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ABSTRACT

Self-help group is a voluntary and self-managed group of people, belonging to similar socio-economic characteristics, who come together to address a felt need amongst themselves. The self-help group (SHG) approach is a model into the field of development whose objectives are to increase the well-being of the poor people, provide access to resources and credit, increase self-confidence, self-esteem and increase their creditability in all aspects of lives. The purpose of this study therefore was to investigate the factors influencing participation of men in anti-poverty SHGs in Dagoretti District of Nairobi County. The main research questions explored the extent to which patriarchy system, masculinity, socio-culture and gender stereotyping influences participation of men in SHGs. The research study adopted mixed research design which combines elements of qualitative and quantitative approaches to provide breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration of information. The data collection instruments included questionnaires, interviews and Focused Group Discussions. The target population was men in Dagoretti District and to some extent institutions that work with SHGs in Dagoretti District. Study findings indicated Patriarchy system, Masculinity, Socio-culture and Gender stereotyping have a significant influence on participation of men in anti-poverty SHGs. Patriarchy indicators such as Key leadership in SHGs, gender preference in leadership, dread of women domination as well as decision making patterns in SHGs were found to have an influence on subscription of men in SHGs. Self-sufficiency, femininity and vulnerability avoidance, overconfidence and hate of women domination indicated masculinity influences. Belief such as help seeking is womanly, SHGs are not cultural for men and societal expectations of men in regarding to seeking were also found to have an influence on participation of men in SHGs. Stereotypes such as perception on which gender fits better in an SHG, women are more natural members of SHGs, SHGs are women oriented, stereotypes in policies of institutions working with SHGs and stereotypes related to low participation of men and complexity of working with women were found to also contribute to the participation of men in SHGs. Socio-culture and Gender stereotyping influences rated highest at 73% and 71.4% respectively with patriarchy system and masculinity influences at 67% and 59%. The researcher recommended awareness creation on benefits of SHGs, changing stereotypes and ancient perceptions regarding SHGs, evaluation of policies and practices of government and institutions to ensure equitable development for all and investing more in education and capacity building for the society to challenge traditional views of masculinity and cultural expectations of men. The study concludes that for men, especially poor man to be encouraged to participate in SHGs that would uplift their economic standards, there is need to address the dominant patriarchy system, help men define what it is to be masculine in a way that favours them, redefine socio-cultural arena and work towards changing stereotypes that cause men to shun SHGs. Further studies should focus on perspectives of women on factors influencing participation of men in SHGs and exploration of models of SHGs that men would be attracted to.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Sub-Saharan Africa is not only poor, but also the region with the highest share of its population living in chronic poverty. Estimates indicate that half of the Chronically Deprived Countries in the world are found in Africa, with about one-quarter of the world’s chronically poor living in Sub-Saharan Africa (Chronic Poverty Research Centre, 2009).

Just as it is in other developing countries, poverty is a problem that continues to challenge every development effort in Kenya. It is a challenge for all sectors in the country mainly because of the fact that it seeps into all other development problems such as health care, food security, education, HIV and AIDS. Poverty takes most of the national resources becoming a root cause of all the other problems observed in the country.

Poverty is a multidimensional social phenomenon that can be analytically divided into two main dimensions: income poverty, which is the lack of income necessary to satisfy basic needs; and human poverty which is the lack of human capabilities for example poor life expectancy, poor maternal health, illiteracy, poor nutritional levels, poor access to safe drinking water and perceptions of well-being (UNDP, 2003).

Poverty in Kenya is caused by factors such as high degree of inequality of income and production resources, inequality in the access to economic and social goods and services and in the participation in social and political process. Other causal factors include lack of education, lack of job opportunities, unfavourable climatic conditions, large family sizes, poor government planning and interventions, lack of good governance and weak democratic institutions and practices. Mismanagement of the anti-poverty programmes and projects and corruption are also cited in literature as important determinants of poverty (Kulundu, Mwangi, & Mwabu, 2000).

In its early years of independence, Kenya was the most prosperous country in East Africa, its GDP per capita rising by 38 per cent between 1960 and 1980. The following two decades to 2000, however, it recorded a zero increase in per capita GDP, and per capita income in 2003, at US$360, was lower than in 1990. Poverty incidence rose from 49 per cent in 1990 to 56 per cent in 2005 (GoK, 2005).
The Kenya’s poor constitute more than half of the total population. Kenya’s inter-censua population growth rate declined from 3.9% per annum during 1969-79 to 2.5% during 1989-2000. The country’s population is characterized by high mortality rates, low and declining life expectancy, increasing fertility rates (from 4.7 children per woman in 1995-1998 to 4.8 in 2000-2003), high infant mortality and death rates, and declining population growth rates which could be attributed to the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The population in absolute poverty was estimated at 56% in 2000. (Ministry of Planning and National Development, 2005)

It is therefore apparent that to achieve sustainable poverty alleviation and development there is need for holistic and all inclusive approaches to dealing with the concerns of the poor in Kenya. Restoration of adequate economic growth and improvement of people’s welfare is a primary objective of the Kenyan government. The commitment of Kenya Government to eradicate poverty is apparent in its current development strategies, as demonstrated with the efforts towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, especially No. 1, on the eradication of poverty to less than 30% of the Kenyans by 2015 and the Kenya Vision 2030. Kenya’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) describes the country’s macroeconomic, structural, and social policies in support of growth and poverty reduction. The principles guiding the PRSP process in Kenya include giving a voice to the poor, Participation and ownership, Transparency, openness and accountability and equitable distribution of national resources and development initiatives

Kenya Vision 2030: First Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2008-2012 outlines the consensus on policies, reform measures, projects and programmes that the Kenyan Government is committed to implement during 2008-2012. This plan constitutes the first phase in the implementation of Kenya Vision 2030, whose aim is to transform the country into a modern, globally competitive, middle income country, offering a high quality of life for all citizens by the year 2030. One major leading projects that the government has prioritised for implementation is wealth creation to reduce income disparities; it is geared towards reducing inequality occasioned by lack of access and affordability of public services and to create income-earning opportunities across gender, social status and regions. A key strategy to attaining this goal is to target more wealth creating opportunities for disadvantaged groups and regions through increased infrastructure spending in the sub-sectors of roads, water, sewerage, communications, electricity targeting poor communities and regions; and availability of affordable and accessible credit and savings programmes.
The government in the last five years has disbursed funds to be accessed by vulnerable or disadvantaged groups; most of this affordable and accessible credit has been disbursed through self-help groups and hence SHG become of paramount importance to poverty alleviation. Some of the funds that groups have benefitted from are: The Ambassador’s Self-Help Fund (SSHF) from the US embassy in Kenya that provides small grants to registered self-help groups, youth groups, community based organizations, and specific types of educational institutions and medical facilities, Youth Enterprise Development Fund run by the state with a goal to reduce unemployment in Kenya, Women Enterprise Fund among others. An interesting phenomenon however is that men – even those at low income class who could be classified as poor and vulnerable, have not participated or been involved in these groups compared to women.

Questions about men are inevitable, because gender is a living system of social interactions, not a stack of watertight boxes. What affects the social position of women and girls must also affect the social position of men and boys. (Clark Lecture, 2000). Men constitute 48% of the Kenyan population (Census 1999) and although studies and documentation do not place men among the vulnerable compared to other groups such as women, children and the youth, they are an important part of the population that can challenge poverty eradication efforts. Their contribution is important as much as others for attainment of goals and targets set in the MTP and the MDG’s, in fact Kenya’s PRSP calls for involvement and participation of all.

For far too long, men have been secondary, even coincidental, subjects of analysis in gender-based studies. By and large they had been studied as contributors to or directly responsible for the challenges faced by women, or as the means to the well-being of women and children. Recent studies are gradually transforming the thesis and research methodology, with the result that men are being viewed as an important subject of analysis in their own right. (Gayle, 2004)

In the urban areas, the poverty prevalence is 30 per cent for male-headed households compared to 46.2 per cent for female-headed households (Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030, 2008). Though the poverty in female-headed households is higher we cannot disregard the poverty that is in male-headed households. These statistics show that men experience poverty, and although not at the same level with women, its poverty nevertheless. Mwabu, et al. (2000) using the cost of basic needs (CBN) and food energy intake (FEI) approaches in computing poverty rates for Kenya, found that
poverty rates were just marginally higher in female-headed households (41 per cent) than in male-headed households (38 per cent) where husband and wife live together (Mwabu, 2000)

The self-help group (SHG) approach is a model into the field of development whose objectives are to increase the well-being of the poor people, provide access to resources and credit, increase self-confidence, self-esteem and increase their creditability in all aspects of lives. Self-help group is a voluntary and self-managed group of people, belonging to similar socio-economic characteristics, who come together to address a felt need amongst themselves.

Whereas numerous studies demonstrate that investing in women has high returns at both the level of the individual enterprise as well as at the macro level in terms of poverty reduction and development there is a high possibility that lack of involvement of men can have disastrous effects in the future which could lead to loss of gains that would have been made in poverty alleviation and women empowerment. It is important that policies and external forces that impact on the lives of women and men differently are examined. This means acknowledging that policies, plans, programmes and projects need to take into account the differing needs and conditions of men as they do of other groups so that development is truly participatory.

For the removal of poverty, a direct anti-poverty structure is required to combat all those factors which tend to increase the forces of poverty in the both rural and urban areas. It is important to appreciate that the process of poverty alleviation can be more sustainable when all the members of the society are involved.

Dagoretti District is one the newly created districts of Nairobi County. The population of Dagoretti district as in the 2009 census was 329,577 people, 166,391 men and 163,186 females.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Savings and investment levels are targeted to increase at a high rate in order to support the high economic growth and employment creation envisaged under the Medium Term Plan. (Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030, 2008). This will not be achievable without a multi-participatory approach which includes men who comprise a massive 48% of Kenyans.

SHG have proven to be an instrument that can address some of the challenges regarding unemployment, poverty, inequity in gender and in a very big way the challenge of low
savings and investment rates. A lot of money aimed at empowering the poor is disbursed through SHG and also of importance is the amount of money that these groups are able to save and empowerment they offer to their members which can be a humongous stimulant to the economy and poverty alleviation.

Regardless of the sector they belong to or the types of self-help they represent – whether financial, agricultural or housing, self-help groups are powerful vehicles of social inclusion and economic empowerment of their members. It is recognised that self-help groups represent vital links to programme, both governmental and external development partnerships, which have also been established to support population and address poverty (Ireri, 2010). Yet, despite these glaring facts about the benefits of SHG statistics indicate that men’s participation in poverty alleviation self-help groups in Kenya is much lower compared to women.

A 2001 survey by the Special Unit on Microfinance of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (SUM/UNCDF) of 29 microfinance institutions revealed that approximately 60 per cent of these institutions’ clients were women. Six of the 29 focused entirely on women. Among the remaining 23 mixed-sex programs, 52 per cent of clients were women meaning that the average representation of men was at 41% (Deshpanda., 2001).

A study done by Mary Kay Gugerty and Michael Kremer in Kenya indicated that 80 per cent of members of SHG are women and with men taking up 20%. According to the Microcredit Summit Campaign Report, 70% of microfinance clients are women (Harris, 2003). USAID’s annual Microenterprise Results Report for 2000 indicated that approximately 70 per cent of USAID-supported Micro Finance Institutions’ clients are women.

According to the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development, out of 110 SHGs registered during April to June 2012 period, 7 were men only groups, 89 were mixed gender groups and 14 were women only groups. In the mixed groups 38% were men and 62% women.

The Study therefore sought to investigate the factors influencing participation of men in anti-poverty SHGs in Dagoretti District in Nairobi County.
1.3 Purpose of the study

This study was compelled by the fact that poverty alleviation has been a difficult pursuit for Kenya and Africa which means that choice and consequent successful implementation of poverty alleviation interventions must be influenced by implementation capabilities and awareness of what does and does not work.

This study therefore aimed at giving men a chance to tell their side of the story as to why they behave the way they do and hence make it possible for programme designers and other stakeholders to comprehend the dynamics that hinder men participation in financial poverty alleviation groups (and other SHG) and consequently unveil a different bearing of potential challenges of poverty alleviation and gender equality and equity.

The study further sought to contribute to understanding the silence and mystery that surround the subject and practices of men in the policy and development field as well as contribute to the on-going gender debate especially the aspect of harmonious co-existence between men and women.

Finally, the study aimed at contributing to the MTP’s flagship project -conducting a Comprehensive Study and Analysis of Poverty Reduction Initiatives- by provision of insight on how to plan poverty alleviation interventions that are all inclusive; specifically bringing men on board and consequently inform designing and implementation of poverty alleviation interventions and policies.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were to investigate;

1.4.1. How patriarchy influences participation of men in self-help groups in Dagoretti District
1.4.2. How masculinity influences participation of men in self-help groups in Dagoretti District
1.4.3. How socio-culture influences participation of men in self-help groups in Dagoretti District
1.4.4. How gender stereotyping influences participation of men participation in self-help groups in Dagoretti District
1.5 Research Questions

The research questions were; to what extent does:

1.5.1. Patriarchy system influence participation of men in SHGs in Dagoretti District?
1.5.2. Masculinity influence participation of men in SHGs in Dagoretti District?
1.5.3. Socio-culture influence participation of men in SHGs in Dagoretti District?
1.5.4. Gender stereotyping influence participation of men in SHG in Dagoretti District?

1.6 Significance of the study

Poverty has continued to challenge development specialists with various poverty alleviation and empowerment interventions and approaches proving to be unreliable and sometimes counterproductive from time to time. Courses on poverty studies, chronic poverty and other related courses have been introduced at various levels to try to understand poverty and come up with ingenious ways to assuage it corroborating how complex it has become. It is therefore vital that studies aimed at understanding various dynamics of poverty are done. This was one of such studies that aimed at contributing to understanding the underlying and sometimes non-obvious structural factors that cause or exacerbate poverty to inform poverty alleviation project designs.

The study of male participation/non-participation of men in SHG would inform project designers, development specialists and other stakeholders who are investing in SGH as an approach to wealth creation and empowerment – explain why men repulse SHG despite the values, including equality and equity, solidarity, social responsibility, and caring for others, upon which they are based and principles that they exemplify – voluntary and open membership, democratic member control, member economic participation, member education, and concern for the community which ideally should be attractive.

