Gender and Economic Policy Discussion Forum

Shifting Masculinities in contemporary India and everyday implications on gender inequalities

This online forum was organised to offer critical reflections on the shifting masculinities within contemporary India and its everyday implications on gender inequalities and gendered marginalisations. The rising 'toxic masculinity' and the 'crisis of hegemonic, patriarchal masculinity' in contemporary times has made debates around gender, masculinity and power ever more pressing. Masculinity refers to the socially produced but embodied ways of being male, with manifestations including but not limited to manners of speech, behaviour, gestures, social interaction and division of tasks 'proper' to men and women (Srivastava, 2012). Scholars have documented the unease men are having in recent years as they adjust to the changing geographies within which their masculinity is based (Dasgupta and Gokulsing, 2013). As Dasgupta and Gokulsing have pointed out, Indian men who grew up around the turn of the 20th century have grown up seeing a particular form of patriarchal masculinity which is being challenged in contemporary times. Dominant masculine characteristics such as maintaining a family and earning wages are now being taken over by many women, which has led to confusion about the nature of masculine performance itself (ibid). Masculinity is being thought to be in a period of flux, with the very definition of what a man is and how he is to behave being uncertain. Men are responding by often displaying aggressiveness and sexual domination as a form of masculinity, not just to prove their masculinity but to also stamp their superiority over the other gender. In particular, as the pandemic raged on, there has been an alarming upsurge of the 'shadow pandemic' of violence against women. In this context, it becomes imperative that gender-based violence and gender justice be informed through an understanding of masculinity and its consequences for women as well as men.

More specifically, we aimed to explore how men and masculinities are adapting, struggling and transforming in these changing times. What are the key norms around masculinity that are resistant to change and result in backlash, confusion, and struggle? What are the ways men and boys challenge power dynamics in their own lives as well as in their communities and societies? What are the realities of engaging men and how does the concept of hegemonic masculinity inform practical and on-the-ground work by those who try to change men's behaviour to build gender equity? What could be the non-dominant models of masculinity that represent gender equity in pro-feminist ways? And finally, how could we move towards achieving transformative masculinities and promoting gender justice in a post-pandemic world? The speakers for this discussion were Prof Radhika Chopra (formerly Professor of Sociology, University of Delhi, Delhi), Renuka Motihar (independent consultant, Delhi) and Manak Matiyani (queer activist and Executive Director of The YP Foundation, New Delhi). The forum was chaired by Dr Ravi Verma (Regional Director, International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW), Asia Regional Office, New Delhi).

Contextualising the Discussion

Dr Verma stressed the growing ambivalence and cited some of the findings of research conducted by him and his colleagues at ICRW on gender and masculinity. He highlighted four key ideas that are deeply embedded in the Indian psyche of masculinity: a) one of the key markers of masculinity and masculinisation is a strong preference for sons which is reflected in the transfer of lineage and inheritance, and also shows up in health-related parameters; b) men's dominance in decision making and sexual reproductive choices; c) financial dominance and gendered norms regarding the male provider role; and d) belief that women's primary role is homemaking despite their increasing education and employment (Achyut et al., 2016; Barker et al., 2011;Cislaghi et al., 2019; Verma et al., 2006).

He noted that although a large number of men hold views in support of women's education and women's employment, a disproportionately large number of men in India (though there is a lot of variation within India across communities) held the view that the primary role of women is homemaking. Moreover, they believe that when it comes to making a choice, women must give up their jobs to look after their homes, even if they are qualified professionals. He elaborated that during the pandemic as well, women were the ones who were pushed to the care-giving roles, even when they are employed and had to give up their paid work. He also noted the masculinisation of domestic spaces during the pandemic when men started spending longer periods in the homes. Many men may feel depressed and turn violent when they fail to perform the gender-expected role of being a provider and being in a prominent financial decision-making position within the household. Another reflection of this growing ambivalence, as noted by Dr Verma, has been the marked rise in cases of domestic violence and expressions of masculinity during the pandemic, which he recommended needs to be understood and built into programmes.

Referring to a nationwide study conducted by ICRW, Dr Verma added that they found about 30 per cent of the men who were studied were highly rigid in terms of their attitudes and norms, whereas about 70 per cent were on the other side of the spectrum and believed in equality and practiced more equitable behaviour. More importantly, within that 70 per cent, about 30 to 40 per cent is constantly negotiating their space (Barker et al., 2011). The lived reality of men is a crucial factor in shaping their ideas and attitudes, noted Dr Verma. So, if while growing up, men have experienced, lived through or seen violence, they tend to normalise violence to an extent that they don't even recognise it when they do it. Further, sometimes men associate going through a tough experience with being strong and hence they may feel that everyone should go through it to become strong. Men may think of this as a necessary skill for survival, which may explain why sometimes men who go through a lot of violence in childhood end up supporting violence later.

