



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Hearn, Jeff, Muller, Ursula, Oleksy, Elzbieta H., Pringle, Keith, Chernova, Janna, Ferguson, Harry, Holter, Oystein Gullvag, Kolga, Voldemar, Novikova, Irina, Pitch, Tamar, Ventimiglia, Carmine, Lattu, Emmi, Tallberg, Teemu, Millett, Jackie and Olsvik, Elvind

“The social problem of men”: Deliverable 3: Interim Report on National Reports on Law and Policy Addressing Men’s Practices from Workpackage 3

### Original Citation

Hearn, Jeff, Muller, Ursula, Oleksy, Elzbieta H., Pringle, Keith, Chernova, Janna, Ferguson, Harry, Holter, Oystein Gullvag, Kolga, Voldemar, Novikova, Irina, Pitch, Tamar, Ventimiglia, Carmine, Lattu, Emmi, Tallberg, Teemu, Millett, Jackie and Olsvik, Elvind (2001) “The social problem of men”: Deliverable 3: Interim Report on National Reports on Law and Policy Addressing Men’s Practices from Workpackage 3. Project Report. CROME: Critical Research on Men in Europe, Helsinki, Sweden. (Unpublished)

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/7835/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

# THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH NETWORK ON MEN IN EUROPE: THE SOCIAL PROBLEM AND SOCIETAL PROBLEMATISATION OF MEN AND MASCULINITIES

## “THE SOCIAL PROBLEM OF MEN”:

### Deliverable 3: Interim Report on National Reports on Law and Policy Addressing Men’s Practices from Workpackage 3

Jeff Hearn,<sup>1</sup> Ursula Mueller,<sup>1</sup> Elzbieta Oleksy,<sup>1</sup> Keith Pringle,<sup>2</sup> Janna Chernova,<sup>3</sup> Harry Ferguson,<sup>3</sup> Øystein Gullvåg Holter,<sup>3</sup> Voldemar Kolga,<sup>3</sup> Irina Novikova,<sup>3</sup> Tamar Pitch,<sup>3</sup> Carmine Ventimiglia,<sup>3</sup> Emmi Lattu,<sup>4</sup> Teemu Tallberg,<sup>4</sup> Jackie Millett,<sup>5</sup> Eivind Olsvik.<sup>6</sup>

#### 1. Preamble and Purpose of Summary Report

This Interim Report constitutes Deliverable 5 of the Thematic Network. It is a Summary Report of the 10 national reports that have been produced within Workpackage 3. The first workpackage reviewed relevant academic and analytical literature on men’s practices within each country. The second workpackage reviewed relevant statistical information on men’s practices within each country. While both the third workpackage national reports and this summary report need to be read in association with those of the first two workpackage, we have sought to make this summary report understandable in its own right. For this reason there is some repetition of key issues introduced in Workpackages 1 and 2 summary reports. We particularly draw attention to previous discussions in Workpackage 1 in each country on: a) *national/societal gender situation*, including broad shifts in masculinity formations, and the relationship between different masculinities; and b) *general or basic texts on men and masculinities*, including the growth of focused studies. The next workpackage focuses on media representations in each country.

The Thematic Network comprises women and men researchers who are researching on men and masculinities in *an explicitly gendered way*. The bringing together of both women and men researchers is extremely important in the development of good quality European research on men in Europe. Research on men that draws only on the work of men is likely to neglect the very important research contribution that has been and is being made by women to research on men. Research and networking based on only men researchers is likely to reproduce some of the existing gender inequalities of research and policy development. Gender-collaborative research is necessary in the pursuit of gender equality, in the combating of gender discrimination, and in the achievement of equality and in the fight against discrimination more generally. The Network consists of women and men researchers from ten countries: Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, the Russian Federation and the UK (see Appendix 1). It acts as an information resource for other researchers and policy-makers. Good contacts

---

<sup>1</sup> Principal contractor. <sup>2</sup> Network co-ordinator. <sup>3</sup> Network participant. <sup>4</sup> Research assistant.

<sup>5</sup> Network administrator. <sup>6</sup> Co-ordinator for Critical Studies on Men, Nordic Institute for Women’s Studies and Gender Research (NIKK).

with other researchers in other countries, both within and outside Europe, exist and are being developed further through Network contact persons in selected countries.

The overall aim of the Network is to develop empirical, theoretical and policy outcomes on the gendering of men and masculinities. Initially, the Network focuses on two closely related gendered questions: the specific, gendered social problem of men and certain masculinities; and the more general, gendered societal problematisation of men and certain masculinities. The main focus of the current work is on four main aspects of men and masculinities: *men's relations to home and work*; *men's relations to social exclusion*; *men's violences*; *men's health*. This exploration is primarily contextualised in terms of welfare responses to associated social problems and inequalities. It also has direct relevance to policy outcomes in relation to changing family structures; and work configurations within the labour market, the home and wider European society.

This Summary Report examines:

- **Preparation of Workpackage 3**
- **Comparative and Methodological Issues**
- **The General State of Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices in the Ten Nations**
- **Key Points from Each of the Ten National Reports**
- **General Discussion on the Reports, including the 4 Thematic Areas**
- **Conclusion**

## **2. Preparation of Workpackage 3**

The initial meeting of the Network in Brussels and the second meeting at Newcastle were both invaluable in planning Workpackage 3. The following structure was agreed for the structure of the national reports in workpackage 3 (see Appendix 2): Key points; The National Legal, Policy and Political Background and Context; Home and Work; Social Exclusion; Violences; Health; Discussion and Other Comments as appropriate, for example, interconnections between the 4 areas; Bibliography.

In planning the Workpackage it was agreed to develop reviews of both governmental and quasi-governmental legal and policy statements that explicitly address men's practices. 'Policy' has necessarily been interpreted in a broad sense; this includes governmental and quasi-governmental policy statements and developments that are not enshrined in law. It was also considered necessary to discuss briefly the historical development of the growth of laws and policy; the main character of the political and governmental system, and relevant recent changes; the political composition of the national government, and when relevant, 'regional' governments; and the main governmental ministries involved in relevant policy development and their broad policy responsibilities. In some cases, discussion on men's politics/organisations and policy organisations around men has been included.

The timescale was taken normally to start from the beginning of the 1990's, but earlier developments have been included as relevant. Extensions back in timescales are recognised as being valid where appropriate (for example, comparing the situation in some transitional nations pre-1989 and post-1989). Information is thus provided on the 1980s in some cases in order to compare these situations.

While the overall time budget for the various workpackages of the Network is certainly very demanding, the time budget for the work for this particular Workpackage proved to be particularly so. We would suggest that more time is budgeted for work of this kind in future comparable studies.

### **3. Comparative and Methodological Issues**

The Network aims to facilitate greater understanding of changing social processes of gender relations and gender construction, particularly in relation to men and men's practices. Such research and data gathering on men should not be understood and developed separately from research on women and gender. The research focus of the Network is the comparative study of the social problem and societal problematisation of men and masculinities. Undertaking this kind of exploration necessitates specific attention to the challenges and difficulties of comparative perspectives in European contexts. In recent years a comparative perspective has been applied to various aspects of study within the fields of, *inter alia*, sociology, social policy and social welfare. There are many reasons for this tendency, some being more legitimate in scholarly terms than others.

One of the most convincing reasons for adopting a comparative approach is the potential offered for deconstructing the assumptions which underpin laws and policies in different countries. Such a process facilitates a deconstruction of actual and potentially more effective laws, policies and institutional practices. This includes laws, policies and practices addressing men and men's practices. Furthermore, laws, practices and policies increasingly interact transnationally, at both European and global levels. Consequently research may seek to explore the processes and outcomes of those interactions and connections. In many cases where specific social issues have been studied transnationally, attempts have been made to apply *general* theoretical, legal and policy categorisations to particular issues.