The very mandate of SHG places them in a unique position to ensure and promote gender equality and hence without having men on board who are key stakeholders in pursuit for gender equality and equity sustainable attainment of this objective will remain a mirage. It is important that conditions related to poverty as they relate to men are examined as well as analyse how policies and programming impact on the lives of men differently from women, children and the youth. This way it will be possible to acknowledge and design policies, plans, programmes and projects that take into account the differing needs and conditions of men that would encourage their participation in development leading to just sustainable poverty eradication.
1.7 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study focused on Dagoretti District in Nairobi County. Dagoretti District has an interesting feature of having an almost 50/50 population of men and women. The selection of this site was driven by the researcher’s interest in understanding the dynamics of poverty and development and one of the many interesting phenomena identified was lack of men participation in SHG despite the highly rising urban poverty. Dagoretti District therefore gave a context where this can be studied since the population of 50/50 men and women meant that both had a 50/50 chance of participation. The site was also selected because it is not extensively studied as compared to other areas in Nairobi.

The researcher attempted to find out what makes men affected by poverty in the District shun SHG which could be advantageous to them.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

Respondents may be hesitant to talk about the issues that keep them away from participating in SHGs and this may limit the researcher’s ability to accurately determine the reasons for low male participation in SHG. There is also a limitation of misdirected acuities about research. The researcher annulled this by guaranteeing them of confidentiality and also by showing that the research has a potential of benefiting them in the long-run.

The study location is very populous and the sample size will only incorporate small number of stakeholders due to time and resource constraints. The researcher ensured that sampling was done well to ensure that the population was well represented.

1.9 Assumptions of the study

The study was based on the assumption time was sufficient to conduct the research and that male involvement in SHGs has a positive impact towards poverty eradication.

The study also assumed that men would respond positively by giving information and that stakeholders in poverty eradication programs such as banks, MFI, NGO’s and the government would be receptive and willing to support the study.
1.10 Definition of key terms

**Poverty:** Lack of basic human needs, which commonly includes clean and fresh water, nutrition, health care, education, clothing and shelter

**Patriarchy:** A social system in which the male acts as the primary authority figure central to society, community or family

**Masculinity:** Possessing qualities or characteristics considered typical of or appropriate to a man

**Self-concept:** the image we have of who and what we are

**Gender:** Range of characteristics of femininity or masculinity

**Self-Help:** Self-guided improvement

**Chama:** Chama is a Kiswahili word for association or cooperative. It is a name commonly given to financial self-help groups in Kenya

1.11. Organisation of the Study

Chapter one which is principally the introduction to the study covers the following sections: background to the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, objectives and corresponding research questions, significance of the study, justification of the study, scope and delimitation of the study, limitations of the study, assumptions of the study and definition of key terms.

Chapter two titled literature review explores information on what has been done in relation to the topic by exploring further the research objectives and finally identifying the gap in knowledge that exists specifically in the local context. It covers introduction which includes urban poverty and men, Male participation in development and Self Help groups and poverty alleviation. It also looks into the independent variables identified which include patriarchy, masculinity, socio-culture and gender stereotyping.

Chapter three titled the research methodology comprises of: introduction, research design, target population, sampling procedure, methods of data collection, validity and reliability, operationalization of variables, methods of data analysis and a summary.
Chapter four titled data analysis, presentation and interpretations discusses the study findings based on the study objectives and research questions. Discussions are done in line with each of the study objectives. The chapter is mainly divided into background information and factors influencing participation of men in Dagoretti District.

Chapter five looks at the summary, discussion, conclusion and recommendations. Summary are drawn from the findings in chapter four and are presented based on the research objectives. Conclusion drawn from overall study findings from recommendation and areas of further studies were suggested thereafter.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction
This chapter discusses the theoretical framework of the study as well as presenting various literatures pertaining to male participation, poverty and development globally, in Africa and in Kenya. It also explicitly looks at variables and dynamics that influence male participation in development as well as other developmental related areas such as health.

The fundamental focus of the review is to identify various factors that influence male participation in development and specifically SHG. The review also explores likely consequences of men segregation in SHG and empowerment.

The presentation is guided by the aim of the study, objectives and research questions as outlined in Chapter 1.

2.2. Theoretical Framework
To understand men’s behaviour in regard to shunning participation in SHG the Symbolic Interaction Theory was used. Symbolic interaction theory analyses society by addressing the subjective meanings that people enforce on objects, events, and behaviours. Biased meanings are given ascendency because it is believed that people behave based on what they believe and not just on what is objectively factual. Accordingly, society is thought to be socially constructed through human construal. People interpret and give meaning to one another’s behaviour and these interpretations form the social bond dictating the behaviour of the society or community. For the purpose of this study, the basis of using this theory is that there are meanings that men have accorded to SHGs through their interactions with one another and with the society that could be biased and informed by the variables that have been identified thus; Patriarchy, masculinity, socio-cultural influences and gender stereotyping. This theory also fits within the study because all the four variables are socially constructed and are reinforced through human analysis.

Herbert Blumer (1900–1987), who instigated the symbolic interaction theory, stated that people do not respond directly to the world around them, but to the meaning they bring to it, Blumer observed that every time social interaction occurs, people creatively construct their
own understanding of it—whether “real” or not—and behave accordingly. Society, its institutions, and its social structure exist—that is, social reality is given—only through human interaction (Blumer, 1969). In this case therefore there is a meaning that men do not just shun SHGs but there is a meaning that they bring to it which makes them feel that they do not belong in them.

Herbert argued that the human society consists of people engaging in symbolic interaction; people become particularly human through their interaction with others and are conscious and self-reflective beings who actively shape their own behaviour. Reality is what members agree to be reality. And in the case of men participation, men will behave according to what the society refer to as manly and shun what is viewed as womanly. People interact according to how they perceive a situation.

Symbolic interactionists contend that concepts used to collectively categorize people in classes such as ethnicity and gender do not exist objectively but develop through a socially constructed process. Individuals are not born with a sense of self but develop self-concepts through social interaction. An interesting aspect of this theory is the argument that self-concept is shaped by the reactions of significant others and by our perceptions of their reactions. In the case of this study then it shows than there is a likelihood that men may be shunning SHG because of the reactions that they have had from others in regard to these groups and also the perceptions and importance they put on those reactions. This confirms that development or empowerment cannot happen in a vacuum; attitudes of other people can affect the group that you are trying to work with and this shows that there is a high possibility that the societal expectations of men and the stereotypes they put on SHG could be behind the low participation of men in SHG.

The Symbolic Interaction Theory maintains that self-concept, once developed, provides an important motive for behaviour and that to understand human behaviour we must understand how people define the things—objects, events, individuals, groups, structures—they encounter in their environment. In this case, this calls for understanding of the self-concept that men have and also what they view as a would be reaction of significant other who would in this case be their peers or the society in general if they participated in SHG. It is also paramount that we understand how men define the SHG to get to the root cause of their behaviour of non-participation.
Symbolic interaction theory takes into account that social interaction is a process governed by norms that are largely grounded on culture. Cultural norms offer general rules for role behaviour, however symbolic interactionists assert that people have freedom in the way they act out roles. The context of the interaction is usually a key determinant of role performance. This aspect of the Symbolic Interaction Theory then gives a foundation for exploring the underlying cultural norms and expectations that could be attributed to lack of male participation in SHG. This would to a large extent also inform lack of participation in other areas such as reproductive health and adult literacy where statistics are as disturbing as they are in SHG participation.

It therefore becomes apparent that we need to find out the symbolic value that men give to SHG through interaction with others and hence understand the low level of participation and also inform future design of empowerment projects targeting men.

2.3. Urban Poverty and Men

Between a third and half of Kenya’s urban population live in poverty. The urban population is 22% of total population with urbanization at 4.2% annual rate of change (2010-15 est.) (Central Intelligence Agency, 2010). The country is urbanising at such a speed that it is projected to be 50 per cent urban by 2020, and half of all Kenya’s poor will be living in urban areas (Oxfam, 2009). In this respect there can be no doubt that poverty itself is rapidly urbanising in Kenya. Moreover, the percentage of the urban population in the poorest categories of all (the ‘food poor1’ and ‘hardcore poor2’) is on the increase, and the gap between rich and poor is rapidly widening. While some urban dwellers have seen their position improve due to impressive levels of economic growth in recent years, poverty has been deepening for the majority of the urban poor who have become trapped in downward spirals of deprivation and vulnerability. (Oxfam, 2009)

Poverty in households headed by women differs from male headed households, but the difference between the two subgroups is not substantial. Poverty rates among polygamous households headed by men are as high as in polygamous households headed by women. Poverty rates are also high among the unskilled workers in both the private and public sector.

Men in poverty are clearly excluded from participating equally in decision-making at international and national levels, and this has a profound impact on how they live now and their chances of escaping poverty in the future (Sweetman, ND).
In recent years the concept of poverty has broadened to encompass multiple dimensions ranging from empowerment, voice and inclusion to accountability of institutions and lack of security. Gender however has stubbornly remained a one-sided topic group. Men are seen as the guilty party, lurking ominously in the background. Little effort has been devote to understanding men’s possible motivations let alone their own gendered conditions (Bannon & Correia, 2006).

Amuyunzu –Nyamongo and Francis (2006) in a World Bank publication have defined empowerment as a social action that promotes the participation of people, organisations and communities in gaining control over their lives. They also noted that Kenyan men have experienced the reverse of empowerment in the last two decades. Disempowerment is understood as a process that has decreased their abilities to overcome barriers to self-actualisation (Bannon & Correia, 2006).

Given that many women already interact with men on a daily basis in their households and public lives, involving men can make interventions more relevant and workable (Chant & Guttman, 2000). Male inclusion increases men’s responsibility for change.

2.4. Male Participation in development

A presentation by Lang (2003) during a gender equality expert group meeting brought out an interesting dynamic into the male participation debate. He articulated areas in which men’s involvement may be ratified- working with men as decision makers and service providers; integrating men into the development process with a ‘gendered lens’; and targeting groups of men and boys when and where they are vulnerable (for example in relation to issues of poverty or sexuality). Men have been targeted mostly as decision makers and service providers ignoring the vulnerable aspect.

Flood (2004) in his article in the Development Bulletin, questions whether men should be included in programming and policy related to gender. He further questions how male inclusion can be made most beneficial. It therefore becomes clear that the question of male involvement is slowly creeping into the agenda in gender and development work, as it is in such fields as sexual and reproductive health but again there lacks clarity on how best to fit it in.
2.5. Self Help groups and Poverty Alleviation

Self Help groups approach is well studied with most literature advocating for community organisations and arguing that SHG’s are a good approach for poverty alleviation and have to a great extent proven that they play an important part in empowerment (especially of women). Community organisations are valued for their potential contribution to the development of social capital and a vibrant civil society. Moreover, indigenous organizations of the poor and disadvantaged are often seen as a form of collective action that promotes justice and equality (Edwards, 2000).

However it is noted that despite the fact that SHG are valued for their potential contribution to development, the focus of the government and development agencies on women and girls and the empowerment and emancipation of women and affirmative action have largely side-lined men (Bannon & Correia, 2006) just by the way development is designed and organised.

The history of SHG can to some extent explain the modern organisation of SHG. In Victorian Europe, the need for self-help group formation was generated by failing social structures especially in the area of health, which led to increased poverty, disease and death among the vulnerable population. Groups were then formed to deal with the health crisis.

In America the foundation of modern self-help was laid in the nineteenth century. The motivation for forming these groups was immigration to the New World where people were thrust into a strange environment without services to support them. They hence formed groups to help them survive. The main activity of these groups was social services such as burial and funeral rites as well as borrowing and lending money.

In Asia, the Gandhian philosophy of self-reliance provided a background for the development of self-help groups in India. The primary emphasis of these groups was poverty alleviation which then developed into full-grown economically oriented co-operatives with clear schemes of saving and credit provision which specifically targeted women. It is estimated that in the 1990s around 85 per cent of the groups in India were women.

In Kenya, the self-help group concept began in rural area as a women’s initiative for availing ready cash for emergencies as well as support for occasions such as weddings and funerals. The self-help group concept started out in the rural areas primarily as a women’s initiative with the specific aim of social and economic empowerment. Membership of these groups was generally based on residential proximity or family relatedness. Later models have based their
membership also on economic or developmental activities. The initial self-help groups were women’s groups whose main activity was saving and lending money - the popularly-called ‘merry-go-round’. Older groups, which are more cohesive, tend to move on to development activities such as the purchase of household utensils, items of clothing (khangas and sweaters), iron roofing sheets and water tanks, as well as the construction of latrines and bathrooms. Other than these activities, the self-help group provides the single most important forum for education among women at the grass roots. This is due to its social organisation and cohesion, important considerations for peer influence and healthy competition among members (Mutugi, 2006).

The approach of Self-help Groups (SHGs) towards poverty alleviation is that it should be self-help. The logic is that individual effort is too inadequate to improve their fate. This brings about the necessity for organizing in a group by which they get the benefit of collective perception, collective decision making and collective implementation of programmes for common benefit (Karmakar, 1999). These groups participate in agriculture and other income-generating projects, such as fish farming, beekeeping, or handicraft production. Most groups also engage in financial activities and labour exchange. In particular, most groups provide insurance in the form of emergency assistance to members in the face of adverse financial shocks. In the case of illness or death, groups often take up collections and visit members’ homes to provide extra labour. Most of the groups also run rotating savings and credit associations, known in Kenya as merry-go-rounds (Kremer, 2002). Historically, SHG membership in Kenya and all over Africa has been predominantly women with their roots in a long tradition of community self-help groups, such as funeral and rotating labour clubs.

Chant & Guttman (2000) have however brought out another dimension to the whole debate of participation showing the need for involving men in activities meant to empower women. Leaving men out of efforts towards gender equality can provoke male hostility and retaliation, arising out of both exclusion and more general anxieties among men, as some development projects have found. Focusing only on women, in relation to such issues as economic participation, credit, or sexual and reproductive health for example, can leave women with yet more work to do and thus intensify gender inequalities. Women-only projects can mean that women still have to deal with unsympathetic men and patriarchal power relations, and can leave women with sole responsibility for sexual health, family nutrition, and so on (Chant & Guttman, 2000). Men may also feel that as men they have been seen as ‘all the same’, and may resent approaches that are tactless or overly negative. Overall, as Chant and Guttman
conclude (2000:23) including men will be critical to the successful creation of gender equality.

2.6. **Review of literature according to the study variables**

2.6.1. **Patriarchy and Men**

The Encyclopaedia of Sex and Gender defines patriarchy as “an old general term for the disproportionate holding of power and authority by males. Patriarchy is a set of social relationships which provide for the collective domination of men over women. Fundamentally, patriarchy is “the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general”. Traditionally, even though production systems were underpinned by women’s productive and domestic labour, as in cash crop production, male dominance was secured through patriarchal land tenure systems and customary norms controlling the disposal of cash income (Paul & etal, 2005).

According to sociologist Allan Johnson, “A society is patriarchal to the degree that it promotes male privilege by being male dominated, male identified, and male centred. It is also organized around an obsession with control (Johnson, 2005).