Dr Verma also suggested that masculinities are produced in different settings and men in households, men within their own friends' groups and men in the workplace express different kinds of masculinities because these are determined by the context within which they live. It's a vicious cycle, where ideas are produced, reproduced and get reinforced; Dr Verma noted that it appears that there is much more hardening of these attitudes at one level. He questioned whether this is a recent phenomenon or it has always been that way. Was masculinity always in crisis and behaving like this, or was it always a situation where men and the ideas around patriarchy and power always found a way in which they pushed back any attempt that tried to bring about fundamental change in these equations? So, is there is a limit to which the changes are accepted, tolerated or accommodated beyond which there is pushback?

Gender, Space and Care Work

The idea of men being a homogenous group of oppressors, however, is being increasingly challenged and there is growing recognition of the different forms of masculinities and plurality of masculinity. Nevertheless, dominant forms of masculinity are privileged over those ways of being male that are seen to deviate from the ideal. Masculinity is, thus, often a "precarious state" demanding constant corroborations through gender-conforming performances (Bosson and Vandello, 2011) and which can be easily threatened by signs of femininity such as taking up household work. For example, during the nationwide lockdown, men participating in the clearly demarcated feminine trope of domestic work attracted lockdown memes and humour as it was seen to violate gender norms and jeopardise the possibility to be respected as a "real" man (Chaudhuri 2021).

The performance of unpaid domestic and care work has been popularly constructed and theorised in the literature as pertaining to women and to describe the kind of work that women do in the household, as noted by Prof Chopra. Gender and space are quite clearly demarcated in such an understanding where home becomes the area of unpaid care work and women become the care givers of children and older persons. However, Prof Chopra reminded us that even in the pre-pandemic period, men did forms of care work or work that could be considered as care work. Such care work was often outward oriented, which catered to household requirements such as fetching and carrying, but not wiping bottoms. While both forms of gendered work are executed to keep the household and society functioning, she noted that only one is recognised as care work because of the strong association we have of women and care.

Manak Matiyani elaborated on some of the nuanced ideas around spaces and where masculinity gets embedded in the household space. The home as a space is considered more feminine as opposed to outside the home. But even within the home, there are certain spaces and certain tasks that are considered masculine; for instance, going into the kitchen to move heavy things was considered masculine. However, doing labour in the kitchen or performing domestic work in the kitchen was certainly not considered to be masculine. Likewise, Renuka Motihar observed that there were unsaid rules on what boys could and couldn't do. Drawing from her experience in working with boys and young men, she recounted that a young man had shared how he enjoyed cooking but his family frowned upon this since the kitchen was considered a very feminine space and by association cooking was unacceptable behaviour for men. He had to rationalise his choice to learn cooking as a means to survive once he began to live alone for higher studies and work.

Motihar described another interaction with young married men in rural Maharashtra who shared how there was opposition from within the family when they started doing household work and helping their wives. One man shared that the main opposition came from his parents, especially his mother, who felt that if he performed housework, he would become his wife's slave; her fear was that her son would leave his parents and not listen to them. Motihar also juxtaposed the feminine space of the kitchen with the very masculine spaces of the *akhara*, which is a traditional wrestling space for body-building and male camaraderie, to highlight the rigid construct of male identity that boys and young men feel a strong need to conform to and there is a strong perception of what is acceptable and what is not acceptable behaviour for boys and men.

Pandemic forms of unpaid care work

Taking forward the discussion on men's unpaid care work, Prof Chopra drew attention to the unacknowledged pandemic forms of care work performed by men. She reasoned that the pandemic has brought into sharp focus forms of care work men performed for vulnerable, sick and older persons. During the extreme shortage of oxygen in the second wave in India, many men were seen rushing and ferrying oxygen cylinders from one place to another, standing in queues and anxiously waiting for supplies. Notably, getting critical resources for the household has devolved upon men partly as a carryover from their outward circuits of fetching and carrying that they always did into the pandemic moment.

