Table of Contents

Table of Contents .................................................................................................................. 1
Acknowledgements .................................................................................................................. 2
Glossary ................................................................................................................................. 3
Executive summary .................................................................................................................. 4
Background ............................................................................................................................. 6
   Justification for the review ................................................................................................... 6
   Men and boys ....................................................................................................................... 6
Methodology ............................................................................................................................. 7
   Limitations .......................................................................................................................... 8
Analytical framework .............................................................................................................. 8
Findings ..................................................................................................................................... 10
   1. Objects to change ............................................................................................................ 10
      1.1 Men and boys’ own sanitation practices and behaviours ............................................ 10
      1.2 Sanitation and hygiene campaigns aimed at men ...................................................... 12
   2. Agents of change ............................................................................................................. 15
      2.1 Men’s and boys’ engagement in sanitation and hygiene processes .......................... 16
      2.2 Strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in sanitation and hygiene .......... 20
   3. Partners for change ......................................................................................................... 23
      3.1 Strategies for men as partners for change ................................................................. 23
      3.2 Transformational change .......................................................................................... 25
Conclusions and recommendations ......................................................................................... 27
   Recommendations on how to better engage men and boys .............................................. 28
   Areas for further research ................................................................................................. 29
Bibliography ............................................................................................................................. 30
Annex 1: Key informants and interview questions .................................................................. 36
   Key informants contacted ................................................................................................. 36
   Interview questions .......................................................................................................... 36
Annex 2: Examples gathered from the regional learning workshop, 16th April 2018 ............ 37
Annex 3: ToR Sanitation, Men and Boys: Desk based review .............................................. 39
Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Naomi Vernon and Jamie Myers for their advice and support for this work. We wish to thank all those key informants who made valuable suggestions or who have otherwise contributed to the preparation of this short report, including the participants of the CLTS Knowledge Hub Regional Learning Workshop in Arusha, Tanzania, 16-20 April 2018.
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Behaviour change communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLTS</td>
<td>Community-Led Total Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSHIP</td>
<td>Cambodia Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Disabled people’s organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>The normative socially and culturally constructed ideas of what it is to be men or women (and boys or girls) of different kinds (of ages, classes, ethnicities etc.) in a specific context and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender analysis</td>
<td>A critical and systematic examination of differences in the constraints and opportunities available to an individual or group of individuals based on their gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender discrimination</td>
<td>The systematic, unfavourable treatment of individuals on the basis of their gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>the state in which access to rights or opportunities is unaffected by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender lens</td>
<td>A perspective that pays particular attention to gender differences and relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender norms</td>
<td>Collectively held expectations and beliefs about how women, men, girls and boys should behave and interact in specific social settings and during different stages of their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender relations</td>
<td>Socially constructed power relations between men and women, boys and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>A person’s biological status, which is typically categorised as male, female or intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>Global Sanitation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>Institute of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionality</td>
<td>This means that intersecting social identities (different women and men simultaneously being identified by social class, ethnicity, age, religion etc.), interrelate – or ‘work together’ – within interconnecting systems of privilege and oppression; based on gender, class, caste, race, sexuality, ability, religion etc. This helps us understand how different forms of oppression and exclusion, such as misogyny, racism, elitism, homophobia etc. interrelate and act together (Birchall, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male protectionism</td>
<td>This term refers to men as guardians to protect women. This kind of role invokes notions of patriarchal authority, paternalism and the oppression of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHM</td>
<td>Menstrual hygiene management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIYCN</td>
<td>Maternal, infant, and young child nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Open defecation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODF</td>
<td>Open defecation free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAST</td>
<td>Participatory hygiene and sanitation transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>Sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUAT</td>
<td>Sanitation Quality, Use, Access and Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water and sanitation for health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSCC</td>
<td>Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

This desk review explores existing literature and examples of men’s and boys’ behaviours and gender roles in sanitation and hygiene (S&H) and the extent to which the engagement of men and boys in S&H processes is leading to sustainable and transformative change in households and communities. We developed an analytical framework for the review clustered around 3 areas: with men as objects to change, agents of change and partners for change. Within these areas we developed six themes for analysis: (1) men’s and boys’ S&H practices and behaviours, (2) S&H campaigns aimed at men and boys, (3) men’s engagement in S&H processes, (4) strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in S&H, (5) strategies for men as partners for change, and (6) transformation change for gender equality.

The desk review involved an examination of existing literature to better understand the landscape and identify gaps pointing to a need for further research. To add depth to the literature review, the methodology included interviews with respected water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and gender practitioners in Asia, the Pacific and Africa.

There are some good examples, largely in India, of S&H programmes and campaigns targeting men’s behaviour change in S&H, but these are not necessarily transforming gender norms. Initiatives have been developed to incentivise men to participate in S&H processes, such as the ‘goat-eating’ example in Kenya, where men are offered goat meat to participate in triggering sessions. However, inequalities and patriarchal privilege can be reinforced if women are not offered the same incentives.

There is a large amount of literature on men’s involvement in S&H processes, but much less on men’s partnerships to support women to participate in S&H processes. Unless men are engaged in facilitating opportunities for women’s decision-making in S&H processes, a sanitation and hygiene programme can inadvertently run the risk of increasing S&H burdens for women. Examples in Timor-Leste and elsewhere point to the need for a focus on building women’s confidence so that decision-making roles are not reinforced as the domain of men. Interestingly, action in one of the strongest social taboo areas in WASH, menstrual hygiene management (MHM), appears to be a standout in this regard, with positive examples of men’s engagement in India and Africa. In general, an increasing amount of work is being done on facilitating men’s partnership to support women in WASH processes, but it remains an emerging area in the WASH sector. There has been a significant focus on care roles in broader development practice, but less specifically in sanitation and hygiene.

WASH programmes are increasingly taking an intersectional approach to inclusion. Understanding differences according to class, caste, age, religion, ethnicity, disability, sexuality and income levels enables targeting of particular groups of men and boys (and women and girls) more effectively in S&H. Intersectional analysis can be a way to link gender inequality to social inequality and holds the potential to engage men and boys in more critical reflection on gender as linked to broader social justice and build their commitment to more equitable social change.

Recommendations for better engagement of men and boys in S&H include:

- Engage men (especially fathers and fathers-to-be) and boys to share responsibilities in the household and as positive community role models;
- Work with community leaders to influence the attitudes of boys and men;
- Support campaigns that create a conversation about traditional gender roles and challenge harmful gender stereotypes;
- Promote reflective practice and change for development professionals in relation to gender and sexuality among development practitioners;
- Monitor changes in social norms on masculinities through sanitation and hygiene programmes;
- Monitor factors that motivate men to adopt more hygienic practices (open defecation free (ODF) and handwashing) and a more pro-active role in family hygiene education;
- Encourage development practitioners to adopt an intersectional approach (including stages of life) to target different groups of men and boys more effectively.
Background

The purpose of this review is to explore the current and potential roles of men and boys in sanitation and hygiene. It aims to:

- Explore how men and boys are currently engaged in the sanitation and hygiene process, and feature and how they can be more meaningfully engaged to achieve sustainable behaviour change and a new social norm;
- Identify the specific approaches and methods being used in different contexts to stop men and boys from practising open defecation (OD); and
- Gain a deeper understanding of how sanitation and hygiene can be a platform to shift gender norms, engage men and boys in dialogue about gender issues, and strengthen gender equality outcomes.

Justification for the review

Discussions of gender in sanitation and hygiene often focus on the roles, positions or impacts on women and girls. We recognise this focus is critical to improving gender outcomes in WASH, as women and girls bear the greatest burden of WASH work yet are often excluded from planning, delivery and monitoring due to having less power, resources, time and status than their male peers. However, current efforts to improve sanitation and change social norms may not always actively engage men and boys in the most effective or transformative way. We must learn more about the roles men and boys actually play now and – if necessary – how they can be modified to make efforts more successful.

Men’s and boys’ active and positive engagement means improving sanitation and hygiene outcomes, as well as redistribution of unequal domestic and care responsibilities from women to men. The end result envisaged is an enabling environment for women to have a stronger voice in decision-making processes, and for men to better support women to participate in these processes. It also aims to make these processes more equitable and less discriminating and subordinating of women, which also means less male privileging. Men’s and boys’ engagement here is perhaps the true test for ‘meaningful engagement’ for transformative change.

