"THE SOCIAL PROBLEM OF MEN": DELIVERABLE 13: POLICY OPTION PAPER II EU, EUROPEAN AND TRANSNATIONAL OPTIONS AND PRIORITIES

Jeff Hearn, Ursula Müller, Elzbieta Oleksy, Keith Pringle, Janna Chernova, Harry Ferguson, Øystein Gullvåg Holter, Voldemar Kolga, Irina Novikova, Carmine Ventimiglia, Emmi Lattu, Teemu Tallberg, Eivind Olsvik, *with the assistance of* **Diane McIlroy and Hertta Niemi**

EU FP5 Thematic Network: The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities

POLICY OPTION PAPER II:
EU, European and Transnational Options and Priorities

Contents

EU FP5 Thematic Network: The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities

POLICY OPTION PAPER II:
EU, EUROPEAN AND TRANSNATIONAL OPTIONS AND PRIORITIES

INTRODUCTION

This supranational policy option paper arises from the work of The European Research Network on Men in Europe project, "The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities" (2000–2003), funded by the European Commission within Framework 5. The Network comprises women and men researchers with range of disciplinary backgrounds from ten countries.

This supranational policy paper complements the ten individual national policy option papers (Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, the Russian Federation, the UK) (Deliverable 12). Network associates exist in Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark and Sweden. It addresses the following main questions: the EU, European and Transnational Policy Contexts; transnational developments between and across countries; transnational organisations. and the Four Policy Areas – Home and Work, Social Exclusion, Violences, Health - and their Interrelations.

These are examined in the following sections:
II. 1. Men's Gendered Practices;
II. 2. The Research Context and Changing Forms of Masculinities;
II. 3. Transnational Perspectives;
II. 4. The European Context.
II. 5. The Changing Policy Context and the Changing Forms of Masculinities;
II. 6. Men's Relations to Home and Work;
II. 7. The Social Exclusion of Men;
II. 8. Men's Violences;
II. 9. Men's Health;
II. 10. Interrelations between Policy Areas.

II. 1. MEN'S GENDERED PRACTICES

For many centuries, men, masculinity and men's powers and practices were generally taken-for-granted. Gender was largely seen as a matter of and for women. Men were usually seen as ungendered, 'natural' or naturalised. This is now changing; it is much less the case than even ten years ago (Metz-Göckel and Müller, 1986; Brod, 1987; Kaufman, 1987; Kimmel, 1987; Hearn, 1987, 1992; Connell, 1987, 1995, Segal, 1990; Holter, 1997).

At the same time, there has been a considerable recent development of research on gender relations and welfare issues in Europe (Aslanbeigu et al.; 1994; Leira, 1994; Sainsbury; 1994, 1996; Walby, 1997; Duncan, 1995; Duncan and Pfau-Effinger, 2001). Critical studies of men's practices have received some recent attention within transnational surveys of gender relations (for example, Dominelli, 1991, Rai et al., 1992; Pease and Pringle, 2002; Hobson, 2002; Hearn et al., 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2003; Kimmel et al., 2003; Novikova and Kambourov, 2003).

Throughout much of Europe contemporary gender relations can be characterised by relatively rapid change in some respects, for example, rates of separation and divorce, new employment patterns, alongside the persistence of long-term historical structures and practices, such as men's domination of top management, men's propensity to use violence and commit crime. This can thus be understood as a combination of contradictory social processes of change and no change (Hearn, 1999).

A very important feature and effect of such changing gender relations has been the gradually growing realisation that men are just as gendered as are women. It is now clear that 'gender' and 'gender relations' are about both women and men. This explicit gendering of men necessarily involves both changing academic, policy and political analyses of men in society, and contemporary changes in men's lives, sometimes developing counter to earlier expectations and experiences of recent generations of men.

Making men more gendered, in theory, in policy, and in practice, has meant that previously taken-for-granted powers and authority of men, social actions of men, and ways of being men, can now be considered as much more problematic. They may not yet be much more negotiable, but they are now recognised as more open to debate. A number of social changes now seem to be in place whereby men and masculinities can at least be talked about as problematic.

It is now at least possible to ask such questions as:
• What is a man?
• How do men maintain power?
• Is there a crisis of masculinity?
• Or is there a crisis of *men* in a more fundamental way?
• Do we know what the future of men looks like or should be?
• What policy and practice implications follow both in relation to men and boys, and for men and boys?
• What specific policies and policy options are to be developed in relation to men and boys?

Paradoxically, men and masculinities are now more talked about than before at a time when it is much less clear what and how they are, are to become, should be or should become.

II. 2. THE RESEARCH CONTEXT AND CHANGING FORMS OF MASCULINITIES

The overall research context for examining these policy questions is provided by previous scholarship on two areas of study:
• critical studies on men and masculinities
• studies of comparative welfare systems and welfare responses to associated social problems and inequalities.

There are also close links with policy outcomes in relation to changing family structures; work configurations within the labour market and the home; and other changes in the wider European society. The research context for studying men and the changing forms of men and masculinities are very closely interconnected.

Although there are many ways in which men and masculinities vary between and across countries, in many European countries, until relatively recently, established forms of masculinity and men's practices could be distinguished on two major dimensions – by locality (for example, urban, rural), by social class (for example, bourgeois, working class). In these and many other different ways men have both created huge problems, most obviously in violence, and been constructive and creative actors, as, for example, in the building of industries, albeit within patriarchies.

The exact ways these forms of masculinity have been practiced clearly vary between societies and cultures. In addition, many other cross-cutting dimensions have been and remain important, such as variations by age, ethnicity, sexuality, nationality and nationalism. In recent years, there have been major changes in dominant forms of masculinity. For example, urban bourgeois, rural bourgeois, urban working class, and rural working class forms of masculinity and men's practices have all been subject to major social transformation, as have various state, party and class-based forms of masculinity particulalrly the kind associated with the former Communist regimes. These changes have been most clear in those countries where there has been a relatively rapid transition to urbanised, industrialised society, such as Finland and Ireland. They are also visible in the transitional post-Communist nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

The taken-for-granted nature of men and masculinities is now changing. Recent years have seen the *naming of men as men*. Men have become the subject of growing debates in the areas of academia, policy and media. In some respects this is *not* totally new; there have been previous periods of debate on men (Kimmel 1987, 1995), and then, in a different sense, much of politics, research and policy has always been about men, often dominantly so. What is new, however, is that these debates, particularly academic and policy debates, are now more explicit, more gendered, more varied and sometimes more critical.