In the case of the study of differential European welfare regimes, the most common general model applied in this specific fashion is that devised by Esping-Andersen. There has been an extensive critique of such models, partly in terms of their insufficient attention to gender relations. There is a need for greater attention to conscious gendering in and of assumptions that are brought to bear in such analyses. Commentators have taken a variety of positions regarding the analytic value of these applications from the general to the particular, partly depending upon the issue being studied. Furthermore, there is a need for considerable open-mindedness in the assumptions that are brought to bear in such analyses. For example, feminist perspectives on the relationship between gender and welfare system dynamics, have provided detailed arguments that Southern European welfare regimes may not in fact (contrary to some of the above opinion) be more sexist than those in Northern and Western Europe. In the field of social welfare law and policy there are complex patterns of convergence and divergence between men's practices internationally which await interrogation.

One field of social enquiry which has to a considerable extent escaped specific comparative scrutiny is the critical study of men's practices, although the latter has received important attention within broader and relatively established transnational feminist surveys of gender relations. Yet the limited amount of work devoted specifically to men's practices transnationally suggests there is immense scope for extending critical analysis in that particular area. There are complex patterns of convergence and divergence

between men's practices internationally awaiting further interrogation, including in terms of laws and policies. Yet, the limited amount of work devoted specifically to men's practices transnationally suggests there is immense scope for extending critical analysis in that particular area.

The Network's activity is conceptualised around the notion of 'men in Europe', rather than, say, the 'European man' or 'European men'. This perspective highlights the social construction, and historical mutability, of men, within the contexts of both individual European nations and the EU. This involves the examination of the relationship of men and masculinities to European nations and European institutions in a number of ways:

- national, societal and cultural variation amongst men and masculinities;
- the historical place and legacy of specific forms of men and masculinities in European nations and nation-building;
- within the EU and its transnational administrative and democratic institutions, as presently constituted – particularly the differential intersection of men's practices with European and, in the case of the EU, pan-European welfare configurations;
- implications for the new and potential member states of the EU;
- implications of both globalisation for Europe, and the Europeanisation of globalisation processes and debates;
- new, changing forms of gendered political power in Europe, such as, regionalised, federalised, decentralised powers, derived by subsidiarity and transnationalism.

All of these broad relationships and far-reaching developments have implications for both the collection of gendered laws and policies, and their interpretation, whether gendered or not. In undertaking transnational comparisons, the problematic aspects of the enterprise, including in the analysis of laws and policies, have to be acknowledged. Major difficulties posed by differing meanings attached to apparently common concepts and categorisations used by respondents and researchers are likely. This signals a broader problem: for diversity in meaning itself arises from complex variations in cultural context at national and sub-national levels - cultural differences which permeate all aspects of the research process, including the review and analysis of law and policy. Practical responses to such dilemmas can be several. On the one hand, it is perhaps possible to become over-concerned about the issue of variable meaning: a level of acceptance regarding such diversity may be one valid response. Another response is for researchers to carefully check with each other the assumptions brought to the research and statistical data collection processes. The impact of cultural contexts on the process and content of research and statistics are central in the Network's work, as seen in the different theoretical, methodological and disciplinary emphases and assumptions in the national contexts and national reports.

In addition, the impacts and interaction of different cultural contexts are of major significance for the internal cooperation and process of the Network itself. This has many implications, not least we see these national reports as work in progress. It also means bringing understandings of law and policy upon which the national reports are based closer together over time, whilst maintaining the differences in national concerns. This is clearly very important in terms of the different national relations with the EU, in terms of present and possible future membership.

The range of nations in the Network presents good opportunities for comparative study:

- In terms of “testing” general welfare regime typologies in relation to the issue of men's practices, these countries include “representatives” of all three of the welfare regime typologies identified by Esping-Andersen: Neo-liberal; Social Democratic; and Conservative. At a less theoretical level, the spread of the countries – in Southern, Northern, Western, and Eastern Europe - presents a broad cultural, geographical and political range within Europe.
- These and other considerations also have to be framed within developing notions of what ‘being European’ constitutes. This has salience in relation to how some influential sectors of society within Poland and the Russian Federation have recently evinced a greater desire to be considered European in certain ways including their relationship with the EU. The issues of social marginalisation consequent upon development of an alleged ‘Fortress Europe’ have relevance to the lived experience of many men, who are excluded and/or those actively involved in exclusion.
- They allow exploration on the extent of differential social patterns and welfare responses between countries often grouped together on grounds of alleged historical, social and/or cultural proximity, such as, Norway and Finland; Ireland and the UK.
- Inclusion of countries from within Eastern Europe allows exploration of how recent massive economic, social and cultural changes have impacted upon attitudes and practices relating to men. These matters need to be taken into account in the massive and likely future growth in cultural, social, political and economic transactions between Eastern Europe and EU members, both collectively and individually.

These matters provide the broad context of the national reports in Workpackages 1, 2 and 3. In Workpackage 1 and 2 the extent to which this was addressed in national reports was variable. In some cases in Workpackage 1, notably Estonia’s, this comparative context was explicit. The contextual issue has also been addressed in Workpackage 1 through both longer (Finland) and shorter (Norway, Germany) timescale historical reviews. In Workpackage 2 there was a specific comparative element in the Estonia report comparing gendered rates of occupational mobility between Poland, Russian Federation and Estonia, and employment structure, gender wage gap, and homicide rates in several European countries. We also included in Workpackage 2 baseline comparative statistical information for analysis, by assembling selected statistical measures for the ten Network countries. The comparative dimension has been part of the essential backcloth to the compilation of these national reports in Workpackage 3.

#### **4. The General State of Law and Policy Addressing Men’s Practices in the Ten Nations**

Summarising the state of law and policy addressing men in the ten countries presents a challenge, even though the Network is at this stage focusing on only four main themes. The state of studies on men in the ten national contexts varies in terms of the volume and detail of law and policy, the ways in which this has been framed, as well as substantive differences in men’s societal position and social practices. To simplify the task, we address the following questions: information sources; some broad substantive patterns; and some interconnections of sources and patterns.

First, we make some remarks on sources. As in Workpackages 1 and 2, existing academic knowledge of members has provided the base for the reports. This has been supplemented in some cases by extensive reviews of the available information on law and policy from national governmental, quasi-governmental and other related sources. Accordingly, there

is a wide range of sources and materials that have been drawn on in the construction of the national reports. In some cases much of this material is available electronically, through websites, diskettes and/or CD-ROMs; in others extensive library work and examination of printed paper reports have been necessary; and in some cases there have been further contacts with key governmental contacts and other researchers in the theme areas.

Importantly, in examining law and policy, there is a need to distinguish between several different levels and layers of forms of law and policy, and hence their analysis. These are principally: the broad legal and constitutional arrangements; the specific embodiment of formal policy in law; the development of explicit governmental policy; the often changing forms of local and agency-based policies, sometimes operating more implicitly; and the practice of policy implementation in day-to-day policy practices. The balance between these various forms of 'law and policy' varies between the national reports. The importance of the comparative evaluation of legal and policy support for some form of the provider model (or other models) needs to be stressed.

The amount and detail of policy information stems from the priority that is given to different policy areas, problem definitions and extent of problematisation within governmental systems. This is especially important in the fields of labour market and employment, health and illness, and violence, all of which are generally relatively well developed. There is frequently a lack of clearly and easily available policy information on social exclusion, such as ethnic or sexual minorities. The emphasis on different areas varies between the countries (see Appendix 2). The large amount of existing material is often scattered within a wide variety of governmental locations. In most national reports the greatest attention is given to law and policy in relation to Home and Work; in most the focus on Violence is also pronounced. With some notable exceptions (Finland, Italy, Norway), Social Exclusion is examined in less detail. Although Health is generally the least developed of the four focus areas, it is also an area in which there are marked differences between the countries.