Prof Chopra added that the second wave of COVID in India also revealed that men took on the role of fathering for particular families where they are not necessarily biological fathers. A range of men came to play the role of father and even think of themselves as care givers. Her own research has shown that fathering is not the sole responsibility of a single person, in South Asia in particular; fathering is an activity or a role or a process that is undertaken by a range of different men. Yet, there has been a muting of the figure of the nurturing father within the gendered discourse of childcare and are fusal to acknowledge any form of feminine nurturing practice in an attempt to maintain the boundaries of a male-gendered self (Chopra, 2001, 2003). So, she called for the need to track such practices and examine what such practices meant to those men, particularly in the context of the lack of recognition of men's unpaid care work.

Intersectional Perspective on Masculinities

Masculinity is a relationship not only between men and women but also between men and men. Dominant masculinity that systematically subjugates women also subjugates men who do not conform to the class, caste, religious and sexual subjectivity of the mainstream. Hence, some masculinities are more privileged than others, while others such as Dalit, Muslim, homosexual and queer identities are marginalised. Therefore, masculinity cannot be fully understood without acknowledging this intersectionality and variables such as class, caste, religion, sexuality, disability, age, nationality and identity need to be explored at the intersection of policy and politics.

Caste and class hierarchies in care work

Within the realm of gender, the focus often remains on power hierarchies between men and women, while the multiple hierarchies among men does not always get addressed. Prof Chopra's analysis of the unpaid care work performed by men in non-domestic work spaces like organisations revealed the criticality of caste hierarchies in the mapping of the unpaid care work of men. The literature shows that within organisations in India, power rests not only with men but primarily with upper-caste men, and those lower in the organisational hierarchy are most likely to be from the lower caste. She commented that class, caste

and power combine here very closely, and office boys and cleaners who are unlikely to be high-caste men are the ones expected to perform forms of unpaid care work in the organisational spaces. For instance, they are expected to not just make tea, but also serve tea to their seniors.   Similarly, cleaners fetch and carry household supplies for senior functionaries.

Further, Prof Chopra illustrated how the pandemic has introduced its own dimensions of unpaid care work in organisations, with class becoming entangled with safety and mobility. The pandemic has seen an expansion if not a boom in the platform economy, and digital economies have spawned platform care service givers and gig workers in an almost unprecedented way. In South Asian cities, large numbers of young male migrants—the sent-away boys of underprivileged rural households—are employed in different sectors of this platform economy. The expansion and proliferation of the platform economy has been accompanied by a hyperactive demand for safety and the observance of safety protocols. She commented that often the safety protocols are a selling point promoted by companies—"We Care" slogan. However, who is expected to do the work of caring for safety? It is the platform economy worker who is masked up for sometimes 14 hours a day as a food delivery server or as an Uber cab driver. It is the body of the mobile worker that has become the most carefully recorded for signs of wellness and unwellness and in fact is offered as part of the way in which the "We care" slogan is supported by companies. She acknowledged that the existing paradigms of work might not recognise these protective protocols as care work. Nonetheless, the workers are expected to perform and "to care" as a safety protocol and the "We care" slogan is being carried by the bodies of a set of people who have not been tracked. She calls for these pandemic forms of unpaid care work and its unacknowledged, unaccounted nature to be thought about more seriously.

Digital access, social media and caste

Manak Matiyani shared insights from the YP Foundation's research with young men about the construction and expression of masculinities in Uttar Pradesh. One of his observations was the impact of social media on masculinities, and how access to information-based messages coming from WhatsApp and Facebook was seen to put the young men in a position of power as they get to regulate or control access to information in the family. Being in control and being in the "cool" guy

position in one's own group became very important to the men in that study. Matiyani highlighted that digital access had become the new frontier of masculinity and had become a very important part of how young men expressed their masculinity.

Further, he warned that WhatsApp, Facebook and other social media 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. The bombardment of daily messages, even the daily good morning/ evening messages, have a tinge of caste identity in them. Matiyani argued that caste has become a huge influencer that goes into constructing masculinity and how young men think of themselves as they are growing up. Caste consciousness takes form, particularly in the shift from school to college when they are bombarded with messages around caste-based grouping, and this has become a hallmark of young men's social media experience.

Matiyani highlighted the inextricable link between caste, gender and sexuality as was articulated across the hierarchy of masculinities. For instance, there are different stereotypes around men who are gay or more effeminate based on their caste; also, there are different stereotypes around the body based on the caste. He added that the particular narratives of caste and sexuality became very important for men in shaping their own experiences and also turned into notions about what will and will not be considered "cool". So, a young gay belonging to the Rajput community will have to continuously watch out for the stereotypes around being gay that are coming from the Rajput caste. There are, thus, caste-based norms that influence men's bodies; certain castes (like Thakurs, Pathans and Jaats) emphasize physique, style of walking, etc. (The YP Foundation, 2019).