Patriarchy is a multidimensional condition of power and status. Whyte (1978) study examined indicators of patriarchy which include lack of property control by women, lack of power of women in kinship contexts, low value placed on the lives of women, low value placed on the labour of women, lack of domestic authority of women, lack of male-female joint participation in warfare, work, and community decision making and lack of women's indirect influence on decision making among other indicators. (Princeton, 2012). Patriarchy therefore refers to a societal structure whereby men are dominant not in numbers or in force but in their access to status-related power and decision-making power.

Since SHG ethos are based on democracy and equal membership, then the correlation between non-participation and patriarchy becomes apparent; understanding patriarchy gives an important insight into why men would not want to be in SHG, where everybody is equal and resources belong to all. The institutions and processes that compose patriarchal system are conceptualized as webs of gendered relations which sustain and reproduce male social power such as within various cultural sites that is, language, religion, media and popular
culture, and education (Kilonzo, 2011). Patriarchy operates on a system of male hierarchical relations and male solidarity- a social and ideological construct which considers men (who are the patriarchs) as superior to women.

Marginalized men seek to challenge the position of powerful men but not patriarchy, as they themselves want to occupy the position of patriarch. Powerful and marginalized men in this sense hold on to the past with the intention of maintaining patriarchal values, symbols and status – a past which is obsolete. Men therefore believe in their right to dominate, and those unable to dominate are deemed to be failed individuals (Gayle, 2004).

Kenyan culture is predominantly patriarchal. Patriarchy in the Kenyan society is an organized social structure whereby men as a group hold more power than women – men are given power and authority over women. Power is traditionally believed to be the province of men while women are seen as exercising power primarily at home (Kassily & Onkware, 2010). Gender inequality in ownership and access to productive assets is thus prevalent. Women only enjoy user rights, which are granted by men, to land and livestock especially cattle, goats and sheep. Poultry is the only asset which women have ownership and control rights. Men own and control the other assets.

When women’s profile within the communities’ are raised, it may lead to mistrust by men who again influences their relationships and associations with other groups. Men also tend to feel threatened by the perceived influence wielded by women. (Nokia Research Africa and Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi, ND). In every essence SHG are meant to raise the profiles of all the members and hence men may feel a bit uncomfortable in groups where they and women are at the same level to an extent of needing women guarantors to access credit- this challenges their position as handed by patriarchy.

2.6.2. Masculinity and Men

There is an increasing popular and scholarly interest in men’s issues and the concept of masculinity (Bannon & Correia, 2006). Examining masculinity and the role it plays in the development process is not simply an analytical exercise, but has widespread implications for the effectiveness of programmes that seek to improve economic and social outcomes in virtually every country (Greig, Kimmel, & Lang, 2000).
Masculinity, like gender and patriarchy, is a socially defined construct influenced by innumerable forces including history, culture, religion and economics. Male identities are partially created in the process of individuation that young males go through in an effort to define themselves as separate from their mothers. Strict gender roles are internalized, and boys learn to divorce themselves from qualities they identify as feminine – passivity, weakness, illness, dependence and sensitivity (Male Participation in Sexual and Reproductive Health: New Paradigms Symposium, 1998).

It is worthwhile noting that SHG involvement is all about dependence on one another, win-win approach (not competitive) and sensitivity yet dominance, confidence, strength, competition and rationality are seen as masculine, while submission, nurturing, caring, sensitivity and emotionality are seen as feminine - these ‘feminine’ attributes make SHG work.

Males or male-defined traits include assertiveness, aggressiveness, ruggedness, toughness, decisiveness, inventiveness, risk-taking, confrontation, conquest seeking, ruthlessness and having a killer instinct. Men’s own health and wellbeing are limited by contemporary constructions of manhood (Kaufman, 2003). The emphasis on the pressure that masculinity imposes on men to perform and conform to specific masculine roles (emotional and psychological as well as political and social) has highlighted the costs to men of current gender arrangements (Greig, Kimmel, & Lang, 2000). Masculinity not only restricts men from exhibiting signs of behaviour or thought attributed to the female role, but also entails a wide array of specific behaviours and self-perceptions to which men closely adhere (Wade, 2008).

As biological destiny, masculinity is used to refer to the innate qualities and properties of men that distinguish men from women. In this view, masculinity is men’s nature, and as such helps to explain not only differences but also inequalities between men and women. Men’s political, economic and cultural privileges arise from their ‘masculine advantage’, as variously reflected in genetic predisposition to aggression (in contrast to the passivity of femininity), physical strength (in contrast to the weakness of femininity) and sexual drives (in contrast to the sexual reserve of femininity) (Greig, Kimmel, & Lang, 2000).

Where masculinity is associated with the capacity to provide and fend for families and households, men and boys are increasingly suffering an identity crisis. Many of them cope by resorting to risky and violent activities which revalidate them as males. To understand the rapid emergence of violent and self-destructive masculinities among poor men in Africa, one
must therefore recognise the unmanning and victimising implications of poverty in the face of the unremitting construction of manliness in terms of power and the ability to provide for and defend ones’ family. African men require help in myriad fronts. The most critical help to offer to African men is to support them to clearly realise and accept that they are victims of cultural norms and need help. Currently, no or few programs exist in the continent to directly help men to understand how their gendered behaviours are at the heart of the harms they suffer. Helping men to know themselves and be able to engage with and peel through their own behaviours in the light of gendered cultural constructions is a logical complement to women’s health and children’s health, and an essential component of building a complete and inclusive health care system, achieving optimal overall health in the continent, and getting men to be true allies in the global struggle for gender equality (Izugbara, 2009).

The belief that it is more masculine and therefore better to be entirely independent and invulnerable (never disabled, never sick, never vulnerable) leads to a collective failure to provide social services such as health care, unemployment insurance, welfare benefits, and other benefits that help everyone, including men and boys (Ashley, 2011). This then justifies why men would not want to be involved in SHG since to be a member one has to be vulnerable and rely on others to succeed.

One dominant discourse of masculinity is hegemonic masculinity which, Connell (2000) points out; men internalize and act out in day to day practices as they construct and reconstruct what it means to be a man. In the context of organizations, such practices may help to align the norms of hegemonic masculinity with the performance of their work and the ‘gender work’ undertaken by men in this study may well support this view. However, as Kaufman (1994) suggest, few men meet the hegemonic standard so that for the majority, manhood is ‘chronically insecure’ and a source of anxiety. This anxiety is particularly acute for men in non-traditional occupations whose relationship to this dominant form is made precarious by their association with femininity.

Current efforts to get men to sincerely support women’s empowerment are guided by distrustful, if not wrong-headed suppositions, about men being less gendered than women, about practices of masculinity universally benefiting all men and harming women and children, and about the ‘dividends of patriarchy’ being bestowed equally and universally on all men. The idea of men as gendered people, who occupy differential positions in the
structures of benefits which masculinity marshals, has yet to truly inform programmatic efforts.

The focus of interventions has been on shielding women and children from, and empowering them against, the perceived excesses and harmful activities of men – irresponsible risk-taking, drunkenness, devil-may-care attitude, sexual irresponsibility and promiscuity, poor fathering practices, and masculine violence, in contexts ranging from the home to bureaucratic organisations, and even war. The glaring rarity across most of Africa of policies to directly help men to deal with the impact of social constructions of manhood, and of agencies dedicated to men’s welfare, championing the cause of men, or specifically working to help men recognise the implications of culture in their lives, has its bridgehead in the lack of understanding of men as gendered people (Izugbara, 2009).

2.6.3. Socio-culture and Men

Culture is the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or a social group. It includes not only arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs (UNESCO, 2001). The male is socialized within the culture to think of himself as powerful figure that does not need others (especially women) to succeed. Boys are socialized to prove that they are powerful and in charge and above all to make sure that others acknowledge this. This often develops a sense of insecurity in the male as he has to continuously try to prove himself as a strong person who does not need others for help; he should be a provider of help. Men are culturally supposed to provide leadership in decision making.

Society does not accept a person as a “man” unless he fulfils certain pre-conditions of roles or expectations of society, referred to as “male gender and sexual roles”, or “social masculinity roles” (UNESCO, 2006). Cultural biases operate at all levels ranging from national institutional level, government policy, community level, household and individual levels (Kiriti, 2003).

Socio-cultural arena in a subtle way maintains an illusion of male independence and female dependence. We can't deny that masculinity and femininity are often underestimations of male dominance and female subordination. Hence the disappointment that a man feels when he cannot live up to societal expectations is often quite strong. His attempt to gain power and respect can also be extreme and increases with the level of perceived threat to his masculinity.
In this case joining a SHG would be a threat to a man who may be exposed if he cannot pay a loan in time or needs a loan and has to get women to be his guarantors.

As we participate in social systems, we are shaped by socialization and by paths of least resistance. The safest response to the ways in which we are socialized is to take on the dominant version of reality and act as if it is the only way to be. In order to save ourselves from social resistance or rejection, we usually simply go along with paths of least resistance (Johnson, 2005).

Throughout Africa, as in many parts of the globe, men die younger than women and usually from preventable causes. Many deaths among men result from ‘doing gender’, or doing what is culturally considered to be ‘men’s things’ for example, fighting in wars, street fighting, social drinking, smoking, speeding, refusing to show pain or appear vulnerable etc. The desire to redeem one’s identity as a true male has been, for years, a key driver of criminal and other anti-social acts including cult and gang membership, robbery, drug trafficking, and murder among African men and boys. African men’s proverbial reluctance to seek health care, financial help and professional counselling is also largely culturally-inspired. Rather than go through seemingly unmanning, nay humiliating medical procedures, several African men prefer to die in silence (Izugbara, 2009).

Men have been made so insecure by the society that they will do anything propagated as ‘what men do’, and avoid anything propagated as what men do not do, even if it goes against their nature (UNESCO, 2006). The cultural belief that men are independent, and that their lives are not linked to women’s, allows many men to remain in situations which harm them enormously. A culture that fetishizes dominance rather than cooperation and partnership cannot imagine other models for living and is not supportive of cooperation approach to anything and in this case SHGs.

2.6.4. Gender Stereotyping and Men

The concept of gender stereotypes is crucial in understanding why men would not want to participate in what would be referred to as ‘feminine’ institutions. Gender stereotypes are sets of attributes ascribed to the groups of men and women by the virtue of their sex. Stereotyping is a cognitive mechanism to simplify and organise the complex world. Stereotyping is very difficult to change. Gender stereotypes lead to faulty reasoning and actions in the advantage or disadvantage of others (Yordanova, 2006).
Gender stereotypes are assumptions, false ideas or beliefs certain people tend to have about others, especially to members of opposite sex in regard to ascribed cultural roles (Zalo & Akong’a, 2007). Whether we like to admit it or not, we all use stereotypes as information shortcuts in everyday life. Because we cannot have full information about everything, we often rely on conventional and oversimplified conceptions (Aalberg & Jenssen, 2007).

A stereotype can be described as a form of thought process created in our own mind. It is an oversimplification, or categorization, of a certain group’s traits and behaviour. This oversimplification is based on previous experiences with people belonging to the same group. When meeting a new person, it is easy to perceive him/her as belonging to an earlier created category, instead of seeing a unique individual with diverse characteristics. Stereotypes are not merely images in a single person’s mind; through language they are shared and maintained by many. Because language is culturally shared, “it provides an ideal means of collectively defining and preserving stereotypic beliefs” (Luciano & Maas, 1996).

A stereotype that may influence targeting of women for SHG and for empowerment as opposed to men is that women are more caring than men. Women are more likely than men to identify their own interests with those of their dependents, an attitude which is essential to the welfare of children and other household members (Jiggins, 1989). In this case it becomes clearer why many empowerment programmes would want to focus on women; a simple stereotype that gain will trickle down to others ignoring the fact that there is a likelihood of finding a man or a woman falling into either “caring” or “uncaring” category.

Stereotypical gender roles have probably existed as long as human culture and are such a natural part of our lives that we barely take notice of them. Nevertheless, images of what we perceive as typically masculine and feminine in appearance and behaviour depend on the individual’s perception. Within each gender one can find different stereotypes. A commonly assumed idea is that men are hard and tough, while women are soft and vulnerable (Bauer & Jahlmar, nd).

Gender stereotyping also supposes that men cannot be trusted and investing in them would lead to loss of resources. Evidence in (Khandker, 2003) suggests that lending to women yields greater social and economic impacts relative to lending to men with fear is that if aid is given to men, they might sell food stamps and misspend resources, possibly wasting money on gambling, tobacco, and alcohol. The superiority of women as hardworking, reliable, trustworthy, socially responsible, caring and cooperative is often asserted; whilst men on the
other hand are frequently portrayed as lazy, violent, promiscuous and irresponsible drunkards (Cleaver, 2000).

Gender stereotypes are one of the most persistent causes of gender inequality. They are rooted in every aspect of life and we encounter them at every stage of life. If not dealt with, gender stereotypes on the ‘proper’ roles of women and men become easily imprinted in people’s thoughts and minds and are (re)produced from generation to generation (Gortnar, 2008) and largely determine how we relate with others. Stereotypes can lead development workers or people responsible for empowering a people to actually end up discriminating against them.

Cook & Cusack (2010) argue that stereotypes are deeply engrained in people, particularly in the way they socially create the roles of men and women in the society. Gender stereotypes create erroneous assumption that all men/women are similar, and that an individual woman or man is only a representative of his/her gender. A certain gender – associated characteristic may be seen as the most defining factor in a person and used to explain everything he/she does (Salmenkangas, 2005).

2.7. Knowledge gaps

Though a few writers are seeing the need of involvement of men there is no documentation on why men do not participate in SHG which makes it difficult to address the real root causes that challenge their involvement and participation. There is also little knowledge on the barriers of male participation in SHG as vehicles of poverty alleviation and strategies of dealing with these barriers for an ‘all inclusive’ approach to development.

There lacks information on the relationship between existing poverty alleviation policies on empowerment and men involvement in SHG and general poverty alleviation and lack of knowledge on the perceptions of SHG that men in Kenya and Africa have.

Although the gender and development approach has provoked thinking on addressing the attitudes and practices of men, whether as clients of development agencies or as policy-makers and practitioners evidence is showing that more is being done focusing on men as policy makers and practitioners ignoring the aspect of men as clients of development. There also lacks knowledge on alternative poverty alleviation methodologies and interventions that men are keen on participating. Little has been said on what happens to the men who are in the vulnerable group as classified by Lang (2003).
In this regard, the study sought to determine the reasons for low male participation in Self Help Groups despite their established success in poverty eradication and financial empowerment among women and the few men who are engaged and determine perceptions that men from Dagoretti District have about participating in SHGs.

