

Foundations for the construction of an experiential training working-group with adult males starting from the gender category with a focus on masculinities*

Bases para la construcción de un grupo de trabajo formativo experiencial con varones adultos a partir de la Categoría de Género con enfoque en Masculinidades

Bases para a construção de um grupo de trabalho treinamento experimental com homens adultos da categoria de gênero com foco em Masculinidade

Igor Gerardo Hernández**

Universidad Central de Venezuela/Escuela de Educación

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21803%2Fpenamer.9.17.364>

Abstract

This proposal seeks to highlight the importance and relevance of systematizing experiences of working with groups of adult males to recognize and inspect educational, pedagogical and didactic practices. The purpose is to contribute to the creation of a theoretical corpus on education to consolidate these group works, in order to recognize the most significant pedagogical, didactic, and methodological aspects in this experience, consolidating them into a defined methodological proposal; while developing and disseminating documents to support and guide the work of teachers and other agents connected to the topic. All this, with the ambition to guide the design and management of certain public and social policies regarding the issues affecting men in the current social and cultural contexts. All of the above is rooted in feminist political philosophy, gender studies and masculinities.

Key words: Systematizing working experience, Adult males, Gender and masculinities.

Resumen

Con esta propuesta se busca resaltar la importancia y pertinencia de sistematizar las experiencias de trabajo con grupos de varones adultos para reconocer e indagar en las prácticas educativas, pedagógicas y didácticas presentes, con el propósito de hacer aportes en la creación de un corpus teórico educativo que consolide estos trabajos grupales, a los fines de reconocer los aspectos pedagógicos, didácticos y metodológicos más significativos en esta experiencia buscando consolidar una propuesta metodológica definida; así también, desarrollar y difundir documentos destinados a apoyar y orientar el trabajo de educadores y demás agentes vinculados con el tema. Todo ello con la expectativa de orientar el diseño y gestión de algunas políticas públicas y sociales referidas a las diversas problemáticas que afectan a los varones en los contextos sociales y culturales vigentes. Todo lo cual está sustentando en la filosofía política feminista, los estudios de género y las masculinidades.

Palabras clave: Sistematización de experiencias de trabajo, Varones adultos, Género y masculinidades.

Resumo

Esta proposta visa destacar a importância e relevância de sistematizar as experiências de trabalho com grupos de homens adultos para reconhecer e investigar o ensino, as práticas pedagógicas e didáticas presentes, com a finalidade de fazer contribuições na criação de um corpo teórico educacional que consolide estes trabalhos de grupo, a fim de reconhecer os aspectos metodológicos mais significativos nesta experiência buscando consolidar uma proposta metodológica definida; assim também desenvolver e difundir documentos destinados a apoiar e orientar o trabalho dos educadores e demais agentes vinculados com o tema. Tudo isso com a expectativa de orientar a concepção e gestão de algumas políticas públicas e sociais referidas às diversas problemáticas que afetam aos homens nos contextos sociais e culturais vigentes. Tudo isso sustentado pela filosofia política feminista, os estudos de gênero e as masculinidades.

Palavras-chave: Sistematização do trabalho, Homens adultos, Gênero e masculinidades.

How to cite this article: Hernández, I. (2016). Bases para la construcción de un grupo de trabajo formativo experiencial con varones adultos a partir de la Categoría de Género con enfoque en Masculinidades. *Pensamiento Americano*, 9(17), 137-154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21803%2Fpenamer.9.17.364>



Received: April 6 de 2015 • Accepted: November 3 de 2015

* Artículo derivado del proyecto de investigación: Género y Masculinidades - Procesos de (Re) Aprendizaje con varones adultos. Adscrito a la Línea de Investigación registrado en el Centro de Investigaciones Educativas (CIES) de la Escuela de Educación de la Universidad Central de Venezuela, bajo el N° 012-L-130514

** Licenciado en Educación (UCV), Especialista en Educación de Adultos; docente ordinario de la Escuela de Educación de la UCV en el Departamento de Currículo; Investigador e Interventor social en las áreas de Educación Popular, Educación de Adultos, Género. gerardohernandezucv@gmail.com

Introduction

The recognition that is taken into, when defining this proposal, refers to how the need to incorporate men into the process of gender equality is becoming clearer every day. For men, this incorporation is important and assuming it raises the need for change.

According to Viveros (2002), feminism began to emerge at the end of the 1980s, in order to *illuminate the subjective and cultural itineraries of masculinity*. In particular, it was a question of studying how the construction of manners does not favor equality in the relations between men and women. According to the same author, these studies were designed, among other things, to try to unveil how inequalities between men and women are established and perpetuated, based on the references and wake left by Women's Studies.