In terms of substantive patterns, it may first be useful to note the connections and differences that there are with both academic research and statistical information on men's practices. In Workpackage 1 we discussed how in some countries, especially in Germany, Norway, the UK, but also to an extent elsewhere, it can be said that there is now some form of relatively established tradition of research on men can be identified, albeit of different orientations. We also addressed variations in the framing of research, that is, the extent to which research on men has been conducted directly and in an explicitly gendered way, and the relation of these studies to feminist scholarship, Women's Studies and Gender Research more generally, and the extent to which research on men is focused on and presents 'voices' of men or those affected by men. There are also very different and sometimes antagonistic approaches to research within the same country, for example, between non-gendered, non-feminist or even anti-feminist approaches and gendered and feminist approaches. Other differences stemmed from different theoretical, methodological and disciplinary emphases, assumptions and decisions. Addressing these differences is part of the task of the Network. As previously discussed, these differences in traditions were less observable in the national reports on statistical information in Workpackage 2.

To some extent, and in some perspectives, it might be presumed that academic research and statistical information provide two, often interrelated, ways of describing, analysing

and explaining men's practices, whether dominant, subordinated or different. At the same time, they also construct those dominant, subordinated and different patterns of men's practices in their own ways. Meanwhile law and policy might be initially understood as governmental and quasi-governmental regulations of those dominant, subordinated and different patterns of men's practices. However, law and policy are also themselves modes of describing, analysing, explaining, and indeed constructing men's practices. For these reasons the political and academic differences, observed particularly in Workpackage 1, are both apparent and to some extent obscured in the specific form of the legal and policy modes examined in these national reports on law and policy.

There are both similarities and differences in the substantive patterns of national laws and policies. The social and cultural contexts in which these national reports are written are very varied indeed. The national and local contexts need to be understood to make sense of the different orientations of the national reports. The general state of law and policy in the ten nations is the product of several factors. These include their diverse broad historical and cultural traditions; their legal and governmental institutions; their more recent and specific relations to the EU; and their welfare and social policy frameworks and practices. As regards the various national relations to the EU, there are the clear contrasts between:

- EU/EMU: Finland (1995), Germany (1957), Ireland (1973), Italy (1957);
- EU/non-EMU: the UK (1973);
- EU-associated ETA: Norway;
- EU applicant countries: Estonia, Latvia, Poland;
- former Soviet non-EU applicant: Russian Federation.

	non-former Soviet	former Soviet
EU/EMU	Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy	
EU/non-EMU	UK	
EU-associated ETA	Norway	
EU applicant		Estonia, Latvia, Poland
non-EU applicant		Russian Federation

A persistent challenge in this Workpackage has been how to focus on law and policy that specifically *addresses* men, whilst at the same time being aware of the broad range of laws and policies that are not *explicitly gendered* that are likely to bear on men. In one sense almost all laws and policies can be said to be relevant to men *as citizens* (or indeed as non-citizens, for example, as aliens). In another sense, in most countries, though there may not be a very large body of law and policy information specifically focused on men, there is still a considerable amount of analysis of law and policy in relation to men that is possible. These questions are affected by both deeply embedded historical constructions of citizenship, and more recent reforms around gender and 'gender equality'. On the first count, it is important to note that in many countries citizenship has historically been constructed as 'male', onto which certain concessions and rights of citizenship, for example suffrage, have been granted to women. However, there is variation in the extent to which this pattern applies, and in some cases citizenship has been taken different gendered forms, with citizenship for women and men being more closely associated with relatively recent nationalisms for all citizens. This is not to say



that such latter 'nationalistic' citizenship is non-gendered, far from it; it may indeed remain patriarchal in form, not least through the continuation of pre-nationalistic discourses and practices, sometimes around particular notions of 'equality', as in the Soviet regimes. On the second count, the contemporary societal context of law and policy on men is often formally framed by the presence (or not) of signature of the UN Convention on Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights, signature of and reporting on Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), a '(Gender) Equality Act', a Bureau of Gender Equality between Women and Men, and various forms of gender mainstreaming.

The constitutions of all the nations in different ways embody equality for citizens under the law; non-discrimination on grounds of sex/gender. All, apart from the UK, have a written constitution, although even in this exceptional case the signing of the European Convention on Human Rights and EU membership more generally may be tending to override this anomaly. Gender-neutral language is generally used in law and policy, though often also for different reasons and within different legal and political traditions. In the case of the EU applicant countries, considerable efforts have been put into the harmonisation of law and policy with EU members and directives, including in terms of non-discrimination and gender equality. EU enlargement appears to contribute to strengthening the formal law and policy on gender equality. These various formal apparatuses may contradict with both historical tradition and contemporary legal and policy practice and implementation. The effectiveness of these measures, at least in the short term, is also in doubt, in view of the lack of gender equality, as reported in Workpackages 1 and 2. Gender equality legislation may indeed remain without clear consequences for policy and outcomes, for women and men. There is often a gap between the governmental rhetoric and everyday conduct in society, with men and women mostly unaware of discussions about gender equality at the labour market and elsewhere. For example, the Russian constitution stipulates that "Man and woman" shall have equal rights, liberties and opportunities. The problem is in the realisation of these principles in every branch of legislation, social relations and everyday practice. In addition, governmental responsibility for gender equality is frequently delegated to one ministry, or one part thereof, and in some countries there are significant legal and policy variations between different national or regional governments, and between ministries.

These broad national variations need to be put alongside contrasts between different welfare state policy regimes. Contrasts between Neo-liberal; Social Democratic; and Conservative welfare regimes in Western Europe have been critiqued in terms of their neglect of gender welfare state regimes and gender relations. Such distinctions (for example, Latin Rim, Bismarckian, Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian [Langan and Ostner]; Strong, Modified, Weak Breadwinner States [Lewis, Ostner, Duncan]; Private Patriarchy with High Subordination of Women, Public Patriarchy with High Subordination of Women, Private Patriarchy with Lower Subordination of Women, Public Patriarchy with Lower Subordination of Women [Walby]; Transitional from Private Patriarchy, Housewife Contract, Dual Role Contract, Equality Contract [Hirdman]) need to be refined in two ways: the specification of differences with and amongst the gender welfare state policy regimes of former Eastern bloc nations; the specification of differences amongst men and men's practices.

There is also national variation in the extent to which laws and policies are gender-disaggregated. As noted, a relative lack of gendering of law and policy continues in most

cases. Detailed laws and policies directed towards gendered interventions with men and men's practices are relatively rare. There is little law and policy explicitly focused on men, variations amongst men, and the relationship of those patterns to men's practices and lives. Exceptions to this pattern include, in some cases, law and policy on:

#### *Home and work*

- specification of forms of work only for men (for example, mining);
- men as workers/breadwinners/heads of family and household;
- fatherhood and paternity (including legal rights and obligations as fathers, biological and/or social, and paternity leave of various kinds).

#### *Social exclusion*

- social assistance, according to sex and marital status;
- fatherhood, husband and other family statuses in immigration and nationality;
- gay men, gay sexuality and transgender issues.

#### *Violences*

- compulsory (or near compulsory) conscription into the military;
- crimes of sexual violence, such as rape; and
- programmes on men who have violent to women and children.

#### *Health*

- men's health education programmes.

The form and development of law and policy also intersect with the substantive form and nature of socio-economic change. In Workpackage 1 there was a strong emphasis on the different political and academic traditions that operate in studying men in the different national contexts, as well as distinct historical conjunctions for the lives of men. More specifically, in terms of policy development that has addressed men, a simple, perhaps over simple, differentiation may be made between:

- the Nordic nations (Finland, Norway) - that have had both gender equality apparatus, and at least some focused policy development on men, through national committees, since the 1980s (thus prior to Finland's joining the EU), operating in the context of the membership and work of the Nordic Council of Ministers; this included the 'Men and gender equality' programme (1995-2000);
- the established EU-member nations (Ireland, Italy, Germany, the UK) – that have their developed their 'equal opportunities' and 'gender equality' policies in the context of the EU, and with limited specific emphasis upon men; and
- the former Soviet nations (Estonia, Latvia, Poland, the Russian Federation) - that have a recent political history of formal legal equality but without developed human rights, and are now in the process of developing their gender equality laws and policies post-transformation, also with very limited specific emphasis upon men.