2.8. Conceptual frame work

The conceptual framework illustrated below, shows the relationships that exist between the dependent and independent variables under the study. The dependent variable is men’s participation in SHG as a vehicle for poverty alleviation. The independent variables that were investigated to establish their level of influence on the dependent variable are: Patriarchy, masculinity, socio-culture and gender stereotyping. Also presented are the moderating variables and intervening variables.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
2.9. Summary of the Literature Reviewed

This chapter explicated on the literature review related to urban poverty, male participation and SHG as well as literature related to identified variables: - Patriarchy, masculinity, socio-cultural expectations and gender stereotyping.

Basically, all the literatures simply show that empowerment of women is the primary attempt of the formulation of SHG and this could explain the absence of men. As the women are oppressed in all spheres of life, they need to be empowered in all respect of life. Women empowerment is one of the targets of the MDG however it is important to acknowledge that trying to change the situation of women without looking at how the men in their lives might be affected made an ineffective strategy (Akerkar, 2001).

Reviewed literatures indicate that lack of male participation in SHG is a gender relations issue. Explicitly addressing men can increase men’s belief that they too will gain from gender equality and can engage men directly in the renegotiation of gender relations. Male inclusion can speak to many men’s sense of anxiety and fear as ‘traditional’ masculinities are undermined. Men’s suffering (such as men’s growing burden of illness or social and economic marginalisation among young, poor men) is worth addressing in its own right, and in terms of its potential impact on women (Chant & Guttman, 2000).

The benefits of SHG and other community organisations are well documented. The need for creativity and involvement of all citizens to eradicate poverty is advocated for; for removal of poverty, a direct anti-poverty scheme is required so that it can combat with all those factors which tend to increase the forces of poverty in the both rural and urban areas. (Sumitra & Dukhabandhu, ND). There is clear argument that the process of poverty alleviation can be more sustainable when all the members of the family are involved.

Gender stereotyping, masculinity and patriarchy through the literatures are shown to play important roles in men's behaviours and attitudes. Overall, the literature indicates that the endorsement of traditional patriarchy ideology, conformity to masculine norms, and gender role conflict are all associated with men’s behaviours and attitudes. However, there are very few studies that have directly compared the impact of various masculinity and patriarchy measures on men’s behaviours and attitudes.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter details the research design with corresponding justification, describe population characteristics, outline and explain the sample size used, describe the sampling procedure, discuss the data collection tool and explain how data was collected, analysed and reported. Ethical considerations are also outlined.

3.2. Research Design

A research design is a plan for addressing the research objectives or hypotheses. Research design is the conceptual structure within which research would be conducted. This study adopted mixed methods research design. A mixed research design is a procedure for collecting, analysing, and “mixing” both quantitative and qualitative research and methods in a single study to understand a research problem. (Creswell, 2012). The combination of elements of qualitative and quantitative approaches such as use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection and data analysis as well as inference techniques provided breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration of information. Mixed research design is used when both quantitative and qualitative data, together, provide a better understanding of a research problem than either type by itself, when one type of research (qualitative or quantitative) is not enough to address the research problem or answer the research questions and for pragmatism –practicality; multiple view points; biased and unbiased; subjective and objective (Abraham Fischler School of Education, ND).

There are four major rationales for mixing quantitative and qualitative approaches: participant enrichment (i.e., the mixing of quantitative and qualitative techniques for the rationale of optimizing the sample; such as increasing the number of participants), instrument fidelity (i.e., maximizing the appropriateness and/or utility of the instruments used in the study, whether quantitative or qualitative; for e.g., via a pilot study), treatment integrity (i.e., mixing quantitative and qualitative techniques in order to assess the fidelity of interventions, treatments, or programs), and significance enhancement (i.e., mixing quantitative and qualitative techniques in order to maximize researchers’ interpretations of data) (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Sutton, 2006).
The mixed research design was selected for this study to enable the researcher use multiple methods to research the problem from all sides. The design was also adopted because the use of different approaches was perceived as of help in focusing on a single process and confirming the data accuracy. This design ensured that result from qualitative analysis complemented result quantitative analysis; in this case the research did not miss any available data. In studying the variables identified for example, it was not only possible to know whether an attitude or a perception exists through qualitative methods but also how much of an attitude or perception exists through quantitative methods. This therefore helped the researcher understand the depth of influence that each variable under study has on men’s participation.

**Ethical considerations**

Ethical considerations based on Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) were strictly adhered to in the process of gathering data for the study. There were detailed instructions the instruments assuring the participants confidentiality and anonymity, letters were written by the researcher to participants to request their participation and emphasising their own discretion in responding to the interview and all contact details of the researcher were given on the letter accompanying the instruments.

**3.3. Target population**

The study targeted men between the ages of 18 to 65 in Dagorretti District and personnel of 5 institutions and organisations working with SHG as well as government officials responsible for registering SHG in Dagoretti District. The population of men between the ages of 18 to 60 years are 99,834 which is 60% of men in the district as derived from 2009 census.

**3.4. Sampling Procedure and Sampling Size**

A sample is a subset from a larger population. Sampling is the process of selecting “a portion, piece, or segment that is representative of a whole” (The American Heritage College Dictionary, 1993). In contrast to quantitative sampling techniques that rely on statistical probability theory, qualitative sampling is based on purposeful or theoretical sampling principles. The aim is to identify “information-rich” participants who have certain characteristics, detailed knowledge, or direct experience relevant to the phenomenon of interest (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007)
Random purposeful sampling was principally chosen for the study. The sampling frame was purposefully chosen - men living in Dagoretti District after which a desired number of individuals to participate in the study were randomly chosen. Random Purposeful sampling was principally chosen for the study based on Onwuegbuzie & Collins (2007) that if the goal of a study is not to generalize to a population but to obtain insights into a phenomenon, individuals, or events (as will often be the case in the qualitative component of a mixed methods study), then the researcher purposefully selects individuals, groups, and settings for this phase that maximize understanding of the underlying phenomenon. Thus, many mixed methods studies utilize some form of purposeful sampling.

Criteria used to determine participant eligibility included; Gender and residence: All participants were male except for officers of institutions working with SHG and were either members or non-members of SHGs and living in Dagoretti District.

**Sample Size**

Sandelowski (1995) said that in general, sample sizes in research with a qualitative component should not be so small as to make it difficult to achieve data saturation, theoretical saturation, or informational redundancy. At the same time, the sample should not be so large that it is difficult to undertake a deep, case-oriented analysis. Qualitative samples must be large enough to assure that most or all of the perceptions that might be important are uncovered, but at the same time if the sample is too large data becomes repetitive and, eventually, superfluous.

Adequacy of the sample size was determined by the principle of theoretical saturation which refers to the point at which no new concepts emerge from the review of successive data from a sample that is diverse in pertinent characteristics and experiences. Nembhard, Bradley & Curry (2009) suggested a range of 30 to 50, discussing grounded theory methodology which is similar to symbolic interactionism Creswell (1998) suggested 20-30 , with Morse (1994) suggesting a sample size of 30-50 may achieve saturation. Mason (2010) in his study on Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews found that the highest sample a symbolic interactionism study has had is 87 with a mean of 33.

Following the widely accepted guidelines above 80 men in Dagoretti District were sampled. Focused group discussion were conducted with 2 men’s only group. 2 government officials and 3 officials of institutions working with SHGs were interviewed.
3.5. Data collection methods and procedures

The study used mixed methods of data collection. Mixed methods involve collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data in ways that are rigorous and framed epistemologically/theoretically. The methods used included interviews, questionnaires, and focused group discussion.

An in-depth interview is typically a 1-to-1 interaction between a researcher and a study participant. Interviews allow for the exploration of individual experiences and perceptions in great detail (Patton, 2002). In-depth interviews were used for their optimal ability for collecting data on individuals' personal histories, perspectives, and experiences, particularly when sensitive topics are being explored and hence were used for this research. Semi-Structured Interviews were used by the researcher to get specific information which was then compared and contrasted with information gained in other interviews. The same questions were asked in each interview but the researcher remained flexible to allow important information to arise. Interview schedule and questionnaires were provided for this purpose with a list of specific questions which guided the interview.

Focus groups are guided discussions among a small group of people who share a common characteristic central to the topic of interest (Morgan & Krueger, 1998). Focus groups were group interviews for men in SHG as well as those who are not in SHG. They were chosen because of their effectiveness in eliciting data on the cultural norms of a group and in generating broad overviews of issues of concern to the cultural groups or subgroups represented and in this case men.

A questionnaire is a tool designed with pre-determined questions that helps a researcher to capture information from a respondent through self-administered or researcher administered means. Questionnaires that were used in the study provided both quantitative and qualitative information that was quantified and subjected to statistical analysis. The questionnaire had a series of closed questions, with boxes to tick or scales to rank, and also had a section of open questions for more detailed response.

3.6. Instruments Validity and Reliability

Establishing validity and reliability in a mixed research which has a component of qualitative research can be less precise (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). General agreement seems to have been reached that quality concepts developed for quantitative research such as generalizability, validity, reliability and replicability cannot be applied to a design that has a qualitative
bearing and in that case it is more appropriate to look at credibility/trustworthiness in place of
internal validity, fittingness in place of external validity and auditability in place of reliability.
This study therefore when talking of validity and reliability addressed issues to do with
trustworthiness, fittingness and auditability.

**Validity**

Triangulation was mainly used to ensure the validity of the data. Triangulation methods used
multiple forms of data collection, such as focus groups and in-depth interviews to investigate
the evaluation objectives. Utilising multiple data collection methods leads to an acceptance of
reliability and validity when the data from the various sources are comparable and consistent.
(Barbour, 2001)

**Reliability**

Reliability procedures used were in line with what has been suggested by Gibbs in his
discussion on ensuring reliability in a design with a qualitative bearing. Checking transcripts
for mistakes, checking the persistence meaning of the codes, coordinating communication
among coders and cross-checking codes from the interviewees helps in ensuring reliability
(Gibbs, 2007).

### 3.7. Methods of data analysis and justification

Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis approaches were used to analyse the data

#### 3.7.1. Qualitative Data Analysis

The general inductive approach to qualitative data analysis was used for qualitative data. The
inductive approach is a systematic procedure for analysing qualitative data where the analysis
is guided by specific objectives. The primary purpose of the inductive approach is to allow
research findings to emerge from the frequent, dominant or significant themes inherent in raw
data, without the restraints imposed by structured methodologies (Thomas, 2003).

**Content analysis**

Content analysis is a particular kind of thematic analysis which involves counting instances of
particular occurrences, which can be anything of interest; codes can then be used as basis for
quantitative analysis. Using this method the researcher systematically worked through each
transcript assigning codes to words specific to characteristics within the variables. This type
of analysis was used for open-ended questions in questionnaires, for interviews and focused
group discussions. The researcher looked at instances where the data mentioned indicators (which were used as codes) under the variables of the study. It also helped the researcher quantify the answers, since it was possible to count the frequency of a specific code.

Coding technique was vital in breaking down the data for content analysis. Coding is categorizing the data collected during a study to assign meanings to them. This technique was also used to extract quantitative data from qualitative data through the quasi-statistics which basically looked at the number of times something or category came up. Codes were based on themes, topics, ideas, concepts, terms, phrases or key words found in the data gathered during the study.

3.7.2. Quantitative Data Analysis
Participatory discussions with a number of focus groups could give rise to a wealth of qualitative information. But the complex nature of inter-relationships between factors requires some degree of quantification of the data and a subsequent analysis by quantitative methods. Once such quantifiable components of the data are separated, attention can be focused on characteristics that are of a more individualistic qualitative nature. Quantitative analytical approaches also allow the reporting of summary results in numerical terms to be given with a specified degree of confidence. (Abeyasekera, ND).

Quantitative data analysis was used for some parts of the questionnaire as well as for the codes derived through content analysis. SPSS computing software was used to analyse quantifiable data. Interval scales were used to analyse precisely defined intervals such as the age of interviewees, number of children and level of income.

3.8. Summary of Research Methodology
This chapter has expounded on the following areas: research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, methods of data collection, instruments validity and reliability, operationalization of variables and methods of data analysis.
### 3.9. Operationalization of Variables

**Table 3.1: Operationalization of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Tools of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine to what extent patriarchy influences men’s participation in self-help groups</td>
<td>Patriarchy</td>
<td>Leadership in mixed groups</td>
<td>Percentage of men in comparison to women</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Mixed design</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>SPSS Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making patterns in mixed groups</td>
<td>Perception on whose decision is more important</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief on how social structures should be organized</td>
<td>Attitudes on which gender should lead (Gender Preference)</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief that men are naturally better leaders than women</td>
<td>Perception of who are better leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine how masculinity influences men’s participation in self-help groups</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>‘Self-sufficiency’ attitude among men</td>
<td>Confirmation that men are self-sufficient</td>
<td>Nominal Ordinal</td>
<td>Mixed design</td>
<td>Qualitative Quantitative</td>
<td>SPSS Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance towards what is perceived as ‘feminine’</td>
<td>Referral of SHGs as feminine Negative attitude towards SHGs because they are feminine Perceptions of how a man should behave Attitudes towards women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief that SHG are feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct on what it means to be a man- roughness, confidence etc. in comparison to being a woman Dread of women domination in SHG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To determine how socio-culture influences men’s participation in</th>
<th>Socio-Culture</th>
<th>Resistance of men towards seeking help</th>
<th>Confirmation that men do not need help</th>
<th>Nominal Ordinal</th>
<th>Mixed design</th>
<th>Qualitative Quantitative</th>
<th>SPSS Content analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine the extent to which gender stereotyping influences men’s participation in self-help groups</td>
<td>Gender Stereotyping</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Number of policies that aim at empowering both genders</td>
<td>Ratio Nominal Ordinal</td>
<td>Mixed design</td>
<td>Qualitative Quantitative</td>
<td>SPSS Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-help groups</td>
<td>Cultural based unwillingness of men to pursue women’s assistance</td>
<td>Societal perceptions of self-help groups</td>
<td>Expectation that men are all powerful with no need for help</td>
<td>Perceptions of the society on how men should behave</td>
<td>Attitudes of men towards women’s help</td>
<td>Negative societal perceptions of SHGs</td>
<td>Qualitative Quantitative Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal perceptions about gender roles</td>
<td>Confirmation that group rules and policies are inclined towards supporting one gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender relations in mixed groups</td>
<td>Confirmation that women roles are different from men’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that SHG are fit for women</td>
<td>Level of mutual respect between men and women in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes towards women and SHGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Introduction
This chapter discusses the study findings on factors influencing participation of men anti-poverty self-help groups in Dagorretti District. The chapter presents a discussion on the general background of the study, and influence of patriarchy system, masculinity, gender stereotyping and Socio-culture on participation of men in SHG.