Kaufman (1994), pointing out some of the different reasons he finds for men to approach feminism, he responds from where emerge - as a logical consequence - the revision of the construction of the gender mark in men and the consequent study of masculinities. As he tells us:

- By inquiring about the inequality that women suffer.
- For a sense of injustice suffered by other men.
- For a sense of guilt in relation to the privileges enjoyed by being a man.
- For simple decency.

This proposal by Kaufman (1994) attempts to reveal how the gender order also oppresses men who, in order to maintain their place as men, need to be violent against women, against men and against themselves. Viveros (2002) adds in answering the question: "why include men in gender studies?"

Because:

- Gender is a relational category.
- The reconstruction of the place of women as something 'natural' also involves denaturalizing, de-universalizing and marking men.
- It is also to study power relations from the point of view of the dominant.

Many men have been caught up in rapid processes of changing gender roles that they do not understand, and feel pressured by various demands. Few efforts have yet been made to show that in the education of men, the power we have as such is vitiated and that many of our privileges involve isolation, alienation and not only cause pain to the people around us, but also anguish, sorrow and pain to ourselves. However, these attempts and efforts range from recovering omitted contents of masculinity, such as: sensitivity, affection, tenderness; to influence the desirability of ending and eradicating the existing mandates of the hegemonic model and to heal the complex of manhood to reveal and legitimize the value of individualities: masculinities.

Many attempts (this in particular), as effort and desire, start to see men as near neighbors; as stated by Madrigal and Tejada (2008), for many the masculine condition is a source of pain and frustration; not so many who perceive his masculinity as a pleasant encounter with the firmness, the power and the creative capacity of the mature man. There seems to be a certain disorientation, a difficulty in the ability to discriminate and to attend to the signals of the organism, the risk behaviors, the quality and sense of the relations and many other manifestations to prove us in a imposed model. Too many men are physically and emotionally distant from each other.

It is in this context that group work acquires relevance. Changes in the environment occur more rapidly than the ability to respond to them, remaining as prisoners of rigid behavior and stereotyped roles. The exchange with peers in a climate of cooperation makes it possible for men to confront ideas and actions, to test behaviors and to overcome emotional isolation; in making contact with one's needs reduces the risk of being subject to external regulations. This project is part of the effort, intent and desire to foster a solidarity network, from which to build adequate support to repair new and old wounds.

It is assumed that the preventive and therapeutic nature does not depend essentially on

the techniques used, but on the attitude, the quality of the bond between people and their possibilities of movement and action; of initiatives that are consolidated in concrete actions and proposals, in which, sustained and systematically, progress is made in the way of building new and necessary alternatives and options.

Background

Researchers and pioneering scholars in this field of feminism, gender and masculinities - Kimmel (1996), Kaufman (1994), Conell (1993), Flood (1998); Viveros, Olavarria and Fuller (2001), Figueroa (2014), emphasize that masculinity is not outside the economic and labor order; and, in this sense, the changes in that gender order are directly related to variations in the global economic order, which calls into question the continuous appeal to the superior nature of men as an argument in favor of the natural and inevitable character of domination male; and that from cultural influences such as this, which is only an example, an archetype is constructed that shows and requires more of the separation and the difference with other human beings than of the union and the similarity. In this sense, Parrini (2001) points out that since most feminist discourses constitute an attempt that is: "insistent, penetrating and critical of unmasking men and masculinity, it is not surprising that an important part of the thought that is elaborated around the condition of the woman pointed to unveiling the

condition of the male “(p.7); which serves as a basic argument to establish that:

the traditional archetype of virility still constitutes the dominant referent of social learning of masculinity of the majority ... hence the need to deconstruct that virile archetype and the symbolic order of dominant masculinity, to offer other alternative models of masculinity that illustrate the dissidence of some men with regard to hegemonic masculinity and to illuminate and value the contributions of women to human knowledge and peaceful coexistence among people in our societies ... (Lomas, 2004, p.24)

In this sense, some of the many aspects that are implicated in the being and construction of the masculine subject have been revealed: the male, from which, and in complete agreement with Madrigal and Tejada (2008) one begins to recognize that one's own survival in a process of masculinities implies the experience of much pain, to recognize one's own personal traumas and the suffered and exercised discrimination, which are many and that began in a cruel process of socialization in childhood and that will last in adult life. Hence it becomes necessary to assume survival as a step to personal change and in the search for new identities that recognize the diversity already lived.

These recognitions are, to a large extent,

the ones that have allowed groups of men to form and Consolidate on the basis of similar proposals; such as the Asociación de Hombreres por la Igualdad de Género (Association of Men for Gender Equality, AHIGE), Malaga, Spain, which in its *Manifiesto* (2008) states that contemporary men must assume historical responsibility for the injustices that has generated male chauvinism and the hegemonic model from which it emerges. They tell us that our collective responsibility consists in the explicit recognition that we have historically exercised social oppression: “Our individual responsibility is directed not to become reproducers of sexism in our lives and relationships ... to carry out inner deconstruction as men patriarchal and reconstruction as equal men” (Manifiesto AHIGE, 2008, p.2).