In addition, the various nations are experiencing different forms of substantive and ongoing socio-economic change. In some cases these changes are profound, for example, the German unification process, post-socialist transition in Estonia, Latvia, Poland and the Russian Federation. These changes set the context, the ground and the challenges for law and policy. Other major social changes include those in Ireland with rapid movement from a predominantly rural society through a booming economy, as

well as its own nearby political conflicts, challenges and changes in Northern Ireland. Somewhat similarly since the 1950s Finland has gone through a shift with migrations from the countryside to the suburbs in search of work. In the UK the intersection of government, law, policy and statistics is clear. Since the advent of the Labour Administration in 1997 topics, such as poverty, unemployment, the labour market, crime (including violence to women), health, ethnicity, have become major focuses of policy attention – and often with a relatively strong gender dimension. By contrast, there is much less policy focus on areas of disadvantage such as disability, sexuality or crimes against children. This pattern largely reflects a government policy agenda on: social exclusion defined in rather narrow labour market terms; crime, highlighting some areas more than others, for example, men's violence to women and other men receiving considerably more policy attention than men's violence to children. In Latvia since the restoration of political independence, the political climate of the country has never been stabilised, and rapid changes of governments have been detrimental to the principle of continuity in implementing the initiatives in policy development and pursuing the principles of transparency, accountability and policy responsibilities. Thus the form of law and policy is interrelated with the form of social, economic and political change.

### **5. Key Points from Each of the Ten National Reports**

**Estonia:** 1. The drafting of Equality Act is being prepared by Bureau of Equality between Women and Men in the Ministry of Social Affairs, and then passed to the Government;

2. Current legislation is written in gender-neutral language. Preferences made in any spheres on the basis of sex are illegal.

3. It is hard to link men's social problems (unemployment, health, high rate divorces, drug use, violent behaviour, etc.) with current legislation, however, it is a strong belief that the new Equality Act will assist in solving these problems of men.

4. Government has developed several programmes to deal with men social problems, including the prevention of alcoholism and drug use (1997-2007), and of HIV/AIDS.

**Finland:** 1. National legal and governmental policy is framed and characterised by a complex formal mixture of statements favouring gender equality in principle and statements using gender-neutrality as the major form of governmental communication; statements typically promote and favour gender equality, and this is generally done through gender-neutral laws and policies. This means that there are relatively few explicit governmental statements on or about men. Most laws are constructed in a gender-neutral way.

2. The Finnish Act on Equality between Men and Women came into force in 1987. As with other Nordic predecessors of the Finnish Act, it is mostly a passive law to be used when it is alleged that someone is discriminated against.

3. Gendered exceptions to this generally gender-neutral pattern in which men are explicitly or implicitly named include: compulsory conscription into the army; a strongly pro-fatherhood policy and ideology; national programme against violence; and recent political debate on same-sex marriage.

4. In addition there has been a variety of extra-governmental political activity around men of varying gender political persuasions. Since 1986 there has been a 'Men's Section', (the Subcommittee on Men's Issues), a subcommittee of the Council for Equality between Women and Men. This has recently produced a publication that sets out ways in which gender equality can be developed to men's advantage.

5. There is a lack of consideration of how men might assist the promotion of gender equality in ways that assist women; there is a lack of consideration of how different aspects of men's practices might connect with each other, for example, fatherhood and violence.

**Ireland:** 1. The 'family' in Irish law is the kinship group based on marriage, and the only legitimate 'father' is the married father. Despite the fact that 26% of all births in Ireland are now outside of marriage, unmarried fathers are not acknowledged as fathers under the Irish Constitution (whereas the mother is given automatic rights by virtue of being a mother). Unmarried fathers have to apply to the courts for guardianship of their children. The Irish State has come under increased pressure in recent years to give fathers equal rights as mothers to be a parent to their child. Yet there is little sign that this has led to a more explicit gendering of men in terms of legal reform or that fatherhood is being more actively addressed as a policy issue.

2. Irish fathers have no statutory entitlement to paternity leave. Following the implementation of the recent EU directive, they are entitled to 14 weeks parental leave in the first five years of the child's life, which is unpaid and not surprisingly vastly under used. During 2001 mothers have been granted an extension of paid maternity leave, from 14 to 18 weeks, and unpaid from 4 to eight weeks, while fathers in Ireland are about to gain paid statutory rights to attend two ante-natal classes and to be at the birth of their child. Such gender differences in how public policy is constituted around parenting demonstrates how the provider model and the ideal of the 'good working man' continue to dominate constructions of masculinity in Ireland.

3. There is limited gendering of men in relation to social exclusion, the most significant being in relation to the vulnerability of men who are socially disadvantaged and long-term unemployed. Since 1994 the Department of Social, Community and Family Affairs has been funding men's groups in socially disadvantaged areas. While there is no single model of 'menswork' going on in such groups in Ireland, the most common orientation appears to be personal development, as a support for men who feel excluded and are struggling to find a role for themselves.

4. Given that the central organising ideology which dictates how men are governed in Ireland is the provider model and the hard-working 'good family man', when evidence emerges that not all men are in fact 'good', a deficit in governance and services arises. Minimal attempts have been made to develop intervention programmes with men who are violent to their partners, while only a fraction of men who are sex offenders are actively worked with towards rehabilitation/stopping their offending. Masculinity politics with respect to violence are becoming more complex, with increasing pressure to recognise male victims of women's domestic violence.

5. The health of men is just beginning to be recognised as a health promotion issue, in the context of growing awareness of generally poor outcomes in health for men compared with women and generally lower resource allocation to men's health. The Irish government is committed to publishing a new health strategy in 2001 and has stated for the first time that a specific section on men's health will appear. Health is still tending to be conceptualised in physical terms, with a neglect of psychological well-being. While increases in male suicide, especially by young men, are increasingly the focus of public concern, there has been little attempt to develop gender specific policies and programmes which can help men to cope with their vulnerability and despair.

**Italy:** No key points noted at this stage.

**Germany:** No key points noted at this stage.

**Latvia:** 1. The recent developments of the legal process have reflected the commitment of Latvia to join the European Union. Thus, a number of the international and EU documents and conventions have been ratified. In this year alone there have been introduced new strategies and initiatives expressed in such documents of The Ministry of Welfare as *The Gender Equality Initiative. Draft document; Equal Opportunities to Everybody in Latvia. Draft document.* The expected adoption of the document on gender equality and the establishment of The Gender Equality unit, however, are not provided with clear-cut statements on future policy development.

2. This national report has coincided with an initiative on a new Family Act in which the idea of the paternity leave is introduced and the necessity to struggle with family violence is stated. Both documents mainly deal with the issues of men and women in home, health and work. Family is defined as a reproductive heterosexual partnership for securing the economic and social “body” of the society. Neither document contains the language of differences, sexual, ethnic, racial. It is considered that the issues of ethnicity and cultural differences are to be solved through the policy developments in ethnic and social integration to overcome the ethnopolitical division of the Latvian society.

3. The rigidly “disciplinary” character of the documents issued either by The Ministry of Welfare or by The Department of Naturalization is to the disadvantage to the future policy developments because the language of gender equality and gender mainstreaming is excluded from the ethnic integration policies, and the language of ethnic integration is excluded from the gender equality initiatives.

4. There are no explicit statements addressing men and ethnicity/race, men and sexuality, thus pointing to yet “untouchable” spaces of social exclusion in family, work, health, violences.

**Norway:** 1. In Norway, as in other countries, the period after World War 2 was characterised by extended policy declarations concerning gender equal status, yet it was mainly in the 1960s and 1970s, with increased demands for women’s labour power, that more detailed and binding policies were created. A national Gender Equality Council was created in 1972 as a partially independent organ with the task of monitoring equal status progress. In 1979, a new Gender Equality Act entered into force, with an Ombudsman arrangement and an Appeals Board.