4.2. Background Information
This study was carried out to establish the factors influencing participation of men in anti-poverty SHGs in Dagoretti District in Nairobi County. The study sought to establish how: Patriarchy system, masculinity, and gender stereotyping and socio culture influence participation of men in anti-poverty SHGs. The background information provided layout of the study response and general experience of male participation in SHGs. The results as per findings are discussed.

4.2.1. Response Rate
The study used random purposeful sampling procedure to select 80 men living in Dagoretti District. Out of the 80 questionnaires sent out, 68 questionnaires were returned completed, an 85% response rate above 50% turn out which was adequate to accomplish the study objectives.

4.2.2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
General demographic information of the respondents included subscription to SHGs, age, education level, marital status, parental responsibility and income brackets. The results are presented in the Tables 4.1.
Table 4.1: Subscription in SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription in Groups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men in SHGs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men not in SHGs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.1 show that out of the sample, 85.3% of the men are not in SHGs with only 14.7% being members of SHGs. This agrees with the as previous studies that found majority of men are not members of SHGs and are unlikely to join SHGs or seek help.

Table 4.2: Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket of the Respondents</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.2 show that majority of the respondents in Self Help Group (70%) are aged between 21-30 years and (30%) of the respondents in Self Help Group are below 20 years. Majority of the respondents who are not in Self Help Group (58.6%) are aged between 21-30 years, (20.7%) of the respondents who are not in Self Help Group are aged between 23-40 years, (12.1%) of the respondents who are not in Self Help Group are aged between 41-50 years and (5.2%) of the respondents who are not in Self Help Group are aged between 51-60 years.
This therefore indicates that older men tend to shun self-help groups more as compared to younger men. It also shows that men in the age-group of 21-30 years are more likely to join self-help groups more as compared to any other age group. This henceforth implies that age has an intervening effect on men’s participation in self-help group or men’s help seeking behaviour.

Table 4.3: Marital Status of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status of the Respondents</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Cohabiting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.3 show that (90%) of the respondents in Self Help Group are Married/Cohabiting with (10%) being widowed. Majority of the respondents not in Self Help Group (56.9%) are single, with (26%) being Married, (6.9%) widowed and (10.3%) being separated or divorced. From this data it is apparent that men who are in a married are more likely to join SHG as compared to those who are not. This then infers that increased responsibilities and expectations at the family level have a potential of influencing men to join a self-help group.

Table 4.4: Parental Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Responsibility</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.4 show that majority of the respondents in Self Help Group (80%) have children and (20%) do not have children. Majority of the respondents not in Self Help Group (52%) do not have children and (48%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group have children. This then shows just as in the marital status, increased responsibilities and expectations that come with having a family and children tend to influence men to join a SHG.

Table 4.5: Education Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.5 show that majority of the respondents in Self Help Group (50%) have attained Secondary school education, (30%) of the respondents in Self Help Group have attained Diplomas, (20%) of the respondents in Self Help Group have attained Degrees and (20%) of the respondents in Self Help Group have attained Primary school education. Majority of the respondents not in Self Help Group (58.6%) have attained Secondary school education, (34.48%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group have attained Primary school education, (6.92%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group have attained Diplomas with none attaining a degree.

This then shows an increase in level of education comes with an increase in likelihood of men to join a self-help group or to be more comfortable seeking help. A higher percentage of men with diplomas have joined SHGs compared to men with the same qualifications who have not. Similarly, a higher percentage of
men with degrees have joined a SHG as compared to those with the same level of education who have not.

Table 4.6: Income Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level (KSh. Per Month)</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th>Men not in SHGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 7500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7501-10000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-20000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-30000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-40000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40001-50000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50001 +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.6 show that majority of the respondents in Self Help Group (50%) earn between Ksh. 20,000-30,000, (20%) of the respondents in Self Help Group earn between Ksh. 10,000-20,000, (20%) of the respondents in Self Help Group earn between 30,000-40,000 Kshs and (10%) of the respondents in Self Help Group earn between 40,000-50,000 Kshs. Majority of the respondents not in Self Help Group (27.6%) earn less than 7500 Kshs, (27.6%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group earn between 7,500-10,000 Kshs, (17.2%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group earn between 10,000-20,000 Kshs, (15.5%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group earn between 20,000-30,000 Kshs, (6.9%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group earn between 30,000-40,000 Kshs, (3.4%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group earn between 40,000-50,000 Kshs and (1.7%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group earn over 50,000.
This implies that men who have low incomes despite the fact that they would benefit from SHGs do not join groups and similarly men who would be considered to be earning better in (over 50,000) do not join SHGs. This can also indicate that men who earn less than Ksh.10,000 may be lacking confidence to join SHGs since their low income or need would be exposed and that those who are earning better may be feeling that they do not need others since they are self-sufficient.

**Table 4.7: Source of Income of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Income</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support From Parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.7 show that majority of respondents in Self Help Group (80%) are self-employed and (20%) of the respondents Self Help Group are employed. Majority of respondents not in Self Help Group (60.3%) are employed, (34.5.1%) are self-employed, (3.4%) are supported by their parents and (1.7%) are supported by their spouse. This denotes that men who are self-employed and in the case of Dagoretti District which has Kawangware and Dagoretti markets, doing small scale businesses are more likely to join SHGs and that men who are employed are least likely to join SHGs. This may imply that men who are employed and those relying on parents and spouses may be comfortable since they are assured of an income unlike of men who are doing small scale businesses who need a cushion.
4.3. Influence of Patriarchy on Men’s Participation in SHGs

Various parameters, which were basically indicators of patriarchy, were used to establish the influence of patriarchy on men’s participation in SHGs. These included key leadership in SHGs, gender preference in leadership of SHGs, perception that men naturally provide better leadership, feeling that leadership belongs to men, agreement that SHGs would attract more members if all leaders were men, being uncomfortable with women leadership, decision-making patterns and influence in SHGs and fear of women domination. A frequency analyses as well as percentage analysis were done for each parameter to determine the overall influence of patriarchy on participation of men in SHGs.

Table 4.8: Key leaders in mixed SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.422</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.8 show that majority of the respondents (80%) indicated that the key leaders in their SHGs are men and (20%) of the respondents indicated that the leaders are both men and women. This is a clear indication of patriarchy influence which dictates male leadership.

Table 4.9: Gender Preference in SHG leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.441</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses in Table 4.9 show that (70%) of the respondents in mixed groups would prefer men instead of women and (20%) prefer women leaders. When the respondents were asked why they prefer male leaders, (60%) of the respondents
said men are better leaders, (10%) of the respondents said women cannot make good leaders, (10%) of the respondents said men are fast in decision making and (10%) of the respondents who preferred women said women tend to be more committed on group issues and hence would make good leaders.

This is also an indicator of patriarchy influence since the men would be uncomfortable with women leadership and maybe would even drop out of groups if women took over key leadership positions. The reasons given for preferring male leaders also denote deep influence of patriarchy system where people believe that men are the best. Also the feeling that women are not fast in decision making indicates an influence of the patriarchy system but also to some extent gender stereotyping.

Table 4.10: Perception that Men Naturally Provide Better Leadership than Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.333</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.10 show that majority of the respondents (80%) feel that men naturally provide better leadership than women and (10%) of the respondents said that men do not naturally provide better leadership than women. When respondents were asked why they think men naturally provide better leadership, (50%) of the respondents said that leadership is inborn in men, (10%) of the respondents said that men are courageous, (10%) of the respondents said that men treat each other equally with only (10%) of the respondents saying that women are more reliable and could make good leaders. This also shows the influence of patriarchy since it instils the belief that men provide better leadership and that leadership in men in natural and inborn.
Table 4.11: Perception that SHG would attract more men members if most key leaders are men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.11 show that (80%) of the respondents said that they felt their SHG would attract more men members if most key leaders are men. When asked why men leaders would attract more men members, (10%) of the respondents said men always have new ideas and (50%) of the respondents said men can trust their fellow men. This is also an indication of patriarchy system influence. Patriarchy system expects dominion of men over women and in any instance where this does not happen men will tend to reject the situation.

Table 4.12: I have issues with women having leadership positions in the SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.12 show that (50%) of respondents who have not joined SHGs (50%) have problem with women having leadership positions in the SHGs. When asked to give reasons for their answers, (1.7%) of the respondents said that decisions by men carry more weight, (1.7%) of the respondents said that leadership is never trusted with women, (1.7%) of the respondents said that leadership makes women disrespectful, (10.3%) of the respondents said that women mix emotions with leadership, (6.8%) of the respondents said that women prioritize their issues first and (20.6%) of the respondents said that Women are not good leaders.
Table 4.12: Gender involvement in decision making in SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.316</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.12 show that majority of the respondents (90%) said in their SHGs men are more involved in decision making than women members and (10%) of the respondents said that women members are more involved in decision making than men members. When asked why men are more involved in decision making than women members in SHGs, (20%) of the respondents said men tend to stick to their final decisions more than women, (20%) said men are always ready to improve their lives as compared to women, (10%) said it was because men are the majority in the leadership.

Whether it is true or not that men make more decisions than women, the influence of patriarchy system is felt here as well; men are supposed to be making decisions and their decisions are the best and that is why they are supposed to be in leadership. Similarly an element of gender stereotyping comes out with the percentage that felt that men are always ready to improve their lives more as compared to women.

Table 4.13: Agreement that a decision by man is given more weight by other group members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.447</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.13 show that (40%) of the respondents felt that a decision by man is given more weight by other group members with (10%) feeling that decisions by both genders are taken seriously. When asked why decision by man
is given more weight by other group members, (20%) of the respondents said many people believe in decisions made by men, (10%) of the respondents said men have never misled the group and (10%) of the respondents said women are not naturally involved in decision making. The 10% that thought decisions by all are taken seriously said it would be against gender equality to give weight to decisions made by men only.

This is another indicator of the influence of the patriarchy system since there is a feeling that women are not naturally involved in decision making and that many of them are more comfortable with decisions made by men. Also of interest is the fact that for those who thought all decisions are given equal weight or importance thought it is because they need to ensure gender equality (expected of mixed groups by law) not because they thought the decisions or contributions by women are of substance.

Respondents who reported not to being members of SHG were asked to respond to items below in regard to their non-involvement in SHGs.

**Table 4.14: Reasons for Shunning SHGs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male involvement in SHGs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a problem with groups whose leaders are women</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a problem with women domination in groups</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men can join SHGs but only to provide direction and leadership</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men should be involved in financial decision making than women</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=58
Findings in Table 4.14 show that in respect to having problems with women leaders; (53.4%) of the respondents reported to have a problem with women leaders and (44.8%) of the respondents did not have problems with women leaders. In respect to having problems with women domination in groups; (50.9%) of the respondents reported to be wary of women domination in groups with (49.1%) having no problems at all. In respect to feeling that men can join SHGs but only to provide direction and leadership; (55.2%) of the respondents said responded in the affirmative with (43.1%) of the respondents not agreeing. In respect to belief that men should be involved in financial decision making than women; (65.5%) of the respondents said responded positively with (32.8%) of the respondents said not agreeing. This indicates deeply rooted patriarchal compliance which expects men to have dominion over women and hence explains why men would not want to be in an SHG where everyone is equal.

When the respondents were asked what can be done to influence men to join SHGs, (7.3%) of the respondents said changing the way SHGs are organised, (10.2%) of the respondents said that women should be empowered to respect men, (25%) of the respondents said gender balance should be encouraged in all SHGs rather than have women dominating, (1.4%) of the respondents said men should be spoken to join SHGs, (14.1%) of the respondents said there is need to educate on benefits of SHGs, (7.3%) of the respondents said there was need to create awareness about SHGs, (11.7%) of the respondents said leadership should be given to men and (4.4%) of the respondents said that SHGs should have more profit making projects since this would attract men.

Both the factors that influence non-participation and also the ways offered to encourage participation indicate patriarchal influences since they are all related to men wanting to be in charge of the running of the SHGs.
4.4. Influence of Masculinity on Participation of men in SHGs

In order to determine how masculinity influences men’s participation in self-help groups, various measures of masculinity were used to establish its influence on men’s participation in SHGs. These included labelling of SHGs as feminine, avoiding SHGs not to show weakness, feeling of self-sufficiency and being uncomfortable showing vulnerability. A frequency analyses as well as percentage analysis were done for each parameter to determine the overall influence of masculinity on participation of men.

Table 4.15: Perception among men on Femininity of SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.15 show that (56.9%) of men not in SHGs were of the opinion that SHGs are feminine just by the way they are organized and (39.7%) of the respondents feel that SHGs are not feminine by the way they are organized. When why they felt that SHGs are feminine just by the way they are organized, (10.3%) of the respondents said that SHGs are very mismanaged which indicated femininity, (41.3%) of the respondents said that since majority of the members are women it indicated that they are feminine, (8.6%) of the respondents said that they meet a lot of time and only women have time for such kind of meetings and (23.4%) of the respondents said that women like doing things in groups and hence it was not manly to be in the groups.

This is a clear indicator of masculinity which leads men to shun anything that is considered feminine - joining a ‘feminine’ group challenges their masculinity.
Table 4.16: Perception of men that joining SHGs indicates weakness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.16 show that (50%) of respondents in Self Help Group agreed that men refuse to belong to SHGs not to be seen as weak with (40%) of the respondents in Self Help Group disagreeing. (69%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group agreed that men refuse to belong to SHGs not to be seen as weak and (14%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group disagreed. Being weak is an indicator of low masculinity and hence men who want to be identified as masculine will avoid anything that shows that they are not masculine. Therefore if belonging to a group is perceived to show weakness men tend to avoid it.

Table 4.17: Self-sufficiency attitude among men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.17 show that (55.2%) of the respondents not in SHGs felt that they are self-sufficient with (41.1%) of the respondents agreeing that they require little help but more from men than women. When asked to give reasons for their answers, (10.3%) of the respondents said that their income is sufficient, (3.4%) of the respondents said that they get loans from financial institutions without need of being in SHG, (13.7%) of the respondents said that men are supposed to work hard, (5.2%) of the respondents said that men help each other and (53.4%) of the
respondents said that women are supposed to get help from men and not the other way round.

This also shows clear influence of masculinity on men in form of avoiding help-seeking behaviour and feeling that as men they should not be expecting help from women or any other person for that matter. Masculinity pushes men to look strong and self-sufficient.

**Table 4.18: Self Sufficiency- Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.481</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.18 show that majority of the respondents (63.8%) said that they earn enough income to support them without needing to get help from others with (34.5%) of the respondents said that they are comfortable soliciting for help from other people. When asked to give reasons for their answers, (6.8%) of the respondents said that they are business men who are making their own money, (15.5%) of the respondents said that they have enough money to sustain themselves, (10.3%) of the respondents said that they live within their own means and (1.7%) of the respondents said that they seek loan from banks and not individuals.