In the same sense, and from the feminist theory, recognizing some advances and achievements in the search for inter-generational equity, it is established that a pro-feminist man (perhaps any male) is susceptible of being subjected to a strong process of deterritorialization, that is to say, loss of coordinates, references, and maps that serve as a handle on reality once it has initiated this process that we enunciate in (Carabí, 2006).

The point is that these dilemmas cannot be simply solved at the level of the personal: to answer and transform the status of the

male before the tremendous changes already made, which are imminent to occur, with the coveted ambition, require a collective practice that transcends the political or social and goes beyond the personal or domestic without neglecting or devalue each area, since it is desirable and necessary to consider both.

Justification of the research

This proposal aims to consolidate a methodology to articulate the theory, the intervention and the systematization of the work of training, deconstruction, and reconstruction of the patterns for the exercise of the role of the male in collective work groups.

As a teacher in exercise, my area of interest is associated with working with adult males and the field of training that goes beyond that offered by the formal education system as well as the established curriculum. In this sense, for some years I have been making different contacts and proposals in order to establish a line of work and action for academic and professional training that can be inserted as a concrete practice in collective work, in which are revealed and make sense ideas, postulates and orientations offered by feminist political philosophy, the gender as a guiding category and masculinities as an expression of this.

The training experience offered is intended to be participative, experiential, playful and

reflective, since, inserted in the qualitative approach, it seeks to reveal subjective aspects, as well as to promote the shared work between the facilitators and the participants, socializing and sharing the existing knowledge with the intention of promoting the construction of new contents and knowledge on the subject.

This learning experience will be focused on the psycho-affective and physical dimension of the participant.

Scope of research

This proposal is addressed to:

- Adult male students; in heterogeneous groups of age (over 18 years of age), socio-economic status, area of residence, career or training area.
- Volunteers and leaders with their commitments.
- People committed with their time, their environment and the struggle for gender equality from any field, be it labor, social, political or daily.
- People willing to initiate a systematic, continuous and evaluated work of personal and group learning and the construction of new knowledge, skills and above all attitudes around gender and masculinities.
- The basic needs for group assistance will be collaboratively resolved, such as: meeting place (preferably within the Universidad Central de Venezuela, UCV), transporta-

tion to the meeting place, snacks, and so on., as a initial form to breakthrough of gender stereotypes, individualism and the traditional unconcern of male family and personal care.

It is intended to formulate an initial work proposal of approximately 3-4 hours. The group dynamics proposed, as part of the positive treatment process, is a participative, experiential meeting, privileging the psycho-corporal dimension, in some space within the UCV itself, in order to enhance its diffusion and make it more present and visible in general. A place that allows us to work, discuss and converse with a certain privacy and tranquility but that avoids isolation and self-absorption.

We believe that this group should not be just of reflection or dialectical speculation, but it is expected to favor the options of personal and collective attitude change. Likewise, from each session, it is intended to highlight the desirability that small or large individual and group intentions will emerge without pressure or grandiloquence as indicators of change or action. As an illustrative example, we point out: to take some kind of personal behavior as a way of self-knowledge, to participate in a talk or conference associated with the subject, encourage an informal conversation with friends around these aspects or go to a demonstration against gender violence or in favor of any pro-gender equality social policy.

Objectives of the research

General

Raise awareness in the participants in the integral approach of gender and masculinities with the purpose of enhancing their multiplier action; in order to influence and motivate a process of change gender-specific concepts and practices towards more humane, inclusive, integrative and supportive proposals.

Specific

- To promote gender and masculinity reflection in the personal sphere of the participants, assuming the body and the totality of personal expression as its dimensions of existence.
- To perceive the importance of this aspect within the individual development from the review of the personal history of each participant in collective reviews.
- To distinguish the unique and individual exercise of masculinity in relations.

Theoretical and conceptual framework

Gender and masculinities

It is part of assuming, as Scott (1986) states, that the assigned gender is the way to build relationships and social networks articulating them in two poles: masculine and feminine; from the visible biological traits (especially the genitals) interpreted at birth; thus, as we are born with a penis, we are labeled as men and are assigned a pattern of life, a socially defined

and accepted model of behaviors, values, and expectations to be men. This legitimacy and expected masculinity build the gender of men.