Men and boys

Men and boys differ by class, caste, social group, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, age and so forth. Agencies must address their different sanitation and hygiene needs according to their different stages of life. For example:

- **Boys**: At school, girls and boys learn what tasks are ‘appropriate’ for their gender. Integrating household sanitation and hygiene issues within ‘life-skills’ curricula could support change. Play-based WASH activities have been developed — for instance, a Snakes and Ladders game, by WaterAid Timor Leste and by the Street Football World Network and WASH United — to help boys learn WASH behaviour as part of their regular sports training.
- **Adolescents**: A puberty book has been developed for 10–14-year-old boys in Tanzania by Grow and Know. The book contains guidance on boys’ bodily changes and healthy gender dynamics, based on participatory research with adolescent boys. The Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) has a puberty flip-book that contains guidance on boys’ and girls’ body changes and how best to introduce the subject (see Figure 1).
Men and Boys in Sanitation and Hygiene

Figure 1: As We Grow Up

Source: WSSCC, 2013

- **Men**: Men are typically the provider of the toilet, and the protector of their household’s health and hygiene, as well as the ‘dignity’ and ‘privacy’ of women; technical experts on the design and construction of latrine facilities; and hold formal income-generating roles in sanitation programmes.

- **Older men**: Older men often have sanitation and hygiene needs that can be difficult to meet in some contexts. For example, in November 2014 in Zaatari camp, Jordan, adult nappies were expensive and/or unavailable, and one family supporting an older man with incontinence was forced to improvise with rags and plastic sheeting (Venema, 2015).

This report outlines the findings of a review that focuses on men and boys: the problems they cause and experience, how to engage them (or not), and how to mobilise them as allies in the transformation of sanitation and hygiene outcomes.

**Methodology**

We conducted a desk-based review and key informant interviews. Published and grey literature (e.g. internal guidelines, evaluations, internal reviews and management reports, blogs, conference presentations) were reviewed to assess the degree and effectiveness of the engagement of men and boys in sanitation programming. Documents were located through a keyword search.

The following databases were searched: CLTS Hub, JSTOR, PubMed, Waterlines, WEDC, IRC WASH, Google and Google Scholar, as well as the websites of organisations such as the International Women’s Development Agency, Live and Learn, and Plan International. The literature on men and boys in development more broadly was also reviewed, including outputs from the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) Men and Masculinities project, and more recent work at IDS on gender and sexualities.

Between 1 March and 30 June 2018, Skype interviews and meetings were conducted with staff from a range of WASH organisations, targeting staff with gender-focused roles where available. Attention was given to the balance of the sample of interviewees in terms of geographical spread. Refer to Annex 2 for the list of key informants and questions.
Limitations

The limitations of the study include its short timeframe (10 days); lack of access to certain key informants, organisations and documents; a small sample size for the key informant interviews; lack of available or reliable information; and little prior research on the subject. The role of men and boys in sanitation and hygiene programmes has been under-researched and under-documented (particularly in an African context).

Analytical framework

These ideas were explored within the following analytical framework, which was the basis for the literature review and key informant interview questions (Table 1). The framework guided the analysis of information about men and boys in sanitation and hygiene (roles, practices, behaviours, level of engagement, etc.) and the ways and extent to which different WASH programmes have been engaging in this area. The framework also helped to identify opportunities in the WASH sector to transform gender roles and power dynamics in the community.

The Analytical Framework is organised into three critical areas, with men and boys as:
1. Objects to change – focused on men and boys’ sanitation and hygiene practices.
2. Agents of change – focused on men and boys’ engagement in sanitation and hygiene.
3. Partners for change – focused on gendered power issues in the household, community and WASH sector.

The framework was the conceptual basis for the analysis of the reviewed material and the development of the recommendations.
### Table 1: Analytical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objects to change | Men and boy’s sanitation practices and behaviours | Men’s and boys’ practices – handwashing, hygiene, defecation. | • What are men’s defecation and handwashing practices?  
• Do boys’ and girls’ sanitation practices differ? What are the messages? Do they learn them from their father or mother?  
• What are men’s and boys’ attitudes towards menstrual hygiene? Do their daily activities change when their wife/mother is in menses? |
| | S&H campaigns aimed at men | Behaviour change communication BCC materials/resources which depict men as primary carers. | • What campaigns focus on men’s and boys’ positive behaviour change?  
• Is there any data to show the extent of success of these campaigns? |
| Agents of change | Men’s engagement in S&H processes | Men as agents of change – community and government levels  
• Male peer hygiene education  
Men’s and boys’ engagement in Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) processes, including monitoring OD, sanitation marketing, supporting vulnerable households and those with vulnerable members (people with disabilities, widows, elderly etc.) | • Where have men and boys more actively engaged in S&H processes? How has this worked?  
• In which WASH processes do men engage more with women? |
| | Strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in S&H | Operation and maintenance  
• Sanitation marketing (livelihoods)  
• Hygiene of children | • Are there examples of men as agents of change for improved S&H outcomes in their communities?  
• How are S&H roles and responsibilities allocated (community and household)?  
• Have positive changes occurred during S&H interventions? (linked to #3 above) |
| | Strategies for men as partners for change | Men’s and boys’ partnerships at community level | • Are men supporting women into leadership roles? Are men advocates for what is traditionally perceived as ‘women’s work’ – domestic care, hygiene, sanitation? Are men acting in secretarial/treasurer roles in WASH committees (traditionally non-male roles)? Is this reinforcing power dynamics, or transforming them? Are men’s leadership roles reinforcing power imbalance?  
• Are there examples of boys showing active leadership in S&H at schools? |
| Partners for change | Transformational change | Gendered power dynamics at community and household levels  
• Gender norms that reinforce or challenge inequalities | • How are decisions made on S&H (e.g. purchase of toilet and construction materials, what kind of toilet etc.)?  
• Do husbands and wives share any decision-making? Who makes the ultimate decision?  
• Are there examples of changes over the life span of an S&H programme (community and household levels)? (E.g. men’s role in domestic support, shared decision-making, women’s empowerment, reduced violence against women) |
Findings

In this section, each area of the analytical framework and its associated themes are discussed in turn.

1. Objects to change

This focus area is concerned with men’s and boy’s sanitation practices and behaviours together with the S&H campaigns aimed at men. These themes are discussed below. The term ‘object’ is purposely used as a critique of the S&H literature that refers to men and boys instrumentally. Men and boys are often framed as obstacles to achieving ODF communities and framed as objects to be changed for the purpose of achieving ODF.

1.1 Men and boys’ own sanitation practices and behaviours

Men and boys are often portrayed as resistant to S&H-related change, as the following examples show.

Partial usage of toilets: A study in Uttar Pradesh suggests that even if their household has a functional toilet, men are less likely to be regular users (WSP 2016). A range of reasons are cited, including that men don’t use the latrine to slow the rate of the pit filling, and that men may practice OD when toilets are in high demand as it is more socially acceptable for a man to do so than a woman (Chambers and Myers 2016). This echoes the findings of the Sanitation Quality, Use, Access and Trends (SQUAT) survey (Coffey et al 2014) that in households with toilets, men defecate in the open more than women for reasons including more time for OD, greater mobility of men, lack of shame about OD, not having a toilet where they work, to avoid the pit filling up, and so forth.

Additionally, many communities have strict cultural norms around men and women sharing toilets. For example:

- Bangladesh, men defecate in the bush to avoid sharing a toilet with their daughters-in-law (Hanchett et al 2011);
- Idoma communities in Nigeria, husbands have refused to use the same toilets as their wives and daughters (WaterAid 2009);
- Eastern Zambia, male household heads don’t share toilets with other family members if there is a risk of being seen (Thys et al 2015);
- Ethiopia, the sight of women’s faeces is unacceptable and men will defecate in the open to avoid it (Ashebir et al 2013);
- Madagascar, men (or boys) cannot defecate in the same place as women (including their sister) (UNICEF 2015a); and
- Nepal, older men may refuse to use a toilet (even their own) that their daughter-in-law has used, and hence will defecate in the open (SNV 2017).

Open Urination: Male open urination is a common practice around the world, although it can offend public decency and is often prohibited through by-laws and punishable with fines and/or community service. In India, open urination is included under the Swachh Bharat Abhiyan (Clean India Mission) to end OD by 2 October 2019. Thokne (2016) and Upadhayaya (2015) reported that New Delhi launched a public awareness campaign with billboards reading ‘How long will you be irresponsible? At least have some shame. Clean up your mind.’ In a number of countries pictures of gods, goddesses, and holy symbols and words are painted on walls to stop men urinating there.
Hygiene behaviour change: Hygiene promotion efforts that target men’s behaviours and practices can be used to trigger changes in handwashing (Maulit, 2015). For example, the ‘Shit and Shake’ technique developed by Engineers without Borders targets male practices and links them to hygiene behaviour change (see Box A).

The Global Scaling Up Handwashing Project (WSP 2010) was implemented by local and national governments in Senegal and the World Bank’s Water and Sanitation Program (WSP) in 2006. Women were the target audience because of their central role in caring for the family. However, men were subsequently included in handwashing promotion discussions after recognition that: (1) men control their household’s access and provide funds for soap, (2) men can follow up the outreach session to ensure that household members wash their hands with soap, and (3) men can enable, reinforce, and sustain behaviour change by washing their hands with soap while encouraging others to do the same. Figure 2 shows Senegalese men and women being targeted in handwashing behaviour change promotions.

