IDRC GENDER WORKSHOP
Saturday, October 5, 1996

FINAL REPORT
(Revised - October 30)

By

Waafas Ofosu-Amaah
Patricia Stamp, Ph.D.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .................................................................................................................................................. 3

Section One - Thinking About Gender .................................................................................................................. 5
  Objectives of Workshop ........................................................................................................................................ 5
  Background: Participants’ Stated Expectations for the Workshop ................................................................. 5
  Workshop Methodology ...................................................................................................................................... 6
  “Thought Experiments” about Gender .................................................................................................................. 6
  Workshop Timetable .............................................................................................................................................. 7

Section Two - Building Gender into Projects ....................................................................................................... 10
  Conceptualizing Gender Mainstreaming ............................................................................................................. 10
  Working Propositions Regarding Gender Relations ............................................................................................ 10
  What is gender mainstreaming? Methodological and Practical Issues ............................................................... 12

Section Three - Building Gender Consideration into Programme Initiative .......................................................... 19
  Rationale for the Exercise .................................................................................................................................. 19
  PI# 1: Alternatives to Poverty-Driven Resource Degradation (ALT) - Discussions ........................................... 21
  PI# 2: Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP) - Discussions .................................. 21
  Outcome of PI Exercises ..................................................................................................................................... 21

Section Four - Conclusions and Next Steps ........................................................................................................ 23

Appendices ............................................................................................................................................................ 25

Appendix 1 - List of Materials Distributes at the Workshop .................................................................................. 26

Appendix 2 - Participants’ Evaluation of Workshop Summary of Evaluation Responses .. 27

Appendix 3 - List of Participants ................................................................................................................................ 31

Appendix 4 - Selected Bibliography ....................................................................................................................... 32
Executive Summary

This Gender Training Workshop brought together IDRC Programme and Project Officers from headquarters and from Regional Offices during the Programme Review Meetings (PRM). It was organized by the Gender and Sustainable Development Unit (GSD) as part of its ongoing effort to build capacity within the Centre for gender mainstreaming and analysis and for dialogue on these issues. The objectives of the Workshop were:

1. To revisit gender issues of the past ten years in the concrete context of current IDRC projects and initiatives.
2. To provide participants with the opportunity to share both the positive and the negative experiences they have had in dealing with the “gender question” in their work and to engage in imaginative thinking about the use of gender analysis.
3. Through the use of two selected Programme Initiatives (PIs) and two selected Project Proposals, to explore techniques for incorporating gender analysis into the project and PI development process.

The central theme of the Workshop was gender mainstreaming within the context of IDRC’s programmes and projects. Its conceptual underpinnings were the tools and techniques that Centre staff required for such mainstreaming and their policy and programming implications. The organizers set themselves an ambitious task with this many substantive objectives to be covered during a one-day session. In addition, participants listed a variety of expectations that the organizers had to attempt to meet. As a result, the timetable was very packed. Nevertheless, the Workshop stimulated rich discussions and provided a useful opportunity for Centre staff to exchange ideas on this important but difficult topic. More importantly, it enabled them to consider the gender theme within the broader framework of IDRC’s research mandate and the Centre’s role in championing certain causes with its research partners.

The Workshop discussions addressed a variety of key topics relating to the gender theme, including, WID/WAD/GAD approaches and their relationship(s) to feminism, gender analyses, gender mainstreaming, and the need for dialogue and education on these issues between Centre staff and their research partners in developing countries (IDRC’s “conscientization” role). Also discussed was the need to link gender concerns with other social concerns, such as race and class. A recurring topic was the relevance of the gender theme to the Centre’s mandate and mission. Participants felt that the centrality of this theme and its underlying objective (gender equality or efficiency of development research) were not as clear as they could be in the Centre’s policy document - the Corporate Programme Framework. They therefore identified the need for more clarity of language in these corporate documents, and for other concrete manifestations of senior management’s commitment to promoting this theme in all aspects of the Centre’s work.