This shows deep entrenchment of masculinity influences in men which push them from SHGs which are by essence a means of organized institution of getting help from others and a clear acceptance of vulnerability.
Table 4.19: I have problem with the fact that you need others to benefit from SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.503</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.19 show that majority of the respondents (50%) had a problem with the fact that they need to involve others to benefit from SHGs and (41.4%) of the respondents did not have problem that. When asked to give reasons for their answers, (25.8%) of the respondents feel that benefits should be personal, (6.8%) of the respondents feel that liabilities should not be shared and (34.5%) of the respondents feel that they are worth a lot as an individual and being in groups undermined their distinctiveness as men. This is another indicator of masculinity influence by being masculine a man is supposed to be self-sufficient and hence being in a situation that one needs others to succeed challenges that position

Respondents who are not members of any SHG were asked to indicate whether they fully agree, partly agree or do not agree to the following statements in regard to not joining SHGs.

Table 4.20: Agreement with statements regarding not to join an SHG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts influencing decisions not to join an SHG</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am ready to face any challenge in life</td>
<td>Freq. 14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have witnessed successful men who don’t belong to SHG</td>
<td>Freq. 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.20 show that in respect to the statement that “I am ready to face any challenge in life” (24.1%) of the respondents disagreed (22.4%) of the respondents partly agreed and (48.3%) of the respondents fully agreed. One indicator of masculinity as advanced by the society is to be courageous and not
easily intimidated. The fact that 48% fully agreed and 22% partly agreed that as men they are ready to face life on their own shows masculinity at play.

In respect to the statement “I have witnessed successful men who don’t belong to any SHG”, (17.2%) of the respondents disagreed, (24.1%) of the respondents partly agreed and (55.2%) of the respondents fully agreed. This is another indicator of masculinity influencing male participation in SHGs since they feel that as men they might not to be in an SHG to be successful and also that they look upon other men who have been successful(not women) and have not been in SHGs.

4.5. Influence of socio-culture on participation of men in SHGs

In order to determine how socio-culture influences men’s participation in self-help groups, various indicators were used. Frequencies, percentages as well as data from content analysis (coded and presented in percentages) have been discussed below.

Table 4.21: Belief that SHG is a women affair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.21 show that majority of the respondents not in Self Help Group (79.3%) agreed with the belief that SHG is a women affair with (20.6%) not agreeing with the belief. (60%) of the respondents in SHGs agreed that SHGs belong to women with (40%) not supporting the belief. When asked to explain their answers, (14.7%) of the respondents said that most SHGs are started by women, (2.9%) of the respondents said that women have time to meet, (7.3%) of the respondents said that women are the majority members, (8.8%) of the respondents said that most SHGs deals with women projects and (5.8%) of the respondents said that SHGs benefits the whole society irrespective of gender. This
shows that socio-culture influence since this belief has been put in place by the society and going against it is basically going against the socio-cultural expectation.

Table 4.22: Reluctance to belong to SHGs because it is not cultural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.22 show that majority of the respondents (80%) feel that men are reluctant to belong to SHGs because it is not cultural to be in groups and (10%) felt otherwise. This shows that what the society has put in place as an expectation for men is that they should not come up with solutions with women and hence this can affects men’s subscriptions in SHGs.

Table 4.23: Societal expectation of men to be self-reliant and strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th>Men not in SHGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.23 show that (60%) of the respondents in Self Help Group confirmed that the society expects men to be self-reliant strong and not seek help from others and (40%) of the respondents in Self Help Group disagreed with that view. (60.3%) of the respondents not in Self Help Groups agreed that society expects men to be self-reliant strong and not seek help from others and (36.2%) of the respondents not in Self Help Group disagreed. This shows that the society socio-culture contributes to men’s avoidance of help- by seeking help they are
labelled ‘not man enough’ and hence they have to avoid SHGs to keep their status.

4.6. Influence of gender stereotyping on participation of men in SHGs

In order to determine how gender stereotyping influences men’s participation in self-help groups, various indicators were looked into, these included perception on who fits groups more, feeling that women are more nurturing and hence more natural members of SHGs. Frequencies, percentages and percentages of coded data are discussed below.

Table 4.24: Perception of men on appropriate Gender of SHGs members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.354</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.24 show that majority of the respondents (70%) think that women fits more in SHGs and (10%) of the respondents think that both gender fits more in SHGs. When respondents were asked to give reasons, (10%) of the respondents said that development in SHG benefits women, (50%) of the respondents said that women are better at working in groups compared to men with (20%) of the respondents saying that all genders should be involved.

Gender stereotyping is apparent in form of agreement to label an institution as fitting of one gender as opposed to the other. The reasons that the respondents gave for women fitting more also indicate gender stereotyping because there is a feeling women are better at working in groups than men, which is also labelling men as anti-groups.
Table 4.25: Perception that women are nurturers and better at working with others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>.527</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.25 show that (50%) of the respondents in groups felt that women are better at nurturing and working with others and (40%) of the respondents disagreed with that view. Again this shows a stereotyping that justifies men not being member of SHGs- they are not nurturing and good at working in groups and therefore they do not fit in.

Table 4.26: Perception of men- SHGs are women oriented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>.441</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.26 indicate that (70%) of the respondents agreed that SHGs are women oriented with (20%) of the respondents being of the opposite view. This confirms an existing stereotype that SHGs are women oriented or preoccupied with women issues and hence men do not fit in and this would definitely discourage any man from being interested because their issues are unlikely to be dealt with in the group.
Table 4.27: Policies and Rules of SHGs and institutions more supportive of women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Men in SHGs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men not in SHGs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutions working with SHGs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.27 show that (70%) of respondents in Self Help Group confirmed that there is gender discrimination in rules and regulations of the institutions that they work in as well as those of the SHGs with (30%) disagreeing with that view. (69%) of respondents not in Self Help Group agreed that there is gender discrimination in rules and regulations of the institutions with (24.1%) being of a differing opinion. When asked why they feel there is gender discrimination, (64.7%) of respondents indicated that the institutions believe that men are not affected by poverty, (4.4%) of respondents indicated that Government and institutions use statistics that show women are more vulnerable but ignore men who could also be vulnerable, (20.5%) of respondents indicated that the government favours women and works on a basis that development can be more advanced by women as compared to men and (10.4%) of the respondents said that there is a lot of media campaign on women challenges.

Similarly 100% of financial institutions and not for profit organizations that work with SHGs that were interviewed said that their institutions are more inclined towards working with women because of the expectations of their back donors and funders who are convinced that women are more developmental oriented than men. All these are indicators of gender stereotyping at individual levels, government level and institution levels.
Table 4.28: Discriminative Policies and rules affect participation of men in SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.28 show that (70%) of the respondents felt that the policies of institutions working with SHGs and rules of SHGs affect men subscription in SHGs with (30%) of the respondents disagreeing with that view. When asked why and how the policies and rules related to SHGs affect men subscription in SHGs, (34.7%) indicated that the policies and rules ignore the fact that men and women are different in form of their needs and socialisation, (22%) of the respondents indicated they are forced to have women in leadership which should not be a rule but men should be mobilised to accept it, (11.7%) of the respondents indicated bureaucracy, (17.6%) of the respondents indicated long registration time and process with (5.8%) of the respondents indicated that the SHG policies are just not man-friendly.

There was also clear indication of stereotyping at the institutional levels with 80% of the institutions that work with SHGs saying that they expect women to be the majority in groups and are hesitant to work with groups that have men only or majority are men.

Table 4.29: Low participation levels of men in SHGs discourages Subscription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.29 show that (58.6%) of the respondents felt that the fact that numbers of men in SHGs are low discourages other men from subscribing to SHGs; (31%) of the respondents disagreed with that view. The 58.6% felt that low participation of men in SHG shows that they are not relevant to men. This shows another type of gender stereotyping in that few men participating in groups leads them to being labelled or stereotyped as women forums that men do not belong to.

Table 4.30: Perception that women are complex and hence not easy to work with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key leaders in SHGs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.30 show that (80%) of the respondents in SHGs said that Women are not easy to work with in the SHG and this discouraged men from joining the groups with (20%) of the respondents feeling that women are not complex. For the ones who felt that women are not easy to work (30%) felt that women are emotional and have all the time to waste in groups. (20%) of the respondents felt that women are very slow in implementing projects, (10%) of the respondents said that women are not comfortable working with men and 40% felt that women are petty and prefer gossiping. Those who felt women are easy to work with gave the following reasons: women are more devoted and punctual and women have much respect for their male counterparts.

These are also indicators of gender stereotyping since men have already a formed opinion of how all women work and this affects their actions and relationship with them.
Table 4.31: Summary of the average percentages scored by Variables influencing participation of Men in anti-Poverty SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level of influence</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchy System</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>At 69%, it shows that majority of the respondents supported the patriarchal system and therefore this shows that patriarchy system has an influence on men’s participation in SHGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Indicates that Masculinity has an influence on the decisions that men make regarding seeking for help in SHGs and hence has an influence in men’s participation in SHGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Culture</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>At 73% this is an indicator that socio-culture has a strong influences on men’s behavior and in the case of the study has a strong influence on men’s participation in SHGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Stereotyping</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>At 71.4% it shows that most respondents answered affirmatively to questions that had to do with gender stereotyping and this then indicates that masculinity has a strong influence on participation of men in SHGs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the percentage was obtained through an aggregate of the percentage of responses and percentage of different codes obtained through content analysis from each parameter of variables under study. It shows the 4 variables of study have a significant influence on participation of men in anti-poverty self-help groups. Majority of the responses inclined towards socio-culture influences, followed by gender stereotyping influences. The patriarchy influences came third followed by masculinity influences.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction
This chapter discusses the summary of findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations on the study; factors influencing participation of men in anti-poverty self-help groups: A case of Dagoretti District. Nairobi County. Kenya.

The study sought to answer the questions of the extent to which: Patriarchy System, Masculinity, Gender Stereotyping and Socio-culture influence participation of men in SHGs in Kawangware Slum. Data analysis results generated frequency and percentage distributions on the various indicators of the variables as well as descriptive analysis that determined the influence of the four variables on men’s participation in SHGs.

5.2. Summary of Research Findings
Table 5 gives a summary of the key research findings. It provides an aggregate of the average scores of the four variables. From the table it is clear that socio-culture influences are the leading causes of low participation of men in SHGs. Gender stereotyping which also has components of socio –culture influence but also the oversimplification of SHGs is also seen as influencing men from joining SHGs.

Patriarchy which is a system which expects men to be leaders and dominant also has an influence on whether men join SHGs or not. Also masculinity which is basically the intrinsic factors within men is seen to have lesser influence as compared to the other three variables, however it also it has quite a high percentage.
Table 5: Key Research Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Research findings</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To determine to what extent patriarchy influences men’s participation in self-help groups | - The 5 indicators under this variable averaged 67% which indicated a strong influence  
- 80% reported to have male leaders in SHGs  
- 80% felt SHGs would attract more men members if most key leaders are men.  
- 90% reported that men are more involved in decision making than women because men tend to stick to their final decisions, men are always ready to improve their life as compared to women and this should not be reversed in SHGs  
- 40% in SHGs said a decision by man is given more weight by other group members.  
- 50% felt that leadership is inborn in men and 60% that men are better leaders and should be leaders  
- 80% felt that men naturally provide better leadership than women  
- 70% of respondents preferred men to women leaders  
- 50% of respondents in SHGs felt that leadership make women disrespectful | Thus, leadership in mixed groups, gender preference in leadership and decision making patterns are important indicators of patriarchal system influences with belief on how social structures should be organized and level of trust between men and women having significant influence |
| To determine how masculinity influences men’s participation in self-help groups | - The 4 indicators under this variable averaged a 59% which is indicates a quite significant influence  
- 63.8% said that they earn enough income to support them without needing to get help from others with  
- 24.1% of the respondents “Partly agreed” and 55.2% of the respondents “Fully agreed” that they can be successful without need of being helped by others | Therefore, self-sufficiency attitude among men, resistance towards ‘femininity’, belief that SHGs are feminine, Construct on what it means to be a man- roughness, confidence etc. and dread of women |
- 55.2% of the men said they are self-sufficient with 41.1% of the saying they require little help but more from men than women
- 50% have problem with the fact that they need to involve others to benefit from SHGs
- 56.9% felt that SHGs are feminine just by the way they are organized and would not want to be involved
- 50% in SHGs agreed that men shun SHGs not to be seen as weak, 53.4% felt said that women are supposed to get help from men and not the other way round.
- 22.4% of the respondents “Partly agreed” and 48.3% of the respondents “Fully agreed” that as men they are ready to face any challenge without others
- 50.9% of the respondents have problems with women domination in groups

To determine how socio-culture influences men’s participation in self-help groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The 3 indicators under this variable averaged 73% a strong indication of strong influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 79.3% of men not in SHGs and 60% of men in SHGs agreed with the belief that seeking for help in SHGs is a womanly (a woman’s affair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 80% felt it is not cultural for men to be in SHGs and to seek for help from women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 60% agreed that society expects men to be self-reliant strong and not seek help from others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore resistance of men towards seeking help, unwillingness of men to pursue women’s assistance, Societal perceptions of self-help groups, expectation that men are all powerful with no need for help and perception that men are independent which are all socio-cultural have a strong influence in participation of men in SHGs

To determine the extent to which gender stereotyping

| The indicators under this variable averaged at 71.4% indicating a strong influence |

Therefore, Policies and group rules that govern SHGs which are inclined
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences men’s participation in self-help groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 70% think that women fits more in SHGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 50% of the respondents said that women are better at nurturing and working with others and hence more natural members of SHGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 70% agree that SHGs are women oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 80% of institutions reported to be more inclined towards working with women because women are more developmental oriented than men and because poverty affects women more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 70% of respondents in Self Help Group agreed that there is gender discrimination in rules and regulations of the institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 58.6% of respondents felt that the low participation of men in SHG shows that they are not relevant to men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 80% felt that women are not easy to work with and this discouraged their joining SHGs (felt they are emotional slow and petty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Towards one gender, Societal perceptions about gender roles, belief that SHGs ‘fit’ women more than men and gender relations have a strong influence on participation of men in SHGs.
5.3. Discussion of the Findings

5.3.1. Demographic Characteristics and Participation of men

The findings on men’s participation in SHGs support findings from previous studies. Only 15% of men were found to be members of SHGs which tallied with other studies such as the one carried out by (Gugerty & Kremer, 2000) which indicated that only 20% of SHGs members are men. Microcredit Summit Campaign Report also found out that 70% of microfinance clients are women (Harris, 2003). USAID’s annual Microenterprise Results Report for 2000 indicated that approximately 30% of USAID-supported Micro Finance Institutions’ clients are men. This could imply that men are not comfortable seeking for help. The findings also show that older men tend to shun self-help groups more as compared to younger men, implying that age has an intervening effect on men’s help seeking behavior. The findings also show that majority of the respondents who are in a family situation are more likely to join SHG as compared to those who are not. This then implies that increased responsibilities and expectations at the family level have a potential of influencing men to join a self-help group.

