Mainstreaming Gender or "Streaming" Gender Away: Feminists Marooned in the Development Business

Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay

1 Introduction

This article is about taking stock of experiences of mainstreaming gender. It addresses two related concerns. First, that after three decades of feminist activism in the field of development – both at the level of theory and practice – most development institutions have still to be constantly reminded of the need for gender analysis in their work, policy-makers have to be lobbied to "include" the "g" word and even our own colleagues need convincing that integrating a gender analysis makes a qualitative difference. Second, by constantly critiquing their own strategies, feminist advocates have changed their approaches, but institutional change continues to be elusive (except in a few corners).

Gender and development advocates cannot be faulted for their technical proficiency.[1] Making a case for gender and development, developing and implementing training programmes, frameworks, planning tools and even checklists, unpacking organisational development and change from a gender perspective, have all contributed to building technical capacity and pushed forward technical processes for the integration of gender equality concerns in development. The literature also acknowledges that gender equality is as much a political as a technical project and efforts have been directed towards creating "voice" and influence, lobbying and advocacy.

So who are "we"? I situate myself among those of us who started out in the development movement of the 1970s in a Third World country. I was shaped by the feminist movement in India, was groomed by the international gender and development movement in the late 1980s and into the 1990s, and am now in a northern institution which does research, training and technical assistance in development policy and practice. My job involves working with international organisations, national governments and national and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to integrate a gender perspective in policy and practice. In this article, I use my own experiences to interrogate how the concerns of feminists from similar locations with the political project of equality are being normalised in the development business as an ahistorical, apolitical, de-contextualised and technical project that leaves the prevailing and unequal power relations intact. This normalisation is happening at both the level of discourse and material practice.

2 Gender mainstreaming: the bold new strategy

Mainstreaming was the overall strategy adopted in Beijing to support the goal of gender equality. The political rationale for this strategy follows on from what feminist advocates had been struggling to establish – that rather than tinkering at the margins of development practice, gender should be brought into centre stage (Razavi 1997).

Gender mainstreaming involves:

- the integration of *gender equality concerns* into the analyses and formulation of all policies, programmes and projects;
- initiatives to enable women as well as men to formulate and express their views and participate in decision making across all issues.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) guidelines state:

A mainstreaming strategy does not preclude initiatives specifically directed toward women. Similarly, initiatives targeted directly to men are necessary and complementary as long as they promote gender equality. (OECD/DAC 1998: 15)

In practice, there are two interrelated ways in which gender equality concerns can be mainstreamed: integrationist and transformative or agenda setting.

2.1 Integrationist

The aim is to ensure that gender equality concerns are integrated in the analysis of the problems faced by the particular sector; that these inform the formulation of policy, programmes and projects; that specific targets are set for outcomes and that the monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes capture the progress made in the achievement of gender equality.

2.2 Transformative or agenda setting

The aim is to introduce women's concerns related to their position (strategic interests) into mainstream development agendas, so as to transform the agenda for change. For example, one of the ways of ensuring that gender equality concerns are integrated in agriculture is to make sure that extension services address both women and men and that technological packages are appropriate for both women's and men's roles in agriculture. However, the issue might be that women in their own right, and not as wives or dependants of men, have no rights over land. Advocacy for women's land rights is thus necessary to set the agenda for change of mainstream programmes addressing gender inequality in agriculture.

Integration and transformation require work at two different institutional levels. While integration involves working within development institutions to improve the "supply" side of the equation, a transformative agenda requires efforts to create constituencies that demand change. The latter requires an understanding of the nature of political society, state–society relationships, and the extent to which particular contexts the policy-making institutions are dependent on, or autonomous from, the influence of international development and financial institutions. Integration depends for its success on transformation. In order to build the accountability of policy-making institutions to the gender-differentiated public they are supposed to serve, the creation of the demand for democratic, accountable and just governance has to go hand in hand.

Much of the work in integration has been concentrated on institutions and involved improving the technical processes in development. Gender advocates have had to make a case for integration of gender issues by showing how this would benefit the organisation and meet official development priorities. To do this, they have developed frameworks, checklists and tools for gender integration in policies and programmes and trained people in gender awareness and planning, monitoring and evaluation. The challenge that feminist advocates in development have faced and continue to face is that their work straddles both worlds – the technical and political – but the development business only tolerates the technical role.