The masculinity thus constructed, regardless of cultures and geographies, and assuming local characteristics, is always linked to certain qualities, especially associated with strength, violence, aggressiveness, power, intelligence and the idea that it is necessary to be testing and proving, continuously, that one is “man”. This model becomes a prototype and stereotype: it is hegemonic masculinity; model from which men are measured and interpreted. Being a model that works as an ideal, it is also a reference, which is used to “measure” and “prove”, as we have just said, “how man is he”.

This model - hegemonic masculinity - has cracks and faults, from which they are operating differences, variations, and possibilities; alternatives that discover diverse ways of being men.

That is the reason why it has been developed the idea that there is a model of masculinity, but rather masculinities, understanding with it: many ways to be a man.

Within these forms of being a man, groups that meet to reflect on *masculinities* to share experiences and seek attention to their conflicts and problem areas are included.

About the convenience and usefulness of gender

In his essay *Marcos Teóricos Contemporáneos* (Contemporary Theoretical Frameworks), Angeleri (2008) validates the relative diversity to the term of gender in proposing to answer the following question: “how are gender relations organized as they go on?”; that is, as they are being given. Its formulation implies that the category of gender is not prior but “historically constituted”; for which it is also necessary (perhaps essential) to keep in mind the historicity of gender on a personal level: “femininity and masculinity, as structures of character, must be considered as historically changing, since there is nothing to prevent the existence of several forms of sexual characters arising in the same society at the same time ...” (Angeleri, 2008, p.12). Thus, from the perspective and interest of this work, we overcome the debate regarding the multiplicity of meanings, as well as the tremendously wide term, since we consider it necessary and more imperative in relation to the definition of gender, to overcome the ‘natural attitude’, which, according to Garfinkel (1967) embraces a series of *unquestionable* axioms, beginning with the belief that there are only two genera and, consequently, that this is invariable; thus assuming the genitals as essential signs of the gender and perpetuating, from them, the male / female dichotomy as natural; likewise, and as another *natural consequence* all individuals can and should be classified as

male or female. To which Garfinkel remarks: “The beliefs that make up this natural attitude are ‘incurable’ to the extent that they are so convincingly made that it is almost impossible to mistrust its validity” (1967, p. 122). Hence, it takes the position of overcoming the “natural attitude” or the “naturalization” of the gender and its implications.

From these ideas, it is convenient and pertinent to assume Scott’s (1986) proposal when he states that “gender is a constitutive element of social relations based on perceived differences between the sexes and sex is an essential way of signifying relations of power” (p.23). Scott emphasizes, among other aspects, that gender operates in multiple fields, including normative concepts, social institutions and organizations, as well as subjective identity; it is a useful category of analysis because “it provides a way to decode meaning and to understand the complex connections between various forms of human interaction” (p.107), which results in the fact that “gender is always defined contextually and repeatedly constructed” (p.56). In this sense, Harding (1986) points out, when he recognizes, in the multiplicity of meanings conferred on the genre, “to provide a coherent explanation of the intricate connections that link the psyche to social organization, social roles to cultural symbols, normative beliefs to the experience of the body and sexuality” (p.7).

Both Scott and Harding offer and open a space for the revision of the gender from delimiting it in terms of the interrelations of symbol systems; normative precepts; social structures and subjective identities.

Gender, transversality and the construction of masculinities

We have already reviewed the assigned gender as the way to build social relations articulated in two poles: male and female, from the visible biological features, especially the genitalia, interpreted at birth and even before. This is what Madrigal and Tejada express in their compilation “Acercándonos a las Masculinidades” (Getting closer to the masculinities) (2008), in which they add: “as we are born with a penis we are labeled as men and we are assigned a pattern of life, a socially defined and accepted model of behaviors, values and expectations to be men” (p.7).

In a broader and more comprehensive sense, Morgade (2006) points to the review and understanding of the study of gender by making a complete critical review of how societies have been structured by this “ideological framework,” which, he says, begins with patriarchal ideology and necessarily ends in a social and personal revision and reconstruction.

In this sense, this review implies an approximation to the processes in which the estab-

lished forms of “being a woman” and “being a man” are expressed, reproduced and transformed. To what Morgade adds and specifies: “modern society is characterized by a configuration of relations between the sexes marked by inequality” (2006, p.9). It follows that the set of expectations and social values established for the feminine and masculine constitute a “system of gender relations” (Morgade, 2006, p.11).

The internalization of gender relations is key in the construction of our identity, as men (or as women), and that our behavior and acceptance of it favors “its strengthening and adaptation in both social structures and institutions, all of which is expressed in particular tasks and moments of our lives that allow us to respond to changing relationships” (Kaufman, 1989, p. 135).

