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ABSTRACT

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence constitutes one of the major protection concerns in displacement settings, being the current Syrian crisis in Lebanon no exception. This has led international and Lebanese humanitarian actors to design and implement prevention and response programmes country-wide to ensure the protection of persons of concern.

Yet, gender-related programmes seem to maintain a traditional approach which focuses disproportionately on women and girls. As for SGBV programmes, while women and girls do constitute the bulk of SGBV survivors, such traditional approach overlooks the need of other groups concerned by any gender and SGBV-related interventions. This holds especially true to men and boys, whose engagement in SGBV programming is still conceived in silos, usually included in prevention programmes in their role as perpetrators. Working with men and boys survivors is not widespread and there is no consistent attempt to involve men across all stages in programmes.

With no aim to compromise the much needed interventions with women and girls, this Master’s thesis aims at exploring an enhanced men-inclusive approach to SGBV programmes through the exploration of a tool called the men’s lens. By analyzing how Syrian refugee men’s own masculinities and manhood and their linkages to their social positioning influence the emergence of SGBV, this Master’s thesis explores the feasibility of such approach through interviews and a set of recommendations to humanitarian actors in Lebanon. As such, the thesis contributes to bringing together academia and the humanitarian realm, contextualising the men’s lens to the reality on the ground. This includes the adoption of a practical focus on the intertwenement between SGBV, masculinities and intersectionality among Syrian refugees in Lebanon, with the ultimate goal of contributing to improving current SGBV programmes in the Syria crisis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3RP</td>
<td>Refugee Response and Resilience Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGDM</td>
<td>Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>Clinical Management of Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCWA</td>
<td>Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBTI</td>
<td>Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV IMS</td>
<td>Gender-Based Violence Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>Gender-Equitable Men Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>Intimate-Partner Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCRP</td>
<td>Lebanon Crisis Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and Gender-based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGIE</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity and Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>Sexual Violence against Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAWG</td>
<td>Violence against Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

“The main reason we left is not fear of shelling or bullets. The main reason we left is because of fear for our honour. This is the main reason – fear of us being abused, all of us, our daughters and our men.”

(UNHCR 1 2017b, p. 6)

Displacement is not only triggered by the direct destruction caused by war, but also by the impact of conflict on sociocultural behaviours, positioning and values, as shown by the quote above. Among the myriad of displacement-related issues, Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) is overwhelmingly perpetrated against those in more vulnerable positions and is widespread in displacement settings. Lebanon is no exception. In the wake of the seventh year of the Syria crisis, a large number of abuses and violations were perpetrated, especially against refugees. In response to this, humanitarian actors have organized a coordinated system of protection of refugees in Lebanon with regards to SGBV prevention and response. While I agree it is important to establish a framework with which to approach this problem, the current system of protection in Lebanon leaves me with unanswered questions: what is the approach adopted by such interventions and how do they match with the humanitarian core principle of leaving no one behind?

SGBV programmes are geared towards the prevention and response with regards to violence against women and girls, who constitute 90 per cent of SGBV cases reported in Lebanon (LCRP 2017-2018, p. 119). Without aiming to compromise these important and relevant interventions, I problematize how men are included (or not) in current SGBV programmes, especially since they represent the remaining 10 per cent of all cases reported (ibid), and account for 18 per cent of cases of rape registered (ibid). In addition, men play a key role in opening doors to the achievement of gender equality. Drawing on this group of concerns, I analyse whether a more consistent men-

1 UNHCR stands for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. UNHCR is the United Nations’ agency mandated to ensure protection of refugees, asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons and stateless persons, under the implementation of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol.
inclusive approach to SGBV programmes is relevant and feasible, and if so, what direction can be followed by humanitarian organisations to achieve greater inclusion.

My research is motivated by my own positioning. I am currently professionally involved in the SGBV sector, serving within a humanitarian agency. My positioning has allowed me to identify this under-researched area that is drawing increasing attention among practitioners, donors and policy-makers. Still, the approach observed is inconsistent, and the very few interventions identified are pilot attempts which are conducted in silos, this is, as separate and not interconnected interventions, lacking of vision and strategy in many occasions. My professional and academic experience has also confirmed to me the need to explore new ways to conduct SGBV interventions involving men and boys, which are blocked by the lack of evidence, limited awareness and weak capacities to serve this group of concern.

With that aim, I explore a rationale of the conception of such programmes and their linkages to the involvement of men and boys, and envision some directions to reinforce how men are currently captured in such interventions. Focusing specifically on Syrian men and boys in Lebanon, I not only take into consideration their condition and positioning as males, but also the social, cultural and legal construction around their status as refugees. I do so by developing an approach that sheds the light on men, breaking traditional secondary involvement of men while combatting SGBV, and placing men and boys at the centre of their own involvement in humanitarian programmes on SGBV prevention and response.

In this line, I build on a theoretical analysis on critical masculinities and intersectionality tailored to the context, which shows the gaps and inconsistencies in involving men in fighting against SGBV and informs a model that is proposed as a more consistent and coherent alternative. I argue that programmes need to capture both components at their juncture through a tool called the men’s lens\(^2\), which constitutes a new approach combining masculinities and intersectionality within their mutually reinforcing impact. Although both dimensions find many interlinkages in their nature,

\(^2\) The concept of the men’s lens is to be understood as an approach based on the interaction between masculinities and intersectionality from a men’s perspective. It is worth highlighting that the concept is not related to the ‘male gaze’, coined by Mulvey as a masculine way to see women as objects (Mulvey, 1975), expanded by bell hooks through the concept of “opposition” (bell hooks, 2003).
they are not put into discussion in current SGBV programmes in Lebanon. Resulting from this lack of interconnection in SGBV programmes, I address, on the one hand, the way masculinities are connected to intersectionality and result in violence, and on the other one, how the intersectional dimension questions male refugees’ notion of manhood and masculinities and cross-cuts with the emergence of SGBV. As such, I aim to answer the following research question: how can masculinities and intersectionality of Syrian refugee men and boys inform SGBV programming and have a positive impact on SGBV prevention and response in the current humanitarian setting in Lebanon?

The research question above fits the overarching role of research, and aims at producing a piece of knowledge that is timely and relevant, while making a contribution to the academic community and the humanitarian realm. Once translated into programmes or taken on through further academic discussions, the argument and findings included in this Master’s thesis are thought to contribute to making a step forward towards the reduction of violence and the protection of human rights for all, promoting a greater inclusion in programmes. In this regard, my responsibility as a researcher touches upon my duty to provide reliable and knowledgeable information, so that relevant doors can be open for further research. Yet, and aware of the limitations of this piece of research, current findings will focus on the setting in point, and further research will be necessary to ensure wide generalization of data.

*Disposition – how do the different sections speak to each other?*

My Master’s thesis follows an argument built on the interconnectedness of its own parts. First, a contextual analysis which explains both the Syrian response and the institutionalisation of the work on SGBV. Second, a section on defining the scope of the research has been included to explain to the reader the technical concepts. In that section, I address why some terms are to be used and understood in line with international humanitarian law and the current jargon in the SGBV sector.

The two sections above are key to framing the research process. Following those sections, the Master’s thesis displays the methodology used throughout the process of production of the thesis. This section presents what the methods selected are, together with the explanation of how the
analysis was conducted and how I went, in my capacity as researcher, about the data collection and processing. This sheds light on the thematic analysis conducted and other choices made throughout the process, aiming at coping with limitations identified and being aware of the influence on the eventual shape of the thesis.

The Master’s thesis builds on three main pillars as per the following sequence: first, the theoretical analysis conducted, which has been targeted as per the silos identified in engaging men in programmes, is useful to illustrate the rationale behind such engagement, especially given the mismatch between the reality of current literature available and the context where I am producing this Master’s thesis. Second, the inconsistencies identified throughout this process results in the development of the tool (understood as a means to enable new perspectives) I construct for the purpose of this Master’s thesis: the men’s lens. I deliberately choose such evolving sequence with the men’s lens half-way, since it is both a result of the first stage and an approach for the way forward, guiding interventions in a way that critical masculinities and intersectionality enter into a dialogue. The sequence chosen is key to materialize the linkage between theory and practice.

The theoretical analysis and the model are used as an enabling factor to the practicality of the enhanced men-inclusive approach, which is the reason why they are followed by an empirical analysis of semi-structured interviews conducted to humanitarian staff (third). By interviewing targeted humanitarian actors (UN agency, international NGO and national NGO focusing on LGBTI3 issues), I build on their experience and expertise to assess the relevance and feasibility of such enhanced men-inclusive approach in current programmes in the sector, and subsequently envision the necessary strategies to materialize it. In this regard, the empirical analysis lays the ground for the way forward, which includes going through a process of reflection on decisions made throughout the process, in order to discuss adequacy of the model and alternative approaches to the research object, together with advantages and disadvantages, limitations and resistances identified. The Master’s thesis provides a set of practical recommendations for humanitarian practitioners as well. Such recommendations are included in Annex I as a complement should they

---

3 The term LGBTI stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex persons, and refers globally to persons with diverse sex, sexual orientation and/or gender identity. The term LGBTI is used in the thesis to refer to the defense and promotion of rights of this group. Yet, in some occasions, it is preferred to use GBTI while referring to the specific population targeted in this Master’s thesis.
contribute to putting into practice the new approach explored. The interconnectedness of the sequence of my Master’s thesis and the function of each of the stages are illustrated in Figure 1 below:

As such, my research pursues a technical purpose and targets SGBV practitioners in humanitarian settings as the key actors, providing them with a suggested new way of implementing SGBV interventions. At the same time, it makes an original and valuable contribution to the Gender and Intersectionality field by bringing together academia and the humanitarian realm, especially given its contextualised nature to Lebanon, together with its practical focus on the intertwinement between SGBV, masculinities and intersectionality among Syrian refugees.

**Aim and impact of the research**

My Master’s thesis pursues a clear objective: developing a theoretically informed model that can be translated into practice and inform current programmes of SGBV prevention and response in the humanitarian sector in Lebanon. In order to do so, I explore a new approach to SGBV interventions in Lebanon based on including a deeper analysis on refugee men’s gender and intersectional perspectives, which mutually reinforce each other and have an impact on the
emergence of SGBV. This attempt is to be explored through a proposed approach, which for the purpose of this research I call the men’s lens. Such lens provides new elements to be included in the scope of the humanitarian interventions, which have a limited scope focusing primarily on women and girls. As a result, the limited scope of the engagement of men and boys as perpetrators is not always effective, and men and boys are excluded of information outreach and services in many occasions, being unable to be duly assisted. As stated above, this contradicts the core humanitarian principle of serving everyone and leave no one behind.

Through my research, I broaden the scope and reshape the way men are engaged in such interventions, breaking the silos and pre-existing labels and promoting an approach inclusive of men’s gender and intersectionality perspectives. To do so, I build on knowledge about how Syrian refugee men experience their gender within the shift in roles and changes experienced as a result of displacement, and the subsequent repositioning as per their different identity categories in the new environment. Both factors intra-act, “signifying the mutual constitution of entangled agencies” (Barad 2007, p. 33). This is, mutually influencing the emergence of SGBV, having men both as perpetrator or survivor.
II. BACKGROUND

The exploration of the new approach requires an understanding of how programmes are currently done. It is important to unpack the current context in order to see the mismatch and inconsistencies of current SGBV programmes vis-à-vis the engagement of men, on which new proposals should build. This section aims at providing an overview of the context, especially with a view to explore how programmes are currently implemented. Yet, and given the research object, I decide to explicitly provide the readers with updated facts and figures on SGBV prevention and response within the Syrian crisis in Lebanon. This includes addressing the institutionalisation and limited focus of SGBV programming, which shows the relevance to work on re-empowering men in displacement settings, and hence enables the mindset for the effective adoption of the enhanced men’s inclusive approach proposed.

*Sexual and Gender-Based Violence overview in the current humanitarian crisis in Lebanon*

The Syrian conflict has caused the forced displacement of over 12 million persons by the end of 2016, including “5.5 million refugees, 6.3 million Internally Displaced Persons, and nearly 185,000 asylum-seekers” (UNHCR 2017a). This has had a major impact in neighbouring countries such as Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon, being this last one the country in focus for the purpose of this research. With around 1.5 million Syrians hosted in a population of 4 million inhabitants, Lebanon ranks among the countries hosting the highest number of refugees (Lebanon Crisis Response Plan 2016). In relation to the overall population rate in the country, Lebanon has the “highest ration of refugees per capita in the world” (United Nations Lebanon 2015). Among these, around 1 million refugees are officially registered at the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (Syrian Regional Refugee Response – Lebanon 2017). UNHCR is the United Nations Agency having the mandate to ensure the protection of refugees worldwide by “promoting accession to the 1951 Refugee Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol” (UNHCR 2018b).
In June 2017, data showed that, among refugees registered, 52.5% are female, and 54.8% are children under 18 (Syrian Regional Refugee Response – Lebanon 2017). This has had an impact on the context in Lebanon, aggravating the pressure over resources, increasing the poverty ratio and unemployment rate and resulting in tense interactions between the refugee and the host community. In order to mitigate the risks within such humanitarian context, international organizations and donors have mobilized, only in 2017, 4.63 billion USD to ensure protection to affected populations at the regional scale (3RP 2017-2018), allocating 2.035 billion USD to the humanitarian response in Lebanon (ibid, p. 27). A large number of programmes have been implemented to meet the basic needs of displaced persons, including cash, food, shelter, education, healthcare and protection, among others (3RP 2017-2018). Other programmes focus particularly on preventing and responding to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), which has been proven to escalate in conflict settings (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017; UNHCR 2015, p. 8).

This amount has been cascaded down into different programmes, aiming at ensuring protection and safety to refugees in light of the different vulnerabilities faced. Syrian refugees in Lebanon experience a structural intersectionality (as per formulated by Crenshaw in Shields 2008) and in line with Collins’ concept of matrix of domination (Zinn and Dill 1996, cited in ibid) given the lack of legal documentation and protection, limited economic resources, and the social discrimination faced by the host community. This is aggravated by the current restrictions on employment posed to refugees, who are only allowed to officially work in agriculture, construction and environment-related (cleaning) fields. As a result, many of them are forced to accept employment unofficially, which increases their exposure to abuse and benefits from their impossibility to report given the lack of legal status in Lebanon.

Such structural intersectionality (as formulated by Crenshaw in Shields 2008) experienced by refugees is also translated into the emergence of different forms of SGBV, which is usually prioritized in humanitarian responses (Olivius 2016). In this sense, I explicitly opt for the term ‘SGBV’ (instead of the commonly used ‘GBV / Gender-Based Violence’) to reflect the opportunistic nature of some of the incidents and the relevant “urgency of protection interventions that address the criminal character and disruptive consequences of sexual violence for victims/survivors and their families” (UNHCR 2011, p.6). In this sense, the reality on the ground
shows that women and girls are disproportionally affected by SGBV in Lebanon, reporting 90 per cent\(^4\) of the total number of cases of violence (LCRP 2017-2018, p.119). 20 per cent of total number of survivors are younger than 18 years old (ibid).

Intimate-Partner Violence (IPV) constitutes the most common form of SGBV in Lebanon. This shows that men constitute the majority of perpetrators of SGBV in humanitarian settings, while women represent the bulk of survivors affected. One interpretation to this builds on the fact that social structures and norms place men as victims to such positioning [as perpetrators] (Olivius 2016). On the other hand, men are not only perpetrators, but also experience different forms of violence themselves. 10 per cent of the total number of cases of SGBV have been reported by men (LCRP 2017-2018, p. 119), including 18 per cent of the total number of cases of rape reported (ibid). This holds especially true for gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex individuals, who are subject to “multiple subordinate locations” (Chow 2011) based on their sexual orientation and gender identity, together with their inferior status as refugees (UNHCR 2017b). Syrian refugee men report patterns of sexual exploitation, especially perpetrated by landlords or employers (ibid). As mentioned above, these trends need to be understood within a context where under-reporting of cases is very high due to stigma and taboo related hereto, which is especially aggravated among men and boys survivors.

*Institutionalisation and limited focus of current SGBV prevention and response*

The fact that SGBV escalates in conflict settings (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017) has brought with it the prioritization of SGBV programmes in humanitarian responses (Olivius 2016). This translates into the allocation of relevant financial and technical resources, which has resulted eventually in the specialization of technical staff on the issue. These professional staff are responsible for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of relevant programmes, becoming “agents of change” (Callerstig 2012) while ensuring efficiency of outcomes and expected impact.

\(^4\) It is worth noting that, as per agreement in the SGBV sector in Lebanon, only data in trends can be disclosed. The prevailing under-reporting rate shows that absolute numbers are not indicative of the dimension of the phenomenon.
With regards to the focus of current SGBV interventions in Lebanon, it is worth highlighting that they primarily address the fight against violence against women and girls (VAWG) (Olivius 2016). This can be explained by the fact that this group of concern represents indeed the majority of survivors. As highlighted in the introductory section above, it is not my intention with this research to compromise the much needed resources devoted to women and girls, hindering the way towards gender equality (White 2000, cited in Connell 2005, p. 1807).

Yet, the specific target of these programmes has resulted in the limited involvement of men, being mainly engaged in prevention activities in their role as potential perpetrators, with the aim of reducing the incidents perpetrated against women and girls. It has also been shown that masculinities are barely present in trainings and programmes (Laplonge 2015, p. 97), which applies to Lebanon too. This shows the weak analysis of men’s specific needs to inform SGBV programmes in humanitarian settings such as Lebanon, which subsequently limits the availability of, access to and capacities in terms of services tailored to the needs of men, either as perpetrators or survivors. Among others, and in line with relevant international guidance in this regard, the relevance of addressing men’s needs in SGBV programmes is highlighted:

“Understanding male gender roles and identities in the society and context in which we are operating and the impact of forced displacement on those roles and identities; emphasizing the positive norms and values that are part of masculine identities in the culture and communities concerned; and developing programmes […] that build on men’s skills and capacities to help redress the disempowerment felt by men as a result of displacement” (UNHCR 2008).

Yet, the need to engage men as per their own interest is still overlooked. This results in shortages in tailored programmes and accurate information, outreach and services for refugee men, which ultimately hides that we are overlooking factors leading to the emergence of violence.
III. DEFINING THE SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

Building on the context overview provided above, I consider relevant to establish the scope of this piece of research. This holds especially true for the different key definitions used, which have been adapted as per the approach of this research, which has SGBV humanitarian interventions at its core. The choice of the key definitions has been guided especially by UNHCR commonly agreed international standards, the rationale of the research topic chosen and the positioning of the researcher, explained below.