Figure 2: Adjusting communication materials to emphasise men’s roles

Source: WSP 2010

The Global Sanitation Fund’s (GSF) Cambodia Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme (CR-SHIP) targeted Cambodian men for S&H with the slogan: ‘Most men don’t wash their hands after using the toilet. Do you?’

Summary: Improve men’s and boys’ sanitation practices and behaviours

- Support male change agents in S&H to understand and apply gender-transformative approaches – such as supporting women’s voice and participation, not speaking on behalf of women, etc.
- Monitor changes in social norms on gender relating to S&H, including:
  - Behaviour – what women and men do;
  - Attitudes – what women and men believe they should do;
  - Empirical expectations – what women and men believe others do; and
  - Normative expectations – what women and men believe others think they should do.

Box A: Shit and Shake (developed by Engineers Without Borders)

A facilitator has clay or charcoal on their hands and then shakes hands with an authority figure in the community, usually the chief, and asks them to turn and greet their neighbour with the traditional handshake. This is a visual demonstration of how shit can be left on the hands and passed around from person to person during the handshakes. Through this tool, communities realise transmission of faecal matter occurs through handshakes.

Source: Maulit 2015
1.2 Sanitation and hygiene campaigns aimed at men

There is often an assumption that women have stronger intrinsic motivation to change S&H behaviour because they have socially prescribed caring roles in households and communities. However, a number of S&H campaigns have targeted men, as the following examples show.

Unilever has created character profiles to target men for behaviour change in India. The ‘good man’ and the ‘tough man’ are intended to better target/market sanitation to these men (Figure 3). Whilst justified and used for their instrumental ‘appeal’ to some men, trading on ‘tough man’ stereotypes has been critiqued for reinforcing unhelpful (and male supremacist) stereotypes.

Figure 3: Unilever’s male character profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What tough men do...</th>
<th>The good man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I go outside to go for a poo like all the other strong men do, because toilets are for women, the sick and the old.</td>
<td>Every man and every community has those who need looking after. It’s the duty of men, like me, to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a tough man; use a clean, germ-free toilet.</td>
<td>How can we appeal to a father’s sense of ‘doing the right thing’ to get him to want all his family (including himself) to use a toilet all of the time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unilever 2017

Sanitation and hygiene campaigns often play on existing gender norms to encourage men to wash hands or build household latrines. Many campaigns advocating that men provide a toilet for the household are intended to make him feel like more of a ‘man’. In Haryana, India, the No Toilet, No Bride campaign encouraged suitors to construct a toilet at the husband’s family’s house prior to marriage. The campaign increased men’s investment in sanitation in Haryana, where there are more men than women, but not in Madhya Pradesh, where the male-female ratio is more equal and men can more easily find a wife (Satyavada, forthcoming).

This highlights how S&H can be context specific – in this case influenced by the supply and demand for ‘brides’ and ‘suitors’! Other campaigns suggest that a man’s role is as protector of their household’s health and women’s privacy and dignity. For example, the Swachh Bharat Mission has been critiqued for systematically reinforcing the dominant power of men to provide a toilet (Koonan 2017). This and other examples of promoting male protectionism are provided in Box B.

Box B: Examples of male protectionist approaches from India

In Ashoknagar, India, a teacher at a primary school was suspended because the district held him responsible for his wife's OD ‘Husband and wife are the same, so it is their responsibility’.

Posters for the Swachh Bharat Mission show a man declaring that women's dignity is his dignity and resolving to build a toilet.

The sanitation policy of the Government of Madhya Pradesh begins with a pledge: ‘I hereby pledge to withstand the dignity of my sister, daughter, wife and mother, as long as I am alive, by constructing a toilet in my house...’

Sources: NDTV 2017; Koonan 2017
International campaigns such as MenCare, He for She, Promundo, and We Can, target, and work with, men and their peer groups to transform gender norms. This includes supporting men doing 50 per cent of the caregiving work, including S&H within the household. Although such campaigns have also been criticised for enticing men with the ‘nicer’ aspects of S&H (e.g. protector roles) and the benefits to men of engaging in childcare, but with less emphasis on the drudgery of care work or cleaning.

In some contexts, gender roles are so entrenched that men who take on roles perceived to be ‘women’s’ experience ridicule or humiliation. Box C highlights an example of this challenge, which would need to be accounted for in programming or campaigning.

WaterAid India promotes ‘heroes of change’ to recognise the role of men in WASH in the community. For example, one of the ‘heroes’ is not portrayed as driving changes to prove his masculinity, but to provide an equitable environment and sanitation amenities (especially benefiting girls). Such campaigns highlight role models in their communities for S&H issues but do so to provide an equitable educational environment rather than promoting oppressive ideals of masculinity. If not developed sensitively, campaigns to engage men can reinforce ideas of men’s roles as ‘tough’ and as natural power holders, as in the case of the Unilever ‘tough man’ example above.

Campaigns support changes in policies and practice by challenging the social norms and institutions that sustain gender inequality. Over time, campaigning can change perceptions of what it means to be a man or woman. To date, S&H campaigns aimed at men have not had a particularly gender-transformative dimension (nor have those aimed at women or the general population). To be most effective, campaigns should be context specific: what it means to be a girl or boy (woman or man) varies between and within countries and cultures. They should also have a disrupting element in challenging gendered norms that promote harmful practices. Nonetheless, WASH agencies will often be required to acknowledge and balance the tension between using campaigns that are effective at changing sanitation and hygiene practices because they leverage cultural norms (and hence tacitly reinforce them) and adopting different approaches that challenge norms.

**Summary:** Create campaigns aimed at men for transformational change in WASH

- Create a supportive environment for men to publicly assume a more active role in S&H in the household, workplace and community.
- Collaborate and learn from gender specialists and campaigns like Promundo and MenCare who have successfully promoted gender-transformative change.

---

**Box C: Bewitching men**

A study conducted by the Economic Research Policy Centre and the School of Women and Gender Studies at Makerere University in Uganda indicates that married men who cook are ridiculed by some sections of society and become the subject of gossip. It showed the perception that husbands who help their wives in the kitchen are either greedy or bewitched by their wives is dominant in Kampala and Kabale district.

*Source: New Vision, 2018*
Double spread feature: Power, violence and sanitation

The most extreme expression of unequal gender power relations is gender-based violence. The WASH sector has had a strong focus on safety of infrastructure (i.e. access to and accessibility of toilets and waterpoints). However, there has been less focus on linking in with gender-based violence prevention programmes to transform gendered power relations within households and communities, and how the WASH sector can contribute to creating more equitable households and cohesive communities. Strengthening men’s motivation and capacity to be allies and linking with men’s and women’s NGOs are effective strategies for strengthening violence prevention work in WASH.

As House et al (2014) noted, poor access to WASH is not the root cause of violence; the root cause is the difference in power between people. Nevertheless, poor design or siting of latrines or hygiene-related facilities can increase vulnerability to violence, as well as fear of violence, which can reduce use of the facilities, as well as perpetuate gender inequalities. CLTS methodologies, if not skillfully used, can create additional vulnerabilities through community pressure to reach ODF (House et al 2014) – see Figure 4.

Figure 4: Key categories of violence

Source: Adapted from House et al (2014)

Young men and boys, like women and girls, may be at risk of physical or sexual violence near school latrines or public latrines, especially after dark (Sommer et al 2014). Men may also be at risk of psychological and socio-cultural violence. In India, the shaming of men who refuse to use toilets has been reported (Huffington Post 2017), including confiscation of the lungis (a sarong-like garment) of men caught defecating in the open to shame them into stopping the practice. Shaming sometimes extends to coercion. In Chhattisgarh, men caught defecating were paraded around the town. The men had to shout a pledge: ‘Khule mein sauch nahin karenge!’ (we won’t defecate in the open!) (NDTV 2017).
In some contexts, women are shaming/coercing men to stop OD. In Haryana, for example, older women (who are not restricted by purdah) are part of the nigrani samiti (people-based monitoring committee) to monitor and stop OD (World Bank Water 2013).

In another example, an advertisement by Astral Pipes shows a group of men going to the fields to defecate. In the film, veiled women mock the men. When the men ask the women to let them have some privacy the women respond: ‘Oh, really? When we are assaulted or raped because we have to go to the field in the cover of darkness to relieve ourselves, what happens to privacy or honour?’ (Kera News 2017).

2. Agents of change

This focus area is concerned with men’s engagement in S&H processes as well as strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in S&H. These themes are discussed below.

The literature contains some examples of men as agents of change (i.e. promoting improved S&H practices). Men can be instrumental in driving institutional change, such as Narendra Modi’s Clean India Mission or Mwalimu Julius Nyerere’s national Mtu ni Afya latrine-building campaign in Tanzania in the 1970s. More recently, Dr Kepha Ombacho, a male Director of Public Health in the Ministry of Health in Kenya, led policy reviews and guideline development to ensure that all the counties and stakeholders in Kenya were participating in the sanitation campaign (Wamera pers. comm. 2018). There are few female leaders in S&H, perhaps because male privilege has made it easier for men to take up these high-profile leadership roles.