Religion and nationalism

The current wave of nationalism in India, modelled around the superiority of the Hindu upper-caste male, is seen to have a major impact on the construction of masculinities among young men (The YP Foundation, 2019). Matiyani stressed that it is about the positioning of the country as consisting of one particular kind of Hindu nationalism and Hindu masculinity. Within this model, he noted that based on their research certain masculinities, such as those of Muslim men or Dalit Bahujan men, are characterised as threats to the nation and therefore threats to the ideal

Hindu man who embodies the sovereignty and authority of this nation. During the pandemic, even men going into the community to provide relief were not trusted enough to be let in based on their religion and caste because there were certain stereotypes around who is bringing in COVID. Moreover, social media has become a major tool for the promotion of ideas that vilify certain men and masculinities as threats to the nation or, most violently, as "anti-nationals"(The YP Foundation, 2019).

While examining these nuances, Matiyani argued that friction between men was the defining experience of masculinity, entitlement and power. A lot of masculinity got constructed and a lot of violence was experienced in the interaction between men and men, and not so much in the interaction between men and women. While there was a huge trope of gender-based violence, the perception around gender-based violence was found to be enmeshed with the idea of community and men upholding their community values. For instance, conversations with young men and boys around violence between men and women revealed narratives like Hindu men beat their wives, but among Muslims it is "haram", whereby the young men wanted to position the other community as the perpetrators of domestic violence.

Masculinity, Entitlement and Sexuality

Friendships were all-important among young men, but interestingly there were no friends that you could vent to about your sexual issues, no conversation of that nature happened between men, noted Matiyani. The only conversation perhaps that did happen between men and groups of friends was around a whole lot of sexual stereo typing; it became moments of not just expressing your lack of understanding of women but also your frustration with all your insecurity around having sexual relationships. In an interaction with college-going young men in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, Renuka Motihar found that the young men had minimal interaction with girls and didn't have opportunities or spaces for interaction with girls. In turn, they didn't particularly understand what girls said or meant and didn't even know how to talk to them. There was a strong belief among them that when girls said no, they actually meant yes, which reflected the absence of an understanding of consent.

Manak Matiyani shared that in romance there is a very strong trope of betrayal where if the girl doesn't want to be with the young man, it was perceived as betrayal. If the girl chooses to say no or leave a relationship, it was not perceived as rejection but as a betrayal. A sense of entitlement, that a girl is betraying by saying no, was very strong in the minds of young men, and Manak called for more thought on how to work with men on consent and relationships, and violence in relationships. Moreover, sexuality and expression of sexuality were stereotyped—men have to be dominant, the person who is in charge. There are a lot of misconceptions around women's sexuality and no space to clear those misconceptions. Matiyani elaborated how a lot of it was about small talk and no action; in fact, a lot of men who were talking the most about women's sexuality, like women start having fun after one hour and men are done in 20 minutes, were the ones who had the least sexual experience. There was a lot of pressure and performance anxiety, and sexual stereotypes of men that men have to live up to form conversations between men in friends' groups.

Men as allies and part of the solution

Over the past few decades, there has been a growing interest in engaging men and boys to ensure their role in realising gender equality. In particular, the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo (1994) and later the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing (1995) marked turning points in the manner in which men and masculinities were conceived and placed within the discourse of women's empowerment and gender equality (Nanda et al., 2014). Previously, men and boys were often seen as part of the problem and obstacles to women's struggle for equality; they were rarely identified as an essential part of the solution and allies in the movement. Policies and programmes are being increasingly geared towards bringing men into a shared vision of gender equality and transforming prevalent notions of masculinities to achieve gender justice.

Renuka Motihar shared learnings from early years of her career when she managed a pioneering adolescent girl's programme in different states of India. The programme, new and unique at that time, emphasized adolescent girls' empowerment and giving them better life options. Through the interactions and engagements with the young women, the common refrain was "You have changed my life. Now please change the thinking

of my future husband". We would be surprised to hear this, but it would come to us again and again. In another programme for girls' education in the urban slums of Mumbai, the implementation team discovered that the brothers were extremely watchful and critical of their sisters, while the older men in the family were busy earning a living. The notion was that if the teenage brother cannot control his sister, then his masculinity was questioned. The realisation from the programme was that working with girls alone is not enough to effectively challenge and change gender inequalities, it was crucial to get boys and men involved and make them allies. Motihar noted that an important learning was that just empowering the girl and the young woman was not enough; one needed to change the ecosystem around the girl – brothers, fathers, families and future partners.

