age, religion, caste, occupational status, and income. This information would help in contextualizing the data and the personal histories of the respondents further.

1.1. Name:

1.2. Age:

1.3. Religion:
   a. Hinduism
   b. Islam
   c. Christianity
   d. Buddhism
   e. Jainism
   f. Sikhism
   g. Others, please specify

1.4. Caste Status:
   a. General Category
   b. Other Backward Castes (OBC)
   c. Scheduled Castes
   d. Scheduled Tribes
   e. Dalit / Bahujan
   f. Other
   g. Does not wish to disclose

1.5. Whether married? (Yes/No)

1.6. Do you have children? If yes, how many? (Yes/No)

1.7. What is your current educational status?
   a. Did not complete higher secondary
   b. Completed higher secondary
   c. Pursuing undergraduate programme
   d. Did not complete under-graduate programme
   e. Completed under-graduate programme
   f. Pursuing post-graduate programme
   g. Did not complete post-graduate programme
   h. Completed post-graduation

1.8. Have you worked in past one week?  
   a. yes  
   b. no

1.9. Have you worked at all in the past six months?
   a. yes  
   b. no
1.10. How are you currently employed as? (If yes for the above question):
   a. Permanent Employee
   b. Self-employed / Own business / Entrepreneur / Own Account Worker
   c. Unemployed / Currently looking for work
   d. Temporary employee / Contractual employee
   e. Unpaid Family Work

1.11. How much income do you make from your primary source of employment? (If yes for the above question):
   a. Less than Rs. 1,00,000 per annum
   b. Rs.1,00,000 to Rs.3,00,000 per annum
   c. Rs. 3,00,000 to Rs. 5,00,000 per annum
   d. Rs. 5,00,000 to Rs. 10,00,000 per annum
   e. More than Rs. 10,00,000 per annum

1.12. How satisfied are you with your work?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Moderately satisfied
   c. Dissatisfied
   d. Very Dissatisfied
   e. Indifferent

Family and Background
This section is designed to collect information on the educational and occupational background of the respondent. The conditions, both spatial and social, under which respondents acquire varying educational and occupational statuses have a direct impact on their notions of self, of others and of their aspirations and desires for (im)mobility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>Where were you born and where did you grow up?</td>
<td>Migration history, places lived, worked and studied, reasons and motivations for moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>Who do you currently live with? Can you tell me about your family?</td>
<td>Members of the family, level of closeness to family members, roles and responsibilities in the household, sibling relationships according to age and gender, fights within the family and authority over household, pressures and negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td>Who makes important decisions in your household? What decisions are you involved in?</td>
<td>Intra-household hierarchies, gender differences in roles and responsibilities, fights and negotiations within the household, how are conflicts resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.</td>
<td>If yes to 1.5; How did you get married? How have your roles and responsibilities in the family changed since?</td>
<td>How did you meet your wife, how long since married, choice in age of marriage and in partner, did caste status affect prospects for marriage, experience of being married, conflicts and support to wife, marital fights and issues, violence and reconciliation processes, why are men violent with their partners, relationship with partner’s family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S.No. | Questions/Discussion Points | Probes
--- | --- | ---

2.5. | If yes to 1.6; What do you want your children to become when they are your age? Why so? If no to 1.6; Do you think your life will change significantly after having kids? By what age do you imagine yourself as a parent? | What can be hindrances for them, whom do they look up to most, how is your relationships with your kids, do you have different aspirations with different children

2.6. | What do you think about caste? Has it impacted your life? | Generational differences within family regarding caste, how important is it for you, discrimination based on caste; effect on friendships, relationships, education and work options, caste-based violence, how do you deal with implications of caste such as discrimination or inequality, opinions about people of other castes

2.7. | What do you think about religion? Has it impacted your life? | Generational differences within family regarding religion, how important is it for you, discrimination based on religion; effect on friendships, relationships, education and work options, religion-based violence, how do you deal with implications of religion such as discrimination or inequality, opinions about people of other religions, religious associations and memberships, practice of religion