Among the several influences that have brought this focus on men and masculinities, first and foremost is the impact on men of Second, and now Third, Wave Feminisms. Questions have been asked by feminists and feminisms on all aspects of men and men's actions, in politics, policy, and practice. Different feminist initiatives have focused on different aspects of men, and have suggested different analyses of men and differing ways forward for men. Feminism has also demonstrated various theoretical and practical lessons for men. One is that the understanding of gender relations, relations between women and men has to involve attention to questions of power. There has also been a wide range of men's responses to gender (in)equality and feminism – some positive, some antagonistic, some unengaged and apparently disinterested.

Something similar has happened and very unevenly continues to happen particularly in academia. In some senses there are as many ways of studying men and masculinities as there are varying approaches to the social sciences, ranging from examinations of 'masculine psychology' to broad societal, structural and collective analyses of men. An important development has however been the shift from the analysis of masculinity in the singular to masculinities in the plural. Studies have thus interrogated the operation of different masculinities – hegemonic, complicit, subordinated, marginalised, resistant (Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1987, 1995) –

and the interrelations of unities and differences between men and between masculinities (Hearn and Collinson, 1993). There is also a growing lively debate on the limitations of the very idea of 'masculinities', including around the confusions of different current usages of the term. For this reason some scholars prefer to talk rather more precisely of men's individual and collective practices – or men's identities or discourses on or of men – rather than the generalised gloss term, 'masculinities' (Donaldson 1993, McMahon 1993; Hearn 1996; Macinnes 1998; Whitehead 1999; Clatterbaugh 2000).

Not only are men now increasingly recognised as gendered, but they, or rather some men, are increasingly recognised as a gendered social problem to which welfare systems may, or for a variety of reasons may not, respond (Pringle, 1995). This can apply in terms of violence (Hearn, 1998), crime, drug and alcohol abuse, buying of sex, accidents, driving, and so on, and indeed in terms of denial of such problems as sexual violence (for example, Ventimiglia, 1987). These are all activities that are social in nature, and can have both immediate and long-term negative effects on others, friends, family, strangers, victims and survivors. The association of the gendered problematisation of men and masculinities, and the gendered social problem of men and masculinities is complex (for example, Holter and Aarseth, 1993; Månsson, 1994; Ekenstam, 1998; Popay et al., 1998), as, indeed, are the differential responses of welfare systems (Pringle, 1998a; Pringle and Harder, 1999). But at the very least one would want to acknowledge the various ways in which the more general gendering and gendered problematisations of men and masculinities both facilitate and derive from more particular recognition of certain men and masculinities as social problems. Such recognitions apply through the use of measurable information, such as, official statistics, as well as less exact discursive constructions in politics, policy, law, media and opinion-formation.

These processes of problematisation of men and construction of men as gendered social problems apply in academic and political analysis, and in men's own lives and experiences; they also exist more generally at the societal level, and very importantly in quite different ways in different societies. Thus while it may be expected that some kind of problematisation of men and masculinities may now be observable in many, perhaps most, European societies, the form that it takes is likely to be very different indeed from society to society. The form such problematisations take thus varies in different countries:
- it may appear in public concern around young men, crime, relatively low educational attainments in schools;
- it may take the form of anxieties around the family, fatherhood, and relations with children; elsewhere, the specific links between boyhood, fathering and men may be emphasised;
- or increased concerns about men's ill-health, alcohol use, depression, loneliness, and low life expectancy;
- or the problem of reconciling home and work, with the pressure towards long working hours;
- or men's violence to and control of women and children;
- or men's participation in and continued domination of many political and economic institutions;
- or changing forms of men's sexuality and personal relations.

These questions have been the subject of growing research investigation in specific European nations and research collaboration during recent years. These and other forms of gendered problematisation of men and masculinities and constructions of men and masculinities as gendered social problems have been examined in a range of European national welfare contexts by the Research Network. There is a great national and societal variation in how men and masculinities interact with issues, not merely those of culture but also other major social divisions and inequalities, in particular, class, "race" xenophobia and racism, ethnicity, nationalism and religion. The intersections of "race", ethnicity, nationalism and nationality appear to be especially and increasingly important for the construction of both dominant and subordinated forms of men and masculinities. Examining this entails investigation of the complex interrelations between these varying genderings and problematisations and the socio-economic, political, state structures and processes within and between countries. Fuller understanding of these issues is likely to assist the formulation of social policy responses to them in both existing and potential member states, and within the EU.

Recently, attempts have been made to push forward the boundaries in the comparative field using feminist and pro-feminist perspectives to consider men's practices throughout the world . These attempts seek to locate such considerations within recent debates about globalisation and men's practices, throwing some doubt in the process on the more ambitious and other gender-neutral claims of globalisation theses. Despite such recent developments, there remains a massive deficit in critical transnational studies of men's practices and related policy-making on men, and in the sources available for such studies.

II. 3. TRANSNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

In recent years transnational perspectives, such as those underpinning this Research Network, have been applied to a vast range of studies within the social sciences. There are many reasons for this tendency. One of the most convincing reasons for adopting a comparative approach is the potential offered for interrogating the assumptions that underpin social practices and policies in different countries. Such a process of learning from other countries facilitates reconstruction of more effective policies and practices. Such practices and policies increasingly interact transnationally, at 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 various general theoretical categorisations to specific issues. In terms of differential welfare regimes, the most common model applied in this way is that devised by Esping-Andersen (1990, 1996, 1999). There has also been extensive critique of such models in terms of insufficient attention to gender relations (Lewis and Ostner, 1991; Leira, 1992; Lewis, 1992; Orloff, 1993; O'Connor, 1993; Sainsbury, 1994, 1996, 1999; Tyyskä, 1995; Siim, 2000). There is also a wide range of further broad feminist and gender-sensitive work that examines global and transnational change through a gendered lens (for example, Anthias and Yuval-Davis, 1992; Mies, 1998; Peterson and Runyan, 1999), which also have direct and indirect implications for the re-analysis of men and masculinities in the context of transnational and global relations.

Commentators have also taken various positions regarding the analytic value of applications from broad general frameworks to the particular national and local context (Alber, 1995; Anttonen and Sipilä, 1996; Daly 2000; Harder and Pringle, 1997; Pringle, 1998a; Pringle and Harder, 1999), partly depending upon the issue being studied. There is a need for considerable open-mindedness in the assumptions that are brought to bear in such analyses. For example, Trifiletti (1999), through a feminist perspective on the relations between gender and welfare system dynamics, has 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.