A preliminary definition of gender mainstreaming was discussed. The message conveyed was that gender mainstreaming is a process, rather than an objective in itself or even a clear-cut technique. The institutional aspects of gender mainstreaming were explored, including especially the need to either scale down research proposals/projects or scale them up by making funds available to ensure adequate and thorough treatment of their gender components. This was the only way in which IDRC’s “conscientization” role could be reinforced in any meaningful and practical way.

The Workshop provided an informal and participatory learning environment for Centre Staff to share experiences and concerns about this theme. It also enabled them to identify areas for which they need additional skills, tools and methodologies for gender analysis. The practical focus of the exercises
undertaken - concentrating on two projects being considered by the Centre and two ongoing Programme Initiatives - provided the basis for “hands-on” evaluation of research activities and thematic areas of focus through the medium of the gender lens (“gender goggles”). Key lessons learned from this Workshop include:

- Gender mainstreaming is a process, to be thought of in terms of a methodology rather than as an objective;
- Each institution needs to determine the key elements of this process within the context of its mandate, mission, policies and programs;
- There is a need to operationalize what gender mainstreaming means so that Centre staff can objectively measure their progress in the process of mainstreaming;
- The need for an appropriate gendered perspective may require, in some cases, a necessary scaling up or scaling down of some research projects or proposals, with the attendant policy and financial implications; and
- At the senior policy making level, the Centre needs to articulate these implications and provide support to Centre staff to enable them to carry this message across in all aspects of their research, especially in their interactions with their research partners in the developing countries.
Section One
Thinking About Gender

Objectives of Workshop

The Workshop, timed to coincide with the Programme Review Meetings (PRM) when many IDRC Programme Officers were are at headquarters, was designed to meet the following objectives:

1. To revisit gender issues of the past ten years in the concrete context of current IDRC projects and initiatives.
2. To provide participants with the opportunity to share both the positive and the negative experiences they have had in dealing with the “gender question” in their work and to engage in imaginative thinking about the used of gender analysis.
3. Through the use of two selected Programme Initiatives (PIs) and two selected Project Proposals, to explore techniques for incorporating gender analysis into the project and PI development process.

Background: Participants’ Stated Expectations for the Workshop

Prior to the Workshop, the GSD Unit had given participants an opportunity to contribute to its design by asking Centre staff to respond to the following questions:

1. Within the context of your PI(s), what are the gender-related gaps that you would like addressed (i.e., theoretical concepts, methodological tools, etc.)?
2. Within the context of your PI(s), what are the practical issues relating to gender analysis and mainstreaming that you would like addressed (e.g., difficulty you experience in discussing, promoting and encouraging the implementation of gender analysis with other institutions, partner researchers, co-workers, etc.)?
3. Please identify a research issue within the context of your PI(s) where gender analysis in NOT relevant.
4. What are the exciting new areas of gender-specific research within your region/PI/Theme?
5. Please identify any other related issues you would like to be discussed during the October meetings.

The general consensus from participants’ answers was that gender did not appear to be fully integrated into research projects and that while there was agreement as to the importance of gender, there is a lack of tools and skills to enable Programme Officers to effectively mainstream gender. Many answers identified a need for concrete examples of how to integrate gender within the context of PIs and projects. At the Workshop, participants listed the following additional expectations:

1. Learn skills to help me identify issues related to gender in all my IDRC work, and utilize those skills to add value to projects, etc.
2. How to make projects inherently gender sensitive.
3. To develop the appropriate perspective and attitude, to know whether/know what/assume I know - if not, lead me unto light.
4. Get a practical handle on incorporating gender in a Latin American project context.
5. Practical strategies for taking on the culture argument.
Workshop Methodology

The responses to these questions were used as the basis for the structure of the Workshop. The Workshop timetable is reproduced on the next page. These responses also reinforced the need for the Workshop to make time for the detailed review and analysis of actual proposals and programs - to provide participants with hands-on work with upcoming projects. Two project proposals and two PIs were selected for such review. The criteria for their selection included the need for proposals that are in the early development phase (and therefore facilitate concrete and instructive discussions without fear of offending the “owners” of the project), and the transferability of the lessons to other themes. Some of the responses also noted that the need to understand when gender is NOT an issue is an important key to understanding how gender sensitivity can be implemented more effectively in research projects. This observation prompted the formulation of the “Thought Experiments” that were used in the opening session of the workshop.