In other words, and amplifying what has been said so far, gender studies compel historical, cultural, political, economic, family, generational and transgenerational aspects; it inevitably leads to biographical reviews and personality characteristics, individual resources, as well as others that can still be recognized and included. All of which is reinforcing the gender as a “privileged organizer of the human psyche” doing it through the hegemonic norms of gender. These hegemonic norms of gender presume to think in “a corpus constructed socio-historically of ideological production,

but naturalized and formed in ideals and basic ideas that are expressed through beliefs on the duty to be of the woman and, in particular, of the male” (Kimmel, 1996, p. 98), beliefs, in turn, generating imperative mandates of being (prescriptive) or of not having to be (proscriptive) that need to be fulfilled to recognize themselves as a valuable feminine or masculine identity for themselves.

The masculine identity

When speaking of masculine identity, reference is made to the characteristics attributed to masculinity in a determined historical, geographic, cultural and social moment. Lozoya (1999) points out that: “the characteristics that we usually identify as masculine are not innate, but the consequence of a process of socialization that seeks a certain pattern of relations between the sexes ... and the masculine condition is, therefore, a social product ...” (p.3). This author also explains that the process of constructing masculine identity, condition and subjectivity is prolonged throughout life and never ends and that it always tries to “reduce the potential differences between men to fit a preexisting model” (p.3).

Hence it makes sense to assume the line of those authors (Cantera, 1999; Kaufman, 2001) who approach masculine (or feminine) identity as the result of a social construction; that is, from a gender perspective.

This approach requires taking into account the social, cultural, economic, political and other factors of each society; that is to say, being a man does not have the same meaning for all men (or women) even within the same cultural system.

In this sense, Kimmel (1999) argues that the definitions of masculinity are constantly changing and does not come in our genetic code, it also affirms that masculinity is constructed socially, changing from one culture to another, in the same culture through time; during the lifetime of any individual man; as well as between different groups of men according to their class, race, ethnic group and sexual preference.

These gender patterns, which are assigned before birth, are always linked to certain qualities and attributes that are consolidated in a defined model of being a man; which prevails and becomes the “founding model: men are educated in an environment in which we are required to affirm these definitive attributes of masculinity ...” (Madrigal & Tejada, 2008, p.54).

Some of these attributes are expressed in the synthesis that Cazés (2004) offers, very illustratively and passionately:

It is owned by us, men, in an inalienable way the social and historical protagonism, orga-

nization and command, intelligence, public power and police and military violence, normative capacities and rules of thought, as well as teaching and morals, creativity and mastery, the conduct of others and decisions about one’s own and others’ lives, the creation and management of institutions, medicine and the relationship with deities, the definition of ideals and projects. In a word, public life, the important, the transcendent, the prestigious (p.42).

From this, the same author adds, explicitly and implicitly, this expectation of each man is expected, but as a total expectation, at least a ‘minimum’ that, taken sufficiently, to consider his role and condition; what at the end is, as he recognizes, unavoidable.

Lomas (2004) complements that by saying that it is not necessary to go much deeper to understand the gigantic weight that these social and cultural expectations cause to fall on men, on each man, “as destiny and irrevocable vital project ... And what this results in is, in fact, an alienation that can become absolute and in which every man must renounce almost all (or all) vital gratifications” (p.42).

Lomas also confirms multiple masculinities and links them to the desire of many men who, daily, realize diverse practices and have different experiences and that they have dared

to explore, through intimate, social and political relations and positions different from those traditionally established for men, as a redoubt for the salvation of us men from that hegemonic and inhuman model as unattainable.

Carabí (2006) emphasizes how important it is to foster the development of several alternative models of masculinity, not subordinated to a rationalist, exclusivist and antihuman pattern. He affirms that the new models need to be open, plural and inclusive, both intergenerational and intrageneric; in which the development of equitable relations with women and in a more intimate and solidary relationship between men is explicit and well recognized.

This “construction” begins and is constituted from the diversity of opinions and positions held by men with different tendencies and inclinations, dominated by an open, plural, flexible and dynamic conception that can accommodate all the diversity of forms that masculinity can acquire.

Asturias (1997) believes that change cannot be solved therapeutically, personally, as an internal renewal, but, rather, in a political and group way, since personal growth will not automatically lead to personal political actions that support the gender equality and that is why group and collective strategies are vital to dismantle oppression.

According to Carabí (2006), among the characteristics and approaches that arise for the lifting of new models for the male are: to maintain the confidence and security in themselves; to advocate for a more peaceful, open and receptive personality; to maintain an erotic, free, energetic and strong character; but all supported on a non-oppressive basis or requiring the subordination of others and, on the contrary, are based on an egalitarian, non-hierarchical, anti-sexist, anti-racist and anti-homophobic conception.