The critical study of men's practices has, until very recently, largely escaped specific comparative scrutiny (Pease and Pringle, 2001), although it has received important attention within broader and relatively established transnational feminist surveys of gender relations (for instance, Dominelli 1991; Rai et al. 1992). Yet, the limited amount of work devoted specifically to men's practices transnationally suggests there continues to be major scope for extending critical analysis in that particular area.

Looking globally at the field of social welfare, there are complex patterns of convergence and divergence between men's practices internationally needing further interrogation (Pringle, 1998b). Connell's initial enquiries regarding the global transactions which occur in processes of masculinity formation have opened up a whole range of possibilities for exploration and contestation (Connell, 1991, 1995, 1998; Hearn, 1996a); these possibilities are just beginning to be explored in any depth (Pease and Pringle, 2001). In particular, these studies have begun to conceptualise broad transnational categories of men and masculinities. For example, recent attempts have been made to push forward the boundaries in the comparative field by using pro-feminist perspectives to consider men's practices in Asia, Southern Africa, the Americas (South, Central and North), Australasia and Europe (Pease and Pringle, 2001). These developing global perspectives have closely informed the work of the Network with its focus on Europe - "West", "Central" and "East".

More specifically, transnational perspectives highlight a number of key policy issues, for example, around:
• transnational business men who move across countries, with less national loyalty and identification;
• transnational politics and policy-making;
• migration and asylum seeking, especially of young men, and their implications for women and men, in countries of both emigration and immigration;
• trafficking in women, children and men;
• the intersection of various 'new' and 'old' masculinities, in relation to nationalisms, racisms and xenophobias.

II. 4. THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

In assessing the nature of the European context, it is important to recognise the contradictions between, on the one hand, contemporary trends towards globalisation, regionalisation and transnationalism and, on the other, the persistence of the nation-state. Having said that, there are both similarities and differences in the substantive patterns of national laws and policies. The social and cultural contexts in which the

national reports on law and policy are written are very varied indeed. The national and local contexts need thus to be understood in order 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 European Union (EU); and their welfare and social policy frameworks and practices.

The EU is an economic, social and political union, initially it consisted of six countries in 1957. It has sought to increase the harmonisation of economic and social policies across member states, whilst respecting the principle of subsidiarity (decisions being made at the lowest appropriate level). It is premised on the 'single market' amongst member states and parliamentary democracy, albeit of different forms in the member states. Over the years this inevitably has involved tensions between the push to economic and social convergence and the defense of national political interests. As the Union has expanded these tensions have become more complex, though it is probably fair to say that the 'strong agenda' towards greater unity has become more dominant in recent years.

The EU currently comprises fifteen countries: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the UK. Thirteen further countries are Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey. Accession negotiations are under way for the first twelve of these, with the objective of completing the accession, so they can take part in European Parliament elections by 2004. In addition, twelve of the fifteen EU member states (all except Denmark, Sweden, the UK) now have the same currency (the Euro), and are part of the European Monetary Union (EMU). Thus the ten countries in our review have differing relations to the EU:

- EU member/member of the EMU: Finland (date of joining the EU: 1995), Germany (1957), Ireland (1973), Italy (1957);
- EU/non-member of the EMU: the UK (1973);
- not EU member (though associated in some specific respects): 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 applicant		Estonia, Latvia, Poland
non-EU applicant	Norway	Russian Federation

The EU itself is part of the historical legacy that has been based on the attempt to develop broad social democracy and stop fascism from happening in Europe again. Furthermore, it is relevant to look at the EU, the European Commission and the associated organisations as gendered institutions. This includes the question of the lack of attention to men in power, including men in the institutions of the EU itself. The EU and the EU application process are themselves becoming important parts of

the public politics of comparative European welfare development, including the comparative development of gender policies, and policies in relation to men. This is especially significant in regards the EU's eastward expansion, including the specific conditions for application and accession.

There is a growing recognition of the impact, albeit differential, of the EU itself on the heterogeneous gender politics and gender regimes of the member states (Liebert, 1999). This is partly through the operation of various equal opportunities policies at the supranational and national levels, most obviously in the fields of family, welfare, labor market and education policies, but also more generally in migration and environmental policies (Walby, 1999). In most cases these debates on and indeed in the EU have focused on (increasing) women's participation in the public spheres of employment and education, along with the development of women's rights in social protection and welfare.

Throughout their development there have been strong legal and policy emphases on equality and gender equality within the EEC and the EU. Key measures here include:
- Article 119 (EC) of the 1957 Treaty of Rome on the principle of 'equal pay for equal work',
- the 1975 Equal Pay Directive (75/117/EEC),
- the 1976 Equal Treatment Directive on Employment, Vocational Training and Promotion, and the Working Conditions (76/207/EEC), and
- the subsequent related directives, especially the Social Security Directive (79/7/EEC),
- Article 13 (EC) of the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam on general anti-discrimination in employment,
- the Community Framework Strategy on Gender Equality (COM (2000) 335 final of 7.6.2000) and the related Programme (Decision 2001/51/EC),
- the Employment Framework Directive 2000 (Council Directive 2000/78/EC).

According to Articles 17 and 18 of the Employment Framework Directive 2000, all EU member states are required to implement national legislation prohibiting discrimination in employment on the grounds of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, age, disability or sexual orientation by 2 December 2003. Similarly, Paragraphs (1)(c) and (1)(d) of Article 3 address 'pay' (including travel allowances and occupational pension schemes) and 'benefits', respectively. Article 12 prohibits discrimination on the grounds of nationality.

In addition, there are numerous other Declarations and Recommendations around equal opportunities, which have had the effect of shaping policy norms and creating a policy climate towards this direction (Bulmer 1998).

Overall policy development in the EU is to some extent framed by the development of the European Social Agenda (2000-2005) (*Communication ...*, 2000) This seeks to advance a range of "future orientations for social policy", of which the most relevant to the topic of men's practices are the following:
- "Fighting poverty and all forms of exclusion and discrimination in order to promote social integration";
- "Promoting gender equality"; and

- Strengthening the social policy aspects of enlargement and the European Union's external relations".