2. In 1986, the government created a Male Role Committee to look into and create debate about men within an equal status perspective. The Committee which existed until 1991 made a survey of men’s attitudes and conditions through broad cooperation among feminist and other researchers. This was the first nationwide representative study trying to map the factors *behind* men’s variable support and resistance to gender equality, including violence in the family of origin, bullying, friendship, private life and work relations. The results showed a greater diversity than most observers had acknowledged, including a large minority (20-40 percent depending on variables) of men who actively supported gender equal status, as well as a smaller, negative minority (10-30 percent), including a ‘sex-violence syndrome’ among some (perhaps 10 percent). The survey uncovered strong support for caregiving-related reforms among a majority of men. Accordingly, the Committee proposed measures in three main areas: increasing men’s participation in caregiving and household tasks in the home sphere, combating men’s violence against women, and increasing research efforts.

3. In the early 1990s, there was a slowdown of the gender equality process. Several factors created these changes. Norway experienced an economic setback as well as a

political shift to the right. The welfare state was increasingly targeted by neo-liberal political views. Interestingly, the 1988 survey had shown that these trends were characterised by a strong overrepresentation of men, and especially of men with a single mother upbringing. In the emerging political climate, more emphasis was put on ‘actors’ as against ‘structures’, on market-led changes as against state reforms, and on gender equality as something that had mainly been achieved, rather than a burning issue. Some of these trends had already become influential in the social democratic view of the 1980s, for example in terms of ‘sustainable’ developments, with the market as an increasingly important social regulator.

4. Some progress was also made in the areas of reducing violence and in developing research, most of it from below, in the form of voluntary activities, activists, networks etc., rather than governmental policy decisions. Surveys from the mid-90s showed that a majority of people thought that a strong effort regarding gender equal status was not needed, and politics increasingly shifted in this direction, even if more detailed research showed, both, that more concrete goals were supported by many (for example, better kindergartens, better gender balance in jobs), and that the “gender equal status is here already” view is linked to lack of education and knowledge.

5. A proposal to extend the Gender Equality Act’s provision regarding gender balance in boards and committees (the 40 percent rule) to the private sector has so far met with delays. Recently this proposal has once more been delayed. Increasingly, the stalemate situation in the economy seems to work back, negatively, on other areas, like politics. In recent years, national politics has become noticeably less gender-balanced, with all the major parties led by men, although the figures do not yet show a clear setback. Media research shows the continuing male dominance in, for example, political debates.

**Poland:** 1. With regard to *work*, the concept of sex is not used in the definition of an employee in Polish law (Art. 2 of the Labour Code). Infrequent references to it in legal norms are connected with and justified by objective differences, such as psycho-somatic constitution, anatomical build or maternity, that condition divergent social roles. The above legal regulation ensues from the principle of equal treatment of employees (Art. 11<sup>2</sup> of the labour code added by the amendment of 2 Feb. 1996 – Journal of Laws N<sup>o</sup> 24, Clause 110) and the principle of non-discrimination (Art. 11<sup>3</sup>).

2. Except for a general anti-discrimination clause (Art. 32.2 of the Constitution of the Republic), the issue of *social exclusion*, as defined for the purposes of this report, is not unequivocally reflected in Polish legislation, with the exception of national and ethnic minorities which are referred to directly (Art. 35 Clause 3.2 of the Constitution of the Republic). No differentiation on the grounds of sex is made in these laws.

3. The problem of *violence*, albeit of social importance, is not directly reflected in state politics. It constitutes, however, the core of activities of some social organisations, and is addressed chiefly to women and children. As for offences related to domestic violence, Polish law does not differentiate perpetrators according to their sex.

4. As for *health*, no data were found on organisations that deal exclusively with problems of health, social welfare and suicides concerning men or on nationwide initiatives and programmes in this area (they are mainly aimed at women and children). Legislation ensures special care to pregnant women, children, handicapped people and persons of advanced age (Art. 68 Clause 3 of the Constitution of the Republic).

**Russian Federation:** 1. The gendered examination of Russian legislation allows one to talk about gender asymmetry in this sphere of society. The goal of study Russian legislation is describe “objective” picture of realisation constitutional principle of gender

equality: “Man and woman have equal rights and freedoms and opportunities for its realisation” (Russian Federation Constitution, Part 3, Article 19). At first sight, this constitutional principle is reflected in contemporary legislation. But this is only at first sight. Not only do everyday practice and the reality of funding break them, but legislators do not always understand the principle of gender equality. In one case (election legislation) he/she ignores realisation idea of gender equality in practice. The formal legislation reflects the idea of gender equality, but does not reflect nor guarantee its realisation for both sexes. Women have equal rights be elected (equally with men), but they do not have equal opportunity for realisation of equality with men’s rights.

2. Absolutely another situation is found in the sphere of labour legislation. The legislation reflects the idea of gender equality. In this legislation we see a system of actions for the defence of female rights, especially the “unwed mother”. In this sphere it is most important to address objective necessity and produce appropriate measures. Discrimination of men exists in family legislation. A man finds it very difficult to have the right to bring up a child. Gender research into Russian legislation testifies to ambiguities in understanding gender equality in different spheres of society.

3. Gender legislation is yet at the formative stage, as shown by the examination of some specific branches of Russian legislation.

**UK:** 1. It is striking that men figure so little explicitly in governmental discourses compared to their prominence in much of the critical, and not so critical, academic literature in the UK over the past ten years.

2. When men are addressed explicitly in government-produced material, this is far more likely to be in early-stage consultation documents or in enquiry reports than in hard recommendations, advanced consultative documents or (most of all) Acts of Parliament.

3. As in all the other UK National Reports, there are clearly overlaps in the governmental material between the 4 areas of this analysis: for instance, social exclusion and health; social exclusion and home and work. However, partly because gender (and in particular men) figure far less prominently in governmental material than in the academic (or even the statistical) data, then the overlaps are much less obvious here.

4. Men as violent partners have been the focus of some considerable attention in government discourses: certainly more than men as violent fathers – and this discrepancy needs some urgent investigation. Partly because some research clearly suggests that violent partners may be violent fathers too; and vice versa.

## **6. General Discussion on the Reports, including the 4 Thematic Areas**

**Home and Work:** Although there may not be a very large body of law and policy information specifically focused on men, the various historical and national traditions in the constructions of citizenship have large implications for the place of men in law and policy. These constructions of citizenship have often been presented as ‘gender-neutral’, even though they have clear historical gendering as male. These constructions of citizenship have clear relevance for the formulation of law and policy on men in relation to home and work. There is a general use of gender-neutral language in law and policy, and this has been reinforced in recent years through the signing of the UN Convention on Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights, and the signature of and reporting on Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. In all the countries there is some form of equality or anti-discrimination legislation, and in many there are a ‘(Gender) Equality Act’, and some form of Equal Opportunities Office or Bureau of Gender Equality between Women and Men. Various forms of gender

mainstreaming are also being increasingly promoted, in word at least, in government. In terms of the EU, the main areas of activity, for member and applicant nations, include:

- equal pay;
- equal treatment for women and men at work and in access to employment;
- balanced distribution of work-related and family duties;
- training and informing of social partners about equality policy and norms in the EU;
- participation in EU equality framework programmes.

The general tradition in operation here is gender equality in treatment and process rather than gender equality of outcome. There is also in EU countries the Directive on the restriction of working time, though again its practical implementation is varied. These and other formal 'gender-neutral' national and transnational apparatuses and objectives may contradict with both national historical tradition and contemporary legal and policy practice. Importantly, these include the different traditions of welfare capitalism or welfare patriarchies, that are themselves commentaries on home and work, such as:

- Strong, Modified, Weak Breadwinner States;
- Private Patriarchy with High Subordination of Women, Public Patriarchy with High Subordination of Women, Private Patriarchy with Lower Subordination of Women, Public Patriarchy with Lower Subordination of Women.

The various national governmental and constitutional frameworks intersect with the everyday patterns and realities of home and work. Housework is still mostly women's work; men's family statuses are still, despite rising separation and divorce, defined mainly through marriage and fatherhood; recurring themes in employment include men's occupational, working and wage gap over women, gender segregation at work, differences in patterns of working hours, many men's close associations with paid work. These variations in both men's practices at home and work, and in state law and policy in relation to home and work, interact in complex ways.