The objective of this section is two-fold. On the one hand, this section aims at clarifying how key definitions are to be understood, with a view to better adapt to the needs of the research and the researcher and avoid misconceptions on what and who falls within the scope of each of the terms used. On the other one, I present my personal positioning, which explains what factors can hinder or enable the research process to be successful, especially vis-à-vis the dichotomy insider vs. outsider.

Understanding key definitions

Given the nature of the research topic selected, I build my argument on the common understanding of SGBV programmes prevailing in the humanitarian sector. As an overall framework, I deliberately opt for the term ‘Sexual and Gender-Based Violence’ since “it is one of the defining characteristics of contemporary armed conflict” (UNHCR 2008). SGBV needs to be understood as:

“Any harmful act that is perpetrated against one person’s will and that is based on socially ascribed (gender) differences between males and females. It includes acts that inflict physical, mental, or sexual harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion and other deprivations of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life. SGBV entails widespread human rights violations and is often linked to unequal gender relations within communities and abuses of power.
It can take the form of sexual violence or persecution by the authorities, or can be the result of discrimination embedded in legislation or prevailing societal norms and practices. It can be both a cause of forced displacement and an intolerable part of the displacement experience. All persons of concern, including refugees, asylum seekers, returnees, stateless persons and internally displaced persons, suffer disproportionately from SGBV, not only as a form of persecution and at the outbreak of a conflict but also during flight and displacement” (UNHCR 2011, p.6).

The term is preferred over a more generic ‘Gender-based violence’ to show that gender differences are not the only drive to violence in humanitarian contexts; violence also takes place as an act to humiliate and cause harm on an opportunistic basis (embedded in acts of sexual violence). Although women and girls constitute the majority of SGBV survivors (UNHCR 2015, p. 8), the definition chosen builds on a broader spectrum of survivors, including men and boys survivors. This last group of concern is also affected by this phenomenon as per current dynamics of power, coercion and harm, being the target of the research in point. SGBV against males tackles relevant “gendered dimensions of certain forms of violence against men and boys—particularly some forms of sexual violence committed with the explicit purpose of reinforcing gender inequitable norms of masculinity and femininity (e.g. sexual violence committed in armed conflict aimed at emasculating or feminizing the enemy). This violence against males is based on socially constructed ideas of what it means to be a man and exercise male power” (IASC 2015, p.4). This also relates to violence committed against male GBTI individuals, which is “driven by a desire to punish those seen as defying gender norms” (OHCHR 2011 cited in UNHCR 2017b). The scope of the definition of SGBV touches upon the two overarching theoretical frameworks selected, namely, critical masculinities and intersectionality.

Within this framework, I deliberately opt for the term SGBV ‘survivor’ over the term ‘victim’ in order to make reference to those individuals who experience any type of violence. The term ‘survivor’ highlights their strength and resilience, and avoids stigmatization related to terms such as ‘victim’ (UNHCR 2003). The subject committing an act of violence will be designated as
‘perpetrator’. In terms of types, information will be classified as per the prevailing and commonly accepted disaggregation established in current reporting mechanisms in Lebanon, this is, physical assault, psychological and/or emotional abuse, sexual assault, forced marriage, denial of resources; and rape (LCRP 2017-2020).

Some specifications need to be given too with regards to the use of the term ‘refugee’. As per the official definition set out in the 1951 Refugee Convention (which underpins the mandate of UNHCR), a refugee is a person who “owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it” (UNHCR 2018a). Yet, I will use the term ‘refugee’ to refer to all individuals registered with UNHCR in Lebanon, even if the Lebanese Government does not acknowledge their status as such (UNHCR 2017b). In this regard, UNHCR needed to stop the registration of persons of concern following a governmental decision in May 2015. Non-refugee men and boys in Lebanon (regardless of nationality) are not captured within the scope of this research.

As per the theoretical framework selected, I address the term ‘masculinity’ in line with Connell’s definition of ‘hegemonic masculinities’ (1985) as “making visible power relations, dominance, and the hierarchical order between men, while focusing on patriarchal subordination of women and femininity” (Connell 1985, cited in Hearn et al. 2012, p. 37). This shows the linkages in both the interrelation among men themselves and power, and in the subjugation of male’s dominance over women. Building on such comprehensive approach, I abide by a focus engaging the “variety of ways in which men, masculinities and violences interrelate with each other” (Hearn 1998, p. 35). This underpins my focus on violence perpetrated by or against males, taking as a starting point (and expanding) Hearn’s notion of men’s violences (ibid). Such concept needs to be understood as a “severe social problem” that can happen to “women, girls, boys, children, young people, each other, animals, life, ourselves” (ibid, p. 5).
As per the term ‘intersectionality’, I must recall Crenshaw’s initial notion as an idea around “women, race, patriarchy and colonialism” (2001, cited in Yuval-Davis 2006, p. 195). Yet, I adopt an approach aiming at overcoming the limitations posed by the time and space (Lewis 2013) where the initial term was coined. This is, the term travels and does not only relates any longer to the reality of Afro-American women in the US of the 80’s. Instead, I approach such term as a basis to position the individual across his/her/their identity categories, making a clear allusion to Collin’s *matrix of domination* (Zinn and Dill 1996, cited in Shields). Throughout that “matrix”, Syrian refugee men and boys in Lebanon witness how they experience a loss of privileges compared to their lives prior to the conflict, which has placed them in an oppressive situation based on their different identity categories. They have moved from top to bottom, influenced especially by an unprivileged economic status upon arrival, legal constraints hindering their potential to cope with their new situation, together with a long-lasting perception that Syrians are inferior to the Lebanese. Such sociocultural prejudice has obviously been reinforced given the large influx of Syrians in Lebanon, which has posed additional pressure to the resources and opportunities available in the country.

**Personal positioning**

My personal positioning plays a key role in understanding the rationale and the purpose of this thesis. In this regard, many factors determined the relationship between the *researcher* and the *research*, which has been key to select the research topic (Koobak 2014) and enhance the understanding of the research. This entailed conceiving the positioning of the researcher as a “*momentary phenomenon*, defined through the particular research project and against the background of a (self-) reflexive process that also implies that the researcher makes herself or himself explicitly accountable for the research interests involved in the project” (Barad 2007, cited in Lykke 2010, p.151). I have become the ‘tool’ to bring a reflection on a new approach to the topic in point (Richardson 2000).

Building on Haraway’s concept of *situated knowledges* (Lykke 2010, p. 152), I position myself as a European, white, middle-class and educated man. I have been ex-patriated in Lebanon since late 2015, and during this time, I have been able to get relevant knowledge of the context, its
challenges, and to establish a personal and professional network that has been key to develop this thesis. I enjoy, given this background, a privileged position that allows me to have an initial sense about what could be adequate or suitable in the setting. Yet, my pre-existing knowledge may also pose some backlashes, since my familiarity with some sociocultural factors underpinning this research may make me take for granted (and not include) necessary information for an external audience.

I build therefore on a professional and personal experience that is already on-going. I feel empowered, precisely because I am aware since the beginning of the process of the challenges that I may face, and I feel confident to have the resources to overcome them, as necessary. This is also reinforced by the fact that I have been since then professionally involved in the humanitarian sector in Lebanon, focusing especially on gender-related issues and SGBV. I am well positioned to assess how knowledge on SGBV has been made so far and to change how voices are distributed among all persons involved (Cixous 1976).

The debate outsider vs. insider influences my position and the dynamics of the research process. Yet, I can wisely position myself as either one, paving the way for me to achieve my objectives. I can position myself as an insider through my professional role in gender equality and SGBV, my experience in the country and familiarity with the context, or my condition as a man, especially given the topic in point. My condition as an insider could also be linked to my awareness of how men have the power to perpetrate violence, how violence is sometimes embedded in men’s ways to be raised. Yet, it is also linked to my personal experience of having faced different types of abuses and harassment during my lifetime as per prevailing hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1987, cited in Acker 1990, p. 153), precisely given the mismatch between how I feel and how I am supposed to behave. Other enabling factors enter into play, such as the fact that I am enrolled in a Master’s thesis on Gender Studies and Intersectionality and I work for UNHCR, which “legitimates” me as a researcher on SGBV and refugees.

My privileged position as per my condition as a European, educated, white man working for UNHCR is also promoted by internalized “colonialist approaches” that remain in the Lebanese mindset, since being a European researcher in a developing country provides me implicitly with
more credibility and facilitates me the conduction of this Master’s thesis to a great extent (Best 2003, p. 896), giving more credibility and space to the findings of the research. This has also been confirmed by the role played by my own origin, based on the reinforcement of the idea of the European reason (Charkrabarty, cited in Stoler 2009, p. 351), which grants validity and reliability by default to the findings of my research. This proves, in line with bell hooks, that colonialism still travels in space and time (1991) and that Lugones’ coloniality of gender is still relevant in our current society (2010).

My enabling positioning vis-à-vis the research process is motivated by the professionalization of my role as a SGBV officer and promoter of gender equality as well (Ahmed et al. 2006, cited in Swan and Fox 2010, p. 568). This has helped me create a space for acceptance in the sector and among key informants for me to be the one conducting this research, allowing me to become a potential “agent of change” (Tatli and Özbilgin 2009) who is “entitled” to bring up the need to work on men’s problems, interests and needs (Connell 2005, p. 1806).

In opposition to the above, I can easily be placed back to a position as outsider as well, which clearly limits my leeway to conduct my research successfully. This needs to be understood within a context where my implicit “whiteness invisibility” reinforces my own positioning towards the researched group and creates more distance between the other and myself (Gronold and Pedersen Lund 2009, p. 58). This is especially relevant in a context where my choice on interviewing may reinforce my position as an outsider (Viswesvaran 1994). In spite of my familiarity of the context, I am not and I will never be Lebanese (with includes the adscription to sociocultural and linguistic norms, among others), which is used as a way to put barriers to my research. This enables potential gatekeepers to discredit my work and put barriers to the findings of my research to be heard and taken into consideration, especially under the premise that I may be a threat to intrinsic social and cultural values (Benschop and Van den Brink 2014) that I am somehow unable to understand. Even less I can compare my personal situation with the dire living conditions experienced by Syrian refugees, which clearly limit my role to a researcher, who may be accepted (or not) as an observer for a limited period of time.
Researching on SGBV-related issues increases my likelihood to be labelled as an outsider by those staff who still conceive gender as something not related to men, questioning my presence and action in the research process and the field itself. This may obstruct the easiness to collect data, and especially the degree to which findings can be accepted and eventually, implemented. The credibility and space given to my research may be put at stake.

This relates also to those humanitarian workers unwilling to have an open discussion on violence against men, since this implies in many occasions a same-sex intercourse that contradicts social and religious norms, and questions the widespread internalized homophobia in the region (Weinberg 1972, cited in Creed 2006, p. 372). It can also be due to the perception of my research as an external factor changing well-established approaches to the work on SGBV, constituting micro-ruptures in how things are performed (Jerne 2016). This can definitely create a barrier for my research to find space, and have a negative impact on how my findings and recommendations are eventually taken into consideration (if they are). Such rejection can reach an extent that may even be counterproductive, this is, it can not only block the space for my research to practically induce programmes, but it can also erode my credibility as a worker beyond this piece of research.

Such exclusion as an outsider touches upon my own relationship with my employer too (Kulik and Li 2015), which may perceive me as a subject questioning the current approaches to my work. In line with Meyerson and Scully, this would make me pass as a “tempered radical” (1995). Hence, it is vital to explore potential ways to achieve the support and endorsement of the senior management of my organisation (Benschop and Van den Brink 2014), which will be key to open doors to explore the implementation of the findings and recommendations of my research.

In spite of the above, being an outsider can also have a positive impact. In a country where humanitarian workers know each other, the fact that I am not Lebanese may provide a broader space for workers to speak honestly and sincerely. Risk of retaliation may seem unlikely, which is especially relevant since conversations may bring up some critiques as per they (or their organisations) make their own work. My condition as outsider keeps also a time dimension, since both targeted key informants and the readers know that Lebanon and myself have an ephemeral relation, this is, whatever I do and say will come with me whenever I leave this country.
Given the aim of this Master’s thesis, this is, propose a theoretically informed model to guide SGBV programmes, I have chosen a methodology composed by mixed methods (Lykke 2010) aiming at examining current knowledge available on the research object, and illustrate the new approach proposed through professionals’ accounts. The research includes first a theoretical part (through a theoretical analysis), on the one hand, and an empirical one (through interviews), on the other, seeking complementarity and dialogue between both components. Such choice inserts also some previous knowledge I bring with me to the research, adding my “intellectual, emotional and political baggage” (Ramazonoglu and Holland 2012, p. 148).

With this aim in mind, this section presents the methods selected, together with the procedure related hereto in order to illustrate how I, in my capacity as a researcher, decided to go about it. In this line, I address the choices made and the rationale behind them. Yet, as in every choice, the section addresses other possible directions I could have taken, together with the limitations faced, which is especially relevant given the impact on the research as a whole.

**Methods**

Mixed methods have been my preferred option, choosing a combination between theoretical analysis and semi-structured interviews to provide a “more complete picture of the thing that is being studied” (Descombe 2010, p. 141). My choice relies on my intention to cover a broad spectrum of the research object and the nature of this research, this is, from understanding the rationale behind programmes and remaining gaps, to exploring a new approach and the way forward. In this regard, my Master’s thesis follows the sequence below:

1. Theoretical analysis: Analyzing previous research available and remaining gaps and inconsistencies in SGBV programming;
2. Proposing a *men’s lens*: Developing a *men’s lens* as a proposed constructed model (constructed based on the theoretical analysis);
3. Empirical analysis: Exploring the feasibility and relevance of the model through the experiences and views of humanitarian staff captured in semi-structured interviews.
The mix of methods above presents a deliberately selected ‘sequence’ and ‘relationship’ between the components, establishing an order and a way for them to inform one another (Descombe 2010, p. 147). This sequence needs also to be framed within ‘timing’ criteria, since the different methods entered at different points in time (ibid, p. 150), as explained in the procedure section below. Yet, no method prevails over the other. By doing so, I was aiming at finding correlations between the different components, which, at the same time, could serve the purpose of the research. In this regard, I aimed at building on two theoretical frameworks (critical masculinities and intersectionality) and yet, I had the intention to find a well-justified entry-point to cascade it down to practice. This is where the men’s lens came up.

With regards to the theoretical analysis on critical masculinities and intersectionality, I have chosen to match existing literature with the reality in the ground in favour of contextualisation of theory, allowing me to analyse how the different groups are culturally represented (Hall 1997) and how the intrinsic aspects of power dynamics between them function (Lundberg 2016). This has been done through the selection of the few sources available in the Lebanese context: one addressing men’s positioning to gender equality, and another one providing very relevant data on men and boys who experience SGBV in the Syria crisis.

The choice of selecting literature on masculinities, violence and intersectionality posed several limitations. First, literature on such topics was not abundant, and the one available did not fully cover the sociocultural dimensions triggering SGBV vis-à-vis Syrian refugee men and boys. I believe it would have been more convenient to focus on settings that have been previously explored. Yet, my personal positioning played a big role in my choice, since even if challenges were major, I was moved by my personal motivation to have an outcome useful for my own reality.

As said above, the analysis of the knowledge available has led me to identify common patterns and gaps, which have informed the formulation of the men’s lens (please see section on proposing a men’s lens). Yet, I did not want the research to rely only on secondary data, especially since the model needed to be tailored to practice and its feasibility, explored. This is why I decided to include primary sources and complemented my methodology with a second method aiming at having the views from those who would be implementing the model. As such, I have used semi-structured
interviews, in order to check the feasibility and relevance of such model, and explore the way forward within the actual implementation of such new enhanced *men-inclusive* approach.

I made the choice to include interviews since such method has provided the research with first-hand findings (Descombe 2010), obtained through professionals’ accounts, which are vital to match my baseline scenario and the targeted aim. In order to ensure a broad focus and complementarity in answers, and “delve in depth into a particular situation with a view to exploring the specifics” (*ibid*, p. 181), I have targeted humanitarian actors (staff members of different organisations currently running SGBV programmes in Lebanon) from different levels: one UN agency, one international NGO and one national NGO, the latter working especially on LGBTI issues.

*Procedure*

Obtaining material for the analysis required efforts at different stages, in line with the ‘timing’ criteria as per the stage at which each of the methods entered into play (Descombe 2010). Regarding the first stage, the material at disposal for the theoretical analysis underwent a process of research guided by the following principles: relevance, adequacy, reliability, access and language. In this regard, I made sure that the material at disposal was pertinent, providing updated figures and facts that could be reliable and accessible. Language played a role too since literature selected was only in English, risking that many interesting aspects could not be captured if contained in literature in Arabic, one of the main languages of the country in point. Once at hand, I conducted a long process of review (that took around two months), during which I could take relevant notes and extract the most interesting components that could feed into my thesis. This is why I adopted double standards: I conducted an in-depth review of the most interesting materials, from which I could feed most of the theoretical analysis. Yet, many other sources were included under these criteria, while it is to acknowledge that not all material was reviewed at the same level of depth and interest.

Regarding the sources, I collected academic literature on the theoretical frameworks selected, guided by the material explored in the Master’s in Gender Studies and sources known to me.
through my professional background. Regarding the former, I conducted several rounds of exploration by looking up specific keywords through my notes of the Master’s thesis, which I have inserted in a matrix since the beginning of the Programme. This matrix is digitalized, and is composed of different quotations which come with a column on the left where one can find the author, the topic, the source and the page. As such, I was able to select keywords like ‘masculinity’, ‘intersectionality’, ‘methods’, ‘interview’, ‘theoretical analysis’, especially since all my notes taken throughout the Master’s are in a digital format in a Word document. Regarding the specific literature on refugees and SGBV, I used international UN databases, especially UNHCR’s one, in order to have access to the most updated pieces of literature available on the topic. There I found relevant framework documents useful to have a sense of what SGBV programmes currently include. This relates, for instance, to the Guidelines for prevention and response: SGBV against Refugees, Returnees and IDPs (UNHCR 2003) and the Action against Sexual and Gender-Based Violence: An Updated Strategy (2011). Yet, and given the specificities posed by the context in the MENA region, I have included UNHCR’s regional strategy Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Response in Refugee Situations in the Middle East and North Africa (UNHCR 2015), which is key to tailor the overview and data to the needs of this research.