Supportive male agents of change can generate debate about the role men can play as advocates for transformative gender change and in enabling progress on S&H. Some examples of how men can be change agents for S&H are given below.

**Inspirational/popular celebrities:** The use of role models or idols involves ‘men you want to be like’. Male celebrities have acted as change agents in the Swachh Bharat Mission in India. Actor, producer, television host, and former politician Amitabh Bachchan encourages behaviour change in men who have toilets but don’t use them, and former national cricket captain Sachin Tendulkar captained WASH United and UNICEF’s Team Swachh Bharat. In Senegal, politician and singer Youssou N’Dour has promoted sanitation and hygiene, while in Togo a male pop group sang the theme song written for a 12-month campaign on sanitation.¹

In Cambodia, WaterAid produced a music video of pop stars, including men and men with disabilities, that targets young people with handwashing messages.²

**Men using their institutional or occupational roles to be change agents:** Some men have power to promote change because of their institutional or occupational positions. In Nigeria, okada riders (motorcycle taxi riders), predominantly men, are an important urban stakeholder group in CLTS. Okadas often carry people to and through rural communities; if the riders are not sensitised or triggered they can unwittingly disrupt an open defecation free (ODF) community by defecating in the bush. Some ODF communities have set up ‘public toilets’ to deal with this problem. Okada riders transport hundreds of passengers every day, so can play a useful role in advocating for CLTS (UNICEF, 2010).

¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2xKzc8q1FhQ.
² https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZhU0svsQV5U
Indonesia has adopted *Sanitasi Total Berbasis Masyarakat* (community-based total sanitation) as the national approach to sanitation. The Indonesian Army was involved in triggering the programme. Anecdotal reports suggest the army told households that if they did not set up a proper latrine, family members who got sick could not visit the *Puskesmas* (government health clinics) to get medication. After that, people built latrines (UNICEF 2016).

**Faith leaders, community elders or monks:** Men seen as wise and who influence public opinion in a deep and authoritative way can be powerful agents of change (see Box D). In India’s Nuh district, Imams announced in the mosques that they would not perform *nikah* (marriage ceremonies) in those households that did not have toilets or that engaged in OD (Satyavada 2018). Similarly, a *fatwa* (Islamic decree) by the Indonesian Council of Islamic Scholars, stresses the importance of good sanitation facilities and hygiene practices. Cronin (2016) reports that the decree also allows the use of the Council’s charity funds (*Zakat*) to provide financial support to the poorest and most vulnerable families for better latrines. A guidance book on the importance of WASH in Islamic teaching was endorsed by the Council, the Ministry of Health and UNICEF. In addition, the Council has developed a book of sermons for local religious leaders to provide spiritual guidance on WASH at Friday prayers and to urge people to change their unsafe S&H habits.

A district in Cambodia became ODF in part due to monks putting pressure on households lacking toilets. The monks said they could not come and bless houses that did not have a toilet as they did not want to practice OD (Tyndale-Biscoe pers. comm).

2.1 Men’s and boys’ engagement in sanitation and hygiene processes

Men are already engaged in S&H processes and efforts. However, in some contexts these processes, including CLTS, sanitation marketing, and participatory processes, have been difficult to implement and/or ineffective at involving men and/or boys. These problems may relate to a lack of consideration of processes in gendered terms and so we need to understand this better.

**Engagement in CLTS**

CLTS programmes, in their mission to change (un)hygienic behaviour, rarely attempt to shift gender roles and power dynamics between men and women at the household and community levels. As such, CLTS processes may inadvertently reinforce gender stereotypes.

The *CLTS Handbook* notes the differences between male and female leadership: ‘Women Natural Leaders tend to be less visible than their male counterparts in latrine construction but more active and responsible in their maintenance, establishing usage norms, and sustaining hygienic behaviour change’ (Kar and Chambers 2008: 48). Improving men’s participation in S&H can be done in a way...
which is conscious of unequal power relations, makes space for women, and doesn’t speak on behalf of women.

Anecdotally, in some countries, it is difficult to engage men in triggering sessions or even ensure they are physically present. In contrast, Chief Macha led the CLTS campaign *No shit, please! One family, one toilet* in Choma, Zambia, in which traditional leaders supported efforts to transform rural sanitation.

Staff working on CRSHIP frequently observed differential gender participation in CLTS triggering activities. Most participants were women. One study in Rongo, Kenya, found that 81% of men dominated decision-making on sanitation at the household level, whereas 76% of those who attended CLTS meetings were women (Arandan 2016). This was not the case in Timor-Leste, where data from the *Bee no Sanimentu iha Komunidade* (Rural Water Supply and Sanitation) (BESIK) programme showed consistently higher rates of men participating in community events and meetings (women’s heavy domestic workloads and lack of pre-consultation with women re. timing for the event perhaps being the likely causes inhibiting attendance). Programmes that do not time triggering events well tend to miss segments of the community. As Kar and Chambers (2008: 17) noted, for ‘different reasons men, middle/upper class and more influential members of community may not be present in the triggering. Absence of people from all categories might weaken the collective power of the ‘triggering’ decision.’

It can be particularly difficult to reach men in pastoralist groups. The Kenya Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme (K-SHIP), funded by the GSF through Amref Health Africa, aimed to reach Maasai men. Getting men to attend sensitisation meetings is a challenge because they are often away looking for water and pasture for their animals. This led to an innovation of offering roasted goat (*olpul*) at triggerings as a way to engage men. This is not necessarily ‘good practice’, since it isn’t necessarily equitable (women don’t get to eat goat) and amounts to (or becomes perceived as) providing new/additional patriarchal privileges for men. In Nepal, Krukkert et al (2010) reported that men can be attracted to hygiene promotion activities by being given specific roles. Men prefer not to be just members of the audience, so the authors recommended exploring giving men an information-sharing role or some sort of leadership role alongside women. This suggestion highlights the challenge of engaging men in ways that do not reinforce power inequality.

In Afghanistan, men and boys participated in the public CLTS process, while female facilitators reached out to the women through household visits.

* I remember in Jawzjan, one of our female facilitators heard women she had met during the CLTS process say that in their community, men were the ones practising open defecation more than women. If men had been present they would not have said that. The other reason for separating men from women is that CLTS encourages people to talk about defecation practices using crude words rather than polite ones. In this context, such words cannot be spoken when men and women are in the same group (Munyaradzi Charuka, Tearfund, n.d.).

CLTS facilitators require innovative approaches to engage men in CLTS recruitment and triggering activities. Often young men have to be convinced to take part in the sanitation programme, as it can be perceived as low priority or low status. For example, when facilitators in the GSF’s Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion in Nigeria (RUSHPIN) project visited conflict-affected communities in Abi, youths in the community complained that security, rather than building toilets, was their priority. ‘When we started this work, the initial response was slow. This was primarily because the young men did not buy into it. Many of them were not even at the ‘triggering’ event as they were on guard in the bush as vigilantes’ said Benedict, a Natural Leader (Ekhator and England 2015).
Female Natural Leaders may face additional challenges from their male peers when encouraging households to build latrines. Men in households and communities may not appreciate a woman taking on this culturally recognised role. *Frontiers of CLTS* issue 5 (House and Cavill 2015) refers to steps in CLTS processes which could transform gender relations if facilitators have simple, practical guidance and tools to help communities. These include making staff aware of their responsibilities, appropriate behaviours and good practices as well as sanitation ‘accessibility and safety audits’ or ‘safety mapping’, peer support between Natural Leaders, and encouraging men and boys to promote the safety of women and girls.

**Engagement in participatory processes**

Sanitation and hygiene programmes can reinforce negative gender norms, roles and stereotypes. Women may be blamed for poor household and community hygiene practices unless triggering/conversations are carefully facilitated. Gendered power issues are at play not only in how S&H is managed within households and communities, but also in the processes of communal negotiations, as well as within interventions and programmes coming into communities.

Tried and tested participatory tools are available to assist project teams to learn about gender roles and responsibilities in the target communities before the project commences (e.g. who cleans the toilet, who supports children or others to use the toilet, etc.). Tools such as the 24-hour clock and the floating coconut illustrate visible and invisible work in the household. The tools can reveal the different WASH-related workloads of women and men in the family and community and identify what they can do to share the workload.

Approaches such as participatory hygiene and sanitation transformation (PHAST) and learning circles enable engagement of men and transformation of gender roles. Both approaches have been used in Fiji and Vanuatu (Halcrow et al 2010). PHAST is used to assist communities to identify their own S&H problems and develop their own solutions. The learning circles approach included separate discussions with men, women and youth, and specifically addressed the involvement of women in decision-making. The changes in gender relations included more confidence among the women to speak out and contribute to community decision-making; more respect for women among men at the household and community levels; some change in gender roles, with men taking on an increasing role in domestic hygiene; and reduced gender-based domestic violence in one community.