There is, however, much to be done in order to give explicit attention to the full implications of achieving gender equality within the European Social Agenda, in terms of what this means for men and changing men's practices. The policies of the existing EU social agenda (including EU policies on equality, gender equality, social exclusion, racism) imply the development of policy options on men.

There have already been some steps in this process, for example, the EU "Men and Gender Equality Conference", Örebro, held in March 2001 under the auspices of the then Swedish presidency, and the EU conference on "Gender and Social Exclusion", Copenhagen, September 2002 under the auspices of the current Danish Presidency. It is likely that this process of considering the implications for men and changing men's will increase in the coming years, albeit from a variety of political interests and motivations.

In focusing men within this European context, a persistent challenge is how to examine 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 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. Indeed it might be argued that some forms of (male) citizenship, based on notions of individualism and even exclusion of community and similarity, are often in tension with some forms of (male) nationalism, based on notions of cultural lineage, culture and language, and exclusion of individuality and difference.

On the second count, the contemporary societal context of law and policy on men is often formally framed by the ratification, or not, of such international agreements as:
- the ILO Convention 100 on Equal Remuneration for Men and Women for Equal Work 1957,
- the ILO Convention 111 in Respect of Discrimination in Employment/Occupation 1957 (http://www.unesco.org/culture/worldreport/html_eng/stat2/table13.pdf),
- the UN Declaration on Human Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights,

- the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,
- the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and
- the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) (and reporting thereon) (http://www.unhchr.ch/html/intlinst.htm).

These are often supplemented by a '(Gender) Equality Act', a Bureau of Gender Equality between Women and Men, Convention on the Rights of the Child, and various forms of gender mainstreaming. Some of these international agreements are open to reservations and different interpretations.

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 form 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 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 harmonization 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 policy measures, at least in the short term, is also in doubt, in view of the lack of gender equality (Hearn at al., 2002a, 2002b).

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 labor 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 realization 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. 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 (1990, 1996). 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. Contrasts between Neo-liberal; Social Democratic; and Conservative welfare regimes in Western Europe have thus been critiqued in terms of their neglect of gender welfare state regimes and gender relations. Such distinctions include the following: Latin Rim, Bismarckian, Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian (Langan and Ostner, 1991); Strong, Modified, Weak Breadwinner States (Lewis, 1992; Ostner, 1991; Duncan, 1995); 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, 1986, 1990, Waters, 1990, Hearn, 1992); Transitional from Private Patriarchy, Housewife Contract, Dual Role Contract, Equality Contract (Hirdman, 1988; 1990) 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 relatively 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 (sometimes court-mandated) for men who have been or are violent to women and children.

Health
- men's health education programs;
- men's relations to reproductive technology.

The form and development of law and policy also intersect with the substantive form and nature of socio-economic change. In the earlier review of academic research 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' program (1995-2000) (http://www.norden.org/jaemst/sk/maend.asp?lang=4).

- 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.

An important step in that process has been fulfilled by the Research Network, insofar as its aim was to identify gaps in research on men which are critical to the progress of the European Union's social policy objectives as outlined above. More specifically, its objectives were:

(i) To analyse and understand more fully across the EU and its potential members the differential associations of men's practices with various social problems including men's relations to home and work, social exclusion, violences, and health.

(ii) To formulate provisional strategies to address some of those social problems in terms of national and EU responses on equal opportunities and other policy areas.

(iii) To identify areas for ongoing inquiry so as to further develop such strategies.

(iv) In the context of European Union enlargement, to anticipate some of the national and transnational social problems relating to the impact of men's practices upon social cohesion and inclusion in existing and new member states of the EU.

(v) To gain a more adequate understanding of contemporary and changing representations of men, and negotiations around such representations in governmental and other official, media and research contexts.

The choice of countries included in the Network was highly geared to the tasks and objectives discussed above:

(i) The "testing" of 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 (1990, 1996, 1999) - Neo-liberal; Social Democratic; and Conservative – along with examples of post-Communist states. The spread of countries – in Northern, Western, and Eastern Europe - presents a relatively broad cultural, geographical and political range within Europe.

(ii) Developing notions of what "being European" constitutes. This has salience in relation to the fact that some influential sectors of society within parts of central and eastern Europe 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 the development of an alleged "Fortress Europe" are also highly relevant to the lived experience of many men, both those who are excluded and/or those who actively involved in processes of exclusion – and on the lived experiences of women associated in various ways with these men.

(iii) The extent of differential social patterns and welfare responses between countries which are often grouped together on alleged grounds of historical, social and/or cultural proximity, for instance, Sweden and Finland; Ireland and the UK.

(iv) Exploration of how recent huge economic, social and cultural changes in Central and Eastern Europe have impacted upon attitudes and practices relating to men (for example, Grogaard, 1996; Novikova 2000; Kolga 2000; Novikova and Kambourov 2003). Following the historic transformations of the late 1980s and early 1990s, processes of "East-West" interchange and EU enlargement are likely to constitute a period of further historically major change in gender relations and gender equality, the relations of men's power and marginalisation of some men, and thus the societal position, opportunities and experiences of women, in the coming decade.

Added saliency is provided by the extent of "cultural exchange" (largely one-way) which has occurred between those countries and western/northern Europe. At the same time, access to materials from Estonia, Latvia, Poland and the Russian Federation provides allows investigation of the different constellations of practices and beliefs between the countries in the context of their very different historical and cultural trajectories. It has also allowed some charting of future European trends in relation to men's practices. Following the historic transformations of the 1990s, processes of "East-West" interchange are likely to constitute a period of further historically major change in gender relations and gender equality, the relations of men's power and marginalisation of some men, and thus the societal position, opportunities and experiences of women. The inclusion of Germany with its special position post-unification is also very important as representing a different historical and cultural path in the post-communist period. There is considerable research interest in the differences between men from the former Eastern and former Western parts of Germany (for example, Zulehner and Volz, 1998, Műller, 2000).

This fourth (iv) "East-West" aspect of comparative study is such an important and central theme that it needs further extended discussion. The recent massive economic, social and cultural changes there have impacted and are impacting upon attitudes and practices relating to men. This has in some cases included major processes of marginalisation for some men in the social and economic transformations that have taken place since the late 1980s. These processes of marginalisation (including in some cases health problems, problems of crime and violence, racism and xenophobia as well as ethnic and linguistic marginalisations) have continued alongside the perpetuation of some men's continued domination of positions of power.