Yet, I needed to complement such material with other sources aiming at filling gaps, such as the linkage between masculinities and violence (usually absent in literature on SGBV), the study of men as survivors and especially, the lack of contextualised literature. In this sense, there is not much national literature tailored to Lebanon, due to the prevailing sociocultural norms of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, which still consider these topics taboo or shameful. This may be the reason why there is little literature available when it comes to analyzing men as survivors too, both in the overall repository of SGBV work and in the context in point. Yet, I have included strategic national instruments available under the national aid portal for Lebanon (open access) such as the LCRP 2017-2020 and particularly its section on SGBV. With regards to contextualised literature to the research object, I made use of sources of which I was aware since I was involved in their own process of dissemination: first, El Feki, Heilman and Barker (2017), who analyse how Syrian refugee men support (or not) gender equality in Lebanon, with a special focus on their perspectives on manhood, masculinities and violence. Although they make relevant point on the fact that Syrians are less open to gender equality compared to Lebanese, I consider
their approach biased and somehow stereotypical, homogenizing all the refugee community under one prejudged positioning. In addition, I think they reproduce the partial engagement of men in gender issues, which has been portrayed also in the literature mentioned above. It shows only one side of the story, while I defend that the story needs to be told entirely. Secondly, I have aligned to the focus captured by UNHCR’s recent sources (especially 2017b) to complement the uncovered areas in engaging men and boys as survivors, which I knew since I was involved in the coordination of the case study on Lebanon.

Once I analysed the material generated for the first stage, I was able to envision what frameworks the interviews would fall within, having a clear idea of what the model would look like. Based on the overarching themes (prevention, response, additional identity categories) that were identified and informed the model, I was able to formulate a set of questions accordingly (included in Annex II), laying the ground for a new set of material to emerge. Material obtained through the second method was rich, and the interviews lasted around one hour each. In addition, I have structured interviews around open-ended questions, allowing a certain degree of flexibility and enabling informants to go deep into their own reflections (Descombe 2010, p. 175). This helped them prioritize the qualitative aspects of the involvement of men in SGBV programmes, which resulted in more material than expected. Yet, the strategic targeting of actors working on different realms within SGBV interventions has created an enabling environment for complementarity in answers.

Building on the different recurrent themes identified through the literature explained above, I have especially targeted informants from different nature in order to enhance the generation of particular content of interest. With that aim, I have targeted one UN agency working on SGBV and specialized in refugee issues, one international NGO running programmes on SGBV internationally, and one national NGO focusing on the needs of LGBTI refugees in Lebanon. Regarding the latter, I have intendedly targeted such organisation in order to obtain more accurate data on this particular group of concern, especially those focusing on building national capacities of case workers or health staff, with a focus on CMR for males. The other two organisations have been targeted in order to have a closer insight on SGBV prevention, and especially the engagement of men and boys in fighting against violence against women, and in response, such as the provision
of psychosocial support to male perpetrators or of a well-tailored service package for male survivors of SGBV.

The set of questions used to guide the interview process can be found in Annex II to this Master’s thesis. The interviews conducted have prioritized open-ended questions in order to have a closer qualitative insight, using the questions only as a reference for the discussions with key informants (Descombe 2010). Although they are not included in the set of questions, follow-up questions have been constantly asked to ensure that quality information was provided. I chose verbatim transcription for the material obtained through the interviews, which was especially useful in generating quotes that could be highlighted during the process of analysis. In this regard, and in order to preserve confidentiality of informants (Descombe 2010, p.172), I have established a coding system as follows: UN agency will be called ‘informant A’; international NGO will be recalled as ‘informant B’, and the national organisation working on LGBTI refugee issues will be referred to as ‘informant C’.

Identification of key informants has been easy and quick, since I built on pre-existing working relations. Yet, obtaining their acceptance and proceeding with the interview needed few weeks, reaching out to some of them more than once. I needed to follow-up closely in order to ensure that interviews actually happened. Interviews were conducted in English, which made unnecessary the use of an interpreter, especially given their proficiency in the English language. This helped me avoid having external factors that may have a negative impact in disclosure of the informants, or on a deviation of the message conveyed (Aull Davies 2002, p. 113).

**Analysis**

In line with the methods presented above, I have followed relevant procedures to lay the ground for the qualitative analysis proposed. It is precisely in this qualitative nature where I found the guiding principle for the backbone methodological procedure selected: thematic analysis (Braun and Clark 2006). In line with Braun and Clark’s definition, the thematic analysis helps “identify, analyse and report patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organizes and describes your data set in (rich) detail” (2006, p. 79). Yet, it is worth mentioning that I have used the thematic analysis
as a ‘tool’ to facilitate the analysis, and not as a method itself, benefitting from the flexibility of being free to choose what I want to consider a “thematic meaning” and what not (Braun and Clark 2006).

Thematic analysis presented itself as the most suitable tool for this particular research given its qualitative potential. It is an accessible tool for those like me who may have less experience in research, and is adequate to explore similarities and repetitions in the different data corpus to establish common patterns. At the same time, thematic analysis leaves still some leeway for my own interpretation and application of the themes identified as per my researching needs, which, in this case, is rather oriented to inform programmes. Thematic analysis is a flexible tool that I can apply as per my needs, having the authority to decide what angle I want to look at the data from (ibid, p. 95).

It is precisely in the flexibility of thematic analysis where many decisions needed to be made, limiting the number of “thematic meanings” created through the data. This is due to the fact that possibilities are infinite in thematic analysis (Braun and Clark 2006, p. 92), depending on how the researcher looks at the data (Ryan and Bernard 2003, p. 103), for which keeping in mind my ultimate goal of informing programmes through a new approach was essential if I did not want to create an excess in theme identification. In my research, this held especially true while observing the large number of recurrent themes that arose (Descombe 2010, p. 190) and the final data corpus generated, creating a more accurate data set for manipulation, and establishing how I would manipulate the resulting data items (Braun and Clark 2006; Ryan and Bernard 2003).

The analysis for both datasets obtained have some commonalities. As such, both stages have been guided by the three principles established by Opler (1945, cited in Ryan and Bernard 2003, pp. 86-87), this is, by themes that are visible through the manifestation of expressions in the data, as first principle; expressions that are culturally agreed upon, as second principle; and inter-relations of the different things, as the third principle. In this regard, I have made the decision to align my analysis to all three principles. For instance, I have identified themes through explicit topics addressed in the literature or highlighted by informants during the interviews. Likewise, a cultural agreement that I have built on relates to the inferiority experienced by Syrians in the displacement
setting, moved both by their condition as refugees, but also by the social construction of *Otherness*, both captured by the literature and underlined during the interviews. Other cultural expression could have arisen, such as statements justifying men’s rights to exert violence against women, especially in cases of marriage, or the exclusion of LGBTI individuals as persons rejected by sociocultural norms.

Yet, as explained above, the analysis of the material generated happened in two different lapses of time, which made that some specific aspects are related to each of the stages. Specifically, regarding the analysis of the material generated for the theoretical analysis, major efforts were made to establish thematic meanings, avoiding to resort to pre-conceived and commonly agreed topics in literature (Braun and Clark 2006, p. 94), and select what was really relevant for my research.

The approach adopted for the thematic analysis in the theoretical analysis was rather inductive, this is, keeping close to the data obtained (Braun and Clark 2006, p. 83). Yet, the contribution of the researcher came in the selection and cross-cutting of data.

At this point, some assumptions needed to be made to inform how to cluster the data. The first level related to *focus* of each data corpus in relation to the different nature of humanitarian interventions, and that this would be the most suitable way to find correlations between masculinities, intersectionality and SGBV. Indeed, this helped me cluster the information as per preventive and responsive data, which helped me envision clustering as per prevention of SGBV, on the one hand, and complementary interventions to both situations needing protection response or focusing on a protection outcome (such as the exposure to violence or the movement along the social status experienced by refugees). Such entry-point was useful in order to inform the *men’s lens*, which would need to put all components into discussion in a two-way communication process (see section on *Proposing a men’s lens*), and would match the aim of my research (Braun and Clark 2006, p. 80).

Following the first steps of the thematic analysis, I needed to align expressions (this is, how information was manifested) with their relevant themes, which other authors would denominate *categories* (Glaser and Strauss 1967), *codes* (Miles and Huberman 1994), *labels* (Dey 1993) or
concepts (Strauss and Corbin 1990) (Ryan and Bernard 2003, p. 87). Problems could have arisen if the alignment between the expressions and the themes had not been correct, which would have led to misunderstanding, as if the reaction or comment referred to a different topic – consequently, the weight given to a theme would have changed, and as such, the entire thematic analysis would have been imbalanced. Hence, at this stage, further decisions needed to be made to unpack the different datasets selected, especially with a view to identify categories to enhance the information that could be analysed and compared (Ryan and Bernard 2003). Main categories identified were prevention, response, and intersectional positioning, which underpinned the reasoning for the formulation of the men’s lens and guided the production of the set of questions used for the interviews.

Firstly, it was specifically in the analysis of the material from the interviews when I used particular observation or scrutiny techniques (Ryan and Bernard 2003), such as repetitions, indigenous categories (themes brought up with links to the cultural context), transitions (understood as changes in voice tones identified in the interviews), and especially, similarities and differences identified. I did not fully rely on missing data as a component to analyse to avoid the risk of getting carried away by subjective interpretations or sensations (Ryan and Bernard 2003, p. 92).

Examples of the categories mentioned above are the engagement of men in programmes only as perpetrators, the strong masculinity patterns or the need to tackle the impact of the shift in gender roles produced in the displacement setting (repetitions), the harmful attitudes identified towards gender equality or homosexuality among Syrians (indigenous), the reaction expressed by informants while asking about feasibility and relevance of the new approach (transition), or the consensus and openness for this new approach to materialize and direct programmes towards a holistic approach, including connection to complementary services (similarities). Other aspects have been analysed, as per the extent to which each actors positioned themselves to certain topics (differences).

Secondly, the analysis of the material of interviews entailed major process or manipulation techniques. Once data items were identified, I selected quotes that seemed relevant, and I placed together those whose subject was related, organizing them in a basic word document. Building on
that document, I developed manually a mind-map bringing together the different data items. I could have chosen to invest more efforts in the manual manipulation of the information, especially the different data items, for example, by using the ‘cutting and sorting’ technique (Ryan and Bernard 2003, p. 94), piling up pieces of papers linked under the same theme. Yet, the manipulation technique chosen helped me focus the process from the micro to the macro level, identifying sub-themes at the initial stage.

Finally, gearing more towards the macro level, I made the decision to cluster the sub-themes in *metathemes* or overarching themes (Ryan and Bernard 2003), especially since I aim at proposing a new approach for programmes, the analysis needed to be implicitly aligned with a programmatic logic. This metathemes were aligned to the umbrella ones identified in the first stage (theoretical analysis), namely prevention, response, and positioning. The *metathemes* that were identified through the empirical analysis were:

- Relevance and feasibility;
- Engagement of men in prevention of SGBV;
- Inclusion of men and boys as survivors in SGBV response;
- Addition of complementary services in programmes based on intersectional perspectives;
- Potential risks in the process.

*Ethical considerations*

I intendedly formulate ethical considerations to guide this research given their role in mitigating eventual negative inconveniences. They also contribute to ensuring objectivity and neutrality in findings (Letherby 2003, p.82), which is key to promote their eventual endorsement. This is closely linked to my personal positioning, since these ethical considerations help me preserve my relation of trust with the key informants selected, in a way that my daily interaction and my current positioning is not altered by potential resistances that may arise while conducting this piece of research. This also relates to the need to be careful to not affect my relation to my own organisation (Kulik and Li 2015), ensuring that this research can be conducted and findings shared without fearing consequences at a personal or professional scale. Preserving my good relation to the
management of my organisation is key to maintain their commitment, which is essential if I aim at finding ways to inform SGBV programmes accordingly (Callerstig 2012).

Throughout the research, I have adopted an approach that preserves confidentiality at all stages. With this aim, my theoretical analysis builds on data that is already public. This is in spite of my access to more accurate (and though sensitive) data that would have improved the potential interest in my research. References have been added accordingly to ensure transparency.

Confidentiality has been taken into consideration while handling information related to key informants too (Descombe 2010, p. 172). Names of organizations and staff interviewed have been anonymized in order to preserve their privacy and avoid linking conclusions to specific persons. I have safely kept raw data obtained, in a way that the only information shared is the one contained in this Master’s thesis. This is especially relevant given the relative small dimension of the SGBV humanitarian sector in Lebanon, where interconnections are frequent. This helps me not put at risk their relation towards their own organisation (Kulik and Li 2015), or even towards mine, leaving work relations aside. As a result, they may feel more willing to speak freely and dig into sensitive aspects of the research.

Other ethical considerations relate to voluntary participation of key informants, who have been informed about the research prior to the conduction of the interviews. The informed consent form produced for my Master’s thesis (see Annex III) has been shared with informants while contacting them for the first time. In order to ensure more accurate findings, all relevant information has been put at the disposal of the interviewees before holding the discussion, for them to make an informed decision about their own participation. Informants have provided oral individual consent at the beginning of each interview.

Safety has also been regarded within the conduction of this Master’s thesis. Interviews have also been conducted in an accessible and well-known location, with the aim to avoid that informants can be linked to the findings of this research by any means.
V. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

The theoretical analysis presented in this section aims at explaining the rationale behind how current SGBV programmes are designed, planned and implemented in connection with the two theoretical frameworks selected, this is, critical masculinities and intersectional theory. It shows the logic followed by interventions and how it is connected to both international and national literature available on the topics, providing a review of the main references. By doing this analysis, I showcase the myriad of factors affecting the inclusion of men in SGBV programmes, demonstrating that men are still involved in programmes in silos.

In order to do so, the theoretical analysis articulates around two sections as per the two theoretical frameworks, for which a brief literature review is provided. Such disposition is important to specify what the underlying and interconnecting factors are, feeding into the idea that a new consistent approach may be relevant. In this line, I review and build on relevant literature to explain how the sociocultural ideals around Syrian, refugee and man condition the way they are engaged in SGBV programmes, and the reasons behind their exclusion or lack of attention in programmes. In other words, why men are overlooked in programmes when they get out of their traditional role as perpetrators, being excluded from assistance and services under the sociocultural unavailability to be a survivor and their permanent hindering labelling as the Other.

Literature review of frameworks selected

Academic literature on critical masculinities is abundant, including some relevant pieces linking masculinities and violence. This covers especially a common understanding of such interlinkages, and especially how it influences men’s attitudes, actions, positioning (Holmgren and Hearn 2009) and tendency towards violence, including not only perpetrating it, but also being subject to it. Such common approach in literature defends that men actively embody gender norms and adopt attitudes accordingly. Although I do take into consideration these factors, I consider such approach to be too narrow, since I believe that men cannot only actively embody such practices, but also be subject to how these practices are embedded by others.
This also relates, for example, to the dialogue between masculinization and socialization of boys addressed by Miedzian (1992) and Jackson (1990) (Hearn 1998, p. 35), regarding which I position myself much closer to. I understand socialization as adjustment and embodiment of masculine gender roles, in line other authors, such as Pringle (1995), who links violence with the need experienced by men to dominate and control (Hearn 1998, p. 35). This social conception of masculine behaviour to which I align this thesis has been coined by Connell, especially when she theorized *hegemonic masculinities* (2005), including their types and evolution. I believe this is a very important contribution to literature, opening a new way of thinking about how men were positioned in society, and what new dynamics were generated as a result of the interaction between them. In addition, I consider that such concept of hegemonic masculinities is pre-conditioned by a determined sexual orientation, for which I build on Rich’s concept of *compulsory heterosexuality* (Rich 1980; re-worked in Butler 1990). I deliberately include this concept since it is strongly prevailing in Lebanon, and persons not adjusting to it may face isolation, discrimination and, as shown in the section below, violence.

A major reference in academic critical masculinities is Hearn, who shed light on the need to focus on the *explanation of men* (1998, p. 3). Hearn’s approach underlies the need to unpack sociocultural phenomena affecting men, which is still under-researched and which justifies that men should be the focus of the necessary research referring to themselves. Especially relevant is Hearn’s concept of *men’s violences* (1998), which digs into the rationale of the perpetration of violence by men, sometimes as a way to control, and some others as a channel to reproduce violence experienced by themselves (including during childhood). Although I acknowledge the validity of the concept, I deliberately expand it, breaking with the unilateral focus on men as perpetrators of violence against women. This allows me to overcome the fact that the predominant available literature addresses men’s involvement in SGBV from such homogenized perspective, overlooking an important angle of SGBV and excluding part of the spectrum of persons concerned. This is the approach observed in further general literature on the topic, such as important reference on masculinities and refugees (Olivius 2016; Van der Haar 2013) or widespread journals on the topic (especially NORMA – International Journal for Masculinity Studies).
Taking into consideration the orientation of this Master’s thesis, it is important to mention what is the position adopted by institutions in the programmatic realm. In this regard, I align to the commonly agreed international mandate urging international organizations to adapt programmes aiming at engaging men. This relates especially towards the mainstreamed work on gender equality, regarding which the United Nations made major efforts through the Beijing Declaration to promote “shared power and responsibility between men and women and argued that women’s concerns could be addressed only in partnership with men toward gender equality (United Nations 2001, pars. 1, 3, cited in Connell 2005, p. 1807). The Beijing Declaration included specific areas of action in this respect, including gender-based violence, which required the explicit engagement of men (ibid).

As per the intersectional framework selected, reference need to be made to the academic concept coined by Crenshaw’s structural intersectionality (cited in Shields 2008). Although I align to this concept to explore how the different identity categories of Syrian in displacement determine this positioning, I expand such concept to complement with categories such as displacement, currently absent in Crenshaw’s ideals. I consider displacement to be a key category, which precisely makes such structural intersectionality travel (Hemmings 2007; Clifford, cited in bell hooks 1993, p. 173).

With regards to such moving along an intersectional position, a mention is worth to Collins’ academic concept of the matrix of domination (Collins, cited in Shields 2008). I consider this term to be still valid and applicable to different contexts. Yet, it lacks practicability, since it does not provide any tool to measure the different oppressions, which would be key for this research to explore how to propose solutions through programmes. Finally, major reference is to be made to Cockburn (1989) and Connell (2005) and their construction of Otherness, which I definitely endorse in this thesis to analyse the relations within the refugee group and in their interaction with the Lebanese host community.
Critical masculinities are not fully or directly addressed in SGBV programmes, which are based on a conception of gender as a women’s issue (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017). In this line, humanitarian programmes prioritize response to women and girls (Olivius 2016) - yet, little analysis is included by SGBV programmes in terms of exploring how refugee men experience their own gender and positioning in the Lebanese displacement context, and how both factors influence the emergence of violence. This becomes especially relevant for the Syrian refugee community in displacement, given the shift in gender roles produced in such settings (Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia 2016). Men are usually placed to a secondary position in providing income for the family, and women become the breadwinners, enjoying higher levels of participation in decision-making processes which, however, vanish once the conflict ends (ibid). The consequences of such dynamics in the new setting are perceived as emasculating:

“Social pressure to realize the “provider” model of manhood is a frequent source of tension. In a region where male employment is often a prerequisite for marriage, unemployment and poverty are often felt as emasculating” (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017, p.25)

Syrian refugee men are also affected themselves by different types and forms of abuse, exploitation and violence in light of the discrimination suffered based on their status as refugees and decrease in social positioning, which is less explored in programmes (ibid). This raises relevant questions. For instance, how has the current humanitarian setting affected Syrian refugee men in Lebanon and their relationship to SGBV? And especially, how has it altered gender roles and sociocultural positioning of Syrian refugee men? How does this impact the emergence of violence? And how are such changes effectively informing SGBV humanitarian interventions?