**Engagement in sanitation marketing**

Men take on more formal income-generating roles in the sanitation sector than women, who tend to lack opportunities to join enterprises and/or face discrimination in the sector. This includes small-scale enterprises. In many settings, formal roles in sanitation marketing reflect traditional roles for women and men. Men are typically put in the role of technical expert in the design, financing, construction and emptying of latrine facilities. Men are the ones who tend to be given technical training.

Many studies show how WASH programmes have approached the role of men in relation to women in sanitation marketing:

- A study of WASH businesses in Indonesia, Vietnam, and Timor-Leste found that sanitation marketing companies are predominantly run by men (Willetts et al 2016).
- A study in Cambodia, Indonesia and Laos showed that women have a significant role in small-scale WASH enterprises but barriers include access to finance, literacy levels and religious/socio-cultural norms (Leahy et al 2017).
WaterSHED Cambodia studied gender differences between male and female sales representatives, consumer preferences to inform recruitment, retention and growth/success for female sanitation entrepreneurs in the market.

iDE found that in small enterprises a husband is usually the business owner and responsible for manufacturing, while the wife manages bookkeeping, marketing and customer service; iDE often provides technical training to the business owner but hasn’t trained ‘the wife’. Recently iDE Bangladesh and Cambodia began a business training initiative targeting women business operators.

Plan International Bangladesh motivated male business owners to include their wives in their Sanitation Markets. In Bangladesh, Rahim, a local sanitation entrepreneur, was selected by Plan International Bangladesh in 2015 to manufacture sanitary napkins as part of his Sanitation Market. His wife received a three day residential training in the production of disposable sanitary napkins, and support with marketing the product. Halima and her team sells on average 4,000 packs per month. She has a good customer base selling her products to 12 pharmacies, five shops, two clinics and 138 schools (Plan International Bangladesh, n.d.).

Sanitation marketing activities have also been targeted to the places where men meet. Krukkert et al (2010) reported that a health and sanitation facilitator in Rumathan village in Nepal targeted men gathered at tea stalls for discussion of safe water storage and hygiene practices (i.e. where their drinking water comes from, who is collecting, treating and/or storing the water). This exercise made the men realise that they should support women in domestic work rather than wasting time in the tea stall. In Bangladesh, the WASHplus programme targeted similar male-dominated places (like tea stalls) in order to circulate a catalogue of sanitation options (WASHplus 2015).

In Malawi, UNICEF’s sanitation marketing campaign used a more participatory role for masons in sanitation design, marketing and business modelling (UNICEF 2015b). Masons were asked to develop messages or slogans that would communicate the key features of a long-lasting, affordable toilet. Participants’ suggestions included:

- **ndi mwalamwala** (as strong as a rock);
- **amuna apumule** (men must rest – alluding to the fact that men are constantly reconstructing toilets at present);
- **cha zakazaka** (lasts for years and years).

Two of the slogans were combined to come up with the tagline for the latrine and an image of an elephant was used to create the logo (see Figure 5).

*Figure 5: Tagline and logo designed by Malawi masons*

Source: UNICEF Malawi/PSI 2016
Summary: Maximise men’s engagement in sanitation and hygiene processes

- Use participatory processes to change men’s and women’s expectations of each other with respect to S&H (i.e. that men act as technical experts and women maintain the toilets). This could enhance the impact and sustainability of men’s involvement in S&H.

2.2 Strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in sanitation and hygiene

The care and domestic work burden falls disproportionately on women in all cultures but the degree of this inequality varies. Women are very often allocated (or in some cases may even want to actively promote this division of labour between males and females) responsibility for household hygiene and sanitation. Latrine cleaning, even of school and public toilets, often remains a woman’s role. While it is often perceived as socially unacceptable for men to take on household or care work, boys are more likely to undertake these tasks. Unequal distribution of S&H work can reinforce gender roles and time poverty for women and limit their other roles and options within and outside the home (see Box E).

Household decision making on sanitation:

Despite women doing most of the S&H work in the household, it is often men (the chief wage earners) that choose to invest in sanitation facilities within the home, the type of toilet to be installed, and where to construct it. Women are rarely consulted.

- In the context of out-migration of men, women often have to wait for men’s approval before agreeing to build a household toilet (Sue Cavill pers. comm. 2017, with reference to Nepal and Malawi).
- In Odisha, India, male heads were the sole decision-makers on the construction of sanitation facilities in 80 per cent of households; in 11 per cent men consulted or otherwise involved women. Women made the decision in only 9 per cent of households (Routary et al 2017).
- A consumer research study in Uttar Pradesh showed that among those who do not have a toilet, construction of a latrine is given higher priority by women than men (Satyavada 2018), as highlighted visually in Figure 6 below.

However, such gender differences in power in decision-making are context specific. For example, a study in Nigeria (Adeyeye 2011) found that 13 of 20 respondents (six male, seven female) said neither men nor women had more control over sanitation decisions in the household; each had their own

Box E: Plan International Real Choices, Real Lives’ project findings on unpaid care

‘Generally, the women look after household jobs and the men are responsible for work in the fields. The girls and boys help all the adults with their work. In some cases men help with the cooking if the woman is ill and sometimes women help with the weeding in the field; it’s a fair division where no one is being tricked… These roles rarely change unless the woman is away which means the man has to do the cooking.’ Mainani’s mother, Togo

A smaller, yet significant number of families do appear to be resisting gender stereotypes both in their attitudes towards domestic work at home and in their behaviour:

‘No, no, no. It should be equal. And boys should learn the same things, and tasks should be divided equally in the house but you know that our parents’ tradition in the past was that girls were for doing housework and boys were for working, and it’s not like that. Everyone has the right to work, everyone has the right to clean, and everyone has the right to cook and wash the clothes.’ Noelia’s grandmother, Dominican Republic.

Source: Plan International 2017
roles. One female respondent said women had more power than men because the men are always gone, while the women stay in the home. Six of 20 respondents (three male, three female) claimed that men had more power than women because they are responsible for giving orders.

A study in Vietnam (Leahy et al 2016) found that men were more willing than women to pay for constructing a bathroom with a flush toilet. There have been similar findings in Timor-Leste. A pour-flush toilet is often the product of choice for men, even in water-scarce locations, because it is linked to status. This can increase women’s workload due to the need for more water collection as well as the cleaning of the toilet.

Figure 6: Comparison of men and women’s priorities

Source: WSP 2016, Uttar Pradesh Consumer Research Study

Summary: Develop strategies for men as agents of change

- Identify and engage men (especially fathers and fathers-to-be) and boys who want to be positive role models to promote S&H in the household and community.
- Engage community leaders and thought leaders to influence boys’ and men’s attitudes.
- Engage with men’s groups (e.g. sports clubs, professional associations, army, etc.) for S&H purposes. Doing so could reach men who are hard to reach or marginalised.
Double spread feature: Menstrual Hygiene Management

There is increasing understanding in the WASH sector of the need to focus on MHM in S&H interventions. Male champions worldwide are helping to break barriers and taboos, in partnership with women and women’s groups. Arunachalam Muruganantham (aka ‘Pad Man’) invented a low-cost sanitary pad-making machine in India (Venema 2015). Plan International in Uganda has dedicated male and female field staff working on MHM. Men have also been encouraged to become sellers of reusable sanitary pads (AFRipads) who can challenge social norms by discussing MHM with men and women in the community.

Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) -funded activities in Kenya have trained men as MHM Trainer of Trainers and champions in a three-pronged approach which includes breaking the silence, managing menstruation hygienically, and safe reuse and disposal solutions (Figure 7). One Kenyan regional governor decided to support his wife’s work in promoting MHM while personally financing various initiatives for sanitary products in his county (Wamera pers. comm. 2018). An assistant county commissioner, who reports directly to the Office of the President of Kenya, has integrated MHM work in his schedule. He is known for talking about MHM at schools and community meetings in his official capacity and in full official regalia (Wamera pers. comm. 2018).

Figure 7: An MHM lab designed to break the silence on menstruation.

In Nepal, the ODF movement and Chaupadi (segregation during menstruation) -free communities have challenged many men’s beliefs about segregation of women during menstruation. Tyndale-Biscoe (2017) quotes one woman as explaining:

My husband would not let me in the kitchen during my menstruation, but still wanted me to serve him his dinner. I told him that if I can serve him dinner, then I should not be restricted elsewhere and he saw the sense of this and agreed.

In an MHM qualitative study undertaken by the BESIK programme in Timor-Leste (BESIK, 2015), both women and men reported that the men cook and carry out domestic chores along with other family members when their wives are menstruating, due to the belief that menstruating women will contaminate what they touch. While men doing the cooking makes that role less gendered and provides a rationale for sharing other care work, its motivation can be seen to have negative (or stigmatising) dimensions. Nonetheless, it opens a space for discussing the norms and associated behaviours which can be linked to both sanitation and to gender equity.
3. Partners for change

This focus area is concerned with strategies for men as partners for change and transformative change. These themes are discussed below. The review found few reports giving examples of men who have acted as partners with women for change to help deliver gender balance in responsibility for S&H (in the workplace, household or community), supported women to be leaders in WASH or advanced consideration of gender in WASH movements.