These issues relating to men have also been accompanied by and, indeed, intimately intersect with major changes, at least partly negative, in the life experiences of many women in a number of Central and East European states, including: increasing female exclusion from the labour market and from higher level jobs; less control over their own bodies (for example, often less choice in matters of abortion); sometimes reduced freedom in ability to seek divorce; increasing sexual exploitation both inside their

own countries (often by men coming from existing member states of the EU) and inside the EU (via "trafficking" of women and children from Central and Eastern Europe). These changes take complex forms in different parts of Central and Eastern Europe, with conditions varying considerably by class, locality and region. An important aspect of these changes is the development of the formal policy-making innovation and rhetoric of equality and equal opportunities, both as parts of the process of EU application.

In particular the relation of the transitional nations to the EU and the more Western parts of Europe is likely to be a major focus of economic, social, political and cultural development and change in the coming years. This includes:

(i) the differential position of the transitional nations in the EU application process in relation to the EU and the EU member nations;

(ii) the impact of EU gender equality and associated social and economic policies on the transitional nations in their application phase and, at least in some cases, likely EU membership (especially in the context of some of the more negative trends in the lives of many women in some of these states noted above);

(iii) the particular and differential processes of both the reproduction of men's power and the marginalisation of some men in the transitional nations, and how they link with and sometimes contrast with the patterns in existing EU nations;

(iv) the social, economic, political and cultural impacts of forms of masculinities and men's practices from the EU nations upon the transnational nations, and also increasingly those impacts from the transnational nations upon the EU nations;

(v) the specific position and relation of those countries of the EU which are geographically adjacent to the transitional nations, such as Finland and Germany.

The Research Network has facilitated greater understanding of changing social processes of gender relations and gender construction particularly in the context of welfare responses to the associated social problems. It has also brought together existing, up to date research, statistical and policy data on a national basis. Moreover, the Research Network has also revealed a number of major gaps and shortcomings in existing research and policy-oriented knowledge. These gaps have particularly concerned: (i) the understanding of men in a transnational rather than a national context; and (ii) those men who are most powerful and those men who are least powerful.

The outcomes from the Network have clearly demonstrated that there remains a massive deficit in critical transnational studies of men's practices and their impact upon/interactions with the lived experiences of women. Furthermore, there is an equally massive deficit in the sources available for such study. Strategies to counter these deficits will be critical to both the ongoing development of the European Research Area and the concomitant promotion of the European Social Agenda .

II. 5. THE CHANGING POLICY CONTEXT AND THE CHANGING FORMS OF MASCULINITIES

Men and masculinities are understood as set within changing policy contexts. There have been huge historical changes in forms of masculinity and men's practices. Yet there are also stubborn persistence in some aspects of men and masculinity. Perhaps the most obvious of these is men's domination of the use of violence. Moreover, changing gender relations both constitute governments and other policy-making institutions, and provide tasks for governmental, partnership and third sector agencies to deal with. In this sense governments and other policy institutions can be seen as both part of the problem and part of the solution.

The historical legacy inherited by the EU includes attempts to develop broad social democracy and stop fascism happening again. The EU itself can be understood as a project of positive possibilities largely led and negotiated by men politicians after the Second World War in contradiction to short-term nationalistic interests. It can be seen as a project devised to reduce men's historical tendency to nationalistic conflict and war, and so achieve relative stability in Europe. There is indeed increasing recognition of the central place of men and masculinity in the collective violence of war (Enloe 1990; Higate 2002), and the apparent increased use of rape by men and sexual violence in war.

To understand the national and transnational policy context also involves considering the relevance of 'the social problem of men' within organisational and governmental policy formation, in national, regional and indeed EU institutions. It is thus necessary to analyse and change the place of men within the gender structure of governmental, transgovernmental and other policy-making organisations. This includes the question of the relative lack of attention to men in power, including men in the EU, the implications of mainstreaming for men, and men's relations to gender equality more generally.

The social problem of men also relates closely to existing EU social agendas, including EU policies on equality, gender equality, social exclusion, and racism. There is thus a need to develop policy options on men, including 'best practices' and other illustrative policies on men.

Addressing policy around men and masculinities is an important and urgent matter. There are indeed risks and dangers in non-action, for example, in the intersection of various 'new' and 'old' masculinities, nationalisms, racisms and xenophobias. There are also key issues around the changing policy context in Europe. These include the relation of the EU to eastward expansion, including the specific conditions of application and accession; questions of migration, especially of young men, and their implications for women and men, in countries of both emigration and immigration; trafficking in women, children and men, especially the actions of men as the consumers within the EU member countries. The 'social problem' of men is thus of central and urgent interest to the EU and the applicant countries.

There are also many other transnational organisations and groupings, for example, the Council of Europe, the UN, UNESCO, UNICEF, ILO, the Nordic Council of Ministers, the EU Women's Lobby, and various NGOs which have come to recognise the importance of the place of men in the movement towards gender equality. The UN held a Beijing+5 Special Event on Men and Gender Equality in New York, June 2000

(http://www.undp.org/gender/programmes/men/men_ge.html#Beijing + 5 Special). Further governmental and transgovernmental interest seems likely to develop.

It is necessary to analyse and change the place of men within the gender structure of governmental and other policy-making organisations. There is also a need to develop policy options on men, including best practices and policies on men. Addressing policy around men and masculinities is an important and urgent matter. We now introduce the four main policy areas.

II. 6. MEN'S RELATIONS TO HOME AND WORK

Recurring policy themes include men's occupational, working and wage advantages over women, gender segregation at work, many men's close associations with paid work, and increasingly men in non-traditional occupations. There has been a general lack of attention to men as managers, policy-makers, owners and other power holders. In many countries there are twin problems of the unemployment of some or many men in certain social categories, and yet work-overload and long working hours for other men. These can especially be a problem for young men and young fathers; they can affect both working class and middle class men, for example, during economic recession. Work organisations are becoming more time-hungry and less secure and predictable. Time utilisation emerges as a fundamental issue of creating difference in everyday negotiations between men and women. Men's unemployment can have clear and diverse effects on men's life in families.

Another recurring theme is men's benefit from avoidance of domestic responsibilities, and the absence of fathers. In some cases this tradition of men's avoidance of childcare and domestic responsibilities is very recent indeed and still continues for the majority of men. In some cases it is being reinforced through new family ideologies within transformation processes. In many countries there is a general continuation of traditional 'solutions' in domestic arrangements, sometimes reinforced by "family values" or political right wing approaches. There is also in many countries a growing recognition of the micro-politics of fatherhood, men's domestic responsibilities, home-work reconciliation at least for some men, and increasing emphasis on men's caring, sometimes linked to a gender equal status perspective.