The questions above help conceive a setting where further analyses on masculinities and intersectionality are needed. This touches upon the inter-linkages to violence, and the fact that there is currently no research or programmatic practice in the Syria crisis in Lebanon addressing such myriad of factors, and hence, programmes are not tailored accordingly. Further analyses are
needed beyond “the sexual difference as a matrix of power” (Braidotti 2002, p. 44), breaking hierarchical binaries by default and allowing men come up to the front, assuming their role as active actors of gender relations in society. By doing so, programmes could eventually adopt a broader notion of men, breaking the commonly accepted idea among SGBV programmes and practitioners that men are a homogenized category (‘the deconstruction of the monolith of men’, in Hearn 1998).

**Men as perpetrators and their engagement in fighting against SGBV**

Programmes working on gender equality usually target the engagement of men as per a triple positioning, as stated in Messner’s triangle of men’s positioning towards gender equality (Messner 1997, cited in Hearn’s lecture, 2017). Men position themselves towards gender equality as per the privileges lost, the extent to which the costs of masculinities can be prioritized; and how to highlight men’s differences (*ibid*). In line with Hearn’s explanations, each positioning would lead to different scenarios: a gender reform, where men can contribute to gender equality in the current gender order; gender resistance, where men can engage to change the gender order; and to a gender rebellion, where men can participate in deconstructing or multiplying genders (*ibid*).

There is consensus around the need to analyse masculinities while studying violence, especially since programmes tackle a social construction around violence, and not violence itself (Newburn and Stanko 1994; Collier 1995, cited in Hearn 1998, p. 35). Therefore, if we shed light on the integration of masculinities in programmes in the MENA region, we see that men need to be engaged in SGBV prevention and response given their default nature as “gatekeepers for gender equality” (Connell 2005, p. 1802). This is especially relevant in Arab society and especially in those countries in conflict, where patriarchy perpetuates the gap between men and women in their access and control over opportunities and resources (ESCWA 2016), shown in access to education, employment, housing, legal protection and decision-making in public life, among others.

Yet, such patriarchal structure is nuanced in the different Syrian and Lebanese communities. Syrian men are portrayed as more radical perpetrators of gender inequality, compared to their Lebanese counterparts (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017, p. 146). With reference to a recent
survey on gender equality published in Lebanon, Syrian interviewees support to a greater extent statements such as:

“There are times when a woman deserves to be beaten”, “a woman should tolerate violence to keep the family together” or “to be a man, you need to be tough” (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017, p. 153).

If we put the lens on the divergence between men and women, more men than women think that granting rights to women is in detriment of men’s rights; more work on gender equality is not necessary; and an acceptable level of gender equality in society has already been achieved (ibid, p. 158). The same applies to negative attitudes towards sex, regarding which more men than women think that men need more sex than their female counterparts, or that men should be ashamed if they cannot perform sexually (ibid, p. 178). With regards to homosexuality, mostly men consider that homosexuals should not be treated as a normal part of society; they should receive medical and psychological treatment; homosexuality is immoral, and that it endangers the institution of the family (ibid, p. 180). 68 per cent of men interviewed think homosexuality is a Western product (ibid). As per the results of the survey in point, and in terms of acceptance of SGBV, 24 per cent of men agreed that a wife should have sex with her husband if he is the provider, and 27 per cent stated that a man who rapes a woman has no reason to be prosecuted if he accepts to marry her (ibid, p. 185). The topics mentioned above make clear that further research is needed to better understand the intrinsic aspects underpinning such harmful attitudes. For example, what is the rationale behind such apprehension against homosexuality, how is sexuality experienced by the large number of men who have sexual encounters with men and, yet, condemn homosexual behaviours? What do women think of all this?

The attitudes above show that notions of masculinities (in different forms as explained in the paragraph below and in line with Connell’s theories) are very strong within the Syrian community, which has an impact on the emergence of violence and, at the same time, on how programmes are tailored. Within the dynamics between Syrian and Lebanese, Syrian (seen as migrant men in Lebanon) are perceived as a threat to morals of justice and equality (Van der Haar 2013). Women are perceived as needing protection, while “migrant men and boys are approached from a security
and control perspective that associates them with problems ranging from radical Islam and terrorism to criminality, violence against gays and nuisance in public spaces” (Van der Haar 2013, p. 216). As shown by this piece of literature, mentalities forge the way both men and women are portrayed. Yet, it is important to problematize that such dynamics would have been affected if we had selected a different target group. For example, the portrayal of each of the communities towards each other would have definitely been different if, instead of analyzing Lebanese and Syrian, we select the relation of Lebanese with the large number of migrant workers (usually from Ethiopia or South-East Asia) that are working in Lebanese homes, or simply those Syrian having the economic means to come to Lebanon by their own means, creating a two categories of Syrian: the refugees and the powerful.

In the context in point, where there is a shift in gender roles as explained above, new dynamics, including masculinities, emerge (Connell 2005). This informs the notion of violence that guides programmes, which relies on a remaining heteropatriarchal context (Hearn 1998, p. 72). This is reinforced by a permanent implicit agreement on Connell’s hegemonic masculinities in such setting, which are defined as “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (Connell 1995, cited in Hearn’s lecture). Such hegemonic masculinities constitute the cornerstone to accept the prevailing hierarchical binary order and subsequent power relations (Hearn et al. 2012), determining the approach that SGBV adopts. Men are included in programmes as the “independent, self-reliant, powerful, strong, tough, robust and invulnerable” (ibid, p. 44), who have the power to exert violence (or not) against others. Violence represents also a “point for the production of men and boys” (Hearn 1998, p. 7) in society, for which fighting against it becomes a political action and positioning.

Other dynamics of the displacement setting and the interaction with the local and global gender orders (ibid, p. 1804) also impact the rationale behind SGBV programmes. This relates, for example, to the “social and economic pressures on men to compete in the workplace, to increase their hours of paid work, and sometimes to take second jobs” (ibid, p. 1803). Such factors are aggravated in a displacement setting as the Lebanese, since “many men feel they fail because of
their social position, which leads to tension within the family” (Van der Haar 2013, p. 220). These dynamics are also embedded by a *compulsory heterosexuality* (Rich 1980), which reinforces a binary conception of the gender order (Persson 2012, p. 139). This is, “on one hand, women and femininity as coherent whole; on the other, men and masculinity as its opposite. One is defined by its desire of the other” (Butler 1990, cited in *ibid*).

The principles exposed above shape the rationale behind the design and implementation of SGBV programmes. Men keep placing themselves towards gender equality from a position of power, which can only be overcome if they allow to do so. With reference to Holmgren and Hearn, the *Man Question* seems to be, in spite of the efforts, static in the way it is addressed (2009, p. 403). In line with Kaufman, the way SGBV programmes are currently designed and implemented reinforces the clear separation between the different components of violences perpetrated by men, this is, towards women, each other and themselves, in the so-called *triad of men’s violences* (Kaufman 1987, cited in Hearn 1998, p. 5), getting the sector far from a comprehensive inclusion of the entire spectrum of actors involved in SGBV prevention and response programming.

*Including men and boys survivors in SGBV programming*

As explained above, theory and practice confirm that men are the *doers of violence* (Hearn 1998, p. 35). This is understood from a masculinities perspective too, in which men are perceived to be “victims of the social structures and norms that have socialized them into this position [as perpetrators]” (Olivius 2016, p. 60).

Yet, men and boys are not only perpetrators, but can also be subject to violence, exploitation and abuse. In spite of the fact that SGBV against men and boys is a striking issue in the context addressed by this research, little is known about the types and forms of SGBV that men and boys experience in displacement settings (UNHCR 2017b, p. 6). This is especially relevant because the lack of evidence-based research on this topic has a negative impact on the efficiency of programmes, which is partly due to the high rate of under-reporting of SGBV incidents among males (World Health Organisation, cited in *ibid*, p. 13). Therefore, efforts are needed to help
surivors report incidents, which would definitely be important for persons affected to have access to services. Yet, would we have the capacities to serve everyone who reports? And would there be resources available or, however, if we successfully encourage reporting, then we will need to prioritize cases and exclude some of them given potential limitations? More clarity is needed in order to meet the goal of increasing reporting. So far, and as per the prevailing under-reporting, the types of SGBV affecting men and boys, the barriers to access services and the limitations in service provision are then overlooked, which shows the relevance to undertake timely actions in this sense.

Shedding light on SGBV-related challenges faced by Syrian refugee men and boys, it is worth noting that violence occurred both in Syria and in countries of asylum, such as Lebanon. With regards to conflict-related violence (in Syria), SGBV has proven to become a warfare tool not only against women, but also against males. Most of the cases of violence reported by males within the Syrian conflict occurred in detention centres, where men and boys were subject to different types of sexual torture as a way of punishment or as a systematic strategy to obtain information from the opponent (UNHCR 2017b, pp. 23-27). In detention centres, “30 to 40 per cent of all adult men experienced sexual violence [...] in Syria” (ibid, p. 24). Furthermore, “94 per cent of detainees and 97 per cent of the disappeared in Syria are male” (ibid). As stated in the report in point, “117,000 people remain imprisoned in detention centres and another 65,000 have been forcibly disappeared” (ibid).

Yet, men and boys report having experienced sexual violence also at home through raids, in checkpoints while trying to cross from one city to another, and in random public spaces where they have been threatened by armed groups (UNHCR 2017b). Conflict-related violence against men and boys has been considered “very common”, “widely happening” and “happening all the time” (ibid, p. 24) by participants interviewed to inform research, which confirms that men and boys are especially targeted in conflict settings, experiencing a high exposure to generally undocumented types and forms of SGBV.

Focusing on the Lebanese setting, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex Syrian individuals are especially targeted (UNHCR 2017b, p. 27) given the lack of protection they face as both refugees
and the non-acceptance of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity (UNHCR 2017b). This dichotomy underpins the dialogue between gender and intersectionality addressed in this Master’s thesis, since both factors influence each other and constitute the rationale to put these individuals at risk.

Although 70 per cent of gay, bisexual, transgender and intersexual men and boys fled Syria as a result of the discrimination and violence faced (UNHCR 2017b), SGBV perpetrated against these individuals in Lebanon adopted new dynamics, influenced especially by their impossibility to seek legal redress given, especially, the lack of legal residency in the country and the State prosecution of same-sex practices\(^5\), and the subsequent fear to be imprisoned or deported. This relates to different types of violence suffered, such as “rape, kidnapping and sexual assault, forced oral sex, sexual exploitation, beating of the genitals and threats of rape” (ibid, p. 28). Such acts are committed by different perpetrators, among which police, military, taxi drivers, roommates, neighbours, employers and landlords seem to rank first. Gay, bisexual, transgender and intersexual Syrian refugees suffer from a permanent housing insecurity, since they need to be very careful about who they live with in order to not be put in danger. Sometimes they need to accept giving sexual favours to their landlords in order to find refuge, or to their roommates to not be reported to the police (ibid). Many of them are receiving cash assistance from different organizations, aiming at meeting their basic needs such as food or health. Yet, this housing insecurity forces them to use that cash to pay rent, leaving such basic needs uncovered.

SGBV against GBTI refugees also occurs in checkpoints, which are abundant throughout the Lebanese territory given the current security situation. Some of them report having been taken by a taxi driver without their permission, benefitting from their illegal status and their impossibility to complaint. Once in the checkpoint, they have been arrested, subject to sexual torture and forced to enter sexual acts without their consent (UNHCR 2017b, p. 29).

Syrian refugee boys represent one of the main targeted groups of SGBV survivors in Lebanon, too. This is due to some sociocultural patterns linked to masculinities, which consider that

\(^5\) Same-sex practices are still criminalized under Article 534 of the Lebanese Penal Code, criminalizing “sexual practices against nature”. Societal values determine the interpretation and application of the aforementioned provision.
harassing or attacking a boy sexually is less harmful for the reputation of the boy himself, as well as of the entire family, especially if compared to how shameful it is when a girl’s virginity is violated (UNHCR 2017b, p.30). Some other aspects related to gender roles and positioning in society, such as privileged access to public spaces for men compared to women, constitutes a risk for higher exposure to SGBV, especially for boys (ibid). In this regard, 54.2 per cent of boys have been sexually harmed or harassed physically; 24 per cent have been verbally harassed and 10.4 per cent declared having been sexually harmed or harassed through exposure to pornography and social media (ibid).

Syrian men and boys in Lebanon are also facing sexual exploitation, especially with regards to employment, child labour and through IT and new communication technologies. Closely linked to the critical masculinities theories addressed above, Syrian men and boys experience a strong pressure to adjust to their expected role as provider of the family, especially in a context where 70 per cent of the families declare living under the poverty threshold (UNHCR 2017b, p. 33). As a result, and given the restrictions imposed from the Lebanese Government over refugee employment, many are forced to work informally, being exposed to a large number of abuses, harassment and violence. As such, many are requested to give sexual favours to their employers in exchange of their wages, or are being coerced to enter sexual encounters unwillingly by other persons having a word over their job position (ibid). This also relates to children who are being forced to work, since 12 per cent of Syrian families acknowledge using child labour as a coping strategy to overcome economic pressure (ibid). Boys, given gender constructions in society compared to girls, are the ones who are pushed to enter the labour market, being exposed to exploitation of all sorts. Further analysis in this regard would be necessary, especially to dig into the rationale for child labour, its types and its consequences in the long-run. Such analysis could be go in parallel with a better understanding of a gender dimension touching upon adolescent girls’ challenges too, such as school drop-out, early marriage or other forms of exploitation.

Other forms of SGBV perpetrated to Syrian refugee men and boys relate to new communication technologies, who are used to blackmail individuals and force them to give sexual favours in exchange of silence. Men and boys report having been filmed while undressing or using the bathroom, and have been forced to enter sexual acts in order for these files to not be disseminated.
Some male refugees report having been filmed during a sexual assault, and having been forced to main continuous sexual encounters against their will due to the fear that these images are sent out (UNHCR 2017b).

GBTI refugees also state being coerced to enter sexual relations forcibly through dating applications such as Grindr. Instead of benefitting from the usage of such apps to enhance their belonging to a community (Nguyen Tan Hoang, in Dinshaw et al. 2007) and provide them with more opportunities to establish a support network, some users use their pictures as a threat to report them to the police if they do not accept having sexual relations with them. What in principle should lead to liberation and well-being, ends up putting an end to the “gay marketplace of desire” (Nguyen Tan Hoang, in ibid, p. 192) that such apps were created for.

Beyond the typology of the SGBV experienced by Syrian male refugees in Lebanon, it is essential to adopt a critical masculinities approach to analyse the impact of such acts. SGBV has a strong psychological impact on survivors, who experience shame and guilt given the lack of adjustment to their expected behaviours as “men” (UNHCR 2017b, pp. 36-39). This may include feeling confused about their sexual orientation after experiencing an incident of violence, questioning their manhood and their ability to be the protector and provider of the family. This can also be related to their feeling of ability to satisfy their wives, leading to suicidal attempts in some occasions. In terms of social impact, they face exclusion from the community, being highly exposed to the emergence of new forms of violence against themselves if they disclose the information. This links especially to the high likelihood to be perceived as gay (ibid, p. 37). Such impact has consequences on the entire family, since the notion of “honour” in both the Lebanese and Syrian communities may make the community perceive the survivors’ daughter as not decent to be married to or their sons as boys growing up in households with poor values (ibid, p. 38). Some wives may choose to divorce their husband, since they are neglected by the entire community and harm their own reputation. SGBV perpetrated against men and boys has also a strong impact on their health, especially in those occasions when surgery is needed and there are no capacities in place to conduct clinical management of rape for males.
All the above is closely linked to the persistence of many barriers to service access and provision. This supports the relevance of this Master’s thesis and the need to inform programmes, in a way that such gaps are overcome in the sector. In terms of limitations to access services such as psychosocial support, legal counselling or case management, among others, male survivors need to face relevant sociocultural patterns (such as the perception of no longer being a man), the absence of systems allowing survivors to be identified and for them to disclose information, and the lack of services targeting adult men. This adds on the limited capacities of organizations dealing with such cases, half of which consider violence against males to not be a priority in the sector (UNHCR 2017b, p. 60) and show reluctance to incorporate this topic into their duties. This adopts also a geographical dimension, since services are usually provided in urban areas, leaving remote zones uncovered. Other limitations relate to the legislative realm, since in countries like Lebanon, the definition of rape refers to the act perpetrated by a man against a woman (ibid, p. 57), excluding all possibilities of sexual violence perpetrated against males. This leaves male survivors with no possibility to seek legal redress.

**Intersectional theory and SGBV programmes**

As shown by the literature explored, SGBV prevention and response entailed that masculinities could not be the only reason leading to the emergency of SGBV. It is precisely because SGBV occurs in a particular context and time that other layers exert an influence on the individual. This is the case of intersectionality, which helps eliciting the positioning of Syrian refugee men, and by doing so, determines their reactions and behaviours vis-à-vis SGBV, enabling us to envision what factors need to be included in programmes.

**Adding the intersectionality layer**

In Olivius’ words, displacement contexts leave men “disempowered, emasculated, frustrated and bored” (2016, p.57), which turns out to be especially aggravated within the male Syrian community in Lebanon (El Feki, Heilman and Baker 2017, p. 192). Programmes in this sense are proven to be necessary to “redress the disempowerment felt by men as a result of displacement” (UNHCR 2008, 47
p.58, cited in Olivius 2016, p. 63), given their direct impact on the emergence of violence (El Feki, Heilman and Baker 2017, p. 192). This adds on intersectional findings shown by relevant data such as the Gender-Equitable Men (GEM) Scale in Lebanon, placing educated men, younger men or men in a privileged socio-economic status as more prone to adopt closer positioning vis-à-vis gender equality (El Feki, Heilman and Baker 2017, p. 155). This also applies to those with educated mothers or fathers who were actively participating in childcare and domestic work (ibid, p. 191). At the same time, men are more likely to reproduce violence if they have been subject to it or witnessed it by themselves during childhood (ibid, p. 191 and Hearn 1998, p. 26). In any case, Syrian refugee men score lower than their Lebanese counterparts in such positioning (El Feki, Heilman and Baker 2017, p.192). Through this new approach, I connect the involvement of men in programmes as both perpetrator and survivor, while taking into consideration the change in their social positioning. I establish hence a three-fold approach that is interconnected, merging into what I call a multi-dimensional SGBV related to Syrian refugee males (see Figure 2 below).