3.1 Strategies for men as partners for change

There is a large amount of literature on men’s involvement and leadership in WASH processes, but much less on men’s support to women in S&H leadership and decision-making processes. It can be difficult to engage women in S&H programming, policy and processes. Unless men are engaged in facilitating opportunities for women’s decision-making in WASH processes, S&H programmes run the risk of increasing women’s workload.

In Zimbabwe, a community facilitator remarked to some men that he knew their wives’ bottoms. Men reacted with anger and astonishment. ‘How on earth?’ the men asked. The facilitator explained that he saw the women’s bottoms when they lifted their dresses to defecate in the bushes. The men got the message and resolved to construct latrines at their homesteads (Charuka, n.d.). Trading on patriarchal protectionist ideals amongst men makes it possible to build a toilet, but the results include reinforcing patriarchal ideals of control over women – the very opposite of what is necessary for women to meaningfully participate or take leadership. There is a paucity of experience in this field of men supporting women’s leadership but there are some promising practices.

Experience in Timor-Leste (see below) highlights the need for a focus on confidence building for women and encouragement (by men) of women to speak up in meetings, so that decision-making roles are not reinforced as the domain of men. Self-confidence is a key issue in promoting women’s leadership, even if men give women the space.

The BESIK programme worked with the Timor-Leste Government (Directorate of Water and Sanitation Services) to develop a comprehensive manual for training 88 government community facilitators in participatory and inclusive WASH community planning processes. Key elements of the process are supporting female and male community members to undertake a gender analysis of WASH activities and facilitating a discussion on how women and vulnerable groups can be supported to be more
involved in decision-making processes. Many facilitators reported higher representation of women on water management groups as a result of these inclusive processes. There were anecdotal reports from some communities of some men taking on more household chores to enable greater participation of their wives.

World Vision noted that while WASH committees may have equal gender representation in terms of positions on the committee, women on committees may not have an equal voice to that of men. Approval or ‘permission’ from husbands and traditional gender roles in the home can be a barrier to women’s active involvement. A World Vision employee in Ghana noted that ‘It is not expected for a woman to speak before a stranger if the husband has not given her permission to do so’ (UNC and World Vision n.d.: 2).

Efforts to change the role of men and boys in S&H (in and outside the household) can disturb ‘men’s sense of entitlement, power and privilege’ (Gary Barker, Promundo). The role of male community leaders is key to mitigating this perceived insecurity for men and role modelling the positive effects of transformational change. We found examples of male religious leaders promoting change in gender norms and relations, as illustrated in the boxes below. Whilst some religious leaders promote more supportive roles for men in the community, such as the Swazi pastor described in Box F, other initiatives take more structured approaches to engaging leaders and challenging views based on dialogue and reconsideration of the faith itself, such as in World Vision’s programme, also described in Box F.

**Box F: World Vision’s Channels of Hope for Gender**

Channels of Hope for Gender explores gender identities, norms and values that tend to damage male and female relationships domestically and publicly. Channels of Hope for Gender has been implemented in countries including Ethiopia, Uganda and The Solomon Islands. The programme works through a biblical framework to explore and transform gender relations in families and communities. The approach engages faith leaders who are respected opinion, culture and change agents. While faith leaders are amongst the most influential members in any given community, their interpretation of religious texts can be detrimental to gender relationships. Pastor Ergete Mesfin of Shasheme, Ethiopia, believed the Bible taught that women should sit quietly in church, never asking questions or expressing their opinions. His wife, Woinshet Lemma, reflected on their marriage:

> I usually felt inferiority complex and consider myself inefficient. I thought that the right to manage all our properties was given only to my husband. I also had dissatisfaction in my marriage. Wives are considered as one of the properties of the husband.

World Vision’s Channels of Hope for Gender training opened their eyes to a different perspective on the Bible’s teachings on gender roles.

**Source:**

**Summary:** Create strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in WASH

- Avoid reinforcing traditional gender roles and harmful gender stereotypes in S&H behaviour change campaigns.
• Engage open-minded men in partnering with women’s groups; getting advice from gender specialists would be a good starting point.

3.2 Transformational change

As the pitfalls and best practices in the previous sections indicated, most examples documented tend to refer to complementarity and balance in roles of men and women in S&H. Whether and how men are involved in S&H is not a result of their biological sex but depends more on how men and women are raised and whether they believe that men and boys can also take care of S&H. There has been considerable focus on care roles in the broader discourse in development sectors but much less in S&H. More transformational approaches refer to male power and privilege, institutions and development actors’ behaviour (Edström et al 2015).

WaterAid used WASH as an entry point to challenge gender norms in Timor-Leste. A Community Dialogue Manual was developed as a guide for integrating gender awareness and dialogue sessions between women and men within WASH planning processes (WaterAid 2016). The manual aims to create a shared understanding of gender roles and relations and how workloads can be changed to be fairer. For instance, the 24-hour clock participatory tool reveals the different WASH-related workloads of women and men in the family and community and invites men to consider if there is anything they can do to share the workload. Some of the outcomes reported are that men are giving women the opportunity to speak in community meetings and management groups (WaterAid 2016). One woman said:

*I am amazed with my husband after [gender] sessions that talked about equal work between men and women. It’s not dramatic change yet, but on many occasions, he starts to ask me what [house]work I’m doing and without talking much he starts taking on one or two responsibilities. He is also looking after our children more often, helping them to take a shower or cleaning them after the toilet.*
With reference to maternal, infant, and young child nutrition (MIYCN) behaviours, Strengthening Partnerships, Results, and Innovations in Nutrition Globally (SPRING) has worked to improve MIYCN and hygiene behaviours in Niger through a community video followed by interactive discussions, and home visits to answer participants’ questions. In Niger, these behaviours are influenced by cultural norms and practices, including polygamy and an emphasis on male decision-making. Husbands in the community are exposed to video messages. The videos encouraged couples to take shared responsibility for child nutrition instead of each parent working independently (Dougherty et al 2017).

WASH programmes are increasingly taking an intersectional approach to inclusion. Understanding differences according to class, ethnicity, disability, sexuality and income levels enables better targeting of particular groups of men and boys for WASH.

In particular, disability is becoming a stronger focus in most WASH programmes. Collaboration with disabled people’s organisations (DPOs) is increasingly used to seek inputs from people with disabilities on how to improve organisational and national WASH policies. However, there is room for the sector to adopt a gender intersectional approach. Where DPOs and disability rights groups are led by men, this can further marginalise women with disabilities. In most communities, women, girls and transgender people with disabilities are the most vulnerable. There is plenty of scope for the WASH and disability sectors to facilitate the participation and voice of those further marginalised. More engagement should occur with women’s and men’s NGOs.

Intersectionality can be useful for identifying multiple marginalised groups, and it can also be a key way for men to support women’s leadership and challenge social inequality more broadly. A project in Maharashtra (Gram Panchayats) mobilised men to support women’s participation in local government, who were then able to influence decisions on water and sanitation (amongst many other things) (Edström et al 2015: 16).

**Summary: Address gender power issues affecting sanitation and hygiene**

- Name and analyse men’s power and avoid falling back on strategies that reinforce male protectionism or men’s sense of entitlement over women.
- Encourage personal learning and change in relation to gender and sexuality to enhance organizational effectiveness and the potential for gender transformative S&H.
- Deepen and invest further in encouraging men to support women’s leadership, decision-making and technical skill in the WASH sector.

---

**Box G: David’s story**

David is living in Cowdray Park in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe, and uses a wheelchair. Through his association with a DPO (FODPZ), he was selected to take part in baseline data collection in World Vision’s project locations. Each day the World Vision vehicle came to his house to collect him and dropped him off again in the evening. He felt good to be part of the process and noticed that people in his neighbourhood started to take more notice of him and treat him with more respect. ‘They think I am an important man now, they value my opinion’, he said, adding ‘they also think I must be rich now that I travel around in such a car!’

*Source: Tyndale-Biscoe et al (2016)*
Conclusions and recommendations

Sanitation and hygiene, especially at the household level, has been regarded as the primary responsibility of women and girls. Whether and how men and boys get involved in sanitation depends on whether men and women are raised to believe that men and boys can assume this role. Questioning gender roles (including in the context of S&H programmes) is part of the process of challenging gender inequities and building more equal, inclusive and sustainable societies.