With respect to level of education, the findings indicated that an increase in level of education comes with an increase in likelihood of men to join a self-help group or to be more comfortable seeking help. A higher percentage of men with diplomas have joined SHGs compared to men with the same qualifications who have not. Similarly, a higher percentage of men with degrees have joined a SHG as compared to those with the same level of education who have not. The findings also show that men who have low incomes despite the fact that they would benefit from SHGs do not join groups and similarly men who would be considered to be earning better in Kenyan Standards (over 50,000) do not join SHGs. This are indicators of both masculinity and socio cultural influence where a man is not expected to show weakness for those earning little and a feeling of self-sufficiency for those with much more.

5.3.2. How Patriarchy influences Participation of Men in Self-help groups

From the literature review extracts, fundamentally, patriarchy is "the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general (Paul & etal, 2005). Kassily & Onkware (2010) noted that in patriarchal system power is traditionally believed to be the province of men. This is agrees with the findings of the study where 80% of the men reported
to have men as leaders in their groups and with 80% of the men feeling that SHGs would have increased membership if leaders were male. The opinion was advanced on the premise that men always have new ideas and that men can trust their fellow men- a patriarchal ideology. This then explains the findings where 50% of men indicated that they have a problem with women leadership; it is in line with expectations of a patriarchy system since having women in leadership position is going against the norm; this was further emphasized by the findings that 50.9% of men shunned groups due to domination of women – because they are the majority in the groups. This shows that since majority of men feel that their place is over that of women, a patriarchal expectation which expects men to provide leadership and not to be followers it is not normal to be in a SHG where majority are women and you are expecting help from them.

Majority of men at 70% indicated that they preferred men to women in leadership of SHGs due to the perception that men are faster in decision making besides the perception that women in leadership positions tend to be disrespectful with 50% of respondents indicating that they would have a problem with women having leadership positions in the SHGs. This supports the study by Nokia Research Africa and Institute for Development Studies (ND) which found out that when women’s profile within the communities’ are raised, it leads to mistrust by men who again influences their relationships and associations with other groups. The study also found that men tend to feel threatened by the perceived influence wielded by women.

Kilonzo (2000) noted that the institutions and processes that compose patriarchal system are conceptualized as webs of gendered relations which sustain and reproduce male social power. He further noted that patriarchy operates on a system of male hierarchical relations and male solidarity- a social and ideological construct which considers men (who are the patriarchs) as superior to women. This agrees with the findings of the study where 80% of the respondents felt that men naturally provide better leadership than women, since they treat each other equally; they are born leaders and are courageous. This is Patriarchy system at play, forming a social and ideological construct which instils a belief that men provide better leadership and that leadership in men is natural and inborn.

Indicators of patriarchy examined by Whyte (1978) included lack of women’s indirect influence on decision making among other indicators. Patriarchy was therefore seen as a
societal structure whereby men are dominant not in numbers or in force but in their access to status-related power and decision-making power. This also agrees with the findings of the study where 90% men reported that in mixed groups men are more involved in decision making than women members and justified this with aspects such as men tend to stick to the decisions they make and that they are better at making decisions- compliance with the patriarchy system which causes men to struggle with having to share the role of making decisions with women which is inescapable in a SHG set up.

With respect to the relative importance given to decisions made by different gender, the findings show that 40% were of the opinion that decisions made by men carry more weight. Whether this is true or not this is an indication that the influence of patriarchy system is very strong. There was a strong feeling that women are not naturally involved in decision making and that many of them are more comfortable with decisions made by men. Also of interest is the fact that for those who thought all decisions are given equal weight or importance thought it is because they need to ensure gender equality (expected of mixed groups by law) not because they think the decisions or contributions by women are of substance.

In order to address the challenges faced and influence men to join SHGs, the respondents made the following suggestions: enhanced women empowerment; ensuring gender balance in all SHGs; convincing men to join SHGs; creating awareness and sensitizing men on the benefits of SHGs; assigning men more leadership roles in SHGs; and investing in more profit making projects in the SHGs.

5.3.3. How Masculinity influences Participation of Men in Self-help groups

Literature review noted that the research of masculinity and how it affects men behaviour and participation in development is increasingly becoming an area of tremendous interest as advanced by Bannon & Correia (2006) and this then shows that this was an important variable to be studies.

Male Participation in Sexual and Reproductive Health symposium report (1998) defined masculinity, just like gender and patriarchy, as a socially defined construct influenced by innumerable forces including history, culture, religion and economic. The report noted that strict gender roles are internalized, and men learn to divorce themselves from qualities they identify as feminine - passivity, weakness, illness, dependence and sensitivity. This reflected
the finding of the study where 56.9% of the respondents felt that SHGs are feminine just by the way they are organized and hence were uncomfortable to join them. The reasons advanced for their views included: SHGs are mismanaged; majority members are women; there are no men related SHGs; they meet many times and only women have time for such kind of meetings; and women like doing things in groups and hence it was not manly to be in the groups.

According to Wade (2008), masculinity not only restricts men from exhibiting signs of behaviour or thought attributed to the female role, but also entails a wide array of specific behaviours and self-perceptions to which men closely adhere. Similarly Izgubara (2009) noted that masculinity is associated with the capacity of men to provide and fend for families and households which agrees with the findings of the study where 55.2% of the respondents indicated that they were men, self-sufficient and with adequate resources and hence required no help from others. The reasons advanced for this response included the following: 63.8% felt that their income was sufficient (although their income brackets showed otherwise); they are able to access loans from financial institutions without need of being in SHG.

Though the men interviewed are small scale business men they felt that they did not need help because they are ‘business men’ who are making their own money; they live within their own means; they have enough money to sustain themselves; and they seek loan from banks and not individuals. This is a high indication of male ego which is typical of masculinity. It shows deep entrenchment of masculinity influences in men which push them from SHGs which are by essence a means of organized institution of getting help from others.

Kaufman (2003) defined masculinity traits as assertiveness, aggressiveness, ruggedness, toughness, decisiveness, inventiveness, risk-taking, confrontation, conquest seeking, ruthlessness and having a killer instinct. This agrees with the study where 50.9% of the respondents reported to have a problem with women domination in groups, domination of women challenges the conquest seeking aspect of masculinity. On the other hand UNESCO (2006) elucidated that the expectation of masculinity of men is that they are not supposed to have weaknesses or vulnerabilities. They must not show feelings as these would make them appear weak or vulnerable. This agrees with the findings of the study where 50% of the respondents indicated that men refuse to belong to SHGs so that they may not be looked at as weak with 53% of the respondents feeling that women should be seeking for help from men and not the other way round. With weakness being an indicator of low masculinity, men who
want to be identified as masculine will avoid anything that shows that they are not masculine. Therefore if belonging to a group is perceived to show weakness men will definitely elude it.

Ashley (2011) also explicated the belief that it is more masculine and therefore better to be entirely independent and invulnerable (never disabled, never sick, never vulnerable) which leads to a collective failure to provide social services such as health care, unemployment insurance, welfare benefits, and other benefits that help everyone, including men and boys. This tallies the findings of the study where 22.4% of the respondents “Partly agreed” and 48.3% of the respondents “Fully agreed” that as men they are ready to face any challenge without needing others. The respondents who fully agreed advanced an argument that they are worth more as individuals and being in groups undermined their distinctiveness as men.

The following were the interventions suggested by the respondents that should be employed to encourage men to join SHGs: provision of basic education on the benefits of SHGs; encourage integration of the society; showcasing benefits of SHG to attract men; awareness creation; putting in place policies that support equitable development; encouraging formation of men only groups for men not able to go over the masculinity challenges; and discouraging impeding cultural influences that discourage men. The findings are supported by the argument by Izugbara (2009) that helping men to know themselves and be able to engage with and peel through their own behaviours in the light of gendered cultural constructions is a logical complement to getting men to be true allies in the global struggle for gender equality.

5.3.4. How Socio culture influences Participation of Men in Self-help groups
Socio-culture influence in men is explored by UNESCO (2006) saying that “Society does not accept a person as a “man” unless he fulfils certain pre-conditions of roles or expectations of society, referred to as “male gender and sexual roles”, or “social masculinity roles””. This corroborates the findings of the study which had 80% of the respondents saying that it is not cultural for men to be in SHGs and to seek for help from women and that this influenced their participation in SHGs.

In regard to belief that SHG is a women affair, 79.3% agreed and for these reasons that had to do with the whole societal perception rather than the men’s perception (not acceptable by the society) men were willing to forgo any benefits that they would get from joining SHGs. This agrees with UNESCO (2006) which describes men as a group that has been made so insecure by
the society that they will do anything propagated as ‘what men do’, and avoid anything propagated as what men do not do, even if it goes against their nature (or benefit). As Izgubara (2006) put it rather than go through seemingly unmanning, nay humiliating medical procedures (or in the case of the study, procedures expected of all members of SHGs), several African men prefer to die in silence.

According to UNESCO (2006), pre-conditions set by the society influence men behaviours. 60% of the respondents said that society expects them as men to be self-reliant, strong, solution oriented and independent and hence cannot join SHGs which is an indicator of relying or being dependent on others. Mainly because a belief has been offered by the society, going against it is fundamentally going against the socio-cultural expectation which men do not want to risk since it would affect their standing in the culture. This then corroborates what Izgubara (2009) had to say about African men’s proverbial reluctance to seek help as being largely culturally-inspired. The finding also supports Johnson (2005) who wrote that as people participate in social systems they are shaped by socialization and by paths of least resistance (to what is expected of them). The safest response to the ways in which people are socialized is to take on the dominant version of reality and act as if it is the only way to be. In order to save themselves from social resistance or rejection, people will usually simply go along with paths of least resistance.

5.3.5. How Gender stereotype influences Participation of Men in Self-help groups

Gender Stereotypes were defined by Zalo & Akong’a (2007) as assumptions, false ideas or beliefs certain people tend to have about others, especially to members of opposite sex in regard to ascribed cultural roles. The findings of the study agreed with this by having 70% of the respondents saying that SHGs fit women. The reasons advanced for such thinking included a feeling that development in SHG benefits women; and women are better at working in groups as compared to men. These findings are in line with Gortnar (2008) who argued that gender stereotypes on the ‘proper’ roles of women and men become easily imprinted in people’s thoughts and minds and are (re)produced from generation to generation and largely determine how different genders relate with others.

Further, 70% of the respondents were of the view that SHGs are women oriented – a stereotype arguing that SHGs are preoccupied with women issues and therefore men do not belong. This corroborates what Luciano & Maas (1996) said of gender stereotyping as being
an oversimplification, or categorization, of a certain group’s traits and behaviour. This oversimplification is based on previous experiences with people belonging to the same group instead of seeing a unique individual with diverse characteristics. This means that there is a high probability that this stereotype is based on past experiences with one or a few groups which has now been generalised to all SHGs.

Majority of respondents (50%) felt that women are better at nurturing and working with others and hence more natural members of SHGs. Again these are stereotypes that may influence participation because men are already ‘disqualified’ from being relevant members. This agrees with Jiggins (1989) who talked on a commonly advanced stereotype that women are more likely than men to identify their own interests with those of their dependents, an attitude which is essential to the welfare of children and other household members. Bauer & Jahlmar (ND) elaborated on a commonly assumed idea that men are hard and tough, while women are soft and vulnerable which agrees with this finding.

Historical low participation of men in SHGs has also lend to labelling SHGs as irrelevant to men; 58.6% of respondents felt that the historical low participation of men in SHG shows that they are not relevant to men and hence discourage participation of other men. According to Mutugi (2006), the initial self-help groups were women’s groups whose main activity was saving and lending money - the popularly-called ‘merry-go round’. A stereotype has then been formed on the what was of groups in the past and ignores what Mutugi (2006) then said of latter SHGs – they are more cohesive and tend to move on to development activities.

Majority of the institutions working with SHGs at 80% reported to be more inclined towards working with women because women are more developmental oriented than men and because poverty affects women more. This could be based on the evidence advanced by Khandker (2003) suggesting that lending to women yields greater social and economic impacts relative to lending to men with fear is that if aid is given to men, they might sell food stamps and misspend resources, possibly wasting money on gambling, tobacco, and alcohol. However as Cleaver (2000) put it, the superiority of women as hardworking, reliable, trustworthy, socially responsible, caring and cooperative is often asserted; whilst men on the other hand are frequently portrayed as lazy, violent, promiscuous and irresponsible drunkards is basically a gender stereotype. This is confirmed by 70% of the respondents in Self Help Group who said that they that there is gender discrimination in rules and regulations of the institutions which favoured women more; some of the rules were that a higher percentage of members has to be
women and that as men they were scrutinised more before they were considered for credit. The men also reported to be ignored in capacity building since there was an assumption that they were already empowered- this generalisation, they said affect poor men who need empowerment.

In agreement with what Luciano & Maas (1996) described of gender stereotyping as being an oversimplification, or categorization, of a certain group’s traits and behaviour, 80% of the men respondents felt that women are not easy to work with and this discouraged their joining SHGs. The reasons they gave to justify their response was that 30% felt that women are emotional and have all the time to waste in groups, 20% felt women are very slow in implementing projects with 10% saying that women are petty and prefer gossiping all of which men have no time for.

The respondents who held the view that women are easy to work with provided the following reasons: women are more devoted and punctual; and women have much respect to their male counterparts. Both the negative and positive comments advanced by the men indicate since they have purely categorised and oversimplified their attitude towards women who could be co-members in SHGs.

5.4. Conclusion of the Study

From the study results, it can be noted that participation of men in SHGs is low just as statistics from previous studies have shown. It is noted that the participation of men in SHGs or men’s help seeking behaviour is at low level in Dagoretti District in Nairobi County. Despite SHGs being referred to as an important vehicle for an important for advancing poverty alleviation and development, they are still not popular among majority of the men. This could further be an implication that various stakeholders have not been serious about participation of men in development. It is clear that whereas efforts have been made to enhance men’s involvement as decision makers and service providers in development and poverty alleviation, more has to be done to involve men as a ‘vulnerable’ population that may also need their own type of empowerment.

In regard to Patriarchy system influences, majority of the leaders in mixed SHGs were found to be men. In addition, men were preferred in leadership positions due to their ability to make quick and firm decisions when required, there was a strong belief that men provide better leadership and that leadership in men in natural and inborn. Patriarchy system expects
dominion of men over women and since this was not possible in SHGs, they were rejected. This indicated strong influence of patriarchy and therefore for participation of men to be enhanced there is need to address the dominant patriarchal society.