In all countries there are elements of the provider-breadwinner model, though the strength of this is very variable. Marriage and paternity law have been and largely remain basic ways of defining different men's statuses in law. These have been and to varying extents are ways of defining men's relation to work as providers-breadwinners. For example, in Ireland men have constructed very much in terms of the good provider role at home rather than strictly as workers; the married father is the legitimate father, 'complementing' the recognition of motherhood in the national constitution. In Italy there is also support for maternity in law; alongside this, fathers have rights in the case of illness or death of mother. In Poland paternity is assumed for the mother's husband, although it can be declared differently or established by the court. In Estonia men are generally not yet used to staying home to take care of children or to being single parents, and after divorce, as a rule, children are left to the mother to raise. In the Russian Federation the norms of the Family Code are mostly gender-neutral. At the same time there are a number of norms that violate gender equality. Among them is the husband's right to divorce his wife if she pregnant and within a year after the birth of child as well as the husband's duty to support his wife (his former wife) during her pregnancy and within three years after the birth of a child. There are also serious discrepancies between the legal stipulation of equal rights and the practical opportunities for their implementation, for example, in the field of women's property rights. These and other elements contrast with and complicate the gender-neutrality of most law and policy.



There are, however, major changes, complications and contradictions. There is growing politics around fathers' rights, some degree of shared care/parenthood, and leave for fathers and as parents. In Latvia a husband-breadwinner model coexists with an egalitarian family model reflecting a diversity of social attitudes towards the institution of the family. The model of a husband-breadwinner's family, however, is implicitly reconstructed in family politics and legislation targeted at women as childbearers and major childcarers. Two further tendencies are the growth of family sovereignty, on the one hand, and the growth of family policies, on the other, as the family is stated to be an important institution of society in the draft document of the Family Act. In Estonia men whose wives are on pregnancy or maternity leave have the same rights. An employer is required to grant a holiday at the time requested to a woman raising a child up to three years of age. The provision is valid also for a man raising a child alone. Holiday pay for father's additional child care leave is paid from the state budget. The new amendment is a significant new right for fathers and clearly acknowledges that both men and women have family responsibilities. This is also clear in Ireland, where the movement from a traditional, largely rural society has involved pressure to give fathers' equal rights as mothers, and an increasing sharing of breadwinning between women and men. In Finland there is an emphasis on shared parenthood after divorce in law if not always in practice. In all the nations apart from the Russian Federation there is some kind of parental/paternity leave, but the conditions under which this operates are very variable.

Policy development around men's parental and paternity leave has been active in the Nordic countries. Supporting fatherhood is a central part of governmental policy in Finland. In Norway a proposal from the Male Role Committee for the father's quota, or "the daddy's month" has been enacted. The results were remarkable. Soon after its introduction in 1993, two thirds of eligible fathers used the reform, which gave the father one month of paid leave (of a total of 10 months). This reform, like most of the debate on men as caregivers, had women as the main subject – to the extent that the father's pay was stipulated on the basis of the mother's labour market activity.

All countries have some kind of equal wage legislation on such grounds as an employee's sex, nationality, colour, race, native language, social origin, social status, previous activities, religion. Equal pay for equal work is far from being realised, as discussed in Workpackages 1 and 2. There are clear gendered policies and laws for the armed forces and conscription, and also for some other areas of work, such as religious workers and ministers. In the workplace historical restrictions of work according to arduous and hazardous to health for women, and thus indirectly men, also continue. Definitions of unemployment and retirement age also vary for women and men.

In many countries the increasing neo-liberal and market-oriented climate has brought a more individualist approach to gender. Various trends in the 1990s, such as 'turbo capitalism', globalisation, restructuring, more intense jobs, have ensured that absent fathers and the lack of men in caregiving roles remain as key issues. The result of a more laissez-faire political attitude and economic and working life developments is often an increase in the *gender segregation* in parts of society. There are, however, 'counter-trends' and increased positive engagement from men are 'intact' families, post-divorce childcare, and wage work. There is also evidence that the *provider model* is again strengthened in some sections of working life, especially at top levels, although ideological changes further down in the hierarchy, including middle management, seems to develop a pro-equality direction.

On the other hand, there are limited moves towards greater equality planning in workplaces, as in Finland and Norway, where the 40% rule (as a minimum for women and men) operates, in theory but not always in practice, in public sector bodies and committees. In Germany a law on promoting gender equality in private enterprises, was announced two years ago and just recently been postponed again. A proposal for reform of the private sector, along the lines of the 40% quota system, has been made in Norway, and there the proposal for quotas similar to the public sector has been delayed.

While there are growing governmental and related discourses about men at home and work, including the reconciliation of the demands of home and work, there is usually a lack of explicit focus on men, especially in clear and strong policy terms. There is also a lack of linkage between men as parents and governmental documentation on men, for example, as violent partners or violent parents.

**Social Exclusion:** As in Workpackages 1 and 2, this has proved to be the most difficult area to pre-define, but in some ways one of the most interesting. The ways in which social exclusion figures appears rather differently in the ten nations. However, even with this variation there is still frequently a lack of gendering of law and policy in relation to men: This is despite the fact men often appear make up the majority or vast majority of those in the socially excluded sub-categories. This also applies to the association of some forms of social exclusion with young men. There are thus rather few laws and policies specifically addressing men in relation to social exclusion. In most countries many socially excluded citizens may often be discussed in politics and thus socially defined as men, yet the relevant laws and policies are not constructed in that way.

To illustrate these considerable variations, we may note, for example, how in Norway, there is a focus on the relation of citizens to the social security system, and on rural and urban youth. In Estonia government is increasingly recognising social exclusions, such as men's lesser education than women, non-Estonian men's lower life expectancy, homophobia, drugs, AIDS. Such problems have been denied a long time; however government is close to recognising these problems, especially drugs and AIDS. However, there is no clear plan how to deal with these men's social problem. In Germany there has been extensive debate on same sex partnerships. Although this has not yet yielded the same status as for heterosexual marriages, there has been some extension of rights, for example, old age care, housing rights, medical, educational rights regarding the partner's children. In Ireland men are generally not gendered in public policy, yet, through EU funding, men's groups for men have been set up in disadvantaged localities, usually based within a personal development model. At the same time outside the state father's rights groups are exerting greater pressure.

National reports have approached this area differently, as follows:

- *Estonia – poor education, non-Estonian men's lower life expectancy, homophobia, drugs, AIDS, unemployment;*
- *Finland – poverty, unemployment, homelessness, alcohol and drugs, social exclusion and health, gay men and sexualities, ethnic minorities/immigrants; disabled.*
- *Germany - homosexuality.*
- *Ireland - travellers, asylum seekers, economic migrants, gay men, men in socially disadvantaged areas, personal development, fathers' rights; disabled.*
- *Italy – poverty, pensioners, benefit claimants*

- *Latvia – not specified.*
- *Norway – class and ethnic divisions, welfare/benefits claimants, poverty, northern and poor municipalities, rural and urban youth.*
- *Poland – homosexuality, national/ethnic minorities, homeless, alcoholics, drug users, offenders, prostitutes.*
- *Russian Federation – not specified.*
- *UK – neighbourhood renewal, gay men, sex and relationship education, young men, poor education.*

Somewhat paradoxically, countries with a stronger hegemonic masculinity, represented by great concentrations of capital and power, may in fact offer some more options for diversity among some groups of men, compared to smaller tightly-knit “male-normative” societies. Gender power relations and sexism intersect with other dimensions of oppressive power relations, such as racism, disablism, heterosexism, ageism and classism, are a major dynamic in the generating patterns of social exclusion. Yet most governmental strategies to counter social exclusion do not explicitly address the issue of men; and where they do, an acknowledgement of oppression towards women and children is largely absent. Occasionally we hear of men as the socially excluded, rarely of men who perpetrate the various social exclusions.