Another aspect to keep in mind is to liberate man from the mandate to hold control and promote the sharing of power. All this proposal forces the male to become aware of their reality in what concerns the traditional construction of masculinity so as to subject it to a critical analysis that envisages him as the architect of his own change from assuming it as valuable from his personal sphere, leading him to be receptive to other men immersed in change in order to support each other and mutually.

Methodological framework

Type and research design

This proposal arises, partially, as a result of an experimental work formed from my experience as an adult male in different processes of awareness in the area of gender and masculinities, which have permeated my teaching in the non-formal field. Likewise, it is part of the

qualitative approach, since it seeks to deepen the subjective aspects that arise in different dimensions of the socio-cultural interaction and interdependence in which we recognize men and women. It is inductive in nature, considering that it is hoped to obtain findings rather than starting from pre-established assumptions; as well as holistic, given the significance of articulating the results in some conceptual way within the educational and formative work, with which we hope to develop a descriptive and meaningful analysis of the data collected, based on the experiences reported by the participants.

It covers a design inscribed in the general methodology of action research, in which the conditions of a social group are determined and established, a series of actions are designed and implemented in order to improve the problematic situation of the group, and the effects or the impact of the actions that have been implemented during the process (Montero, 2006).

Some working groups with men, among which we note, in particular, the work that the Escuela Equinoccio (El Salvador); and the Colectivo WEM (Costa Rica), among other groups such as Porotos (in Chile) and the Red de Masculinidades (Colombia), which have been developing strategies and socio-educational interventions in which, intentionally or not, this

theoretical-methodological option is serving as a basis for consolidating the work that is being carried out. Which, as has already been established, is not easy, much more so if we consider that there are no models of proven intervention to appeal. Somehow, everything related to the work with the processes of re-learning from the gender perspective, oriented to work with men, requires a lot of creativity, experimentation and consistency, due, perhaps partially, to what Connell (2003) points out as a historically recent recognition.

We believe, in this sense, that linking, approximating and systematizing the experiences that are accumulating, as well as foster those that may arise, would support these initiatives, especially to distance ourselves from the perception that much has not been done, or that is constantly “starting from scratch” before such a demanding and preemptory demand. Similarly, as Montero (2006) points out, it is necessary to strengthen the links and relations between the academic field and social interventions.

Vargas Uría (2014) means working with men as:

The set of practices that emanate from the reflection on the construction of masculine gender and that are translated ... in the development of processes of re-education that allow demonstrating that there is not a sin-

gle form of being a man. That is to say, one can unlearn the behaviors assumed as natural ... to re-learn other forms of self-knowledge that, ultimately, generate human relations based on respect, sensitivity, equity and equality (p. 6).

In order to give methodological support to this option of social intervention, then some considerations are stated as regards systematization as a process of support and follow-up to learnings. Among the more general and definitive approaches to the processes of this methodological option, Jara (2006) points out that it is used within popular education and for social projects; starting from the idea that the experiences are collective and individual processes, in that sense they are socio-historical processes, dynamic and complex; in such experiences many elements are involved: conditions, situations, actions, perceptions, emotions. Hence, all experience is always done in certain conditions of an economic, social and political context, at local, national or global level; as well as in particular situations. He points out that "all experience is within a particular situation, which can be institutional or group and, of course, particular" (Jara, 2006, p.4). Experiences are constituted by actions, but also by our perceptions; they are also constituted by: sensations, emotions and interpretations of the people who live those experiences. All experience is framed by the characteristics of

the subjects; The experiences are lived with expectations, dreams, hopes, illusions, ideas and institutions. People do these processes, but these processes also mark people: they impact, condition, demand, make and, in that sense, experiences have effects and impacts. In what we recognize latent one of the implications of gender equity policies: finding ways and means to recognize legitimate interests and needs of men, without weakening the effectiveness of policies to advance the interests of women.

Due to the before expressed is that the task of seeking to understand them, extract their teachings and communicate them is so necessary as demanding. Seek the critical appropriation of lived experiences, sharing with others what has been learned. Jara affirms that:

Systematization is that critical interpretation of one or more experiences that, from its order and reconstruction, discovers or explains the logic of the process lived in them: the factors that are involved, how they related to each other and why (2006, p. 2).

Systematization, conceived in this way, means to reconstruct what happened, to make a historical recovery of what happened, to order the different elements that happened throughout those processes. Reconstructing and ordering what happened to transform and take lessons is an epistemological, social, polit-

ical and cultural posture; as proposed by community social psychology, from the theoretical and participatory research-action, from the methodological point of view. Then, you have to know what to do with all of that: understand, interpret in depth, identify causes, consequences, effects and roots of these phenomena. Likewise, the contradictions, continuities, discontinuities, coherences and inconsistencies. From which epistemological postures can arise and also, methodological proposals that allow to reconstruct what happened; as well as categories of analysis and theoretical to be able to interpret what happened, to draw lessons, conclusions that illuminate and inspire future practices. This may be effective in evaluating the effectiveness of different educational actions with men, in order to support the ideal of including effective methods to promote gender equity within formal, non-formal and informal education systems; the relevance of which is highlighted by Jara (2006) in advocating that systematization and systematization processes serve to:

- Have a deep understanding of what happened, to improve and transform the practice.
- Share teachings with other similar practices.
- Develop the creative capacity of the subjects.