On the other hand, Dr Verma drew attention to the ambivalence and pushbacks to programmes and commented that a large number of men believe that it is a zero-sum game for them, since they may believe that if women get rights and more choices, then it is men who stand to lose. He added that ICRW surveys and subsequent studies have shown that men feel women have made a lot gains from women's empowerment programmes and policies, which makes men resentful. A number of programmes on gender transformation have taught us one thing the hard way: in a lot of these programmes men and boys do show a change in their attitudes and they demonstrate equity and equitable behaviours but they feel resentment and they don't sustain that behaviour change. Standard interventions have shown that men say that they won't commit violence but when their peers are committing violence or they witness any harassment, they don't intervene. Due to peer pressure, they may continue to align with their peers.

Recommendations

Renuka Motihar noted that the dominant strategies used by organisations that work with boys and men in India are gender-accommodating or gender-transformative strategies to change the attitudes of men and boys around gender equity. She elaborated that programmes that used accommodating strategies typically engaged men in their roles as husbands, partners and community members. On the other hand, gender-transformative programmes mainly used social and behavioural change communication strategies to

target husbands and young men, encouraging them to reflect on and question established masculine behaviour, traditional gender and social norms, and roles and relationships that may have adverse effects (Motihar, 2017).The discussion brought forward the following key recommendations and strategies that could guide programme development.

Need to track non-violent and supportive practices of men

Prof Chopra lamented the fact that in studies about masculinity, nobody tracks care and what is being tracked is only violence. She urged us to break the silence around male non-violent practices, such as the care giving and supportive practices of men that are highly neglected. She cautioned that we may not be able to do exciting and meaningful interventions unless we also track the supportive practices of men and have those narratives out there. By bringing attention to the pandemic forms of care work and the pandemic forms of unpaid care work, she called for greater recognition of the interlocking of care with risk and safety.

Need for shift in terms of engagement of boys and men in programmes

Many programmes that engage men and boys do so with the aim of preventing violence against women. Renuka Motihar commented that it is not enough for programmes that engage men and boys to do so only through the lens of their impact on girls and women as perpetrators or as allies and supporters. Practitioners should be careful that including men and boys does not mean positioning them as 'saviours' or 'protectors' of women and girls. To make India truly gender-equitable, the need is for developing programmes that understand and challenge the traditional idea of masculinity and initiate reflection and questioning.

Start interventions early, with multifaceted programmes and strategies to engage men

Renuka Motihar observed that there is a continued need for programme interventions to catch men young, make them gender sensitive and challenge established norms, build their capacities and assist them in becoming active participants in their own development. There are also challenges of access to and sustained availability of young men because they are highly mobile and parallelly engaged in education, skill-building and livelihood. To avoid the high dropout in programmes, interventions should include a component of activities such as sports or skill building along with gender sensitisation.

Incorporate the lens of intersectionality and build in the centrality of caste

Manak Matiyani advocated building in the centrality of caste in programmes that seek to intervene on issues around livelihood, gender and sexuality. He noted that addressing the intersectional experiences of men was beyond simply recognising different identities. Intersectional programmes need to strive towards holding men accountable for the privileges they have and the violence they then are able to perpetrate with impunity, while simultaneously acknowledging the kinds of pressures and vulnerabilities that they face.

Shift from teaching consent to building men's ability to deal with rejection

Manak Matiyani called for making conversations about consent and relationships more relatable to men, noting that the "no means no" approach of teaching consent to men was not working. There was no space in programmes to talk about rejection, to talk about how they feel when rejected and about their experience of betrayal. He emphasized the need to open those spaces to young men to acknowledge their experiences, emotions and process, and deal with rejection.

Enhance organisational ability to address multiple needs and issues

Manak Matiyani noted that programming in the pandemic required adaptations because there were a lot of challenges in ensuring engagement, and even more so in gender programming. There was a need to enhance organisational capacities to address multiple needs and promote expertise on diverse thematic issues together; for instance,

livelihood issues would need to be addressed along with gender programming.

Need to build long term and consistent engagement

Due to the complex, deep-seated nature of these norms and the discomfort in discussing them, programmes that seek to change them require long-term and consistent engagement while working with the same group of boys and young men over time (Motihar, 2017). Bringing about normative and structural change requires long-term investment. Yet, there has been limited funding available, as noted by Renuka Motihar.