It is not surprising if there may be a degree of cultural uncertainty on men's place in the home and as fathers and a growing recognition of ambivalence, even when there is a strong ideology of familialism. There is also in some countries a growing interest in the reconciliation of work and home; and growing variety of ways of approaching this. Given the considerable difference that still exists between men's and women's earnings, it is not surprising that it is the woman who stays at home after the birth of a child. Since she is usually the person with the lower income, a couple does not need to be wholehearted advocates of traditional domestic ideology to opt for the traditional solution. Evidence from Nordic countries shows that parental leave which is left to negotiations between men and women, is mostly taken up by women, although most people, men especially, say they want a more balanced situation. Men and indeed fathers are clearly not an homogeneous group.

Many research studies have noted how there have been contradictions between the ideas men profess and the way men actually live. The fact that men and women living

together do not always give the same assessment of their relationship in general and the distribution of tasks between them in particular has become a much discussed topic in methodology. The paradoxical ways in which gender conflicts on the distribution of housework may be negotiated may be illustrated from German research: while in the early 1980s women living with men were generally more likely than men to claim that they did more of the work, some studies in the 1990s have shown the opposite.

EU, European-wide and transnational policy priorities include:

- to encourage men to devote more time and priority to caring, housework, childcare, and the reconciliation of home and paid work;
- to remove men's advantages in paid work and work organisations, as with the persistence of the gender wage, non-equal opportunities practices in appointment and promotion, and domination of top level jobs;
- policies on men in transnational organisations and their development of equality policies;
- to encourage men's positive contribution to gender equality;
- to remove discriminations against men, such as compulsory conscription of men into the armed forces, and discriminations against gay men.

II. 7. THE SOCIAL EXCLUSION OF MEN

This has been one of the most difficult area to pre-define, but in some ways one of the most interesting. Social exclusion often figures in the research literature in different ways, such as:

- unemployment and poverty,
- ethnicity, racialisation and racism,
- homosexuality,
- homelessness,
- social isolation,
- poor education.

The social exclusion of certain men links with unemployment of certain categories of men (such as less educated, rural, ethnic minority, young, older), men's isolation within and separation from families, and associated social and health problems. These are clear issues throughout all countries. They are especially important in the Baltic, Central and East European countries with post-socialist transformations of work and welfare having dire consequences for many men, and thereby often for women and children.

Even in Nordic countries, which are relatively egalitarian with a relatively strong social security system, new forms of problems have emerged. In the last decade, new forms of marginalisation have developed, with shifts from traditional industry to more postindustrialised society. Globalising processes may create new forms of work and marginalisation. Some men find it difficult to accommodate to these changes in the labour market and changed family structure. Instead of going into the care sector or getting more education, some young men become marginalised from work and family

life. Working class men, especially young, marginalised working class men, are frequently considered particularly vulnerable to social exclusion.

There is a lack of attention to men engaged in creating and reproducing social exclusions, for example, around racism, and the intersections of different social divisions and social exclusions.

EU, European-wide and transnational policy priorities include:

- to reduce the social exclusion of men, especially young marginalised men, men suffering racism, and men suffering multiple social exclusions;
- to reduce the effects of the social exclusion of men upon women and children;
- to ameliorate the effects of rapid socio-economic change that increase the social exclusion of men;
- to specifically address the transnational aspects of social exclusion of men, in, for example, transnational migration, and homosexual sexual relations;
- to change men's actions in creating and reproducing social exclusions.

II. 8. MEN'S VIOLENCES

The recurring theme here is the widespread nature of the problem of men's violences to women, children and other men, and in particular the growing public awareness of men's violence against women. Men are overrepresented among those who use violence, especially heavy violence. This violence is also age-related. The life course variation in violence with a more violence-prone youth phase has been connected to increasing exposure to commercial violence and to other social phenomena, but these connections have not been well mapped.

Violence against women by known men is becoming recognised as a major social problem in most of the countries. The range of abusive behaviours perpetrated on victims include direct physical violence, isolation and control of movements, and abuse through the control of money. There has been a large amount of feminist research on women's experiences of violence from men, and the policy and practical consequences of that violence, including that by state and welfare agencies, as well as some national representative surveys of women's experiences of violence, as in Finland. There has for some years been a considerable research literature on prison and clinical populations of violent men. There is now the recent development of some research in the UK and elsewhere on the accounts and understandings of such violence to women by men living in the community, men's engagement with criminal justice and welfare agencies, and the evaluation of men's programmes intervening with such men. The gendered study of men's violence to women is thus a growing focus of funded research, as is professional intervention.

Child abuse, including physical abuse, sexual abuse and child neglect, is now also being recognised as a prominent social problem in many countries. Both the gendered nature of these problems and an appreciation of how service responses are themselves gendered are beginning to receive more critical attention, both in terms of perpetrators and victims/survivors.

There has been a strong concern with the intersection of sexuality and violence in Italy, the UK and elsewhere. This is likely to be an area of growing concern. There is some research on men's sexual abuse of children but this is still an underdeveloped research focus in most countries. In some countries sexual abuse cases remain largely hidden, as is men's sexual violence to men.

There has also been some highlighting of those men who have received violence from women. Men's violences to ethnic minorities, migrants, people of colour, gay men and older people are being highlighted more, but are still very unexplored. They remain important areas for further policy development.

EU, European-wide and transnational policy priorities include:

- to stop men's violence to women, children and other men, assisting victims and survivors;
- to enforce the criminal law on clear physical violence, that has historically often not been enforced in relation to men's violence to known women and children;
- to make non-violence and anti-violence central public policy of all relevant institutions;
- to assist men who have been violent to stop their violence, such as men's programmes, should be subject to accountability, high professional standards, close evaluation, and not be funded from women's services;
- to recognise the part played by men in forms of other violence, racist violence.

II. 9. MEN'S HEALTH

The major recurring theme here is men's relatively low life expectancy, poor health, accidents, suicide, morbidity. Some studies see traditional masculinity as hazardous to health. 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 and drinking, hereditary factors, as well as occupational hazards, can all be important for morbidity and mortality. Gender differences in health arise from how certain work done by men are hazardous occupations. Evidence suggests that generally men neglect their health and that 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 a reluctance to seek medical intervention for suspected health problems. There has been relatively little academic work on men's health and men's health practices from a gendered perspective in many countries.