---

### Education and Work

This section is designed to collect information on the educational and occupational background of the respondent. The conditions, both spatial and social, under which respondents acquire varying educational and occupational statuses have a direct impact on their notions of self, of others and of their aspirations and desires for (im)mobility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>When did you discontinue your education and why?</td>
<td>Factors that influenced discontinuation of education, would you be willing to continue education if given a chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>How important is education for young men of our age? How important is it for you?</td>
<td>what are the advantages and disadvantages of your educational status, what would you like to change about your schooling experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.</td>
<td>Did you experience bullying or violence of any kind in school/college? If yes, who were the perpetrators? What did you do?</td>
<td>Do men engage in more violence in schools and colleges and why, common issues over which young men fight, how do young men deal with violence or bullying, was there anything particular about young men which makes them more susceptible to violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.</td>
<td>In educational spaces, including schools and colleges, what kinds of pressures (apart from studies) do students have to deal with?</td>
<td>Are the pressures different for young men and young women, what were the pressures for you personally, how did you deal with this, who helped you and who didn’t, how do these pressures change as you age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.</td>
<td>Is it difficult for young men to find employment these days?</td>
<td>Aspirations for jobs, factors which influence success in getting employed, discriminations and problems in searching for jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consumption Behaviour

This section is designed to collect information on the consumption habits and sites of respondents where masculinities are articulated and get constituted. Consumption is intricately linked to the articulations of class (among other variables) and more specifically, middle-class in the Southern societies. These links and connections further contextualize masculinities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>If yes for 1.8 or 1.9,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is this your first employment? If yes, do you like working here? If no, where did you work before this?</td>
<td>Reasons for leaving previous employment, reasons for taking up the present job, expectations from work, what factors could influence you moving out of this job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Could you tell me a bit about your work and workplace?</td>
<td>Income, work benefits, security, harassment, workplace hierarchies, relationship with employers/supervisors, relationship with those ranking lower in work hierarchy, relationship with female colleagues and female supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Are male and female employees treated differently in your workplace? If yes, how?</td>
<td>Ask about facilities for women, working hours, attitudes of supervisors towards women, which positions do they generally hold, attitudes regarding the work that women do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>What was the first thing you bought from your salary or savings? Have you been wanting this for a long time?</td>
<td>Aspirations for products or services, products regularly spent on, where and when did you grow aspirations for these products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Do you think men and women spend on different things? If yes, what are the things that you spend on?</td>
<td>What all do you currently spend on including beauty products and clothes, brand preferences, specific areas and times for shopping, what things would you like to spend more on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Do you see any difference in the way your parents spend money on things and the way in which you spend money? If yes, what are these differences?</td>
<td>What do the parents want to spend on, are their fights regarding your spending behaviour, who fights the most and how do you deal with this, how important are savings for you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Friendships and Relationships

This section has been designed to explore the value of relationships such as friendships, love, marriage and infidelity and the different ways in which men engage in these relationships, the utility they derive from each of these and the purpose of these in their lives. Relationships have a bearing on the sense of self and these would be reflective of self-constituted as well as relational aspects of masculinities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.</td>
<td>How important are friends in your life? What roles do they play in your life?</td>
<td>How many friends, differences between friends and the names you call them, where did you meet your best friends, how do you decide whom to be friends with, who are the closest friends and how are they different from others, ways and spaces of making friends such as school/college/ neighbourhood/workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.</td>
<td>Do you have both male and female friends? Is the relationship with a female friend different?</td>
<td>Things discussed with male friends vs. female friends, spaces occupied with friends, where do they hang out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.</td>
<td>What are the things that you generally discuss with your friends? What do you not reveal even to your closest friends?</td>
<td>secrets, borders of friendship, comfort and discomfort in friendships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.</td>
<td>When do you get angry with your friends? Can you reveal some instances? How do you reconcile fights with friends?</td>
<td>Factors influencing loss of friendship, fights between male friends and fights with female friends, respect in friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.</td>
<td>Do you have a girlfriend/boyfriend? Why/why not?</td>
<td>How did you meet your partner and how did you start dating, previous relationships, importance of relationships, ideal partner and qualities that you seek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.</td>
<td>What is the difference between a “friend” and a “girlfriend/boyfriend/partner”? Are these equally important relationships?</td>
<td>Importance of friendships and romantic relationships, how do friends react to partners, has your relationship affected your friends’ circle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.</td>
<td>What expectations do you have from romantic relationships? Do you think women have different expectations from relationships than men?</td>
<td>What does romance mean to you, romance in public spaces, different ways of being romantic, learning how to be romantic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sex and Sexuality**