Otherness and difference of Syrian refugee males in Lebanon

An intersectional perspective in working on SGBV related to male Syrian refugees cannot be understood without analyzing the social construction of the Syrian refugee community vis-à-vis the Lebanese host community. Thus, my argument builds on Crenshaw’s concept of intersectionality, since we see that gender (in its different dimensions of gender identity, expressions, roles and ideologies) never comes as a stand-alone category. As such, “the intersectional approach […] entails that gender is always furnished with ethnic and class significance and that ‘race’/ethnicity always already has a gender and a class content (Crenshaw 1989; Botman et al. 2001; McCall 2005; Phoenix and Pattynama 2006, cited in Wekker 2009, p. 63).

I build on a notion of ‘intersectionality’ that is made of multiple social identities and categories (Shields 2008; Yuval-Davis 2011, cited in Vervliet et al. 2014, p. 2025), which lead the individual to be placed either in a privileged or oppressed position (Vernon 1999, cited in ibid). Such inter- and intra-relation of categories determine the exposure of Syrian refugees, in this case, to different type of abuses and discrimination in Lebanon. Either economically, psychologically, socially or
legally, among others, Syrian refugees’ oppressions are rooted in their *multiple subordinate locations* (Chow 2011, p. 413). Their intersectionality is, at the same time, dynamic. Syrians in Lebanon experience hence a *moving intersectionality* (ibid, p. 419), since they become different subjects as they change time and location.

The context where I develop my research is marked by a strong dichotomy between ‘autochtones’ and ‘allochtones’ (Van der Haar 2013, p. 215), where national Lebanese citizens are perceived to be more advanced, modern, open-minded, while Syrian refugees are socially constructed as more primitive and disadvantaged. Although, as shown above, research seems to confirm that Syrian show more unequitable attitudes towards gender equality and SGBV than their Lebanese counterparts (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017, p. 146), literature promotes the homogenization of Syrian refugees behind such disadvantaged mindset and behaviours.

Syrian refugees are, thus, socially constructed as the Other, reproducing, once again in history, “the duality of the Self and the Other [that] is fundamental to human thought and actions” (De Beauvoir and Hegel, cited in Van der Tuin 2009, p. 14). Thus, the myriad of legal, cultural and socioeconomic vulnerabilities experienced by Syrian refugees, which constitute at the same time the reason for asylum in Lebanon, makes them be perceived as the “dehumanized inferior” (Lorde 1984, p. 114), reinforcing the understanding of a humanitarian situation from a binary angle. I observe too some new colonialist traits in such dynamics, since, in line with Lugones’ concept of *coloniality of gender*, Syrian refugee males are subject to a “process of active reduction of people, the dehumanization that fits them for the classification, the process of subjectification, the attempt to turn the colonized into less than human beings” (Lugones 2010, p. 745). This lays the ground for a widespread socially accepted right to dominance by the Lebanese, which is reinforced by the subsequent inferiority of Syrians (Lorde 1984, p. 115).

This dichotomy Other vs. Self hinders the actual integration of Syrian refugees in Lebanon. Instead of shedding light on commonalities (such as language or history), Syrians are permanently labelled as “different”, as observed through my personal experience in the country for the last three years, hearing how Syrians are accused of having different origin and are considered to be less educated and civilised than their Lebanese counterparts, who proudly claim their Phoenician descent and
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French colonial past. Among others, such “difference” is especially promoted by the powerful Christian population in Lebanon, who sees Syrians (who are mostly Sunni Muslims) as incompatible with values of equality and justice. Thus, they reinforce the binary conception of Self vs. Other moved, in many occasions, by an internalized pre-conception of “Muslim homophobia” (Wekker 2009; Mosse 2009; El Tayeb 2011; Haritaworn 2015 and Puar 2007, cited in Jivraj 2016, p. 181). In line with bell hook’s idea of the commodification of difference (cited in Baca Zinn and Thornton Dill 1996, p. 323), Lebanon benefits from the current humanitarian situation to use the idea of Syrians as the “deviant” (ibid), and themselves, as promoters of a much more diverse society. Yet, the dynamic oppressor-oppressed between Lebanese and Syrian refugee males enables that Syrian refugees, despite their vulnerability, become visible (or even hypervisible, as cited by Chow in 2011, p. 411), influencing knowledge and programmes accordingly (Burgin 2013). These dynamics oppressor-oppressed need to be framed also within the Lebanese reality, since Lebanese are one of the largest migrant communities abroad. So, although they are familiar with this categorization as the “other”, further analysis would be interesting on how the dynamics are reproduced at the micro-level, or how this “otherness” gets worse when other identity categories with negative social connotations enter into play (such as race or low social status, thinking of migrant workers).

Building on the above, the theoretical analysis presented in this section shows the inter-relation of the core components of this Master’s thesis: masculinities, intersectionality and SGBV. Although inter-related in nature, the above shows that there is still no rationale and no literature addressing the complexity of such inter-relation in this particular context. This is especially relevant because, in the end, the lack of a consistent rationale leads to the reproduction of harmful gender norms and the limitations in services offered to refugees accordingly. Therefore, the section below proposes a model where the mutually reinforcing impact of both theoretical frameworks opens a new door for the emergence of a new approach.
VI. PROPOSING A MEN’S LENS

The theoretical analysis presented in the previous section is useful to identify the sociocultural dynamics and conceptions that underpin the rationale behind SGBV programmes, and the subsequent (un)coverage of critical masculinities and intersectionality. The theoretical analysis shows that both programmes and literature capture such framework in isolation, as if both components were not interconnected. This is, men are engaged in programmes as per their linkage to violence, overlooking the myriad of identity categories that influence their resort or exposure to violence. At the same time, programmes aiming at helping refugees in coping with their protection concerns (such as livelihood, cash, shelter…) are not connected to the work that is needed to engage men in changing mentalities and serve those who experience violence.

To solve this inconsistency, and based on the theoretical analysis exposed above, this section presents the enhanced men-inclusive approach proposed, which I will call the men’s lens. This men’s lens constitutes a tool to look at things differently, with the aim to have a new approach where men are included consistently and systematically in all stages of programmes. This approach aims at tailoring programmes also to men’s needs and involve them as main actors throughout prevention, identification and response to SGBV.

What is the men’s lens?

The men’s lens constitutes a tool to inform a new way of conceiving SGBV programmes. This is, a door to re-think how programmes are currently designed and implemented, in favour of a more consistent involvement of men, deliberately articulated around prevention and response as the framework for all SGBV interventions. As such, this new approach contributes to setting the foundation of a new way to design SGBV programming, this is, creating new “meanings” (Aull Davies 2002, p. 98) as per the way programmes can be understood, analysed and implemented.

The men’s lens does not only serve as observation tool, but also as an introspective tool to enhance a conception of gender and programmes where men are brought into self-reflection and questioning of their own positioning, aiming at inducing an effective change in mentalities and
behaviours. In line with the theories that aim at surpassing hegemonic masculinities after the decade of 2000 (Hearn et al. 2012, p. 37), this new approach proposed does not conceive critical masculinities as a *stand-alone* framework, since masculinities are necessarily interconnected to a large number of other strands (Hearn’s lecture 2017). Hence, I intend to cope with this lack of communication between critical masculinities and intersectionality by putting both in discussion with each other. While SGBV programmes address masculinities from separate angles, they are far from merging these two components with a layer analyzing how men are positioned in society. With reference to Lee and Lloyd’s *hybrid theories* on the combination of stress, frustration and sub-culture (1994, cited in Hearn 1998), the interaction between all those components leads to more violence. As they state, “social stress is associated with unequal access to resources, especially for the poor. In this view, individual who are under stress resort to violence as an outlet for frustration, which may result from one incident or a slow build-up of incidents” (Lee and Lloyd 1994, p.9, cited in Hearn 1998, p. 30). This is especially relevant in the current displacement setting, in which men are placed back as a result of a shift in gender roles produced in humanitarian contexts (with links to their loss of power, authority and dire socioeconomic circumstances).

*Mutually reinforcing impact and emergence of a multi-dimensional SGBV*

The *men’s lens* should not only be understood through the simple addition of its different components, but rather how these two interact and influence each other, while being framed in the prevention and response logic of interventions. In this line, the *men’s lens* provides a platform for the dialogue between the two theoretical frameworks of the thesis to happen. I align with Haraway’s concept of *diffraction*, which constitutes a “tool that can dynamically open up analytical fields to a continuous production of new approaches and perspectives” (in Haraway 1997, cited in Lykke 2010, p. 154). As such, we see that the word “dynamically” adjust to the bilateral relationship established in this Master’s thesis between critical masculinities and intersectionality in light of the displacement situation of the target group. I use both theories as *travelling concepts* (Collins 1998, cited in Lewis 2013, p. 873), especially as a result of the transformation experienced during displacement and the impact on both components, together with their mutually reinforcing interaction. This is, the concept travel by changing their meaning as per
refugees leave Syria and arrive to Lebanon, and it is then when I identify the *intra-action* (Barad 2007, p. 33 - building on Haraway’s concept) between the components of the *men’s lens*. As Haraway mentions, “diffraction is the production of difference patterns in the world, nor just of the same reflected – displaced – elsewhere” (1997, p. 268, cited in Lykke 2010, p. 155). This is, it is specifically in the *interference* of the components where I find the triggering entry for the new approach in point (Haraway 1992, p. 300).

Within this framework, I decide to build on critical masculinities theory to better understand programmes need to capture how Syrian refugee men experience their own gender in the context of displacement, where a shift in gender roles in produced. This helps me build on the relationship to violence, and how such relationship may be distorted by the threats posed to their traditional expected behaviours as protectors and providers, to which they struggle to adjust in the displacement setting. As a consequence, either they perpetrate violence to liberate such frustration, or are exposed to different forms of SGBV in order to secure meeting their basic needs. At the same time, I build on intersectional theory to introduce an intersectional dimension in SGBV programmes, showing the linkage between the transformations experienced in their social positioning in their condition as ‘refugees’. The mutually reinforcing influence of both components leads to what I call the *multi-dimensional SGBV* related to Syrian refugee males, this is, the interconnected emergence of violence related to men as both perpetrators and survivors. Yet, it is worth noting that these phenomena are not universal or inevitable, but rather derive of dynamics that are in constant flux among people, at different times and places.

As shown by Figure 2 below, some examples are useful to illustrate such mutually reinforcing relationship, which constitutes this approach. For instance, as shown through the theoretical analysis, and taking masculinities as the starting point, the fact that Syrian refugee men are experiencing a loss of authority by not adjusting to their role as *breadwinners* comes together with the discrimination promoted by other men (from both Lebanese or Syrian refugee men) based on the decrease in manhood experienced, which conditions their positioning in society, altering their intersectional positioning (so masculinities is the cause, and intersectional movement is the result). On the other hand, and using intersectionality as triggering factor, many Syrian refugee men face limited access to resources and income, which forces them to give sexual favours (to their
employers or landlords) in order to preserve their socioeconomic well-being, having an impact on how their experience their masculinity and manhood (so the starting point is intersectionality, and masculinities are found as a consequence). These incidents are, in many occasions, not reported, given the increased shame and stigma that threatens their masculinity and the way they experience their gender. As a result, men do not seek and receive required services, which may be translated into the reproduction of violence against their wives, or also against other men. In the end, it is in this *interference* (Haraway 1992, p.300) where such multi-dimensional SGBV finds a starting point, being Syrian refugee men also at the spotlight as both survivors and perpetrators. This is illustrated in Figure 2 below:
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*Figure 2. The men’s lens - Self-produced diagram by Muñoz Alonso for the purpose of this Master’s thesis.*

*De-normalizing men’s practices*

The *men’s lens* breaks the consideration of men’s practices as “normal” or gender unconscious, changing the approach that makes them be taken for granted and overlooked in gender analyses (Martin 2001, cited in Holmgren and Hearn 2009). Through the *men’s lens* and the two theoretical frameworks selected and intra-acting, I enhance the dissemination of the *explanations of men*, based on the analysis of men’s realities within the social and cultural construction related hereto.
(Holmgren and Hearn 2009). Yet, I do so by taking into consideration the plurality of such realities, breaking the homogenous ideals of men and how such unities and differences inter-relate (Hearn 1998, p. 4). Thus, I problematize men’s problems, bringing them up to the humanitarian agenda (ibid) and coping with the absence of men in “explicit inquiry and deconstruction” (ibid, p.3). This will eventually contribute to encouraging the adoption of a broader approach to SGBV and men, where “men are named as men” (Hanmer 1990; Collinson and Hearn 1994, cited in ibid).

It is precisely in this juncture of knowledge creation where resistances emanate, especially since men’s practices are conceived as something that requires less attention to work on. Resistances come mainly from colleagues involved professionally in the work on SGBV programmes, who may prefer to defend the most traditional paradigm that focuses on women and girls. Although they may act as gatekeepers or “guardians of the current paradigm” (Wekker 2009, p. 59), my proposed approach carves its way into a newer and broader understanding of the intrinsic relationship between men and the work on SGBV, breaking the current work in silos that disaggregates the men’s component into punctual and isolated initiatives.

Once the preferred model is identified, the next step is to double-check the feasibility and relevance of the men’s lens: how can it be materialized? How does the men’s lens translate into practice (a.k.a as SGBV programming)? To answer these questions, and in line with the methodology exposed above, I have targeted three key informants from different organisations (with various mandates) to better explore possible materializations and way forward of the new approach proposed.
VII. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Following the formulation of the model proposed, which builds on the theoretical analysis of existing knowledge, this section presents how the *men’s lens* can be translated into practice, this is, transformed into programmes. With this aim, this empirical analysis provides primary data obtained through semi-structured interviews to explore the feasibility and relevance of the model in point, showing the linkages to the space, resources and willingness to adopt the new approach. The information presented in this section fits the model in point, in line with the themes identified during the qualitative analysis conducted.

The interviews target three humanitarian actors working in UNHCR in Lebanon: one UN agency, one international NGO and one national partner, covering the spectrum of all actors present, in order to incorporate the stakeholders who effectively implement programmes. The decision made regarding actors included is aligned to the aim of this research, and the analysis of the information follows the processing techniques explained above in the methodology section.

**Relevance and feasibility**

Many similarities were identified among key informants with regards to the model proposed. First, conducting research on refugee men and SGBV was of interest for all actors. Informants pointed out that more attention is needed to the topic, both in terms of research and actual humanitarian programmes. One specific reaction was identified through transition techniques, where the relevant informant shed light on the lack of reflection behind programmes and the impact on the quality of the interventions, which ultimately affects the efficiency of programmes.

“While we are extremely busy in doing our yearly programming, we sometimes do not put enough time to self-reflect about not only the quality of our projects, but to reflect around our interventions and if new approaches are needed. Approaches that need to be implemented not only within [name of Organisation], but something that needs to be harmonized and standardized across operations” (informant A).
Some repetitions were identified in the number of times that key informants related gender and SGBV to the traditional focus on women and girls of current SGBV interventions in Lebanon (Olivius 2016). This has already been identified through existing approaches and knowledge available, as exposed in the background and theoretical analysis sections above. Some informants explained that this is due to a remaining traditional conception of gender, which is still perceived to be equivalent to women, leaving many actors outside the scope. This is due, they explain, to the fact that heterosexual intimate-partner violence constitutes the core of SGBV interventions and is still the most common form of SGBV. This has determined the direction taken by funds and donors, who placed women and girls as earmarked priorities in their action plans and mandates.

Yet, some clashes were identified through transition techniques, where I could sense the enthusiasm and insistence of the interviewees while they described the mismatch between their personal conception on the meaning of “gender” and the need to adopt a broader approach including other actors involved. In this line, similarities were identified in the need to call upon one’s professional duty to have the knowledge and capacities to work with all survivors, even if the bulk of survivors are indeed women. Some differences were observed in the extent to which they position themselves around this point, finding a special engagement shown by informant A and C regarding the need to work with GBTI refugees. This is most probably due to the mission of the organisations they represent, since both of them have clear goals in including the work on LGBTI issues.

As identified in the interview with informant A, GBTI refugees are still considered to be “second-class survivors”. GBTI refugees face higher vulnerabilities and exposure to SGBV given their illegal status as refugees and their non-conforming gender identity and sexual orientation, which translates into difficulties to find work and the final impossibility to report cases of violence that may arise. As stated by informant C, GBTI refugees cannot report cases of violence given the high risk of ending up in jail given such double vulnerability (refugee status and SOGIE status), which relies on challenges emanating from their multiple subordinate locations (Chow 2011, p. 413). Special emphasis in their statement was identified through transition techniques in informant C. This happened particularly while addressing the trans issue, that I could identify both through a
clear transition in the statement, together with an implicit indigenous marker as if we were touching upon a forbidden topic as per the sociocultural norms in Lebanon:

“If we have a family coming from Syria to Lebanon, and they have support here from their community, from the people they know… I cannot say it is easy, but easier to find a job, to find a safe space. However, a trans or a gay person coming from Syria, alone, does not have the same support. They are more vulnerable to any violation” (informant C).

Similarities were also identified in the way they structured the different levels of interventions. As per stated by all of them, current SGBV interventions articulate on three levels: access to quality case management and other services for survivors; prevention activities through community-based approaches; and mainstreaming of violence against refugees into national strategies, policies and activities implemented in this respect. One specific participant highlighted the fact that interventions rely heavily on self-referrals, this is, individuals who voluntarily approach organisations seeking for services and assistance. The informant shed light on the fact that such self-referrals pose different problems to ensure that needs are effectively met: assistance only reach those who approach the organisations, which shows that there are many refugees who are not getting assistance as long as there is lack of information or unwillingness to report. This is somehow problematic, because it shows that programmes do not take into consideration what support persons affected have at their disposal. This is, assistance is not adjusted as per the resources available for each of the individuals, which shows the need to further explore how assistance can be tailored to each of the needs, or how to set-off the absence of family support, such as in the case of GBTI refugees.