Why is this so? Both integrationist and transformative versions of mainstreaming require explicit acknowledgement of equality goals. These entail redistribution of power, resources and opportunities in favour of the disadvantaged, which in the case of gender mainstreaming happens to be women. Many of the reasons why the development business barely tolerates any role for feminist advocates has to do with the understandings of the development process itself. The most influential and pervasive understanding of development is that it is a planned process of change in which techniques, expertise and resources are brought together to achieve higher rates of economic growth (Kabeer 1994).

3 From incorporation to rights

In recent years, concerns about the accountability of decision-making institutions to the public, respect for human rights and the need for enhanced voice and participation have tempered this economically defined development agenda. Even so, transformation – as signifying changes in relations of power and authority and growing equality between social groups – is hardly ever explicitly acknowledged as a goal, except where it is instrumental to the development imperatives of poverty eradication, improvement in children's health, family welfare, intra-household equity and fertility decline.

The international policy agenda throughout the 1960s, 1970s and much of the 1980s was less concerned with women's rights than with how to

incorporate women into the development process. Both scholarship and activism at this time was concentrated on convincing international development agencies about the importance of women's roles in development. Even though the UN's Commission on the Status of women (CSW), set up in the early 1970s, functioned as the only international institution at that time devoted to addressing the issues of justice for women, it was more concerned with analysing and responding to the development-based economic and social issues concerning women, rather than defining and pursuing rights issues (Molyneux and Craske 2002). It was not until the 1990s that the focus shifted to rights and led to the questioning of women's position in their own societies.

This focus on rights was brought about by the burgeoning international women's movements struggling worldwide for the right to have rights and basic civil liberties. While the international conferences organised by the UN in the 1990s provided the spaces for organising around rights and the forums in which to articulate demands, it was the growing strength of social movements, especially women's movements, which brought back issues of social justice, equality and rights into the development agenda.

Feminist scholars have argued that advocacy on behalf of women which builds on the common ground between feminist goals and official development priorities has made greater inroads into the mainstream development agenda than advocacy which argues for these goals on the grounds of their intrinsic value. The reason, they say, is because in a situation of limited resources, where policy-makers have to adjudicate between competing claims, advocacy for feminist goals in intrinsic terms takes policy-makers out of their familiar conceptual territory of welfare, poverty and efficiency, into the nebulous territory of power and social injustice (Razavi 1997; Kabeer 1999). Even though it has not automatically secured accountability to women's concerns, explaining the world to policy-makers has nevertheless driven the work of feminist advocates in development. These advocates have been kept busy with the technical processes of developing frameworks, planning tools and checklists and have become adept at using the language that development institutions recognise of social justice, rights and equality. Radical analytical and methodological tools become

undermined, as when Molyneux's distinction between strategic and practical gender *interests* (1985) became translated in development planning language as *needs* rather than rights (Moser 1989).

However, there are other reasons why the development business can barely tolerate the technical role of gender and development advocates, while rejecting outright the political project of gender equality. These have to do with deep-seated resentment of and consequent resistance to the project of equality between men and women and the language of politics that assertions of equality brings forward.[2] The language of women's rights is deeply disturbing because it involves separating out the identity of women as citizen-subjects from their identity as daughters, wives and mothers, the subject of social relations. It is threatening not only for development institutions, but also for communities and families who stand to lose when male prerogatives to rights and resources are in jeopardy. Feminist scholarship has devoted much attention to unpacking the inherent male bias in development processes (Elson 1991) and more recently male bias in the construction of rights and law and interpretation and implementation of law (Mukhopadhyay 1998; Goetz 2003). The cumulative impact of these resentments and resistance has been the silencing of the project of equality and its rendering into an ahistorical, apolitical, de-contextualised and technical project both at the level of discourse and material practice.