The literature highlights both challenges of constraining definitions of masculinity in relation to S&H as well as positive examples of men as champions for change and allies for gender equity through participation in sanitation and other ‘household care responsibilities’. There are some good examples, largely in India, of WASH programmes and campaigns targeting men’s behaviour change in S&H, but these are not transforming gender norms – instead, in many cases they reinforce gender stereotypes and roles. We have seen examples of how some initiatives can incentivise men to participate in WASH processes, but can run the risk of reinforcing inequalities, such as the men eating goat example in Kenya. Current experience reveals a tension between trading on gender norms and stereotypes that appeal to men for short term change in sanitation and hygiene practices rather than working more strategically toward gender transformative change. There are few examples of boys’ roles in WASH, except in schools.

Yet sanitation and hygiene can be an entry point to promote more equitable sharing of household responsibilities among men and boys. Engaging and facilitating men to consider more gender-equitable identities, relationships and practices requires investment of time and effort. The literature contains examples of programmes that:

- Involve men, alongside women, in the creation, implementation, and evaluation of S&H programmes;
- Reflect the importance of men’s and boys’ participation in unpaid WASH work, that is, developing their understanding that their participation in this area benefits themselves, their families and communities;
- Ensure men and boys have the necessary S&H knowledge and skills; and
- De-stigmatise and de-feminise S&H for men and provide support to boys and men to overcome fear of ridicule for adopting these attitudes and behaviours.

While this review found good examples of men supporting women’s leadership in WASH as role models and agents for change at the institutional level, it is unclear how men are supporting women to access such power. The WASH sector can support men to use their power, status and resources to support women’s leadership, decision-making and technical skill-building in WASH. It is critical that male champions do not speak for women but are partners for change in a transformative way. More transformative approaches to involving men and boys in programmes make it necessary to think about our (as development professionals) own values, biases, blind spots and fears surrounding gender, power and sexuality. International NGOs and partners also have to consider how their societies’ expectations about gender influence our choices and opportunities. Training for WASH professionals can promote reflection about our own gender biases and support staff to learn about gender-transformative WASH.
Recommendations on how to better engage men and boys

Based on the findings of this review, and drawing on the conclusions outlined above, the following broad recommendations are made for how better to engage men and boys in sanitation and hygiene interventions.

Table 2: Recommendations on how to better engage men and boys in sanitation and hygiene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objects to change</td>
<td>Create campaigns aimed at men for transformational change in WASH.</td>
<td>• Create a supportive environment for men to publicly assume a more active role in S&amp;H in the household, workplace and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborate and learn from gender specialists and campaigns like Promundo and MenCare who have successfully promoted gender-transformative change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve men’s and boys’ sanitation practices and behaviours.</td>
<td>• Support male change agents in S&amp;H to understand and apply gender-transformative approaches – such as supporting women’s voice and participation, not speaking on behalf of women, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor changes in social norms on gender relating to S&amp;H, including: o behaviour – what women and men do; o attitudes – what women and men believe they should do; o empirical expectations – what women and men believe others do; and o normative expectations – what women and men believe others think they should do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents of change</td>
<td>Create strategies focused on roles and responsibilities in WASH.</td>
<td>• Avoid reinforcing traditional gender roles and harmful gender stereotypes in S&amp;H behaviour change campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage open-minded men in partnering with women’s groups: getting advice from gender specialists would be a good starting point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise men’s engagement in sanitation and hygiene processes.</td>
<td>Use participatory processes to change men’s and women’s expectations for each other with respect to S&amp;H (i.e. that men act as technical experts and women maintain the toilets). This could enhance the impact and sustainability of men’s involvement in S&amp;H.</td>
<td>• Identify and engage men (especially fathers and fathers-to-be) and boys who want to be positive role models to promote S&amp;H in the household and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage community leaders and thought leaders to influence boys’ and men’s attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage with men’s groups (e.g. sports clubs, professional associations, army, etc.) for S&amp;H purposes. Doing so could reach men who are hard to reach or marginalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners for change</td>
<td>Address gender power issues affecting sanitation and hygiene.</td>
<td>• Name and analyse men’s power and avoid falling back on strategies that reinforce male protectionism or men’s sense of entitlement over women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage personal learning and change in relation to gender and sexuality to enhance organizational effectiveness and the potential for gender transformative S&amp;H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deepen and invest further in encouraging men to support women’s leadership, decision-making and technical skill in the WASH sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas for further research

- Prior to further research, a toolbox on ‘Men in gender-transformative WASH’ approaches is needed to promote gender equality in S&H. This could be trialled and refined through practice and action research.
- Investment in research – and particularly action research – to document ‘positive deviants’\(^3\) and pilot promising approaches by drawing on combinations of existing tools and evidence across different sectors.
- Intra-household measurement to understand the diverse patterns of S&H-related work and the division of responsibility between men and women, boys and girls.
- How to design S&H programmes that support the equalising of gender relations as well as more positive masculine norms and relations between men.
- Approaches and tools that facilitate men to support women’s leadership, voice and participation in S&H issues.
- How to address ‘intersectional engagement’ alongside gender concerns within S&H programmes.
- Partnership models for the strategic engagement of WASH organisations with women’s organisations, networks and movements together with men’s groups on S&H issues (which is starting to happen in South and East Asia, and the Pacific).

\(^3\) Examples of outliers in a population or group that trend in the desired direction.
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Annex 1: Key informants and interview questions

**Key informants contacted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key informant</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getrudis Noviana Mau</td>
<td>WaterAid Timor-Leste</td>
<td><a href="mailto:getrudis.mau@wateraid.org.au">getrudis.mau@wateraid.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Halcrow</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghalcrow@snv.org">ghalcrow@snv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi Coultas</td>
<td>Plan UK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mimi.Coultas@plan-uk.org">Mimi.Coultas@plan-uk.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Mutta</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amutta@snv.org">amutta@snv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Greaves</td>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frank.greaves@tearfund.org">frank.greaves@tearfund.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina Jurga</td>
<td>WASH United</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ina.jurga@wash-united.org">ina.jurga@wash-united.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teia Rogers</td>
<td>Plan UK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Teia.Rogers@plan-uk.org">Teia.Rogers@plan-uk.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Duey</td>
<td>Water for People</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mduey@waterforpeople.org">mduey@waterforpeople.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristie Ulrich</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristie_Urich@wvi.org">Kristie_Urich@wvi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Gosling</td>
<td>WaterAid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LouisaGosling@wateraid.org">LouisaGosling@wateraid.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priya Nath</td>
<td>WaterAid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PriyaNath@wateraid.org">PriyaNath@wateraid.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jola Miziniak</td>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmiziniak1@oxfam.org.uk">jmiziniak1@oxfam.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Willetts</td>
<td>ISF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Juliet.Willetts@uts.edu.au">Juliet.Willetts@uts.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerker Edström</td>
<td>IDS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:J.Edstrom@ids.ac.uk">J.Edstrom@ids.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascha Singeling</td>
<td>Plan Nederland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mascha.singeling@plannederland.nl">mascha.singeling@plannederland.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Moran</td>
<td>Partnership for Human Development, Timor-Leste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Kidd</td>
<td>Freelance Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview questions**

- Can you describe the sanitation practices and behaviours of men and boys in your programme area(s)?
- Have there been any changes in these practices and behaviours over the lifespan of your programme?
- Have men had an educational/leadership role on hygienic practices in their community / family? Examples? Prevalence?
- What are men’s and boys’ attitudes towards menstruation? Has this changed over time?
- Where have men and boys been more actively engaged in WASH processes? How has this worked?
- Have you seen any changes in gendered roles and responsibilities related to WASH activities (and otherwise) over the lifespan of the programme?
- Have you seen any changes in decision-making and power relations between men and women at household and community levels?
- Are there examples of men actively supporting women to be leaders in their community? How has your programme/campaign enabled this to happen? As a result, have you seen any changes in:
  - Domestic workloads and child care?
  - Women’s empowerment and wellbeing?
  - Gender norms?
  - Violence against women?
Annex 2: Examples gathered from the regional learning workshop, 16th April 2018