Repetitions and similarities were observed in the role played by prevailing masculinities in accessing (or not) the necessary assistance. Some indigenous and cultural elements arose, especially while highlighting the reluctance in being self-referred based on the acknowledgment that men are powerful and privileged, and hence, they are the ones who violate rights, and not the other way around. This shows the remanence of a gender order embedded by hegemonic masculinities (Connell 1985, cited in Hearn et al. 2012, p. 37), which make that men cannot be
raped - they rape. This is also due to the sociocultural barriers to encourage disclosure, especially in light of the strong discrimination and ostracism that refugee men can face if they revealed any incident of violence suffered, who would be seen as not adjusting to their expected role as a man. Transition techniques were applied while addressing these statements, for which participants made their point through the formulation of strong rhetorical questions:

“A man who has been harassed or raped, in our culture, we would question: is he a real man? How did he accept that to happen? How did he get raped?” (Informant A).

More similarities were observed in the informants’ views around the fact that SGBV programmes are partially men inclusive, and that there is not a consistent approach in men’s involvement across organisations. This shows that men’s practices are still understood as gender unconscious, happening by default and not deserving attention from programmes (Martin 2001, cited in Holmgren and Hearn 2009). The involvement of men remains extremely limited and is done bits and pieces, as confirmed by informant A. This relates to the lack of SGBV-related awareness and capacities in working with men in fields such as health, legal, education or livelihoods. This aggravates by the lack of a common approach and the strong misconceptions that remain among organisations and the Government, which rely on the implicit notion of taboo while assuming that men can be weak. Programmes are not really tailored to specific needs of different profiles, and there are still key services that are not available for men and boys in Lebanon (such as safe shelter when they need to escape violence).

There seems to be though a consensus within the SGBV working group (which includes UN agencies, as well as national and international NGOs country-wide) about the need to engage men in fighting against VAWG, reinforcing the idea that men are still the doers of violence (Hearn 1998, p. 35). This is, engaging men as perpetrators, building especially on men’s impossibility to be survivors as per the widespread manhood portraying them as the ones violating, and not being violated. Yet, this is implemented in isolation, with no coherent approach. A specific point in this regard was highlighted by informant B, who explained that there is an increasing openness in
having internal discussions within organisations on why and how to engage men beyond their role as perpetrators, but also as partners and fathers:

“The dialogue on engaging men started because women themselves were asking us to engage with men. Not just as perpetrators, but even as partners. We received so much feedback, for example, from married women asking for awareness sessions on sexual and reproductive health for their husbands” (informant B).

Yet, the engagement with perpetrators was limited to awareness and sensitization given potential security concerns. Although organisations found a need in working directly with violent behaviours and rehabilitation of men perpetrators, there was a common agreement in the sector to not do so, and rather find alternative ways for engagement. This relates, for example, to the inclusion in SGBV programmes to work with community leaders, whose influence has been shown effective in creating behavioural change among members of the community.

The main repetition and similarity identified relates to the consensus about the need for a stronger men-inclusive approach, especially in the current displacement setting in Lebanon. This constitutes a key stand-point for this Master’s thesis, since the lack of consensus across informants would have put at stake the possibility to explore any new approach, taking the findings eventually into a new direction.

Yet, building on their consensus and with regards to the shift in gender roles produced, where the women become the breadwinners of the family, similarities were identified in the need for firmer interventions on tackling masculinities, since the secondary and frustrated role assigned to refugee men in the new setting has an impact over the entire family. Such emphasis was identified through transition techniques, especially marked in informant B:

“I can remember so many instances where women would tell us […] they had been stopped by their husbands for providing for the family, even though they had access to a work opportunity, because it was too
emasculating for the men. Men were imposing this harsh economic climate on the family, letting the family starve just because he could not bear upon himself that the women would work and he is sitting at home. And now you ask me if there is any tailored programming to address this kind of feelings? I don’t think so. And if there is space for it? Absolutely” (informant B).

The statement above reaffirms how working on masculinities is necessary to mitigate the risk of emergence to violence. This includes also denial of resources, captured above, where the pride of the men to not let their wives work outside the ones is translated into violence exerted in starving the family. This shows some fluidity in the experience of men, who are victims of their frustration and emasculation, and become though perpetrators as a reaction.

**Engagement of men in SGBV prevention**

A large number of similarities were identified in the approach to SGBV prevention, understanding masculinities and tackling them through programmes expressed by all actors interviewed. In this line, the general consensus is that there are currently no specific programmes on these issues, especially with regards to masculinities and cis-gender heterosexual men. This shows the prevailing compulsory heterosexuality (Rich 1980, reworked in Butler 1993) embedding the Lebanese and Syrian communities, which underpins the main barriers to overcome in terms of SGBV prevention. Once more, repetitions were found when it comes to how prevention is tailored to women’s needs, and provide among others, relevant information on divorce or how to find a safe place. Yet, some differences among actors showed that one of them adopted a more radical rejection to the absence of men’s needs in prevention, qualifying it as “counter-productive” and “discriminatory”, leading to a weaker outcomes of activities.

A remarkable difference was identified in the way each organisation had tried to include men’s needs in prevention. For example, LGBTI organisations have attempted to address these issues in prevention, finding space to discuss issues related to identity and orientation, as stated by informant C. Other informants shared having tried to conduct awareness raising activities at the
community level underlying a broader understanding of gender, based on mutual respect of different gender identities. This also applies to some further attempts to analyse with men the impact of SGBV on their family well-being. Yet, no action specifically focused on the exploration of men’s own masculinities and multiple gender identity, and divergences in attempts and approaches identified showcase the lack of a coherent way to engage men and boys in preventing SGBV.

*Inclusion of men and boys as survivors in SGBV response*

Similarities were identified in the focus adopted by informants while addressing SGBV response in Lebanon, which relates especially to SGBV case management services and some initiatives at the community level, both conducted after an incident occurs. Informants coincided on the lack of consistency in how response to men and boys is done, if any. Response is given on a case-by-case basis, adopting a reactive, and not proactive, intervention towards the needs of men and boys survivors.

In this regard, repetitions were identified through the datasets while addressing the challenges posed by existing capacities and expressed the need to strengthen them on a permanent basis in order to ensure the timely and quality provision of case management and specialized services. A specific mention by informant B relates to the two-fold nature of capacities, having a financial and a technical dimension. In terms of financial capacities, similarities were observed as per the way informants highlighted the necessity to make donors understand the need to involve men and boys in SGBV work. This is especially relevant given the current budget reductions that countries in the Syria crisis are currently experiencing (including Lebanon), especially in light of other refugee emergency crisis in the world (such as the current Rohingya crisis in Myanmar).

Informants coincided in stating that prioritization of funds is unavoidable, also among donors, and a better planning is needed to have a vision about the specialized services and staff that SGBV survivors will have at their disposal. Yet, such prioritization is usually guided by remaining preconceptions based on women and girls’ higher vulnerability. A particular difference was identified in the statement of informant B on donor funding, regarding which they states that there
are many cases showing that vulnerabilities are not limited only to one sex, contradicting this systematic, and sometimes misleading, assumption underpinning how funds are granted. It is important to problematize how their approach would change in a situation where funds are scarce, and a strong prioritization is needed, this is, if we reach the point where the Syrian crisis is not at the spot of international attention. This would have a direct impact on who benefits and who cannot benefit from the assistance, strengthening the criteria to access it, probably moved by what we consider to be a higher vulnerability and what is not at imminent risk. This is precisely the juncture where embedded sociocultural perceptions will enter into play, having a direct impact on the well-being of a community that is already cross-cut by different vulnerabilities.

Technical capacities were showcased as challenging by several informants, especially given the lack of adjustment in case management work to the specific needs of profiles outside women and girls. Yet, a difference in approach was observed by informant A, who declares themselves as a social worker by practice and defended categorically the necessity to introduce a specific approach in case work to men and boys. This is also confirmed by informant B, who is convinced that there are still shortages in adopting a gender lens for male survivors, in spite of its applicability within core SGBV guiding principles such as the survivor-centered approach.

SGBV response faces further challenges given the broader lack of awareness regarding the existence and need of other profiles of survivors beyond women. This holds especially true for rural areas, where the discussion can barely take place. In urban areas, where discussions on LGBTI issues are though frequent, discussions on SGBV response are not translated into capacities or resources, and they rather stay within the limits of an ad-hoc forum. This has led, for instance, to the current absence of solid referral systems in place for male survivors. Although much needed, the sector justifies such absence by restoring to confidentiality issues, especially in terms of fear of disclosure and retaliation by men involved.

Many similarities were observed while addressing the attitudes that still prevail among staff working directly with men and boys. In this regard, all informants stated that case managers and persons involved in the response to male survivors still have strong negative perceptions of such group. Yet, a difference is to highlight in the statement of informant B, which is the one valuing
the evolution experienced by their own staff. In this sense, it is stated that they experience some positive evolution after being professionally involved with this group of concern for few years, which however goes through some backlashes given the prevalence of original prejudices and beliefs conveyed through their traditional interaction with their own community:

“It is extremely difficult [to change harmful attitudes towards men and boys survivors]. Obviously, case workers are part the communities that are perpetuating the stereotypes we are fighting. What is encouraging is working with case workers who have been in the field for four or five years, and who have switched almost completely their point of views and even their values. […] Yet, every once in a while you will fall against somebody’s limits in terms of their values, assumptions and attitudes towards gender” (informant B).

As per the conclusions above, it was easy to identify many similarities promoting the need to enhance the SGBV response to men and boys, starting from a more coherent inclusion in programmes. Yet, and even if there is consensus, some differences were identified in how categorically some informants position themselves towards the need for a change and specialization. This includes capacity-building programmes to case workers on men and boys survivors, especially since this is an efficient tool to make them change harmful attitudes towards this group of concern.

Addition of complementary services based on intersectional perspectives

With a stronger focus on response, and in line with the theoretical analysis and the men’s lens proposed, I decided to explore how services should (or not) be complemented with additional interventions. In this regard, similarities were found across interviews where it was stated that many of the current SGBV interventions combine already with additional services aiming at helping the individual cope with the incident faced. Yet, this is hindered when men are the ones who need services for response. This is, informants coincided that there is no structured
interventions to work with men to prevent or respond to SGBV through additional services such as cash assistance (which could refrain the individuals from perpetrating violence against their wives or from resorting to negative coping mechanisms, respectively), safe shelter for male survivors, or livelihood opportunities for men (reducing the likelihood to accept abusive working conditions and related exploitation).

With regards to how to enlarge intervention towards a holistic approach that includes such additional services, informants stated that a strengthened system of data collection is much needed. This contributes to better knowing your targeted population, as well as what the root causes for the problems identified are. As per some of their proposals, this could be done, for instance, through a systematic conduction of individual interviews or discussions with communities on SGBV and men. This would help the sector have a clearer picture on how to provide services and prioritize targeted beneficiaries accordingly (for example, with regards to livelihood for large families where SGBV is present, or mental health services for those who were subject to torture or sexual violence during conflict, aiming at reducing their likelihood to reproduce violent behaviours). Other particular example cited by informant B relates to thinking of working with men on stress and anger management, which could also be beneficial in stopping them to resort to violence against other persons, dissuading them from the use of violence as a way to channel their own frustration and anxiety. Yet, a change in discourse was identified through transition techniques to make a very clear point: this can only be achieved if we first build trust, which would be key to ensure that men and boys seek guidance and support in organisations:

“If we do not know who they are, if we do not facilitate the process of men approaching us seeking for support, if we do not install trust, we will not have proper understanding. Then, at the same time, we will not have proper targeted activities. And that will be one-type activities, testing and piloting here and there” (informant A).

The relevance of trust was highlighted in two directions. Trust with the individuals and the community is first essential to create an enabling environment to implement programmes, as explained above. This was shown by similarities among the interviewees, who support that such
work involves not only men, but also women and children, in a way that their understanding of the evolution of that individual is enhanced. Yet, informants shared that self-trust constitutes also a key component to target SGBV, and is currently overlooked by programmes. This contributes to making the individual feeling resilient and empowered, not reliant only on support and external aid, and enables them stop feeling that they have failed and “they do not exist anymore”, as strongly pointed out by informant A.

Additional services like cash and safe shelter for survivors are considered relevant by all interviewees. This holds especially true for GBTI refugee survivors, who have less chances to access shelter networks (given inexistence of shelter and prosecution by the State). Furthermore, shelters for men are unlikely to happen in Lebanon given the challenge to create a safe space free of stigma for this group of concern. This has also links to the cash assistance they currently receive, which they need to allocate to rent-related expenses given the housing insecurity they face as a results of pressure and threats from landlords and roommates.

Although it is agreed that there is leeway for introducing additional services enhancing SGBV response, repetitions were identified as per one specific topic: sustainability of outcomes. This is, some challenges remain on how to ensure that such holistic approach endures the protection outcomes it serves, lasting in time. This applies, for instance, to cash and shelter complementary services, which were highlighted as one strategy for a positive impact, which is unfortunately temporary.

_Potential risks in the process_

Obstacles for the feasibility and materialization of the men’s lens highlighted across the interviews presented a personal and an organisational dimension. In both cases, though, the concept of “willingness” came up in all interviews as a _sine qua non_ condition for succeeding in changing the current approach, relating to personal, but also political and social willingness for change.
At the individual level, the need for case workers as individuals to have an actual understanding of SGBV and gender issues was specially highlighted, making appeal to meet humanitarian professional standards. Yet, this came up in different ways in the interviews. For instance, for some informants this was linked to an indigenous and cultural factor, since it includes a radical change in mentalities, which requires a big personal commitment by staff involved. This can be easily achieved if, as highlighted by informant A, some peer-to-peer or mentoring support is provided along the process, especially in order to overcome the work as an “outsider” and enhance understanding from within. For others, it related rather to a structural change in current profiling and background of staff involved, which would also include the increase in the number of male case workers, since most of the staff working on SGBV prevention and response are female. This can only happen through a *de-stigmatization* of casework as a female rooted discipline in detriment of male students and professionals, as stated by informant C, which brings us back to the prevalence of sociocultural values.

More similarities were found at the organisational level. In this regard, informants agreed on the importance on having SGBV-trained staff in charge of such portfolio. They highlighted the need to have professionalized staff, who can join the team already with some academic and technical expertise on the issue. This has, also, an impact on the organisation as a whole, as identified through transition techniques in one of the interviews, who states that the work of such professionalized staff has positive repercussions on the organizational culture and other members’ attitudes:

“I can really say *very very very* honestly that my perception towards addressing men and boys issues was very much affected by the people who were leading SGBV programming. […] And I believe I had few perceptions, wrong perceptions, and I managed to overcome them. It needs *a lot* of personal work” (informant A).

The interviews showed that informants think it is important to exert such positive influence on the organizational environment across sectors. This is due, for instance, to the need to have “internal allies or advocates” (informant A), aiming at sensitizing colleagues from programme or finance,
who are the ones responsible for mobilizing resources. In the end, this can be beneficial to systematizing the prioritization of funding requests for SGBV interventions with men and boys.

This also applies to the challenges in engaging other actors. There is currently no “buy-in” of involving men and boys in SGBV interventions at the government level, and sometimes among the management of organisations (informant B). Communities are no exception, especially while trying to engage religious leaders and community influencers in overcoming misconceptions. Engaging such actors is highlighted as key to guide the process of change in mentalities, on one hand, and establishing necessary set and regulations at high level, on the other one, which once again, is rooted in the need to enhance political and social willingness for change.

As shown by the empirical analysis above, the conclusions obtained through the thematic analysis conducted confirm that there is space to use a men’s lens in order to adopt a men-inclusive approach to SGBV programmes. Informants consider it feasible and relevant, and suitable to all stages of the programme cycle, touching especially upon prevention and response. Had not we observed such common ground in their views, the direction taken by this Master’s research would have been different. It would have helped see that a harmonize understanding is needed, in order to coordinate actions, avoid duplications and enhance efficiency in aid. Yet, the empirical analysis shows that such common ground is possible. Although to different extents, all informants see an added-value in including complementary services to rebalance the consequences of the decrease in social status experienced in the displacement setting in point, confirming the relevance of the introduction of an intersectional perspective in SGBV programmes. As such, a set of recommendations tailored to the context is provided in Annex I in order to facilitate the practical implementation of a men’s lens and its translation into current programmes.
Many decisions needed to be made throughout the process, both with regards to the methodology understood as a process, as well as to the formulation of the model itself, approached as a result. These decisions, presented in the relevant sections above, where the result of a process of reflection conducted by the researcher.

Yet, these decisions were not made in isolation, and came with a process of reflection where all different options were assessed, seeking the best interest for the research and the achievement of its aim. As such, this section addresses a discussion problematizing such process of reflection around decisions made. This relates, for example, to what other directions I could have opted for, what other options could have been possible, or what the research is currently missing as a result of the decisions made throughout. Within this framework, I assessed advantages and disadvantages, thought of taking other directions, faced limitations and identified challenges and resistances, included below.

*Discussing the men’s lens*

The *men’s lens* particularity not only lies on the fact that two theories are combined towards a new approach programmes, but on the fact that these theories are in discussion with each other. Hence, the model does not only unpack each of the components, but also creates a space for the combination of both frameworks. As shown in the relevant section above, it is in this juncture where the *men’s lens* finds its raison d’être, and opens the door to the creation of meaning towards informing prevention and response interventions. Such mutually reinforcing impact between the theoretical frameworks is its main particularity, since it shows that programmes need to have a comprehensive approach and touch upon both dimensions in order to ensure efficiency of outcomes.

The combination of both theoretical frameworks is smooth, and linkages are easy to find and understand. Yet, I problematize in this Master’s thesis that, although by nature these are theoretical frameworks that fit together, they are not brought into dialogue in current programmes, leaving
their intra-action overlooked. This is precisely the rationale behind the *men’s lens*, where both frameworks enter a mutually reinforcing impact. Yet, both theories are not balanced to the same extent in the model, being axed towards the critical masculinities component, which has a heavier weight. This is due especially to the fact that critical masculinities are present both in prevention and response to SGBV, while the intersectional component informs specifically the response dimension. Also, intersectional theory opens a door for an infinite number of identity categories to enter intra-action (Barad 2007, p.33), which ends up leading to the fact that it is basically social class and ethnicity the two main components prevailing within the *men’s lens*. In this sense, it would have been definitely interesting to adopt a more specific focus and explore the addition of other identity categories in the intersectionality component, such as age or disability. This is, to explore deeper how the intra-action in the model is influenced as per the different age ranges, or what are the specific aspects that we need to take into consideration for persons with disabilities in displacement, whose intersectional and masculinity positioning may be influenced differently while being put into discussion with one another, currently lacking in programmes. Other considerations such as sexuality or religion (given the impact on intersectional positioning of refugees accordingly) would also be very interesting to explore.