4 Gender mainstreaming means getting rid of the focus on women

While a mainstreaming strategy does not preclude initiatives specifically directed towards women, in the development business it has come to mean exactly the opposite. Initiatives specifically directed towards women are seen as a failure of mainstreaming. Since 2000, my department in the Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam, has been involved in a project in Sanaa, Yemen, financed by the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE). The objective of the project has been to support the rural women's directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture to reach out to women farmers. Earlier the RNE, under the leadership of the sector specialist for women and development, supported the Ministry of Agriculture in Yemen in developing a gender policy that would pave the way for a better deal for the majority of invisible tillers of the land and tenders of household

cattle – that is, the women and girl children of Yemen. The Ministry of Agriculture in Yemen has a section called the Rural Women's General Directorate (RWGD). In each of Yemen's provinces, teams are attached to the provincial agriculture extension offices, which generally consider only men to be farmers, to serve the interests of this silent majority. Our responsibility was to build the capacity of these units and to make sure that they served the interests of women farmers, who are responsible for a large part of the work that contributes directly to household food security. This project received strong support from the Minister of Agriculture, who strengthened the rural women's sections in the provinces, often upgrading them to directorates, so that they had more power within the bureaucracy.

Responsibility for this project at the RNE has shifted back and forth from the sector specialist for women and development to the officer-in-charge of agriculture and rural development, on the grounds that 'gender had to be mainstreamed'. The sector specialist for women and development was keen for this project not to be seen as a "women's project", but as one that made a difference to the policies and practices of the agricultural sector and to the donor strategy. But this is not what happened. Negotiations between the Ministry of Agriculture and the RNE regarding future support for the sector continued to treat the rural women's general directorates as marginal. Finally, faced with budget cuts, the RNE axed the project on the grounds that 'gender had been mainstreamed' and thus there was no need to resource the special emphasis on women. This is in a country where extreme gender segregation means that women farmers cannot be approached by male extensionists, even if they wanted to, and where women workers of the Ministry are seen as illegitimate occupants of public office because they are women and not men.

5 Whose responsibility?

Gender mainstreaming means that nobody is responsible for getting it done. At an international conference held in 2002 entitled 'Governing for Equity' and organised by my department in the Royal Tropical Institute, a panel of gender advocates from international organisations and donor bodies discussed the strategies and problems of their organisations in gender mainstreaming (Mukhopadhyay 2003a). The presentations highlighted the common experiences of international institutions in integrating a gender

perspective. While there is recognition and acceptance within institutions of the importance of gender equality in development, the *practice* of incorporating a gender perspective in all programmes and policies is beset with difficulties that are not being overcome by present strategies. The main strategy has been to incorporate gender equality concerns in external policies, to demonstrate the importance of gender analysis as a tool for operationalising the mandate of the institution, and in some instances the setting up of a gender infrastructure, such as gender focal points or departments. For the most part, however, the integration of gender equality in the work done by these institutions relies on committed gender expertise and the "good will" of colleagues. Accountability for ensuring that gender equality concerns inform policy-making and programme implementation on a sustained basis is hard to pin down.

Gender mainstreaming has been adopted as a tool for gender integration in the UN system by other multilateral institutions. This strategy raises two kinds of questions regarding accountability. First, gender mainstreaming as a tool does not actually convey to those using it what exactly it is that they are responsible for ensuring. According to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) representative at the conference, it would be preferable to focus on women's rights, children's rights and men's rights because the rights focus actually tells one what has to be achieved. Second, gender mainstreaming as a tool is supposed to ensure that everybody is answerable for gender equity commitments. This has generally meant that nobody is ultimately responsible for getting it done. The limited success of gender mainstreaming in international institutions is due both to the absence of professional and political accountability and the lack of institutional spaces for enforcing accountability. Who is going to hold UNICEF or the World Bank or for that matter DGIS (the Development Cooperation Directorate of the Royal Netherlands Government) responsible for not promoting gender equality? And how?

6 Gender mainstreaming=more women in organisations

While gender mainstreaming implies the integration of *gender equality concerns* into the analyses and formulation of all policies, programmes and projects, in organisational practice this has increasingly come to signify that gender equality goals can be achieved

solely by increasing the number of women within organisations and in positions of decision making. This line is generally pushed by well-meaning donors.[3] Most gender mainstreaming checklists mention this as an item that has to be ticked off in order to determine whether or not a client government department or an NGO has made progress on gender equality. For them, this is easier to measure than to what extent gender analysis has entered into the formulation of policies, programmes and projects. While it is important to push for equality of opportunity for both women and men within development organisations, this cannot be the be-all and end-all. If such measures are introduced in an ahistorical and de-contextualised manner, they can have serious consequences for gender politics within organisations.