| Why this issue is important | Men don’t always go to triggerings but have the decision-making power to construct a latrine. Men can be barriers to sanitation and hygiene promotion if not targeted. “...my husband has not yet decided where to build latrines...”  
Men may think that toilets are for women and so don’t always use them  
Men are often away from home for livelihoods (fishermen or farmers or pastoralists or artisanal miners), and so may practice OD/urination unless their attitudes are changed  
Men are rarely interested in sanitation unless it has a monetary aspect attached to it  
Men don’t think it’s their role to get involved in sanitation and hygiene issues  
CLTS can reinforce gender stereotypes |
|---|---|
| Challenges | Open urination is considered “normal” and men are not ashamed to do it in public. Urination is not considered critical in the OD conversation. Even the F diagram or the triggering session don’t refer to urination, but just defecation!  
In Maasai communities, men must not be seen defecating – so people don’t think they defecate (e.g. the male warriors – the Moran). For others, the toilet has to be designed in a way to provide privacy (Maasai).  
There are myths and misconceptions about handwashing – e.g. that handwashing will kill cattle (Maasai, Kenya).  
Boys in Maasai communities often climb trees to defecate from the branches.  
Men and women have to have separate latrines (for in-laws) – in polygamous households the man and each of the wives have a toilet – the wives take turns to clean the man’s toilet and each keeps a key to the man’s toilet for this purpose.  
If the women have been triggered in pastoralist communities they have to wait for a season for the men to come back to make a decision on whether to build. Men in many cultures inherit the ancestral land and so women can’t build a toilet on their land. Men own the resource that are requisite for sanitation interventions, yet they are not involved in the initial stages of CLTS (triggering), the women are triggered but can’t make the decision to build latrines on their land without the approval of men  
In other tribes (like Kalinga) men go to triggering – and build latrines and handwashing.  
Men are interested when sanitation becomes monetised and there are opportunities for them to earn money. When a house becomes ODF then the certificate is often given to a man, but it’s the woman who has done all the work. |
| Solutions | Work through traditional leaders whose word is respected and elected leaders to support mobilisation of boys and men.  
Work with community leaders to change social norms that prevent women from building latrines.  
Cultural traditions mean that male public health officers, rather than women, have to reach Maasai.  
Maasai communities keep the *manyatta* (traditional housing) but are happy to build a modern latrine.  
In some communities, arrangements have been made with neighbours so that in-laws can use their latrines when they visit.  
Goat eating at the community meetings to attract male Maasai to the triggerings (Amref/KSHIP programming in Kenya). |
- Others have gone to markets for triggering when men are sitting drinking.
- Older women in Maasai communities have more decision-making power.
- Go to where men are – e.g. football or the radio.
- In Maasai cultures women are able to build.
- Institutional triggering (Uganda Sanitation Fund) has triggered leaders to become champions including LOC1 (a local elected political leader) and Chairman.
- Male champions at the household level who take care of the toilet (example from Uganda of a man who always put ash in the pit) or targeting influential male champions, e.g. men who own more cows and/or have more wives have more decision-making power.
- Incentivising sanitation work among the Village Health Teams to attract men to the work.

**Recommendations**

- Think about the gender of the facilitator/triggerer.
- Trigger and work with influential male Natural Leaders and use male champions to become advocates for S&H as a men’s issue.
- Think about the different times of day to reach men and women – trigger separately if necessary or appropriate.
- Engage boys both in and out of school in their youth groups/social activities.
- Introduce the sanitation conversation during cultural/social activities that attract men, such as goat eating amongst the Maasai community in Kenya.
- Generate interesting conversations about men handling children’s faeces, which has been traditionally done by women.

**Emerging questions**

- How can we do CLTS (or rural sanitation programming) in a more gender-transformative way. What do we do differently at the steps in the process (pre-assessment, triggering)?
- How do we change social norms – men’s expectations of men (e.g. men are bewitched if they take on household responsibilities) and how do we change women’s expectations of men?

**Areas of further research**

- Investigate further areas of interest for men that would be easily integrated into sanitation to have more men participate (e.g. football).
- Practical guidance on how to share the sanitation role between men and women.
- Transmen and women: LGBTI people are vulnerable groups in most cultures, as they experience stigma and discrimination that can have detrimental impacts on their wellbeing and safety. Urination, public toilets and urinals present a particular set of issues for sexual and gender minorities (including intersex people). A North Carolina law, HB2, prevents people from using public toilets that reflect their gender identity if that does not match the sex they were born. Without access to appropriate facilities, transgender people are forced into places where they risk being subject to violence. Transmen report problems with using urinals and lack of facilities for menstrual management in men’s toilets: ‘Given that male public toilets rarely have hardware for menstrual hygiene management, it seems likely that transmen would face practical difficulties using male toilets. It seems also likely that intersex people face many similar problems to transgender individuals in regard to public toilets’ (Benjamin and Hueso, 2017).
Annex 3: ToR Sanitation, Men and Boys: Desk based review

Call for applications

Remit/what we want to find out

The purpose of this review is to explore the other side of gender – men and boys, in sanitation and hygiene. Whilst discussions around gender in WASH (and elsewhere) often focus on the roles, positions or impacts on women and girls, we are curious to explore how men and boys are not engaged in efforts to improve sanitation and change social norms, and how they can or need to be targeted to make efforts more successful. Only when women and men are equally and meaningfully involved in sanitation and hygiene programmes, can they result in positive lasting change.

Our main aims for this review are to:

a) Explore how men and boys can be more meaningfully engaged in the WASH process to achieve sustainable behaviour change and a new social norm.

b) See what specific approaches and methods may be needed and are being used in different contexts to stop men and boys from practicing OD.

c) Gain a deeper understanding of power dynamics, relationships and roles and responsibilities within households and communities when it comes to sanitation and hygiene, and how these impact on long term sustainability.

We have conducted an initial brainstorm to map out some of the issues that may be interesting to explore, such as:

Power

- Decision-making and power within the household and control over resources/finance.
- Power dynamics within a community and how it impacts on WASH, sustainability, the involvement of all community members etc. Exploration of visible power such as the power of chiefs and leaders (who are often men), but also the power of traditions, beliefs regarding acceptable roles and responsibilities of men and women.
- How can we motivate/encourage/harness men in peer to peer efforts to stop gender-based violence in the context of sanitation?
- How do class, social group, ethnicity, race and age (among other things) impact on the ability and willingness of men and boys to engage in processes relating to improved sanitation? Can processes aimed at improving sanitation result in compounding disadvantage and discrimination, or power and privilege?

Roles and responsibilities

- Roles related to physical labour, maintenance, cleaning.
- Men’s attitudes towards women in terms of protection and safety but also regarding roles in the household.
- Water carrying done by women – do men then use more because they don’t have to carry it? (in Asia).
- Cultural ideas about men and boys: i.e. men go outside, men don’t shit.
- How do gender roles challenge or reinforce existing norms and inequalities?
Open defecation

- Men working away from home (in relation to a lack of toilets).
- Men: ease of going in the open because of ease of urinating – maybe OD follows on.
- Also because of the above, insensitivity of men to women’s needs.

Campaigns targeting men or male sanitation behaviour

- Campaigns focused on women but aimed at men: e.g. no toilet no bride; campaigns stressing women’s dignity. Do they reinforce existing patriarchal norms and stereotypes?

Engagement in the WASH process and programmes

- Engagement in menstrual hygiene management (MHM).
- What to do in relation to targeting men and boys? How to target them, separately and together with women and girls, creating opportunities for exchange and collaboration?
- What are programmes with a gender component doing about men and boys? (or does most of it just focus on women?)
- Is there anything specific in relation to men and handwashing that is often overlooked? (in terms of times recommended for handwashing many relate to traditional women’s roles i.e. after wiping a child’s bum, before cooking etc).
- What are the different needs at each stage of a man’s life (e.g. child, adolescent, man, elderly man) and how can these needs be met within WASH programming? In these stages, are there differences between e.g. old men and old women?

What the review will look like

We are seeking someone to carry out a desk-based review on this critical topic and find out what evidence and information is currently available, and what further research is necessary. The consultant will interview people working in different organisations in Africa, Asia and South East Asia, and find documentation relating to the above subject matter: experiences, knowledge, challenges, specific activities/campaigns etc aimed at men, angles and considerations in addition to the above. We hope that the initial review will lead to an in-depth publication, e.g. an issue of Frontiers of CLTS and be a starting point for discussing practical guidance for programmes. The successful applicant will also be a speaker in a webinar to further publicise the results.

We envisage this being approximately 10 days’ work, split between desk-based research, interviewing key stakeholders (by phone and/or email), analysis and writing up. The precise focus, structure and scale will be agreed upon with the Hub after the applicant has been selected, through face-to-face or skype meetings and follow up emails. The first stage will involve a 2-3 day process of research and evaluating what information on the subject is currently available, and subsequently assessing with the Hub whether it is sufficient to warrant proceeding to further stages. Initial outlines and drafts will be shared with the Hub for comment throughout the process.

Application details

We warmly welcome applications for this review, please send a 1-2 page application outlining how you envisage carrying out this study, your relevant experience, plus your CV and daily rates to n.vernon@ids.ac.uk.
Deadline for applications: 31 January 2017
Deadline for final review: approx. end-April 2017
Men’s and boys’ active and positive engagement in sanitation and hygiene (S&H) means improving sustainable outcomes, as well as increasing the potential for redistribution of unequal domestic and care responsibilities from women to men. Discussions around gender in S&H (and elsewhere) often focus on the roles, positions or impacts on women and girls, however this issue of Frontiers of CLTS explores examples of men’s and boys’ behaviours and gender roles in S&H. Of particular interest is the extent to which the engagement of men and boys in S&H processes is leading to sustainable and transformative change in households and communities and reducing gendered inequality. The issue focuses on how to engage them (or not), how to mobilise them as allies in the transformation of S&H outcomes and the problems they contribute to and experience.
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