However, critical masculinities theory presents itself as limited, manageable, and straight-to-the point. As a result, critical masculinities theory push intersectionality towards the edge, making it being understood as an additional component, and not a dimension on an equal footing.

I have identified further limitations in *depth* as well, this is, the extent to which the *men’s lens* can inform programmes. In this regard, there are some aspects related to SGBV programmes that the model is unable to capture, especially when it comes to provide specific guidance on technical issues. This relates, for example, to how safety plans and response services need to be provided specifically to each of the cases, what is the content of awareness raising activities to conduct under the prevention axe, or how to tailor to the specific needs of the survivor the assistance given in each of the cases, under the response. The model does not provide either guidance on how to prioritize the different interventions, leaving unanswered what is the suitable sequence for the different interventions (shelter, cash, medical, food…). The model could have come with other annexes, such as a template or a check-list, useful to assess compliance of programme to the new approach. Yet, the major weakness observed relates to *commitment*, this is, the model does not
have a normative character. Therefore, it stays as a proposal that no one has the obligation to follow, putting its own nature at stake.

Yet, the model has been constructed in line with this research as per the justifications given in the sections above. Still, it is presented as a flexible approach, where other theories and layers could be at play as well. For instance, introducing a third dimension on colonialist theory would have been very relevant to the model, especially, with regards to how the social positioning and gender norms affecting Syrian refugees in displacement (vis-à-vis especially the submissive relationship towards their Lebanese counterparts) find roots in remaining colonialist approaches. In this sense, I think a third intra-acting dimension linked to social construction and otherness in this regard would have been relevant if the aim of the thesis had been linked to historiographical purposes. Yet, this would have entailed several challenges, especially while determining what timeframe the research should tackle, since the displacement context addressed in the research and the historiographies between Syria and Lebanon may not coincide. At the same time, queer theory could also be relevant for the model, going deeper into concepts explored briefly such as compulsory heterosexuality (Rich 1980), or gender performativity (Butler 1990), especially if we want to inform programmes to find solutions as per specific topics related to sexual orientation and/or gender identity. Yet, this may need a further research process, since solid research should provide information as per the different groups, breaking with the prevailing tendency to homogenize LGBTI individuals under one lens.

Other considerations could have been discussed while deciding over the entry-point for the model, this is, how to approach it without adding or removing any component. In this regard, I could have chosen to stay within the same research object, and yet adopt a different focus. For example, I could have addressed masculinities and intersectionality in the current displacement setting through the legal instruments and definitions that are currently in place, and not through the vision of SGBV programmes. It would have been relevant, for instance, to address gaps in legislation and the exclusion of men in Law 293 on family violence and the National Plan to Safeguard Children and Women in Lebanon, where men are not included as survivors, and only as perpetrators. I could have also tackled the lack of mechanisms for men to seek legal redress in cases of violence, rooted in the limited definition of rape (which currently does not include men as survivors), the rationale
behind relevant legal rulings set, or the prevailing use of Article 534 of the Penal Code to prosecute homosexuality under stated “sexual practices against nature”.

As a result, instead of such programmatic men-inclusive approach linked to the emergence of SGBV presented in this thesis, other “lenses” could have been proposed. For instance, and if I had chosen to scan the inclusion of masculinities, intersectionality and SGBV in the legal realm, a very interesting lens would have been linked to how masculinities are mainstreamed (or not) in national instruments, especially in opposition to the international tools currently in place. Also, such focus would have touched upon how refugees are included (or not) in national strategies and tools or, building on their disadvantaged social positioning in Lebanon, they are currently left out of the national legal protection systems. However, a different approach to the model would have entailed that we may not obtain the information needed to inform prevention and response interventions to SGBV, but rather to other type of programmes, such as advocacy or legal representation or reform.

The implementation of the men’s lens the way I propose it in this thesis is mainly positive, since it fills a gap confirmed by the humanitarian staff interviewed throughout the process. Yet, some negative aspects emanate from its actual implementation, such as potential resistances that may be trigger if the rationale of the men’s lens is not well explained. As stated in this thesis, the new approach does not aim to compromise the much needed interventions with women and girls in the domain of SGBV; yet, and under the obligation of serving everyone and leaving no one behind, the approach aims to ensure that the full spectrum of persons involved in interventions is covered. Still, it does it through a stronger focus on the involvement of men, being themselves at the centre of their own prevention and response. If this is not explained properly, it may be seen as if men took over the space again, especially in a field where women are still discriminated by legislation and access and provision to services, and strong advocacy movements are on-going.

Yet, the adoption of alternative options would have led to a different result, where the main focus of this Master’s thesis would have been lost. This is, the amended model would have not been adequate for this piece of research and would have not contributed to answer my research question, this is, how both theoretical frameworks can inform SGBV programmes. In line with the alternatives exposed above, a different model would have rather informed political or historical
research (in the case of colonialist theory), or given a clear picture on the cross-cutting vulnerabilities of LGBTI refugees in the current setting, useful for advocacy purposes for decriminalization of the Article 534 mentioned above and the full enjoyment of human rights. As explained in the following sub-section, this links to the methodology adopted, which, if done otherwise, would have led us to different findings that could have been exploited differently (let us think of a quantitative survey instead of interviews, which would be much more useful for the production of awareness or dissemination material). All of them useful decisions, but yet, for different purposes.

Advantages and disadvantages of the methodology selected

The approach adopted in the methodology has clearly enabled the generation and analysis of material. This relates especially to the different stages identified in the relevant section: first, the theoretical analysis, which laid the ground for the empirical analysis to happen, at a second stage. Yet, I could have chosen to look at the sequence of the thesis from a different angle, establishing a different dialogue between the parts. One option would have been to start by the empirical analysis, using the analysis of semi-structured interviews to inform theory (which, however, would have diluted the practical outcome pursued in this Master’s thesis). This would have been useful to highlight the match or mismatch of knowledge available as per the practice that humanitarian staff consider best.

Another option would have been to conduct interviews prior to the formulation of the model, and use the model as the recommended way forward. Yet, this would have posed several challenges in enhancing the connection between theory and practice, since no approach is confirmed by practitioners, but emanated from self-conclusions of the researcher. Although it looks convenient, I consider it to be less safe, since no professional has had the chance to double-check the proposed approach. Also, in that case, it would have been better to grant a clear normative character to the approach, so that organisations know what to follow. However, this would have been obviously challenging given my limited role and influence in determining the strategic planning of organisations beyond mine.
I made a deliberate decision to construct a model so that theory can be brought to practice, and explored through practitioners in the empirical phase. However, I could also have decided to not include any model or tool proposed, and just limit the analysis to the information I had at disposal. Yet, this would have been a risky option, especially since the eventual operationalization of the findings in current programmes definitely required a structure, and the absence of such guiding framework would have entailed that the same groups keep falling through the cracks in the way programmes are done. It would also have influenced negatively the credibility of the approach itself.

Some advantages and disadvantages have been identified in the methodology chosen to conduct this Master’s thesis. In terms of advantages, the methodology selected is appropriate to establish a framework relevant to the context where I am conducting research. Especially, and given its contextualised nature, the inclusion of relevant reports produced within the humanitarian sector has allowed me to better refine the findings and adjust them to actual needs on the ground. The analysis of literature conducted constitutes itself an added-value for this piece of research, since there is currently no available research that addresses such components in this particular context, and even less, that triangulates the different theoretical frameworks proposed.

Regarding the first method used, the lack of previous experiences and knowledge on practical implementation of a similar approach made that the literature explored does not go beyond theoretical purposes, which makes it difficult to link to the practical outcomes of humanitarian programmes. In addition, literature on the topic is not contextualized to the Middle East or to Lebanon specifically, which entails that many sociocultural dynamics determining gender norms and social positioning are ignored in most of the pieces found. In this sense, the eventual choice to focus on a different setting would have probably facilitated access to more sources, and more openness to discuss the topic (given the strong patriarchal values remaining in Arab societies) (ESCWA 2016).

Regarding the inclusion of semi-structured interviews, they have been useful to stay faithful to the prevalence of practical aspects for this project and the actual reflection of the here and now of the
topic in point. In the same line, targeting humanitarian actors working at different levels was positive in enabling different layers of answers to happen, while covering the most spectrum possible of actors involved. Interviews have allowed me to conduct my research guided by a participatory process too. I have been able to establish correlations, differences and similarities between the information provided by interviewees through the verbatim transcription of interviews and the relevant coding system established prior to their analysis.

However, I considered using different methods instead of interviews. For instance, a Focus Group Discussion would have been very strategic in benefitting from participants’ inputs to build on each other’s contributions, paving the way towards a consensus on the way forward for SGBV programmes and men. This would have clearly facilitated the analysis of data collected, although different dynamics would have emerged and possibly, information disclosed would have been affected accordingly. In addition, the choice of a Focus Group Discussion would have opened the door to other techniques of analysis, such as the analysis of the missing data, this is, what participants are not explicitly saying, but rather implicitly showing while addressing topics that make them feel unease (Ryan and Bernard 2003, p. 92). Yet, such option would require stronger research skills, without which I could have misled towards subjective findings depending on my own perspective. This would have ultimately questioned the reliability and validity of the findings too.

Another method considered was the dissemination of a survey with closed-ended questions. Initially I considered disseminating a survey among a random sample, reaching out to a larger number of informants, just moved by the ambition of having impressive numbers. Yet, this choice entailed that I should prioritize quantitative techniques, which took me away from the detailed analysis in-depth that I was pursuing. This would have posed challenges for disclosure, since trust is not previously built and therefore, the dropping-rate in answering could be considerable. Findings would most probably be superficial, since asking intimate questions on SGBV through a survey touches upon unethical standards. Also, a random sampling could have not captured key profiles, such as the ones specifically targeted in this thesis (let us think of the relevant information that would have been missed if I had not specifically targeted an LGBTI organisation, for example). Findings would have been maybe higher in number, but weaker in terms of technical
substance. In the same line, and if I had chosen to prioritize the quantitative nature of the research and conducted a survey, it would have been interesting to cluster the information maybe not per theme, but rather as per the different profiles of informants. This would have allowed me to establish correlations about the age, sex, origin, sexual orientation and other identity categories, and their openness to include masculinities and intersectionality in current programmes. The sample could have been much bigger – however, findings would have been less accurate and intimate, making meeting the objective of the thesis more difficult to me.

Different considerations were made while deciding over who would be the targeted informants, since this is key for the smooth development of the research process. Regarding targeted informants, I could have included a governmental instance or bilateral donors; yet, this would have hampered the practical aim of this Master’s thesis, since these are not instances running SGBV programmes themselves. Special mention needs to be made to the considerations of interviewing refugees at an initial stage. In this regard, there is no doubt that having first-hand experiences and views of refugees would definitely have been enriching to inform programmes. Yet, I identified several limitations, moved especially by unethical aspects, since interviewing refugees may put them at further risk given safety and confidentiality concerns. This is especially relevant given that the implied objective for this research is to produce a Master’s thesis, from which they will not be benefitting directly, which makes such ethical considerations necessary (refer to the section on Ethical considerations above). Nonetheless, I definitely keep in mind to conduct research with direct beneficiaries for further research opportunities (still with relevant ethical considerations), where it is ensured that they would directly benefit from the impact of the research.

Another disadvantage relates to how validity of the findings can be put at stake while extrapolating the findings (given the particular focus to the reality of Syrian refugee in Lebanon), and also if there are changes in the current setting, producing a change in the dynamics underpinning the current research. For instance, and as addressed in detail through the men’s lens (see Figure 2 above), the eventual scenario in which Syrian refugee men and boys were granted legal status in the country would stop them from working informally and would therefore reduce their likelihood to be subject to different types of abuses or harassment, especially at the workplace. This would also be the case if, for example, some changes in mentalities and behaviour occurred with relation
to masculinities in the current Arab patriarchal status (ESCWA 2016), which would have a positive impact on accepting that men cannot longer be the only providers of the family, and the likelihood to either experience or perpetrate SGBV in this sense would decrease. Another example relates to the improvement in the acceptance of refugees with a non-conforming gender identity and/or sexual orientation, which would increase their possibilities to find a job position and experience some mobility within the social scale, altering their intersectional positioning in the country and influencing their likelihood to be subject to SGBV and resort to negative coping mechanisms. This leaves some degree of uncertainty if the Syrian conflict eventually comes to an end, and the gender and intersectional positioning of refugees changes accordingly. Hence, findings are mainly valid in the current context and are somehow out of control of the researcher, depending on social, cultural, economic and political dynamics beyond the research. Yet, I believe in the added-value of the findings of the research as long as they are situated in time and place, as said before.

Limitations

Some limitations have been identified throughout the methodology selected, especially with regards to access to informants and time related hereto. Although my existing professional relation to the interviewees has had a positive impact on my positioning as a researcher too (Best 2003, p. 893), allowing me to easily reach out to the relevant interviewees, I still have some doubts on the reasons behind the (un)willingness of informants to participate in the research. In this regard, the fact that I am positioned in an institution that is currently funding many of the organisations that I have targeted for the interviews may have played an important role in getting their acceptance, which may have though been based on their reduced leeway to decline my proposal. Other concerns relate to how our professional relation also affected their leeway to disclose information, since maybe the wish to please a colleague or to help (moved by previous experience being in the same position) was stronger than giving visibility to any hindering factor to the process, including negative findings. Yet, the fact that they also know that I am already working on such topics has given me a very important legitimacy to ensure the validity of the findings and the leeway for acceptance of the final recommendations formulated, promoting the creation of a confessional rapport between us (Letherby 2003, p. 82). Nonetheless, it is important to think that I would have
faced major challenges in conducting a big-scale qualitative research and accessing actors accordingly, since the number of actors I could think of interviewing is limited and interviewing unknown professionals would have had an impact on the thesis as a whole, especially with regards to access, time and disclosure of information.

Time was also a constraint given the identification, access, selection and analysis of material that was required until the information was processed and included in this Master’s thesis, given especially the qualitative approach chosen. As such, time constraints were especially identified in the analysis. This relates to the review of literature, at a first stage, and the interviews, at a second stage, which included long hours of verbatim translation to be able to capture core messages and literal statements made by informants, paving the way to the thematic analysis conducted. The challenges posed by time constraints also had an impact on the planning and actual conduction of the individual interviews, which was put at stake by key informants’ unavailability or eventual unwillingness to participate in the research.

The attempt to contextualize the research has some backlashes too. Although with this piece of research I opted for going deeper into the specificities of the context in Lebanon and providing readers with specific and tailored findings, it is worth highlighting that the focus of the research risks of making difficult to generalize findings (Aull Davies 2002, p. 86; Descombe 2010, p. 181), especially given the process of interpretation involved in all qualitative analysis (Aull Davis 2002, p. 90). This is due, first, to the limited scope of this research in terms of number of key informants selected, which may articulate the findings as per the personal experience of interviewees (ibid). Secondly, findings may only be adequate for the current context in Lebanon, which limits their use to guide programmes somewhere else. For example, the shift in gender roles produced in the Syria crisis, which is one of the triggering factors to the emergence of SGBV, would have found limited application in other settings. The same applies for the linkages with manhood or harmful attitudes towards homosexuality, which may have been less highlighted in other parts of the world. As such, limitations are to be found while generalizing such findings, making necessary a re-contextualisation of the men’s lens to other settings of potential application.
Resistances to the new approach

The process itself has encountered resistances, especially, among colleagues with limited knowledge of SGBV, not really involved as key informants throughout the research, but rather consulted informally about it. In this regard, I build on Holmer-Nadesan’s definition of resistance as the “capacities to draw upon alternative discourses that subvert the privileged position of the dominant system of social identities and values” (1996, p. 57, cited in Swan and Fox 2010, p. 575). Applying such definition to this Master’s thesis, the main resistances showed some reluctance in doing things differently (adopting a new approach), as if things were done correctly and there were no gaps solid enough to justify this change. The dominant system seemed to be preferred, for which a justification such as the one included in this Master’s thesis gained even more relevance.

Furthermore, the research has been conceived to inform SGBV programmes and eventually induce a change in mentalities and behaviours, which entails, among other, “the challenges of planning gender-related change, efforts oriented to incremental change, resistance to gender equality, the issue of intersectionality, and the need for voice” (Benschop and Verloo 2011, p. 278). These resistances have an impact at the working level or by refugees themselves. Regarding the former, some colleagues to which I told about my research topic (not the ones targeted for the interviews) expressed the fear of potential changes in organisational beliefs, visions and practices (Benschop and Van den Brink 2014). The latter is rooted in traditional positionings among male refugees, as relevant literature in Lebanon shows that Syrian refugees adopt rather traditional positions towards the promotion of gender equality and the reconfiguration of gender norms (El Feki, Heilman and Barker 2017, p. 153), compared to their Lebanese counterparts.

Proposing to include men while working on gender-related issues (and especially SGBV) seemed surprising while mentioned to professionals in the humanitarian field, at first, and challenging subsequently. First, the fact that the majority of survivors are women and girls has reduced the leeway for action given current restrictions in budget. I have felt that working on and with men is still perceived to a greater extent as a field compromising the financial and human resources available to work on VAWG (Olivius 2016, p. 57). I could definitely see an alteration on the habitus of colleagues working in humanitarian organisations, this is, inducing a change both at the
structure and at the mind level (Bourdieu 1977, cited in Tatli and Özbilgin 2009). Hence, the integration of a men’s lens seems to be determined by how much men “deserved” to be included as a greater component of the work on SGBV (Jost and Kay 2010). The reaction observed may have been motivated by the extent to which the introduction of a new approach affects their relationship with their own organisation (Kulik and Li 2015) and to what extent they understand my research as “micro-ruptures to performativity” (Jerne 2016).

Yet, colleagues specialized in the sector (including the ones targeted for the interviews) have considered necessary and relevant the exploration of a new approach. Within my own organisation, no resistances have been identified, saving me from passing as a tempered radical (Meyerson and Scully 1995), working for an organisation whose approach to SGBV I would be “suspiciously” seeking to progressively broaden up and hence transform from within.
IX. CONCLUSION

My Master’s thesis explores the introduction of an enhanced *men-inclusive* approach (called the *men’s lens*) in current SGBV programmes targeting Syrian refugee men and boys in Lebanon, aiming at inform a new way of doing programmes. With this aim, and with no intention of undermining the much needed SGBV interventions on women and girls, I explore the introduction of a new approach by problematizing how the traditional approaches to SGBV programmes leave part of the phenomenon uncovered in both SGBV prevention and response, especially with regards to men and boys, and how programmes can be enlarged through the consistent and systematic inclusion of men and boys in SGBV programmes.