This was evident in a workshop I conducted in Cambodia in April 2003, the theme of which was gender mainstreaming in human rights organisations (Mukhopadhyay 2003b and 2003c). During the workshop, the Director of the largest human rights NGO in Cambodia explained that increasing the number of women in his organisation was what he interpreted as constituting gender mainstreaming. He had adopted a policy whereby 30 per cent of the staff would, over a period of time, be female. He has faced and is facing stiff resistance from his Board and especially from the one female member. She opposes the policy on the grounds that hiring women means lowering the standard of the workforce because women are generally less qualified. Asked what he had done faced with this resistance he replied that he was determined to make the policy work and had continued to hire and promote women. Representatives of the donors for this organisation, who were also present at the workshop, saw his stand as vindication of their efforts to push gender equality in human rights NGOs. The Director, a man, emerged as the champion of gender equality and the woman member of the Board, not present, as the villain. Male leadership is legitimised by the underlying message: attempts at introducing equality policies are opposed by women themselves (read backward) and men are far more open to liberal ideas (read modern). Even more sinister, however, was the account of how this very same NGO had performed "rather badly" a couple of years ago and that this coincided with the time that the gender policy was introduced. Members of the organisation present at the workshop equated poor performance with the *introduction of the gender policy and less qualified women in the workforce*. Asked to give concrete instances of how having more women in the organisation had led to poor performance, they were unable to do so. Nevertheless, it had become "common sense" understanding that the presence of more women leads to lowered standards of performance. The head of the Women's Department kept quiet in this discussion. The adoption of gender quotas and the attempts at promoting women had started a gender war in the organisation. This then helped reinforce the dominant culture of misogyny.

7 Gender equality in the absence of institutional mandate for promoting equality

To what extent is it possible to enforce gender equity commitments for institutions and within policy agendas whose main objective is not necessarily the promotion of equal rights and human rights? The main question is *not* how does one do it – feminists have been doing it all the time, creating a fit between gender issues and the organisational mandate/culture within which they operate (Razavi 1997). Rather we should ask whether it is possible in the long run to use instrumentalist arguments to persuade those not convinced of the intrinsic value of gender equality.[4] What really is the efficacy of internal advocacy without supportive politics?

In 2002, I was requested to undertake a situational analysis of gender mainstreaming efforts in selected Ministries in Ethiopia. The report concluded that the Ministry of Education was doing far better than the Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Health (Mukhopadhyay 2002). Each of these ministries has a Women's Affairs Department (WAD). The commitment of the Ethiopian government to address gender equality and equity concerns in development is formalised in the 'National Policy on Ethiopian women' issued by the Prime Minister's Office in 1993. The policy draws attention to the main areas of concern, enlists strategies for implementation of the policy and sets up gender machinery within government. The National Policy on Women mandated the setting up of the WAD in the Prime Minister's Office; Women's Affairs Bureaux in the Regions and the WADs in the Ministries and Commissions.[5]

Why was the Ministry of Education succeeding, while the Ministry of Agriculture was not? The

difference in performance on the gender front between the Ministry of Education and, for example, the Ministry of Agriculture seemed to be the main policy line promoted by the leadership and the *political support* that the WADs received from the leadership. The policy line developed by the Ministry of Education was based on a sustained analysis of the education sector in Ethiopia, which showed how achieving gender goals in education was essential to achieving overall goals. The WAD has been closely involved in the development of the new education and training policy which states clear support to girls' education and a strategy article for improving girls' education was adopted by the Ministry in early 1997 (Ministry of Education 1997). In July of the same year, the country embarked on an ambitious Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) which sought to increase the Gross Enrolment Rates and to reduce the gender gap in education and which incorporated the strategies that had been developed for improving girls' education.