Need for a strong transformative agenda in programming

Dr Verma stressed the need to transform institutions and contexts in which these masculinities are produced or reproduced, and move beyond programmes that simply co-opt politically correct language and state that they are conducting a transformative programme. He added that a change in the lived reality is the most significant aspect of any transformative programme and it cannot be achieved by just changing individual thoughts and opinions but by bringing about change in family, institutions and organisations, since these are the places where masculinities and caste hierarchies are produced and reproduced, and only then this transformative process can be sustained. Thus, he called for greater will or the means to shift the larger context in which these masculinities are produced or reproduced. Further, he cautioned that working with boys and men to address the issue of masculinity is not unidirectional or linear; rather, it is an iterative and reflective process that needs us to be committed for a long time.

References

Achyut, P., Bhatla, N., Verma, H., Uttamacharya, Singh G., Bhattacharya, S. & Verma, R. (2016).*Towards gender equality: The GEMS journey thus far*. New Delhi: International Center for Research on Women (ICRW).

Barker, G., Contreras, J.M., Heilman, B., Singh, A.K., Verma, R.K., & Nascimento, M. (2011). *Evolving men: Initial results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES)*. Washington, D.C.: International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) and Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Promundo.

Bosson, J. K.& Vandello, J.A. (2011).Precarious manhood and its links to action and aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 2, 82-86.

Chaudhuri, S. B. (2021). Lockdown Humour and Domestic Work: Perpetuating Gender Roles. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 56, 8, 20 Feb. 2021. Retrieved 5 November 2021 fromhttps://www.epw.in/engage/article/lockdown-humour-and-domestic-work-perpetuating-stereotypes

Chopra, R. (2001). Retrieving the father: Gender studies, "father love" and the discourse of mothering. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 24(3/4), 445-455.

Chopra, R. (2003). From violence to supportive practice: Family, gender and masculinities. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 38(17), 1650-1657.

Cislaghi, B., Bankar, S., Verma, R.K., Heise,L. & Collumbien, M. (2019).Widening cracks in patriarchy: Mothers and daughters navigating gender norms in a Mumbai slum. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 22(2), 166–183. DOI: 10.1080/13691058.2019.1580769

Dasgupta, R.K. & Gokulsing, K.M. (2013). Introduction: Perceptions of masculinity and challenges to the Indian male. In R.K. Dasgupta & K.M. Gokulsing (Eds.), *Masculinity and its challenges in India: Essays on changing perceptions*(pp. 5-26). Jefferson, NC: Jefferson Publishers.

Motihar, R. (2017, December 12). *Addressing masculinity in India*.IDR. Retrieved 20 December 2021 from https://idronline.org/addressing-masculinity-in-india/

Srivastava, S. (2012). Masculinity and its role in gender-based violence in public spaces.In L. Prabhu& S. Pilo (Eds.), *Fear that stalks: Gender based violence in public spaces* (pp. 13-50). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The YP Foundation (2019). *Mardon wali Baatein. A research project on men, masculinities and SRHR*. Retrieved 20 December 2021 from https://theypfoundation.org/resources/mardon-wali-baatein/

Verma, R.K., Pulerwitz, J., Mahendra, V., Khandekar, S., Barker, G., Fulpagare, P., & Singh, S.K. (2006). Challenging and changing gender attitudes among young men in Mumbai, India. *Reprod Health Matters*,14, 28, 135–143.

Speakers at the forum

Prof Radhika Chopra, formerly Professor of Sociology, University of Delhi

Renuka Motihar, Independent consultant, Delhi

Manak Matiyani, Queer activist and Executive Director of The YP Foundation

Chairperson

Dr Ravi Verma, Regional Director, International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW), Asia Regional Office, New Delhi

The brief was prepared by Dr Sreerupa, ISST in consultation with Dr Rajib Nandi, ISST.

Gender and Economic Policy Discussion Forum

presented by

ISST

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL STUDIES TRUST

Core 6 A, UG Floor, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi - 110003
Phone: +91-11-4768 2222   Website: www.isstindia.org

in association with

HEINRICH BÖLL STIFTUNG
REGIONAL OFFICE NEW DELHI

C-20, Qutab Institutional Area, New Delhi - 110 016
Phone: +91 11 26854405, 26516695   Website: http://in.boell.org

Kaagaz International, 98112 30592