In Masculinity influences in Men’s participation in SHGs, it was noted that SHGs were considered feminine which in all instances discourage a masculine man from involvement. Joining an SHG was seen to be considered as an indicator of weakness and dependence which also goes against the expectations of masculinity. Men perceived themselves as self-sufficient with adequate resources and requiring no or little help from others. There was a feeling among men that they should be the ones providing help to women and not expect help from women or any other person. Masculinity therefore has a quite significant influence which means that men have to be helped to address the issues of masculinity which could affect their development. The society also needs to be mobilised to change its affirmation of what they consider masculine.

From the study, it is clear that the society has set standards for men which men are determined to adhere to keep their social standing. One of the standards is an expectation that men should be self-reliant, strong and with an ability to provide. This standard does not fit well with the ethos of SHGs and hence consequently SHGs do not fit into the world of men. In addition, males are categorically reluctant to belong to SHGs just because it is not cultural to join such a group. Therefore, Socio -culture has a strong influence on whether men join SHGs or not and there is need to address the socio-cultural expectations of men to enhance their participation in SHGs and to consider seeking help in general.

Gender stereotyping was found to have a strong influence on participation of men in SHGs. There was strong indication that SHGs are perceived to fit women more and labelled as ‘women forums’. Women unlike men were seen as better at nurturing and working with others and hence more ‘natural’ members of SHGs or of seeking help as compared to men, there was also a strong stereotype that women are difficult to work with. It was also noted that rules and expectations of institutions were also based on stereotypes. The perception of various institutions, including the government and microfinance institutions was that women need more help as compared to men; this was found to be an oversimplification since it was found that there are men that many need help as well. Consequently, this stereotype led the institutions to being more inclined towards working with women, encouraging women more
to join SHGs, and having relaxed rules for women as compared to men - this automatically results to men shunning SHGs.

Therefore, the findings of this study found that all the variables under study- Patriarchy system, masculinity, socio-culture and gender stereotyping have significant influence on participation of men in SHGs.

5.5. Recommendations of the Study

On the successful completion of the study – Factors influencing participation of men in anti-poverty Self- Help Groups the researcher recommends that; i) in order to enhance participation of men in SHGs which is crucial for poverty alleviation and development especially for men in low income brackets there is need to create awareness on the benefits of SHGs and work on changing the stereotypes and historical perceptions about SHGs that are deeply engrained in people’s minds ii) Policies and practices of the government and other institutions should be evaluated to ensure that by empowering one gender or one age group they are not discriminating against another- this is in light of programmes such as Women Enterprise Fund and Kazi Kwa Vijana(a youth programme) - organisations and institutions should equitably give attention to the needs of both genders and all age groups iii) there is need to creatively invest in more education, capacity building thorough awareness campaigns, debates and the education system for the society in general to challenge traditional views of masculinity, what is cultural and what is not and expectations of the society of men iv) Men should be continuously encouraged to emulate women as team players so as to be fully involved in development and to be part of the newly rethought Gender and Development approach.

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of this study, it is hoped, will contribute to the existing body of knowledge and form basis for future research. The following areas of further researcher are thus suggested: (1) Whereas the current study focused on responses from men, future studies should focus on perspectives of women on factors influencing participation of men in SHGs; and (2) future studies should also explore the models of SHGs that men would want to be involved in (3) The findings of the study should be replicated in other counties of Kenya as well as other countries for comparison purposes and for better poverty alleviation programmes designed around SHGs.
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To whom it may concern,

Ref: Data Collection

The researcher, Mary Mbuki, is undertaking a project study on “Factors influencing factors influencing participation of men in anti-poverty self-help groups in Kenya- A case of Dagoretti District in Nairobi County.”

This research is being undertaken for the partial fulfilment for the requirements of the award of the degree of Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management, from the University of Nairobi.

The objectives of this study is to determine how patriarchy, masculinity, socio-culture and gender stereotyping influences men’s participation in self-help groups.

To assist in the project study, the researcher kindly requests for your participation in filling a questionnaire attached or a one-on-one personal interview or participation in a focused group discussion at a time of your convenience. All the information given will be treated with outmost confidentiality.

Yours faithfully,

Mary Mbuki
Appendix 2: Questionnaire/Interview Schedule for Men in Self Help Group

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

I. Age of Respondent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 61 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Marital Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Cohabiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Do you have any children?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

IV. Highest Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Income Level per Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Source of income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: PARTRIACHAL INFLUENCES

1. Please indicate whether the key leaders in your SHG are

   Women [ ]
   Men [x]

   If the key leaders or most of the leaders are women, why is this so?
   a. We think women can be good leaders. Yes [x] No [ ]
   b. The SHG rules expect us to have women leaders. Yes [x] No [ ]
   c. We need women leaders to be within the rules and regulations of funders and other partners. Yes [ ] No [x]
   d. Other reasons:

   [ ]

2. What is your opinion about the statements below?

   a. I would you prefer to have men instead of women in key leadership positions within our SHG
      Yes [ ] No [x]
      Explain your answer:

      [ ]

   b. Men naturally provide better leadership than women
      Yes [ ] No [x]
      Explain your answer:

      [ ]

   c. Our SHG would attract more men members if most of the key leaders are men
      Yes [ ] No [x]
      Explain your answer:
3. If you belong to an SHG with mixed membership please respond to items below
   a. Men are more involved in decision making than women members
      Yes  ☐  No  ☐
      Why are they more involved?

   b. A decision by a man is given more weight by other group members
      Yes  ☐  No  ☐
      Explain your answer:

   c. Women leaders are chosen to satisfy the rules and regulations of government only
      Yes  ☐  No  ☐

4. Suggest any two ways can we use to solve these challenges indicated above

PART C: MASCULINITY INFLUENCES

1. Why did you choose to join a SHG?

2. If you are in a men only group, why did you choose it as opposed to a mixed group?
3. If you are in a mixed group, how do you find asking for help from others especially women?
   Easy ☐
   Difficult ☐
   Explain your answer:

4. Suggest any two ways can we use to solve these challenges indicated above
   a. 
   b. 

**PART D: SOCIAL CULTURAL INFLUENCES**

1. As a result of belonging to an SHG in Kawangware, please indicate whether you have experienced the following comments or opinions from the people around you
   1. Many believe that SHGs is a women’s affair. Yes ☐ No ☐
      Explain:

2. Some male members are reluctant to belong to SHGS. Yes ☐ No ☐
   Explain:
3. Some male friends and family members refuse to belong to SHGs not to be seen as weak and requiring help from women.  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   Explain:

4. Society expects me to be self-reliant, strong and not seek help from others  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   Explain:

5. Our community perceives SHGs as a sphere for women. Yes [ ] No [ ]  
   Explain:

6. Any other experience  
   Explain:

7. Suggest any 2 approaches that can be used to overcome the above challenges so as to increase male participation  
   ____________________________________________________________  
   ____________________________________________________________
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PART E: GENDER STEREOTYPING AND PARTICIPATION IN SGH

1. Who do you think fits more in a SHG
   Men ☐    Women ☐
   Why?

2. Do you think that women are better at nurturing and working with others and therefore are better at being members of SHGs?
   Yes ☐   No ☐
   Explain:

3. Do you think that government/financial institutions and NGO’s policies that guide their interaction with SHG support one gender more?
   Yes ☐   No ☐
   Explain:

4. Do you think these policies affect the subscription of men in SHG?
   Yes ☐   No ☐
   If yes, how:

5. Do you feel that these policies discriminate against one gender or another?
   Yes ☐   No ☐
Which one? Men ☐ Women ☐

How?

---------------------------------------------

d. Are there any rules or practices in the SHG that you are not comfortable with as a man?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, which one?
   ---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------

e. Do you think these rules discourage men from joining? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, why?
   ---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------

4. What would you say about the relationships between men and women members in the group?
   ---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------

5. Would you say that women are easy to work with in the groups?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   Explain:
   ---------------------------------------------
6. Suggest any two ways that can help overcome above challenges so as to increase male participation in SHGs in Dagoretti District
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for Men Who are not Self Help Group Participants

**PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

1. **Age of Respondent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Below 20 years</th>
<th>21-30 years</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>51-60 years</th>
<th>Over 61 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Respondent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Marital Status:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married/Cohabit</th>
<th>Re-married</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Do you have any children?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Education Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Secondary School</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelor’s</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PHD</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Income Level per Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level per Month</th>
<th>Below 7,500</th>
<th>7,500-10,000</th>
<th>10,000 - 20,000</th>
<th>20,000-30,000</th>
<th>30,000-40,000</th>
<th>40,000-50,000</th>
<th>Over 50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Level per Month:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Source of income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Self-employed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Parent support</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART B: PARTRIACHAL INFLUENCES

1. Why have you not joined a SHG?
2. Please respond to items below in regard to male involvement in SHGs

   a. I have a problem with groups whose leaders are women. Yes ☐ No ☐
   b. I have a problem with women domination in groups. Yes ☐ No ☐
   c. Men should be more involved in financial decision making than women. Yes ☐ No ☐
   d. A decision by a man should always be given more weight by women. Yes ☐ No ☐
   e. Men can join SHGs but only to provide direction and leadership Yes ☐ No ☐

3. What can be done to address the above challenges and influence you to join SHGs?

PART C: MASCULINITY INFLUENCES

1. Please indicate whether some of the reasons below have influence on your non-participation/joining a SHG in Dagoretti District

   i) I feel that SHG’s are feminine just by the way they are organized and I would not like to be involved in feminine organizations or groups
      Yes ☐ No ☐
      Explain:

   ii) I am a MAN, self-sufficient with resources and require little help from others especially women
      Yes ☐ No ☐
      If yes, please explain:

   iii) I earn enough income to support me without soliciting financial help from other people
      Yes ☐ No ☐
      If yes, please explain:
iv) I have issues with women having leadership positions in the SHGs

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please explain:

f. I have a problem with the fact that you need to involve others to benefit from SHGs

Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Please indicate whether you fully agree, partly agree or do not agree to the following statements in regard to you not joining SHGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am able to financially support myself adequately without belonging to a SHG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am ready to face any challenge in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have witnessed many successful men who don’t belong to any SHG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not manly to be in a SHG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggest any two ways can we use to solve these challenges indicated above so as to increase men’s subscription to SHGs

PART D: SOCIAL CULTURAL INFLUENCES

1. Please indicate whether you have experienced the statements below in your interaction with the people around you and whether they have influenced your shunning SHGs

a. Many believe that SHGs is a women’s affair.

   Yes ☐ No ☐

   Do you agree with the belief? Yes ☐ No ☐

   Explain:

b. Some male friends and family members refuse to belong to SHGs not to be seen as weak and requiring help from women.

   Yes ☐ No ☐
Do you agree with the belief? Yes □ No □
Explain:
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
c. Society expects me to be self-reliant and not seek help from others
   Yes □ No □
Do you agree with this expectation? Yes □ No □
Explain:
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
d. Our community perceives SHGs as a sphere for women
   Yes □ No □
Do you agree with this? Yes □ No □
Explain:
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
e. Any other experience from the society and the people around you that may have influenced you from NOT joining a SHG?
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PART E: GENDER STEREOTYPING AND PARTICIPATION IN SGH

Please indicate whether the following factors have influenced you from participation in SHGs in Dagoretti District

a. The fact that SHGs are women oriented. Yes □ No □
   Explain:
b. Policies that govern administration of registered SHGs. Yes □ No □
   Explain:
c. Rules/regulations of microfinance/finance institutions that govern registered SHGs
   Yes □ No □
   Explain:
d. Rules/regulations of SHGs.  
   Yes ☐  No ☐ 
   Explain:

e. Low participation levels by men in SHGs.  
   Yes ☐  No ☐ 
   Explain:

f. Belief that SHGs are the domain of women.  
   Yes ☐  No ☐ 
   Explain:

g. I feel that there is men discrimination in SHG.  
   Yes ☐  No ☐ 
   Explain:

h. The things discussed in SHGs are petty and womanly.  
   Yes ☐  No ☐ 
   Explain:

i. Any other, explain:

   ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Suggest any two ways that can help overcome above challenges so as to increase male participation in SHGs in Kawangware

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Appendix 4: Interview Schedule for SHG /NGO/Government/ finance providers

PART A: General Information

Your Institutions type of partnership with SHG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership/Service Provided</th>
<th>Explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B: PARTRIACHAL INFLUENCES

1. If your institution provides services to a SHG with mixed (men and women) members, who the key leaders
   Women [ ] Men [ ]

   On average, what is the percentage of each sex? -------------------------

2. It is preferable to have one sex over another in key leadership positions within an SHG
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   Explain:

3. Does your institution expect a certain percentage of leadership to be women?
   If yes, do you think that women would have been in leadership positions if it was not of your regulation?

   Explain:

4. Do you think that men naturally provide better leadership than women or vice versa?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   Explain:

5. Do you think that SHGs would attract more men members if most of the key leaders were men
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   Explain: ________________________________________________________________

6. Do you demand that women leaders are in the groups?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
GENDER STEREOTYPING AND PARTICIPATION IN SGH

1. Who is the target group of your organization?
   Women ☐ Men ☐ Both ☐

2. What is your rationale for the choice of target group?
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

3. Who do you think between women and men are better members of SHGs?
   Men ☐ Women ☐

   Explain:
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

4. a. What are your institutions key policies that govern your partnership with SHGs?
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

5. Do you think that the Rules/Regulations of self-help groups discourage men from joining SHGs?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   If yes, how?
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

6. Have you worked with single sex groups?
   Men only ☐
   Women only ☐

   If yes, what has been your experience with each?
## Appendix 6: Interview Questions for Focused Group for Men

### Number of Men

### Patriarchy

1. Why have you decided not to join an SHG?
2. Do you feel that men naturally provide better SHG leadership than women?
3. How do you get your financing?

### Masculinity

1. Would you be open to joining a mixed group? Why?
2. Why do you think men shun SHGs?

### Socio-cultural factors

1. How do you think that the society out there perceive SHGs?
2. Do you think that the way the society perceives SHGs makes men avoid them? How
3. What do we as a society expect of you as men?
4. Are SHGs a women thing?

### Gender Stereotyping

1. Are government policies that govern administration of registered SHGs in favour of women or men? How?
2. Are rules/Regulations of microfinance/Finance institutions that govern registered SHGs inclined towards supporting women?
3. Has low participation levels by men in SHGs influenced other men negatively?
4. Are the Rules/Regulations of SHGs gender sensitive? Explain
5. Do you think that relationships between men and women influence male participation in SHGs? How?
6. Suggest any two ways that can help overcome above challenges so as to increase male participation in SHGs in Dagoretti