In contrast, the main policy direction in the Ministry of Agriculture seems to be to work towards rural economic transformation that will entail agricultural commercialisation and the development of marketable agriculture. A three-point agenda has been devised: creating an enabling environment for capacity building of farmers; formulation of technological packages for commercial agriculture and increased productivity; and revising the rules and regulations to be able to intervene in the world market. Where do poor women farmers or for that matter poor men farmers fit in here? The WAD is left scratching at the margins of this policy because equity considerations are ruled out by these policy objectives. The main policy line does not address how the effects of increased commercialisation on the gender division of labour and women's work burdens and welfare will be minimised and how the marginalisation of women farmers will be avoided, or how household food security will be maintained.[6]

The main lesson that can be learnt from this contrast is as follows. While the overall policy direction of the Ministry of Education was to promote equality in access to education there was political backing from the leadership to pay special attention to girls' education. Gender equality was an explicit goal of the leadership (interview H.E. Genet Zewdie, Minister of Agriculture 2002).[7] The WAD within the Ministry thus had considerable space for manoeuvre and enjoyed support from the political leadership for its advocacy and for suggestions as to how gender goals could be achieved. The political aim of the Ministry of Agriculture, on the other hand, was to build an agricultural sector that is internationally competitive and profitable.[8] The political space for the WAD to intervene in the policy objectives was thus limited, since there was no support from the top for the relevance of any gender equity objectives. The gender guidelines produced by the WAD, based on data that showed the importance of women's roles in agriculture and food security and the gender gaps in extension and support services, remained a cosmetic document with little or no power of enforceability.

8 Conclusion: fighting back

These different examples illustrate how feminist concerns with the political project of equality are being normalised in the development business as an ahistorical, apolitical, de-contextualised and technical project that leaves the prevailing and unequal power relations intact. Gender mainstreaming is being interpreted as getting rid of the focus on women, regardless of context. In Yemen, that context is of extreme gender segregation, which means that women farmers cannot be reached by male agriculture extension workers, and the interpretation of mainstreaming evades this and other questions of gender power relations. Well-meaning donors and compliant organisations have reduced mainstreaming to a one-point programme of increasing the number of women within organisations and the political project of equality between women and men is being undermined by gender conflict within the NGO and by deeply demeaning images of women workers.

While most international organisations claim that there is recognition and acceptance within institutions of the importance of gender equality in development and there is a plethora of frameworks, tools and checklists available to aid these bureaucracies to integrate gender, there are no institutional mechanisms to check on failures. Gender mainstreaming in the absence of accountability becomes merely a technical exercise without political outcomes. As the Ethiopian example shows, integrating gender equality concerns within policy agendas whose main objective is not necessarily the promotion of equal rights is a near impossible task and one that reinforces the powerlessness of gender advocates and the gender equality agenda.

In repositioning gender in development policy and practice, we need to consider how to get back to the political project while not abandoning the present mode of engagement with development institutions. This was the goal of a three-year programme of work at the Gender Unit of the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam entitled 'Gender, Citizenship and Governance'. It aimed to develop a range of good practices to bring about institutional change – changes in institutional rules and practices that would promote gender equality and enhance citizen participation, changes that build the accountability of public administration institutions to the gender-differentiated public they are supposed to serve. In order to build good practice on institutional change from a gender perspective the approach adopted was to resource civil society institutions. Partnerships were developed with 16 organisations in two regions: Southern Africa and South Asia. Each participating organisation undertook action research projects on a theme of particular national and regional importance for gender equality. While these were on a range of issues, the initiatives undertaken can be categorised as follows: (1) enhancing and sustaining women's representation and political participation; (2) engendering governance institutions; (3) claiming citizenship and staking a claim to equal rights.

The activities, successes and failures of these action projects suggest the following lessons:

- *The importance of establishing citizenship as an intrinsic component of development*, where citizenship is understood as feminists have been defining and redefining it to mean having entitlements, rights, responsibilities and agency. This includes the right to have a right, to politicise needs, and to have influence over wider decision-making equality in development. A good example here is the release of women's agency in the efforts by Durbar (see Bandyopadhyay, this *IDS Bulletin*) to articulate the voice of sex workers by changing perceptions and by foregrounding their real experiences of exclusion from entitlements and rights that they face as women.
- *The importance of carving out spaces for articulation and citizen participation*. Just as rights have to be articulated, the space for articulation and citizen participation has to be constructed. In Pakistan, the Government has set up the National Commission on the status of Women (NCSW)

without consultation with civil society groups. Women's groups feared that without a truly independent status, enforcing authority or clear mandate, the commission would be unable to make any significant contribution towards changing the situation of women. Two civil society women's organisations (Aurat Foundation and Shirkat Gah), made the strategic decision to initiate a post-facto consultative process involving all stakeholders, government, commission members, civil society and experts. This reinforced the idea that critical decisions of this nature should involve all stakeholders and that citizens have a right to participate. The consultations with civil society and women's rights organisations at the provincial level served to introduce the members to their constituency and to listen to their expectations. The national consultation brought together all parties – civil society organisations and Commission members – in formulating the key recommendations for changes to the power, mandate and composition of the NCSW. Government measures to enlarge the future role and mandate of the NCSW are underway.[9]