EU, European-wide and transnational policy priorities include:

- to improve men's health;
- to facilitate men's improved health practices, including use of health services;
- to connect men's health to forms of masculinity, such as risk-taking behaviour;
- to focus on the negative effects of men's health problems upon women and children;
- to ensure that focusing on men's health does not reduce resources for women's and children's health.

II. 10. INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN POLICY AREAS

There are many important interrelations between the various aspects of men's positions and experiences, and their impacts on women, children and other men. There are strong interconnections between the four main policy areas. This applies to both men's power and domination in each theme area, and between some men's unemployment, social exclusion and ill health. Men dominate key institutions, such as government, politics, management, trade unions, churches, sport; yet some men suffer considerable marginalisation as evidenced in higher rates of suicide, psychiatric illness and alcoholism than women. These are key issues for both policy development and further focused research.

EU, European-wide and transnational policy priorities include:

• to address the interrelations between policy areas, such as home and work, fatherhood and men's violence, social exclusion and men's health.

REFERENCES

Alber, J. (1995) 'A framework for the comparative study of social services', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 5(2): 131-49.

Anthias, Floya and Yuval-Davis, Nira (1992) *Racialised Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*, London/New York: Routledge.

Anttonen, Anneli and Sipilä, Jorma (1996) 'European social care services: is it possible to identify models?', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6: 87-100.

Aslanbeigu, N. Pressman, S. and Summerfield, G. (1994) *Women in the Age of Economic Transformation*, London: Routledge.

Brod, Harry (ed.) (1987) *The Making of Masculinities: the New Men's Studies*, London: Allen and Unwin.

Bulmer, S. (1998) "The protection of pregnant women at the workplace" in Armstrong, K. and Bulmer, S. *The Governance of the Single European Market* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (eds) 1985. Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5): 551- 604.

Clatterbaugh, K. (2000) What is problematic about masculinities? *Men and Masculinities,* 1(1): 24-45.

Communication from the commission to the council, the European parliament, the economic and social committee and the committee of the regions (2000) Brussels, 28.6.2000 COM(2000) 379 final.

Connell, R. W. (1987) Gender and Power. Cambridge: Polity.

Connell, R.W. (1991) 'The big picture- a little sketch: changing western masculinities in the perspective of recent world history', Paper Presented at the Research and Masculinity and Men in Gender Relations Conference, Sydney 7-8 June 1991. Also in *Theory and Society* 1993.

Connell, R.W.(1995) *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R.W.(1998) 'Masculinites and globalization', *Men and Masculinities*, 1(1): 3-23.

Daly, M. (2000) *The Gender Division of Welfare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dominelli, Lena (1991) *Women Across Continents: Feminist Comparative SocialPolicy*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Donaldson, M. (1993) What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22(5): 643-657.

Duncan, Simon (1995) 'Theorizing European gender systems' *Journal of European Social Policy*, 5(4), 263-84.

Duncan, Simon and Pfau-Effinger, Birgit (eds.) (2001) *Gender, Work and Culture in the European Union*, London/New York: Routledge.

Ekenstam, Claus (ed.) (1998) *Radd Att Falla*, Hedemora: Gidlunds Forlag.

Enloe, C. (1990) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Relations.* London: Pluto; Berkeley: University of California Press.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (ed.) (1996) Welfare States in Transition, London: Sage.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1999) *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grogaard, Jens B. (ed.) (1996) *Estonia in the Grip of Change.* The NORBALT Living Conditions Project. Talinn.

Harder, M. and Pringle, K. (eds) (1997) *Protecting Children in Europe: Towards a New Millennium*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Hearn, J. (1987) *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism.* Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St Martin's.

Hearn, J. (1992) *Men in the Public Eye.* London: Routledge.

Hearn, J. (1996) Deconstructing the dominant: making the one(s) the other(s)', *Organization*, 3(4), 611-26.

Hearn, J. (1998) *The violences of men.* London: Sage.

Hearn, J. (1999) A crisis in masculinity, or new agendas for men? In S. Walby (ed.) *New agendas for women.*London: Macmillan, pp. 148-68.

Hearn, J. and Collinson, D. L. 1993. Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities. In Brod, H. and Kaufman, M. (eds.) *Theorizing Masculinities.* Newbury Park, Ca. and London: Sage, pp. 97-118.

Hearn, J., Pringle, K., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Lattu, E., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø. G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Pitch, T., Ventimiglia, C., Olsvik, E., Tallberg, T. 2002a. Critical Studies on Men in Ten European Countries: (1) The State of Academic Research. In *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 4 (4) 380-408.

Hearn, J., Pringle, K., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Lattu, E., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Olsvik, E. and Tallberg, T. 2002b. Critical studies on men in ten European countries (2): the state of statistical information. *Men and Masculinities*, 5(1): 5-31.

Hearn, J., Pringle, K., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, O.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Olsvik, E. 2002c. Critical studies on men in ten European countries (3): the state of law and policy. *Men and Masculinities*, 5(2): 192-217.

Hearn, J., Pringle, K., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, O.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Olsvik, E. (2003) 'Critical studies on men in ten European countries (4): newspapers and media representations', with twelve others, *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 6(1).

Higate, P. (ed.) (2002) *Military Masculinities: Identities and the State.* Connecticut: Greenwood.

Hirdman, Y. (1988) Genussystemet - reflexioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning. *Kvinnnovetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 3, pp. 49-63.

Hirdman, Y. (1990) *Att Lägga Livet till Rätta: Studier i Svensk Folkhemspolitik.* Stockholm: Carlssons.

Hobson, Barbara (ed.) (2002) *Masking Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holter, Øystein Gullvåg and Aarseth, Helene (1993) *Menns Livssammenheng*, Oslo: Ad Notem Gyldendal.

Holter, Øystein Gullvåg (1997) *Gender, Patriarchy and Capitalism: a Social Forms Analysis*, Oslo: Arbeidsforskningsinstituttet.

http://www.norden.org/jaemst/sk/maend.asp?lang=4

http://www.unesco.org/culture/worldreport/html_eng/stat2/table13.pdf

http://www.unhchr.ch/html/intlinst.htm

http://www.undp.org/gender/programmes/men/men_ge.html#Beijing + 5 Special

Kaufman M. (ed.) (1987) Beyond Patriarchy. Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power. and Change.Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel, Michael S. (ed.) (1987) *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Kimmel, M.S. (1996) *Manhood in America. A Cultural History*. New York: Free Press.