On the other hand, in some of the method-

ological considerations that he presents, he distinguishes that a common axis is necessary, so that, critically, several experiences are analyzed from this one. Likewise, certain conditions are required, he emphasizes, for example that:

- It cannot be given spontaneously, it requires intention and conscience; it must have a rigor, order and individual conditions.
- There must be interest and willingness to learn from experience.
- It must have the sensitivity to let the experience speak for itself.
- It must have the ability to do analysis and synthesis.

In the same sense, he adds that it is very important that the systematization is done in an institutionalized framework; in this sense it should:

- Be a priority for the institution's policy or for the organization.
- Have interest in seeking coherence in teamwork.
- Develop a cumulative process in the institutions.

These considerations, related to working with men, we believe that they can support the challenge of working with them, since they offer guidelines to establish conditions in which the people involved offer their understanding on the subject, to stand up to the demands that the whole society reclaim, framed in the im-

plementation of active policies that manage to move from discourse to praxis. Yes, as has been emphasized, it is a matter of creating human relations based on respect, equity and sensitivity between men and women, we must start from sharing responsibility: as Colín (2014) states: “we cannot advance in gender equality without involving men, since it is not a problem for women, but for society as a whole” (p.12).

Reiterating part of the before mentioned, some experiences in which I have participated, as well as the one I propose, are intended to offer a theoretical-methodological framework that allows recognizing and taking advantage of those aspects that facilitate their replication. Equally, I must say that it is a pending task in which I hope to contribute and participate more effectively, to the extent that I can at least partially complete the approaches expressed here, and that, surely, it will be more feasible and true, to the extent that it brings together efforts and stakeholders in the same direction; as well as to the extent to which it can summon entities and actions already incorporated in similar initiatives.

Some conclusions and reflections as a tentative closure

I am one of those who believes it is important to foster the development of several alternative models of masculinity, not subordinated to a rationalist, exclusivist and antihuman pat-

tern; agreeing on the need for the new models to be open, plural and inclusive, both intergenerational and intragenic; in which the development of equitable relations with women is well-expressed and well-recognized, and in a closer and more intimate relationship between men. This ‘construction’ begins and it is constituted from the diversity of opinions and positions held by men with different tendencies and inclinations, dominated by an open, plural, flexible and dynamic conception that can accommodate all this diversity of forms Which masculinity can acquire.

Authors such as Asturias (1997) believe that change cannot be solved therapeutically, personally, as an internal renewal, but, rather, in a political and group way, since personal growth will not automatically lead to personal political actions that support gender equality and that is why group and collective strategies are vital to dismantle oppression. According to Carabí (2006), among the characteristics and proposals that arise for the lifting of new models for the male are: to maintain confidence and self-confidence; to advocate for a more peaceful, open and receptive personality; to maintain erotic, free, energetic and strong character; but all supported on a non-oppressive basis or requiring the subordination of others and, on the contrary, they are based on an egalitarian, non-hierarchical, anti-sexist, anti-racist and anti-homophobic conception. Another aspect

to keep in mind is to free man from the mandate to hold control and encourage the sharing of power. All this proposal forces the male to become aware of their reality in what concerns the traditional construction of masculinity so as to subject it to a critical analysis that will make it an artifice of its own change from assuming it as valuable from its personal sphere, both in socio-cultural and psycho-affective aspects.

It is, to a large extent, aspects such as these that have allowed groups of men to group together and consolidate from similar proposals; such as those assumed by the Asociación de Hombres por la Igualdad de Género (Men Association for Gender Equality) (Malaga, Spain), which in its Manifiesto (2008) states that contemporary men must assume historical responsibility for the injustices that have generated male chauvinism and the hegemonic model from which it emerges. They tell us that our collective responsibility consists in the explicit recognition that we have historically exercised social oppression: "Our individual responsibility is directed not to become reproducers of sexism in our lives and relationships ... to carry out inner deconstruction as patriarchal men and reconstruction as egalitarian men "(Manifiesto AHIGE, 2008, p.2); from which we highlight approaches such as those made by Pineda (2003), considering that when studying personal actions in any social area, it is necessary to have a theoretical framework

that explains the subjectivities of individuals and their identities as men or as women. Hence we share the idea that studies such as these will allow us to look at men no longer in their status as proletarians, fathers, entrepreneurs, etc., but at their subjective intersection as beings with gender identities - whichever it is - and in their cultural construction as men; from which it will be possible to propose to overcome diverse stereotypes, in order to discover, then, that half forgotten in the studies of gender, highlighting their differences from the cultural configuration of the power relations with women and between different groups of men.