This relates especially to the fact that men and boys are usually only engaged as potential perpetrators in the fight against violence against women and girls, being placed back in their own involvement of gender-related issues. As a result, programmes overlook major components of SGBV prevention, such as the involvement of men and boys in deconstructing and understanding masculinities and manhood, which has been shown to have a direct link in the emergence of SGBV. Regarding SGBV response, men and boys survivors are usually not included in programmes, especially since services across sectors are not tailored to the needs of this group of concern, and there are significant weaknesses in capacities and information on how to deal with male survivors.

Many decisions have been taken throughout the process in order to meet my expected aim. In this regard, I have built my research on a two-fold approach: on the one hand, I have conducted a theoretical analysis building on available literature, making efforts to contextualize theory to the reality of Syrian refugees in Lebanon. This has been key in identifying *silos*, inconsistencies and gaps, and has led me to the formulation of the approach proposed: the *men’s lens*. Such new approach is framed within the prevention and response logic in SGBV programmes, and provides an added-value by building on the inter-relations between masculinities and intersectionality. Although with limitations, I have explained *why* and *how* the decision for such *men’s lens* has been made throughout the process. On the other one, I have intendedly introduced a second method on interviewing humanitarian staff, in order to have a qualitative approach to professionals’ accounts on exploring the feasibility and relevance of the approach, and how to materialize it.
Building on the above, and within the framework of the shift in gender roles produced in the current displacement setting in Lebanon, I have focused the men’s lens on a theoretical analysis on existing knowledge about how refugee men’s lack of adjustment to the role as providers produces an emasculating effect rooted in manhood and masculinities that leads to a decrease in social positioning, and reverts into an increase on SGBV. Such masculinities dimension relates also to those male refugees with diverse sexual orientation and gender identity, whose lack of acceptance and impossibility to report increase their exposure to violence and abuse, having also a decrease in their social positioning while increasing their vulnerability to be subject to violence.

Given the additional layer that the refugee status constitutes in terms of access to national protection systems for Syrian refugees, I have chosen to problematize too how the social positioning of the individual can have an impact on both his conception of masculinity and manhood, and the subsequent emergence of violence. This is illustrated, for example, by refugee men and boys who need to accept giving sexual favours to cope with their economic problems, which causes important traumas as per the clash with the prevailing social notion of manhood and masculinities. In many occasions, this is also translated into new forms of violence, perpetrated against women, men, and children. Hence, I have explored through this enhanced men-inclusive approach the relevance of complementing programmes with an intersectional perspective, translated into additional services aiming at mitigating the harm on their social status.

In addition to this, and in order to obtain primary data on actual accounts, I have conducted an empirical analysis building on individual interviews to targeted humanitarian actors working on SGBV programmes in Lebanon. Through this second method, I have explored the relevance and feasibility of the men’s lens, together with what the best strategies to materialize it and translating into programmes are. A qualitative approach has been adopted to unpack the different datasets of information obtained, prioritizing thematic analysis.

With regards to my research question “how can masculinities and intersectionality of Syrian refugee men and boys inform SGBV programming and have a positive impact on SGBV prevention and response in the current humanitarian setting in Lebanon?”, the conclusions of the
research show that adopting a men’s lens (this is, a men-inclusive approach) is not only feasible, but also relevant given the gaps identified in current programming. This relates especially to need to adopt a consistent and systematic approach in involving men and boys in SGBV programmes.

This encompasses, among others, elements such as the limited awareness raising on men and boys and their relation to masculinities and SGBV as both perpetrators and survivors; the lack of capacities in the sector, especially among case workers and health professionals, which hinders the provision of services tailored to the needs of men and boys; the challenges of changing harmful attitudes towards men and boys survivors, especially those who are GBTI; the promotion of community mobilization on the topic to ensure safe identification and referral of men and boys at risk; the need to tackle stigma around the experience of SGBV among males and the establishment of relevant reporting mechanisms; the reform needed among governmental instances to have more inclusive SGBV policies and tools, overcoming limiting definitions of rape (as only perpetrated against women) and decriminalizing same-sex practices to enable safe reporting of cases; and increase advocacy with donors to have relevant funding for this topic. Finally, the research tackles the need to promote joined advocacy efforts in favour of the legalization of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, which would ensure formal labour and a reduction in their exposure to SGBV.

Building on the findings of the research, I express the hope that this serves as a practical tool that can effectively inform programmes in the sector. With that aim, and building on the interviews contacted, I have additionally provided a set of recommendations in Annex I to guide the implementation of the men’s lens.

Worth highlighting is that the analysis provided in this Master’s thesis fits the overall role of research, especially by producing knowledge and contributing to a community of experts, which in the case in point, brings academia and the humanitarian sector together. It is in my responsibility as researcher that I have built the analysis on reliable and valid secondary data, and complemented with strategic primary sources, aiming at going deeper into its own rationale.

In this line, my Master’s thesis makes a relevant contribution to Gender and Intersectionality studies by building bridges between academia and the humanitarian realm, focusing on SGBV, men and programmes in a very specific setting. The added-value of my Master’s thesis is precisely
how I explore a change in approach by intertwining two dimensions that are overlooked in prevailing approaches to SGBV, namely, masculinities and intersectionality. In addition, such approach is built and conceived from a men’s lens, this is, breaking the secondary role given to men and boys in SGBV programmes and giving them their own voice. This is especially relevant since men have a key role in combating SGBV from the root of their participation in gender relations in society. My contribution to academia and the humanitarian field is also reinforced by the fact that the research is contextualised to the reality in Lebanon, coping with a major gap in literature as per the specific research object selected and providing a practical tool that can be easily disseminated and articulated into programmatic processes.

Yet, some limitations have determined the fate of this research, including my personal needs for further knowledge. Even if I have felt comfortable researching on the object of this thesis, there are definitely many cultural, historical and legal factors related to Lebanon that I may have missed. This applies also to the methodology and theoretical approach, since I have made use of techniques and material that I was aware of (leaving for sure many other useful resources aside given lack of knowledge). On a positive note, the main limitations identified regarding the generalization of data to other settings or times open though the door for further research to expand some of the main aspects highlighted throughout the research. For instance, the men’s lens could incorporate different components as explained in the discussion section, tailoring to the context that the research in point aims at analyzing, as proven by the myriad of possibilities at disposal.

Likewise, this Master’s thesis can be expanded, for instance, through research focusing on the intrinsic aspects of case management services for men and boys survivors in SGBV response, together with access to services and quality of services received, especially if these are provided in complementarity with additional strategies, such as cash, shelter or livelihoods, as addressed in the empirical analysis. Other research would be relevant to inform eventual specific awareness raising and capacity-building programmes on SGBV and its relation to men and boys, or to undertake an analysis of the legal barriers underpinning the exclusion of men and boys from SGBV national strategies and tools. Advocacy tools and exit strategies for survivors should also be explored, in order to explore the most suitable ways to ensure sustainability of outcomes, as highlighted by participants. A more in-depth research on the men’s lens could also be explored,
for example, in a PhD dissertation, in order to assess what resources and capacities are exactly needed to ensure its effective materialization. Such further research could address too, for instance, the tensions produced while applying a homogenous critical masculinities framework to the myriad of sexual orientations and gender identities.

Finally, the findings of my research lay the ground for the materialization of the enhanced men-inclusive approach explored. This is a step towards a greater inclusion in one particular direction; yet, the analysis conducted and the decisions made throughout the process show that there are many directions that can be taken in promoting inclusive approaches in programmes. This particular piece of research is expected to be used as a guidance for the design and implementation of programmes, motivating internal discussions within organisations. By doing so, it is my hope to contribute to tackling the challenges and specificities of the intertwinement between the gender and social positioning of Syrian men and boys in Lebanon, marking a turning point in how the reflection on men’s involvement in SGBV prevention and response programmes is done. This would consolidate the idea of a multi-dimensional conception of Syrian men in Lebanon - sometimes as perpetrators, sometimes as survivors and sometimes as none, but always conditioned by a new and determining identity category: their status as refugees.
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XI. ANNEXES

Annex I: Recommendations for the implementation of the men’s lens in SGBV programmes

Building on the research process and interviews conducted, and aiming at building up bridges between the academic and the humanitarian realm, a set of multi-level recommendations are provided below. They are clustered in three levels: at the community level, at the service providers’ level, and at the duty bearers’ level. This makes them be ready to be explored and implemented, while adapted to the specificities of the displacement setting in Lebanon. The recommendations are as follows:

At the community level

- Promote **prevention activities** within the community, with a focus on engaging men and boys, but also women and girls, in understanding masculinities and men’s own gender role and positioning. This includes the links to SGBV and the necessary deconstruction of stigma and taboo for male survivors;
- Ensure **participatory approaches** in the design and implementation of programmes, involving the local population at all stages;
- **Connect men and boys to services by enhancing understanding on SGBV and men within community mobilizers**, with a focus on Outreach Volunteers, on the need to safely identify and refer men and boys survivors of SGBV, and to work with those who are perpetrating violence in changing mentalities;
- Engage **religious and community leaders** in conducting awareness initiatives within the community, given their influence on community members’ attitudes and behaviours;
- Prioritize the **work with schools** to tackle SGBV against and among children since childhood, which would include awareness raising of students and capacity-building of teachers and school directors on the topic;
- Implement **social behavioural programmes** aiming at challenging current gender roles, involving especially role models of the community to promote change in mentalities among both men and women from the community;
At the level of service providers

- Ensure that **services are accessible** to men and boys, and tailor them to the needs of this group following a needs assessment. This relates, among others, to the need to strengthen capacities on CMR for males;
- Enhance **communication on services available** to men and boys, in order to make them know that they can rely on a comprehensive support network;
- Enlarge **awareness raising sessions among service providers on violence against men and boys, with a focus on LGBTI persons**, to deconstruct prevailing harmful attitudes towards this group of concern;
- Prioritize **capacity-building** on working with men and boys both as perpetrators and survivors of SGBV and SOGIE/LGBTI issues, with a special focus of case management organisations and service providers, including peer-to-peer learning;
- Ensure **SGBV and men-specific budget in projects across sectors**, with a focus on education, health, livelihoods, shelter and water, sanitation and hygiene;
- Ensure that **men and boys** are included within the **target** of SGBV programmes;
- Design and implement **programmes working directly with men perpetrators of SGBV**, focusing on the need to rehabilitate and reintegrate society;
- Ensure a **holistic and consistent approach** in service provision, having the individual and his recovery at the centre to ensure that **self-trust and confidence** is rebuilt;
- Promote deeper analysis on the **minimum standards to ensure proper case management of male survivors**, in order to ensure a timely and quality response;
- Create **platforms for exchange of best practices and lessons learned** among SGBV case workers and organisations dealing with men and boys, in order to promote **harmonization of approaches and knowledge sharing**;
- Create and disseminate **consistent and broad referral pathways** for men and boys survivors of SGBV;
- **Give visibility to men and boys survivors** of SGBV and the need to work with them by producing visual awareness materials and conduct awareness raising campaigns accordingly;
At the level of duty bearers and governments

- **Enhance understanding** on the different types of SGBV at the central level, with the aim of informing and **enlarging the scope of the current legal mechanisms** in place to report cases. This includes:
  - **Advocate for the legalization of refugees in Lebanon**, which would allow them to move freely, work officially, and subsequently be less exposed to different forms of violence and abuse;
  - Promote structural reforms within the Lebanese Ministry of Justice regarding current legislation related to Sexual and Gender-based violence in favour of the inclusion of men and boys survivors. This relates to including men and boys in current SGBV policies\(^6\), and establishing a **more comprehensive definition of rape**, to include men and boys as potential survivors, acts such as same-sex violence within the notion of intimate-partner violence in order to enable men to report cases (currently inexistent);
  - Promote the **formulation of a national law on sexual harassment at the workplace**, in order to establish relevant reporting mechanisms against employers;
  - Enhance advocacy vis-à-vis the **decriminalization of same-sex practices** in Lebanon, especially through the abolishment of Article 534 of the Penal Code criminalizing “sexual practices against nature”, which would reduce fears of being charged if men survivors are willing to report;

- **Advocate** vis-à-vis the Lebanese Ministry of Education to **include modules on gender, masculinities, LGBTI/SOGIE and SGBV in the national curriculum**, especially within the widespread subject on civic education;

- **Raise awareness among bilateral donors** on the need to work with men, masculinities, SOGIE and SGBV, in order to secure funding for projects on these topics;

---

\(^6\) Current SGBV legislation and policies relate to Law 293 on family violence (where men are not captured as survivors) and the National Plan to Safeguard Children and Women in Lebanon (adopted by the Ministry of Social Affairs, currently under review).
- Conduct further research on the topic, involving national bodies in the **production of statistics and data (including baseline studies)** on men’s involvement on SGBV;
- Create **platforms for knowledge sharing among high-level instances** from different countries and operations, in order to break the silos and achieve more consistent interventions;
- Ensure the permanent **inclusion of men and boys** in the work plan and activities of relevant Inter-Agency **SGBV Task-Forces** or Working Groups in Lebanon, including their advocacy vis-à-vis the Government;
- **Involve religious leaders** in the formulation of comprehensive and inclusive national tools on SGBV, in favour of fostering reforms while ensuring social cohesion in the country.
Annex II: Set of questions to guide interviews

The set of questions used for the interviews conducted throughout this research project is as follows:

- What is the main component of SGBV intervention in your organisation? What is the main target group? How does this fit with your understanding of SGBV?

- As per your knowledge of the SGBV sector in Lebanon, in which ways do you think SGBV programmes are *men-inclusive*?
  - 1 – Not inclusive
  - 2 – Partially inclusive
  - 3 - Moderately inclusive
  - 4 - Highly inclusive

- Does your organisation have any SGBV-related policies, strategies or tools explicitly including men in their interventions? Which one?

- How do SGBV programmes address Syrian men as perpetrators or as survivors?

- How would you define the need in the sector to enhance the work with men in SGBV programmes?

- What is the rationale behind it? Do you think the current approach should be changed, and why?

- Building on your answer above, what would you highlight as positive in the current approach of SGBV programmes with regards to men? And what would you highlight as a gap?

- How does your organisation conduct prevention activities to engage Syrian refugee men and boys? If so, to what extent:

  - What are these activities (specify types)?

  - Do these prevention activities explore men’s gender as such (do they have a component on masculinities, SOGIE and self-positioning)?
    - Yes
    - No
      - What are their main components and objectives?

- Does your organisation provide services to Syrian male SGBV survivors?
  - If yes:
    - Do you think the staff of your organisation has the relevant capacities?
    - Has the staff received capacity-building in this regard? With what focus?
- Are you aware of relevant referral pathways for men and boys survivors?
  - If no, what is the reason?
    - The focus is on women and girls survivors;
    - Reduced funding and hence, not a priority;
    - Lack of evidence or awareness of the problem;
    - Sociocultural barriers;
    - Others (specify)

- Building on your answer above, do you think the approach of your Organisation connects the role of men throughout the different stages of interventions? (explain)

- What is the proportion of male staff working in SGBV programmes in your organisation?

- If relevant, what would you suggest as a strategy to ensure that men are effectively included in programmes?

- Do you collect demographic data of your beneficiaries? If so, what identity categories do you capture (sex, age, nationality, sexual orientation, social class, marital status, job situation, family setting…)

- Given the shift in gender roles and decrease in social status experienced by Syrian refugees in Lebanon’s displacement setting, what mitigation measures are put in place to reduce men and boys’ exposure to SGBV?

- Regarding the intersectional positioning of Syrian refugee men (social, cultural, economic dimensions), what additional components and services for our SGBV prevention and response interventions would you find relevant? (select one or more and explain)
  - Cash assistance;
  - Shelter for men and boys survivors;
  - Enhanced prevention activities (in terms of inclusion of different identity categories);
  - Enhanced capacity of staff (case workers, legal / health professionals) and stronger provision of services;
  - Livelihood opportunities (job placement if possible)
  - Stronger access to community structures (emotional / psychosocial groups, life-skills)
  - Major advocacy efforts, with a focus on legal reform (with regards to granting legal residency or remove constraints for employment);

- In terms of impact, how would a deeper focus on masculinities in SGBV programmes would contribute to their efficiency?

- And what is the added-value of the inclusion of additional strategies and how would they strengthen our current programmes on SGBV with relations to Syrian refugee men?

- What obstacles do you find for this to eventually become effective?
- At the personal level (not organisational), what are the struggles you face in promoting a more inclusive work on SGBV with men and boys?

- What would you recommend to strengthen a men-inclusive approach to SGBV programmes? (multi-level)
Annex III: Informed Consent form

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Title of study: Unpacking critical masculinities and intersectionality to inform Sexual and Gender-Based Violence programming – Envisioning an enhanced *men-inclusive* approach (the *men’s lens*) through humanitarian actors in the current Syrian refugee crisis in Lebanon

Investigator: Pedro Muñoz Alonso

Introduction

- You are being asked to be in a research study of critical masculinities, intersectionality and SGBV in the Syrian refugee crisis in Lebanon.
- You were selected as a possible participant because of your current involvement in the SGBV sector in Lebanon and professional experience in SGBV humanitarian programmes.
- I ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Purpose of Study

- The purpose of the study is to assess how critical masculinities and intersectionality can inform SGBV programmes and enhance their positive outcome on prevention and response.
- This research is conducted within the framework of the Master’s Programme in Gender Studies, Intersectionality and Change at Linköpings University. The content of the interview will be used to inform my Master’s thesis.

Description of the Study Procedures

- Information will be collected through a semi-structured individual interview. The expected duration of the interview is one hour. It will be conducted in a neutral space, for key informants to not be linked to their professional position. The interview will be digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in this Study

- The participation in the study entails no risks. The researcher has taken ethical considerations to not disclose names of key informants or organizations, seeking to avoid any type of harm to persons involved.
Confidentiality

- The material acquired through this study is treated confidentially. None of the material will be presented in ways that can identify you as an informant. Quotes used in the Master’s thesis will be anonymized.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw

- The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you.
- You may refuse to take part in the study at any time without affecting your relationship with the investigator of this study.
- You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process.
- You have the right to request that the interviewer not use any of your interview material.

Right to Ask Questions and Report Concerns

- You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact me at pmunozalonso@gmail.com.

Consent

- You are informed on the purpose of this research and provide consent orally based on the information above. You accept that such informed consent is recorded at the beginning of the interview.
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