This section has been designed to probe into idioms of desire, erotic and masti and highlight the mechanisms through which these get integrated into performances of masculinities. Furthermore, enquiries would be made to understand how men value consent, sexual health, contraception and sex, what meanings do they attach to these in different relationships. Ask the respondents first if they are comfortable discussing sexual roles and preferences. If yes then continue with this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>When was the first time you heard about sex and from whom?</td>
<td>Conversations young men have about sex, sources of information, ways in which young men talk about sex including jokes, code words, etc., what all do you talk about sex, comfort in talking about sex and discomfort, changes in understanding sex with age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Do you think sexual relationships are important? Why/why not?</td>
<td>What do you like about sex, prerequisites for having sex, role of emotions, differences in perception between men and women regarding sex, importance of consent, signs of consent including verbal and physical, and free discussion of acts and preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>What do you think is safe sex? How do you ensure safety during sex?</td>
<td>Contraceptives – forms, reasons for using and not using contraception, instances and frequency of unsafe sex and why, other risks associated to sex, women’s perceptions regarding contraception, information regarding sex and sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Have you ever had a sexual encounter with a person outside of your sexual preference?</td>
<td>Instances, perceptions and how they interpret it, how did it make you feel when it happened, laundebaazi, spaces where young men engage in sexual or erotic behaviour among themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact of Technology**

This section has been designed to understand the impact of technology (television, personal computers, radio, smartphones and the internet) in the way masculinities are performed and realigned to newer meanings and expressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Questions/Discussion Points</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Do you watch TV a lot? What do you watch on TV? When do you watch TV?</td>
<td>What did we watch when we were young, is there a difference between what young men watch and what young women watch, what do we watch when we watch TV alone, what do we feel about content on TV, what is liked/disliked and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Do you watch a lot of movies? What kinds of movies do young men in your city watch?</td>
<td>How do young men decide what movie to watch and what not to watch, what is the best part about movies and what is the worst, who is the favourite hero and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Do you use your phone a lot? What do you do on phones?</td>
<td>How is using smartphones different from using regular phones for men, what apps they use on phone, why do young men use passwords and how important are passwords, when are they comfortable with not having a password, what do they think about internet and its importance, what all is internet used for, what is internet not used for and why, does internet usage change as young men grow older, is there a difference between how young men and young women use internet, what will you do if a lot of websites are blocked by the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Do you watch a lot of porn? Why?</td>
<td>Where do they watch porn and what are the sources, what do they like about porn and what do they not like, is porn different from real sex and how, how is privacy ensured while watching porn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S.No. | Questions/Discussion Points | Probes
--- | --- | ---
7.5 | Do you use Facebook a lot? When did you start using it and why? | What do they like about Facebook and what do they not like, who are their friends and are there more male friends, how do they decide whose friend request to accept/reject, experiences of stalking and being stalked online, is there a difference between the profiles of young men and young women, what do profile pictures and status mean to young men, when and why do men update statuses and profile pictures, how does Facebook affect friendships and relationships among young men

7.6 | Do you use whatsapp a lot? When and why do you use whatsapp? | How does whatsapp affect friendships and relationships, is it easier to express on these apps, how do men chat with men and women, do men have all male groups, what are these whatsapp groups used for and what kind of content is shared here, what is most important about whatsapp

7.7 | How valuable is privacy to you when you are online? How is it ensured? | Trade-offs with privacy, ways of ensuring some privacy, when does privacy become unimportant, whose presence demands more privacy, is it equally valuable for boys and girls

---

### Relationship with the City

This section has been designed to understand the relationship of respondents to spaces and the way these spaces are mobilized and in turn co-constituted alongside masculinities. More specifically, this section is an attempt to understand the relationship men have with public space.

| S.No. | Questions/Discussion Points | Probes |
--- | --- | --- |
8.1 | Do you like the city that you currently live in? Why/ why not? | Comparisons with other places of residence, reasons which may motivate migration to other places, aspirational places, problems with the neighbourhood where you currently reside

8.2 | How well do you know this city? Do you explore a lot of places? Why/ why not? | Freedom to move around, transport, spaces for hanging out with friends or partners, spaces for leisure, spaces which young men demand

8.3 | Have you ever felt unsafe anywhere in this city? | What makes you feel unsafe, how would you want to improve on the safety conditions, is the city equally unsafe for boys and girls
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