References

- AHIGE-Asociación de Hombres por la Igualdad de Género (2008). *Manifiesto por el desarrollo de igualdad dirigido a hombres*. Consultado el 25 de agosto de 2008. Disponible en: http://www.ahige.org/AHIGE_Manifiesto.pdf
- Angeleri, S. (2008). *Marcos teóricos contemporáneos*. Caracas, Venezuela: Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- Asturias, L. (1997). "Construcción de la masculinidad y relaciones de género". Ponencia presentada en el foro *Mujeres en lucha por la igualdad de derechos y la justicia social*, realizado en Ciudad de Guatemala el 5 de marzo de 1997. Consultado el 23 de enero de 2009. Disponible en: <http://www.artnet.com.br/~marko/artasturias.htm>

- Cantera, L. (1999). *Te pego porque te quiero: La violencia en la pareja*. Barcelona, España: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.
- Carabí, A. (2006). *Nuevas masculinidades*. Frantisek Hliva.
- Cazés, D. (2004). "El feminismo y los hombres". En C. Lomas (Comp.), *Los chicos también lloran*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Colín, A. R. (2014). "Involucrar a los hombres en la conciliación con corresponsabilidad social como política de Estado". *Dfensor*, (3), 11-16.
- Connell, R. (1993) *The Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality*. Brazilia, United Nations.
- Figueroa, J. G. (2014). "Masculinidades y políticas de equidad de género". *Dfensor*, (3), 43-50.
- Flood, M. (1998). "Homophobia and masculinities among young men (Lessons in becoming a straight man)". Presentation to teachers, Professional Development Training, O'Connell Education Centre, Canberra.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). "Studies in ethnomethodology". En *Debate Feminista*, 20(10).
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, N.Y., Estados Unidos: Cornell University Press.
- Jara, O. (2006). *Dilemas y Desafíos de la Sistematización de Experiencias*. Costa Rica: Centro de Estudios y Publicaciones-Alforja.
- Kaufam, M. (1994). *Los hombres, el feminismo y las experiencias contradictorias del poder entre los hombres: Género e identidad*. Bogotá, Colombia: Tercer Mundo Editores.
- Kaufman, M. (2001). "Effective education with boys and young men to help end violence against women". Informe para el Gobierno de Ontario, Canadá.
- Kaufman, M. (1989). *Hombres, placer, poder y cambio*. Santo Domingo, República Dominicana: Taller.
- Kimmel, M. (1999). *La Producción Teórica sobre la Masculinidad: Nuevos aportes*. México: Universidad Autónoma de la Puebla Plaza; Valdés Editores.
- Kimmel, M. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. Nueva York, Estados Unidos: The Free Press.
- Lomas, C. (Comp.) (2004). *Los chicos también lloran*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Lozoya, J. (1999). *Políticas de alianzas: El movimiento de hombres y el feminismo*. Granada, España: Almuñecar.
- Madrigal, L. & Tejeda, W. (2008). *Acercándonos a las masculinidades*. San Salvador, El Salvador: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.
- Montero, M. (2006). *Hacer para transformar – El método en la psicología comunitaria*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Morgade, G. (2006). *Aprender a ser mujer, aprender a ser varón*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Novedades Educativas.

- Parrini, R. (2001). "Apuntes acerca de los estudios de masculinidad, de la hegemonía a la pluralidad". FLACSO, Chile. En línea. Disponible en: <file:///A:/Red de Masculinidad.http://www.flacso.cl-htm>. Fecha de recuperación: 15-03-2012
- Pineda, J. (2003). *Masculinidades, género y desarrollo. Sociedad civil, machismo y microempresa*. Bogotá: Uniandes.
- Scott, J. (1986). *Gender: An useful category for historical analysis*. Nueva York, Estados Unidos: New York Press.
- Universidad Académica de Humanismo Cristiano (2011). *Estructura, Temperamento y Carácter*. Santiago: UAHC.
- Vargas Urías, M. (2014). "Un paso necesario: el trabajo con hombres para avanzar hacia la igualdad de género". *Dfensor*, (3), 05-11.
- Viveros, M. (2002). *De quebradores y cumplidores: Sobre hombres, masculinidades y relaciones de género en Colombia*. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Fundación Ford, Profamilia.
- Viveros, M., Olavaria, J. & Fuller, N. (2001). *Identidades masculinas: Investigaciones desde América Latina*. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Nacional.