- *The importance of creating constituencies and "communities of struggle"*. Changes in institutional rules and practices to promote gender equality and enhance citizen participation require that women emerge as a constituency, are aware of their entitlements and are able to articulate these. Sakhi, a women's rights organisation in Kerala, found that despite the existence of regulations favouring women's participation in the decentralised planning process and appropriate budgetary allocations, women could not take advantage of these to further their strategic interests. They did not have the organisation nor the articulation of interests needed to intervene. Sakhi set about remedying this situation by helping women to organise. It provided information and training so that women could undertake a needs analysis and training and support for the elected women representatives, building a constituency that could demand gender-fair practices.[10]
- *The importance of establishing substantive equality as opposed to formal equality*. The lived experience of specific categories of women (the most marginalised or those who are most affected by the specific lack of rights) must be honestly

represented in constructing substantive citizenship as against citizenship as formal rights. The end of apartheid in South Africa in 1994 opened up new political spaces for legal reform. One concern of the Rural Women's Movement (RWM) there has been that of customary marriage, which limited women's rights. They linked up with the Gender Research Project (GRP) at the Centre for Applied Legal Studies (CALS), a university-based research unit, to research and advocate on this issue. When it became clear to CALS researchers that many rural women living in polygynous unions were concerned that outlawing polygyny would invalidate their unions and threaten their livelihoods, ways were found to intervene in the law reform process to address the key concerns of women living in polygynous marriages – their rights to property and custody

of children.[11] By listening carefully to the worries and difficulties of particular rural women CALS brought the reform of customary law closer to the lived realities.

These emerging lessons suggest ways of getting back to feminist concerns with the political project of equality. The participating organisations have worked both within institutions to change norms and practices and outside institutions to build pressure on institutions to change, be more responsive and accountable to women's interests. They reconfirm that political project of equality requires engagement in politics – the messy business of creating voice, articulating demand, carving out rights, insisting on participation and mobilising the women's constituencies to demand accountability.

Notes

1. The distinction between the technical, professional and scientific on the one hand and the political on the other, is often made in development institutions. The technical often refers to the processes of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies, programmes and projects. It further refers to how to get things done in a specific timeframe and with set objectives. It relies on models, frameworks and tools for getting things done.

2. This resentment and resistance takes many forms, e.g. in 2003 there was a reorganisation in the Royal Tropical Institute where I work. Our existence as a gender unit was called into question on the grounds that "gender" was too narrow a field and we should be working on wider development issues. As a result we renamed our unit as Social Development and Gender Equity and have constantly to prove our "social development" credentials.

3. Donor pressure on NGOs and governments to abide by certain conditions like civil society participation and/or gender integration has led institutions to apply "checklists" in a mechanistic way. Whitehead shows in her review of Poverty Reduction Strategy Articles in four countries, that in many cases governments have conducted national dialogue on poverty policy not out of a genuine commitment to participation in policy-making, but simply to fulfil this condition of the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) initiative and to access debt relief funds (Whitehead 2003).

4. Meer shows in her review of European Union (EU) and Department for International Development (DFID) gender policy in South Africa that while both have strong gender policies which link gender equality to poverty eradication these policies are located within an overarching framework of market liberalisation which promotes polices that increase the burden on poor women (Meer 2003).

5. See reports cited in this section: Ministry of Education (1999, 2001); The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Agriculture (1996, 2000); and The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Education (1995, 1999, 2000).

6. According to a study done by the department of Planning and Programming of Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and mentioned in the gender guidelines, 48.3 per cent of labour contributed in agriculture is female.

7. The Minister of Education, Genet Zewdie, also pointed out to me that while a lot had to be done (and is being done) to improve the supply side of education, to maintain the momentum required the empowerment of women to challenge the education system to provide better and relevant services.