Kimmel, M., Hearn, J. and Connell, R.W. (eds.) (2003) *Handbook on Studies of Men and Masculinities,* Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

Kolga, Voldemar (2000*) Estonia National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities.

Langan, M. and Ostner, I. (1991) Gender and welfare: towards a comparative framework. In Room, G. (ed.) *Gendering Welfare States*. London: Sage.

Leira, Arnlaug (1992) *Welfare States and Working Mothers: The Scandinavian Experience*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leira, Arnlaug (1994) 'Combining work and family: working mothers in Scandinavia and the European Union', in Brown, P. and Crompton, R. (eds.) *Economic Restructuring and Social Exclusion*, London: UCL Press.

Lewis, Jane (1992) 'Gender and the development of welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2(3), pp. 159-73.

Lewis, Jane. and Ostner, Ilona (1991) 'Gender and the evolution of European social policies', paper at CES Workshop on Emergent Supranational Social Policy: The EC's Social Dimension in Comparative Perspective. Center for European Studies: Harvard University.

Liebert, Ulrike (1999) 'Gender politics in the European Union', *European Societies*, 1(2), pp. 197-239.

Lister, Ruth (1998) 'From equality to social inclusion', *Critical Social Policy*, 18(2), pp. 215-225.

MacInnes, J. (1998) *The End of Masculinity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

McMahon, A. (1993) Male readings of feminist theory: the psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature. *Theory and Society*, 22(5): 675-696.

Metz-Göckel, S. and Müller, U. (1986) *Der Mann*, Weinheim/Basel: Die Birgitte Studie.

Mies, Maria (1998) 'Globalization of the economy and woman's work in a sustainable society', *Gender, Technology and Development*, 2(1), 3-37.

Mueller, Ursula (2000*) Germany National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities.

Månsson, S.-A. (1994) Vad hander med mannen? Om mans vald och sexualitet i det moderna samhallet. In Bjornberg, U. (ed.) *Janus och genus: Om kon och social identitet i familj och samhalle.*. Stockholm: Brombergs.

Novikova, I. and Kambourov, D. (eds.) (2003) *Men and Masculinínites in the Former Soviet Countries* (provisional title), Helsinki: The Aleksantteri Institute, University of Helsinki.

Novikova, Irina, Pringle, Keith, Hearn, Jeff, Mueller, Ursula, Oleksy, Elzbieta, Ferguson, Harry, Kolga, Voldemar et al. (2003) 'Men, Masculinities and 'Europe'' in Connell, R.W., Hearn, J. and Kimmel, M. (eds.) *The Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, Ca.; Sage.

O'Connor, Julia S. (1993) 'Gender, class and citizenship in the comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: theoretical and methodological issues', *British Journal of Sociology*, 44(3): 501-18.

Oleksy, Elzbieta (2000) *Poland National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities.

Orloff, Ann S. (1993) 'Gender and the social rights of citizenship: state policies and gender relations in comparative research', *American Sociological Review*, 58(3): 303-28

Ostner, Ilona (1994). The women and welfare debate. In Hantrais, Linda and Morgan, S. (eds.) *Family Policy and the Welfare of Women*. Cross-National Research Papers, Third Series, 3. European Research Centre, University of Loughborough

Pease, Bob and Pringle, Keith (eds.) (2001) *A Man's World? Changing Men's Practices in a Globalized World*, London: Zed Books.

Pease, Bob and Pringle, Keith (eds.) (2002) *A Man's World? Changing Men's Practices in a Globalized World*, London: Zed Books.

Peterson, V. Spike and Runyan, Anne Sisson (1999) *Global Gender Issues*, 2nd Ed., Boulder, Co.: Westview.

Popay, Jennie, Hearn, Jeff and Edwards, Jeanette (eds.) (1998) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge.

Pringle, K. (1995) *Men, Masculinities and Social Welfare*, London: UCL Press.

Pringle, K. (1998a) *Children and Social Welfare in Europe*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pringle, Keith (1998b) 'Profeminist debates on men's practices and social welfare', *British Journal of Social Work*, August.

Pringle, K. and Harder, M. (1999) *Through Two Pairs of Eyes: A Comparative Study of Danish Social Policy and Child Welfare Practice*, Aalborg, Aalborg University Press.

Rai, S., Pilkington, H. and Phizakerlea, A. (eds.) (1992) *Women in the Face of Change: the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China*, London: Routledge.

Sainsbury, Diane (ed.) (1994) *Gendering Welfare States*, London: Sage.

Sainsbury, Diane (1996) *Gender, Equality and Welfare States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sainsbury, Diane (ed.) (1999) *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Segal, Lynne (1990) *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago Press.

Siim, B. (2000) *Gender and Citizenship. Politics and Agency in France, Britain and Denmark*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trifiletti, Rosanna (1999) 'Southern European welfare regimes and the worsening position of women', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9(1): 49-65-

Tyyskä, Vappu (1995) *The Politics of Caring and the Welfare State: the Impact of the Women's Movement on Child Care Policy in Canada and Finland, 1960-1990*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, ser B tom 277.

UN Human Development Report (2001) New York: UN.
Available at: http://www.undp.org/undp/hdro/01gdi.htm

Ventimiglia Carmine (1987) *La violenza negata. Ricerca sulla violenza sessuale in Italia*. Milano: Angeli.

Walby, S. 1986. *Patriarchy at Work: Patriarchal and Capitalist Relations in Employment*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Walby, Sylvia (1990) *Theorising Patriarchy*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Walby, Sylvia (1997) *Gender Transformations*, London: Routledge.

Walby, Sylvia (1999) 'The European Union and equal opportunities policies', *European Societies*, 1(1), pp. 59-80.

Waters, Malcom (1989) 'Patriarchy and viriarchy', *Sociology*, 23(2): 193-211.

Zulehner, Paul M. and Volz, Rainer (1998) *Maenner im Aufbruch. Wie Deutschlands Maennersich selbst und wie sie frauen sehen.* Ostfildem.

***

Further extensive information is contained in the 40 national reports, the 4 summary reports (academic research, statistical information, law and policy, newspaper representations) and in the 10 "Policy Option Papers I: National Options and Priorities", produced by the Research Network, all of which are available at: www.cromenet.org