**Violences:** The context of law and policy is set here by the recurring theme of the widespread nature of the problem of men’s violences to women, children and other men. Men are strongly overrepresented among those who use violence, especially heavy violence including homicide, sexual violence, racial violence, robberies, grievous bodily harm and drug offences. Similar patterns are also found for accidents in general, vehicle accidents and drunken driving.

Formal gender-neutrality operates in law in most respects. Exceptions to this include in some cases the specification of sexual crimes, of which rape is a clear, though complex, example, with fine differences between countries. In Estonia the Criminal Code deals only with the rape of women, and the Code of Criminal Procedure does not distinguish between the sexes. In the latter Code, rape is included under private charges proceedings. This means unnecessary additional hindrances and inconveniences to the victim in criminal proceedings. In Poland provisions of the penal code do not refer to the rape victim’s or perpetrator’s sex, even though men are almost exclusively perpetrators in these cases. In Latvia while there are legal acts and documents dealing with rape, only one woman has come to claim rape against her husband and nobody has come in connection of rape as a sexual and human rights violation. Recent UK legislation has made it an offence for a man to rape another man; Rape became non-consensual sexual intercourse by a man either vaginally or anally. In Germany there have been reforms on the illegality of rape in marriage. There are also other gender differences in the definition and operation of law. In the Russian Federation gender asymmetry in criminal law manifests itself in defining the range of criminal offences, and in describing the formal elements of definition of a crime, i.e. in the establishment of criminal responsibility. Thus gender-neutrality and gender specificity intersect in complex ways.

While the codification of crime and punishment is ancient, the issue of violence against women is a relatively new topic for policy development for many countries. In many countries this is still constructed as ‘family violence’ rather than ‘violence against women’. For example, in Latvia such violence is discussed in documents as a problem

of a impoverished, less educated family with children. The family level remains a politically convenient target of governmental strategies and initiatives. In 1999, with the initiative of the Baltic-Nordic working group for gender equality cooperation both the situation of family violence and violence against women was mapped in Estonia. On the basis of the results of the survey, a national strategy to combat violence against women will be prepared. It was noted that due to the lack of information the general public, as well as health care specialists and police officers, do not fully realise the seriousness of the problem. In Italy public debate has led to new precautionary laws being developed, with a focus on orders of protection against family abuses; these are, however, not gendered. In the UK 'domestic violence' has both received far more attention and been far more defined as a gendered crime in recent government guidance and legislation than any other form of men's violence. In Finland a national programme has been developed against violence, along with other initiatives against prostitution and trafficking. There is also some change in terminology in Finland, UK and elsewhere from 'domestic violence' or 'family violence' to 'violence against women'.

In most of the Western European countries there is some system of refuges for battered women but these are generally very much lacking in funding. In contrast, in Estonia there is no network of shelters for women or indeed consultation services to violent men. Overall in most countries there is little intervention work with men who are violent to women. In Norway there has been the development of alternatives to violence projects for men on a voluntary basis; in the UK there is some use of men's programmes in some localities on a statutory basis. In many countries the concern with men's aggressive behaviour is still regarded in traditional stereotypes and is explained in terms of impoverishment, value crisis, alcohol and drug-addiction. The results of Norwegian research indicating the possibly significant impact of bullying on men's violence is underexplored. In the UK and elsewhere there is often a lack of consistency regarding violence against women and governmental policy pressing for greater involvement of men in families and greater fathers' rights. In Germany there has also been policy attention to other diverse forms of men's violence, including in the army, sexual harassment, and violence in education.

Even with this rather uneven set of responses to violence against women, it is important to consider that other forms of men's gendered violence have not received the same attention. For example, little recognition is afforded to the predominantly gendered nature of child sexual abuse in governmental documents/legislation despite the fact that this gendered profile of perpetrators is virtually commonplace as knowledge in research, practice and (to some extent) public domains. In the UK there have been numerous official enquiries into cases of child sexual abuse. Hardly any of them acknowledge one of the few relatively clear facts from research about this crime, namely that it is overwhelmingly committed by men or boys. It is to be hoped that the studies by mainly feminist researchers, highlighting the very real linkages between "domestic violence" and child abuse, may focus attention on child sexual abuse as a gendered crime. Overall, there is generally a lack of attention paid to the gendered quality of violence inherent in, for instance, pornography, prostitution, child sexual abuse, trafficking in people. There is a need for more coherent government policies regarding men as childcarers recognising *at the same time* both men's real potential as carers and the equally real problems of gendered violence by men against women and children.

**Health:** The context of law and policy in relation to men's health has a number of contradictory elements. The life expectancy of men and thus men's ageing has increased markedly since the beginning of the 20th century. Yet the major recurring health theme is men's relatively low (to women) life expectancy, poor health, accidents, suicide, morbidity. Men suffer and die more and at a younger age from cardiovascular diseases, cancer, respiratory diseases, accidents and violence than women. Socio-economic factors, qualifications, social status, life style, diet, smoking, drinking, drug abuse, hereditary factors, as well as occupational hazards, can all be important for morbidity and mortality. Gender differences in health arise from hazardous occupations done by men. Generally men neglect their health and for some men at least their 'masculinity' is characterised by risk taking, especially for younger men (in terms of smoking, alcohol and drug taking, unsafe sexual practices, road accidents, lack of awareness of risk), an ignorance of their bodies, and reluctance to seek medical intervention for suspected health problems. Thus 'traditional masculinity' can be seen as hazardous to health.

Despite this, law and policy on health is often non-gendered, or rather, as with Violences, is a mix of non-gendered and gendered elements. In Poland both men and women are entitled to social welfare and health care use on the grounds of orphaning, homelessness, unemployment, disability, long-term illness, difficulties in parental and household matters (especially for single parent families and families with many children), alcohol and drug abuse, difficulties in readjusting to life following a release from a penitentiary institution, natural and ecological disasters, and, in the case of women, for the purposes of the protection of maternity. There are only government programmes on the protection of women's health and no programmes on men's health have been identified. Similarly, in Latvia policy is directed towards the health of mother and child, and stress is put on the importance of women's health in terms of their reproductive health. There is no statement or mention on the issues of men's (reproductive) health. In general, the family is marked as an integrated unit out of which a woman is singled out in terms of her childbearing functions. In several countries there are now national health education programmes. There are the beginnings of health education in Ireland, though the construction of health is mainly in physical terms. Sometimes health programmes, as in Estonia, focus especially on children and youth.

In Norway a number of health campaigns and measures are related to men's health, like attempts to reduce the proportion of smokers, but masculinity is not a main focus. Some research on men's health is ongoing or planned, but it cannot be described as a coherent research field. It is only recently that women's health has achieved this status. In many areas of health prevention, like reducing smoking, the problem patterns persist. There is a need to try new perspectives and methods, including a focus on masculinity and negative 'semiautomatic' life style habits among boys and men. Similarly, in Estonia, national programmes for the prevention of alcoholism and drug-use, tuberculosis, and HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, are all relevant for men.

There is growing concern with young men's health in a number of countries, for example, in Finland with young men's accidental mortality. Much needs to be done on men's and young men's suicide, and on the very high level of deaths from accidents (especially road traffic accidents) in young men. UK reports have noted how class factors intersected with gender regarding suicide rates for the highest risk age group (under 44 years), thus making an explicit link with some men's social exclusion. However, in many countries there are no policies. For example, there are no relevant

provisions in Polish law exclusively on men's health. Men are referred to in individual provisions related to self-inflicted injuries or incapacitation of health carried out in order to evade compulsory military service (both of which are treated as offences).