8. Whitehead (2003) makes a related point in her review of Poverty Reduction Strategy Articles (PRSPs). She shows that poverty analysis in the PRSPs is limited. The description of impoverished groups does not extend to analysis of why they are poor, so gender relations cannot be advanced as an explanation of women's poverty.

9. Based on a case study prepared by the Aurat Foundation and Shirkat Gah Pakistan for the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) Gender Citizenship and Governance Programme and summarised in Mukhopadhyay (2003a).

10. Based on a case study prepared by Sakhi, India for the KIT Gender Citizenship and Governance Programme and summarised in Mukhopadhyay (2003a).

11. *Source*: Based on a case study prepared by Centre for Applied Legal Studies (CALS) for the KIT Gender Citizenship and Governance Programme and summarised in Mukhopadhyay (2003a).

References

Elson, D., 1991, 'Male Bias in the Development Process: An Overview', in D. Elson (ed.), *Male Bias in the Development Process*, Manchester: Manchester University Press: 1–28

Goetz, A.M., 2003, 'Conceptual article on applied research for gender justice' (draft), prepared for Gender Unit of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ottawa

Kabeer, N., 1999, 'Resources, agency, achievements: reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment', *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) Discussion Article* DP108, Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)

Kabeer, N., 1994, *Reversed Realities: Hierarchies in Development Thought*, London and New York: Verso

Meer, S., 2003, 'Closing the gap: putting EU and UK gender policy into practice in South Africa', mimeo report, One World Action

Ministry of Education, 2001, *Education Statistics Annual Abstract 1993*, EC/2000–01, Addis Ababa

Ministry of Education, 1999, *Indicators of the Ethiopian Education System* (quick reference) Addis Ababa: Education Management Information Systems

Ministry of Education (Ethiopia), 1997, *Major Strategies to Strengthen Women's Participation in Education* (Amharic version), Addis Ababa

Molyneux, M., 1985, 'Mobilisation without emancipation: women's interests, and revolution in Nicaragua', *Feminist Studies*, Vol 11 No 2: 227–54

Molyneux, M. and Craske, N., 2002, 'The Local, the Regional and the Global: Transforming the Politics of Rights', in N. Craske and M. Molyneux (eds), *Gender and the Politics of Rights and Democracy in Latin America*, Hampshire: Palgrave

Moser, C., 1989, 'Gender planning in the Third World: meeting practical and strategic gender needs', *World Development*, Vol 17 No 11: 1799–1825

Mukhopadhyay M., 2003a, *Governing for Equity: Gender Citizenship and Governance*, Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute

Mukhopadhyay, M., 2003b, *Evaluation Report of GAD Cambodia*, commissioned by the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Bangkok, KIT Gender

Mukhopadhyay, M., 2003c, 'Workshop on gender mainstreaming in human rights NGOs in Cambodia', Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute

Mukhopadhyay, M., 2002, *Situational Analysis of the State of Gender Mainstreaming in Selected Ministries in Ethiopia*, Commissioned by the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Ethiopia, KIT Gender

Mukhopadhyay, M., 1998, *Legally Dispossessed: Gender Identity and the Process of Law*, Calcutta: Stree

OECD/DAC, 1998, *DAC Guidelines for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Cooperation*, Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC)

Razavi, S., 1997, 'Fitting gender into development institutions', *World Development*, Vol 25 No 7: 1111–25

Whitehead, A., 2003, 'Failing Women, Sustaining Poverty', *Gender in Poverty Reduction Strategy Articles*, report for the UK Gender and Development Network, London: Christian Aid

The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Agriculture, 2000, *Women and Development Guideline: Promoting Women's Participation and Benefit in Agriculture Development*, Addis Ababa

The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Agriculture, 1996, *Population and Development in Ethiopia: Prepared for Rural Development Staff* (Amharic version), Addis Ababa

The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Education, 2000, *Note on Gender Sensitive Counseling: Excerpts From Summer Training Course Conducted for High School Guidance and Counsellors*, in collaboration with Department of Educational Psychology, Addis Ababa University

The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Education, 1999, *Improving Retention With a Special Focus on Girls*, in collaboration with The USAID/BESO Project, Addis Ababa

The Women's Affairs Department of Ministry of Education, 1995, *Some Considerations on Girls Education*, Addis Ababa