The UK Government has supported the movement towards improving men's health by other strategies. Since 1997 it has assisted The Men's Health Forum (founded in 1994) in a number of ways, for instance setting up its website. In January 2001 an All Party Group on Men's Health was set up to raise awareness and co-ordinate policies. The existence of such groups indicates that some MPs consider that there has been insufficient discrete initiatives directed towards the issue. Previously the Men's Health Forum has argued that the government has relied too much on general health policies, hoping that men would be included in these via the normal health structures, even though men often do not access these structures as much as women. Recently, the Government's Health Development Agency has appointed its first men's officer and the aim is to encourage surgeries to open at times more accessible to men and to make health promotion material more accessible to men.

What is almost wholly absent from national governmental policy discourses, as opposed to some research, in relation to men's health is any recognition that high levels of accidental and suicidal death might link with more critical approaches to men's practices, such as risk-taking, self-violence, problems in emotional communication, being 'hard'. Overall there is virtually no consideration of how problems of men's health link more broadly with a critical analysis of men's oppressive social practices.

## **7. Conclusions**

1. *Gender-neutral language* is generally used in law and policy, though for different reasons within different legal-political traditions. The national constitutions embody *equality for citizens under the law; non-discrimination on grounds of sex/gender*. Despite these features, major structural gender inequalities persist, as detailed in Workpackages 1 and 2.
2. The different traditions of *gendered welfare state policy regimes* have definite implications for men's practices; this is clearest in men's relations to home and work, including different constructions of men as breadwinners. The implications for men's social exclusion, violences and health need further explication.
3. The implications of *gender equality provisions* for men are underexplored. Different men can have complex, even contradictory, relations to gender equality and other forms of equality. Men's developing relations to gender equality can include: men assisting in the promotion of women's greater equality; attention to the gendered disadvantage of *certain* men, as might include gay men, men with caring responsibilities, men in non-traditional work; men's rights, fathers' rights, and anti-women/anti-feminist politics.
4. Efforts towards *gender mainstreaming* in law and policy are often, quite understandably, women-oriented; the implications for such policies for men need to be more fully explored, whilst at the same time avoiding anti-women/anti-feminist "men only" tendencies that can sometimes thus be promoted.
5. *The intersection of men, gender relations and other forms of social division and inequality*, such as ethnicity, remains an important and undeveloped field in law and policy. Both the substantive form and the recognition of these intersections in law, policy and politics vary considerably between the nations. These intersections are likely to be a major arena of political debate and policy development in the future.

## **Appendix 1: Institutional Affiliations**

- **Janna Chernova** European University at St. Petersburg, Russia.
- **Professor Harry Ferguson** University College Dublin, Ireland.
- **Professor Jeff Hearn** The Swedish School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland, and University of Manchester, UK.
- **Dr Øystein Gullvåg Holter** Work Research Institute, Oslo, Norway.
- **Professor Voldemar Kolga** University of Tallinn, Estonia.
- **Emmi Lattu** The Swedish School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland.
- **Jackie Millett** University of Sunderland, UK.
- **Professor Dr Ursula Müller** University of Bielefeld, Germany.
- **Dr Irina Novikova** University of Latvia, Riga.
- **Professor Elzbieta H. Oleksy** University of Lodz, Poland.
- **Eivind Olsvik** Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research (NIKK), Oslo, Norway.
- **Associate Professor Tamar Pitch** University of Camerino, Italy.
- **Professor Keith Pringle** University of Sunderland, UK.
- **Teemu Tallberg** The Swedish School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland.
- **Professor Carmine Ventimiglia** University of Parma, Italy.

## Appendix 2: Structure of the National Reports in Workpackage 3

Workpackage 3 focuses on the review of governmental and quasi-governmental legal and policy statements that explicitly address men.

The format for national reports in Workpackage 3 is as follows:

**1. Key points:** the 3 or 4 most important points or results of the national report (no more than ½ page).

**2. The national legal, policy and political background and context** (about 4 ½ pages) including:

- a) *general information on legal, policy and political background:* This section might include:
  - i) a brief discussion of the historical development of the growth of laws and policy. This might repeat part of what you have in your country description in [www.cromenet.org](http://www.cromenet.org);
  - ii) the main character of the political and governmental system, and any relevant recent changes;
  - iii) the political composition of the national government (and when relevant, 'regional' governments);
  - iv) the main governmental ministries involved in relevant policy development and their broad policy responsibilities;
  - v) the legal/policy support for provider model (or other models);
  - vi) presence (or not) of an 'Equality act', gender mainstreaming, and CEDAW signatory and reports;
  - vii) a brief discussion on men's politics/organisations and policy organisations around men (optional).
- b) *timescale:* normally starting from the beginning of the 1990's, but earlier developments may be included as relevant. Extensions backwards in terms of timescales are recognised as being valid where appropriate (e.g. comparing the situation in some East European countries pre-1989 and post-1989).

**3. Home and Work** (including what "gaps" exist). This includes review of *governmental and quasi-governmental legal and policy statements that explicitly address men* in relation to: a) home: family situation, childcare/housework (e.g. law on fatherhood); b) work: employment, unemployment (e.g. safety at work, work reserved for men); c) the relation of home and work (e.g. parental leave, paternity leave etc.)

**4. Social Exclusion** (including what "gaps" exist). As in workpackage 1 "social exclusion" should be interpreted as what is meant in your own cultural context, in terms of linguistic and social construction of "social exclusion". Please outline the specific laws and policies relevant to social marginalisation in your country to facilitate comparative analysis of these varying processes. It would be interesting to know about all forms of disadvantage intersecting with gender which contribute to "social exclusion" in each country. This includes review of *governmental and quasi-governmental legal and policy statements that explicitly address men* in relation to dimensions of disadvantage associated with issues of ethnicity/cultural differences/racism/xenophobia and with sexuality/heterosexism/ homophobia.

**5. Violences** (including what "gaps" exist)

This includes review of *governmental and quasi-governmental legal and policy statements that explicitly address men* in relation to men's violence to women, children and each other, including institutional and military violence. This might also include information on suicide, and on boys' and men's experience of violence, if they are most appropriately located here. Anti-violence programmes addressed to men could also be examined here.

**6. Health** (including what "gaps" exist).

Specific issues to be discussed may include *governmental and quasi-governmental legal and policy statements that explicitly address men* in relation to:

(1) *Men's health and health education* (2) *Social welfare/health care use* (3) *Men's suicide*.

(Sections 3-6 suggest average of 1 page each, some can be longer, some shorter = 4 pages)

**7. Discussion and Other Comments as appropriate e.g. interconnections between the 4 areas.**

**8. Bibliography** Note: a useful source might be CEDAW report of your country. (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women).

**General layout:** Please use the same layout (size of font 12, line spacing 1,5, subheadings etc.) as on the Finland national report. When referring to tables and figures, either in the text or in the title of tables and figures, please use this format: (Author year, Table x). Please use '&' rather than 'and' when there are 2 or more names; please include first names of authors and editors; please include page numbers of chapters in books, and number of pages of books. If in doubt make the references as full as possible. Please save your documents in Word Document form.



### Appendix 3: Percentage of National Reports Coverage Devoted to Main Sections

	General	Home and work	Social exclusion	Violences	Health
Estonia	30	30	5	30	5
Finland	42	21	15	12	10
Germany	27	20	18	26	9
Ireland	17	29	26	22	6
Italy	-	22	38	40	-
Latvia	54	38	-	4	4
Norway	47	15	19	13	6
Poland	38	35	12	6	9
Russian Federation	50	17	-	33	-
United Kingdom	27	25	8	32	8

**Appendix 4 Estonia National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Voldemar Kolga

**Appendix 5 Finland National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Jeff Hearn, Emmi Lattu and Teemu Tallberg

**Appendix 6 Germany National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Ursula Mueller

**Appendix 7 Ireland National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Harry Ferguson

**Appendix 8 Italy National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Carmine Ventimiglia

**Appendix 9 Latvia National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Irina Novikova

**Appendix 10 Norway National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Øystein Gullvag Holter

**Appendix 11 Poland National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Elzbieta Oleksy

**Appendix 12 Russian Federation National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Janna Chernova

**Appendix 13 UK National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices Workpackage 3:** Keith Pringle with the assistance of Alex Raynor and Jackie Millett