“Thought Experiments” about Gender

These opening session experiments were designed to engender some imaginative reflections on the subject of gender in participants’ work. Following the introduction on some of the conceptual and methodological talking points on gender mainstreaming (see Section Two), the entire workshop engaged in two “thought experiments,” designed to explore feelings and experiences both with a deficiency of gender sensitivity and content in project work, and with a sense of surfeit regarding gender as “the flavour of the month.” The two thought experiments, "But That’s Got Nothing to Do with Gender!" and "Gender, gender, everywhere." set the workshop participants up for the work that ensued in the morning and afternoon group sessions, and are summarized in the boxes below:

Thought Experiment #1
“But That’s Got Nothing to do with Gender”

The purpose of this thought experiment was to enable participants to share their experiences with some of the barriers (difficulties or objections to) gender considerations or to quote remarks and anecdotes illustrating resistance to gender. Some examples that emerged include:

- Only women have gender;
- If a project has a woman researcher, it is gender sensitive;
- What is going on in IDRC regarding gender with the structural and programming changes;
- Women participated in the projects by bringing the coffee;
- Women have nothing to do with some types of projects, e.g., seed research;
- There are no gender considerations in projects, e.g., connectivity;
- WID is women’s work;
- There are lots of women - on the ground floor;
- Macroeconomics - it’s all just abstract! It is a bunch of graphs, not about people;
- Information technology has nothing to do with gender;
- Energy has nothing to do with gender - maybe washing machines; and
- It wasn’t important to have more sex in the projects.
Workshop Timetable

9:00  Coffee and informal get-together for participants
Participants share their expectations for the Workshop and preview the Workshop materials package.

9:30  Introduction: What is “gender mainstreaming?”

10:00 Thought Experiments
#1 - “But that’s got nothing to do with gender!”
#2 - “Gender, gender everywhere”

10:30 Work Sessions I - Building Gender Into Projects
Project #1: Testing of Criteria for Assessing the Sustainability of Community-Managed Forests" - Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Project #2: Protocol Development for Apricot Processing and Marketing in Northern Areas, Pakistan." - The Aga Khan Foundation

11:45 Group Reports on Work Session I
General discussion of gender issues and support needs identified during group work

12:30 Lunch
Informal discussion
Brief remarks by Kathleen Clancy on baseline assessment of IDRC gender work.

1:30 Work Session II - Building Gender into Programme Initiatives (PIs)
PI #1 - Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP)
PI # 2 - Alternatives to Poverty-Driven Resource Degradation (ALT)

2:45 Coffee/Tea Break

3:00 Group Reports on Work Session II

3:30 Concluding Session
What have we accomplished?
Where do we go from here?

4:00 Close
Thought Experiment # 2
“Gender, Gender Everywhere”

The objective of this exercise was to identify ways in which the gender issue is sometimes pushed to absurd limits. It enabled participants to brainstorm on gender connections for topics that are picked for their apparent irrelevance to gender issues. Some of the observations include:

- Some institutions don’t (can’t) have enough political correctness (‘PC’) - it could lead to or feed the current “PC” bashing that is going on;
- Some institutions use gender as a way of “doing the numbers”;
- The emphasis on gender sometimes leads to “blindness” to other balance issues, e.g., diversity;
- Gender becomes the “flavor of the month” then is put away or relegated to a little box;
- Gender sensitivity tends to run in cycles;
- No distinction is made between gender analysis, gender mainstreaming or gender balance on research teams;
- It is often not clear why gender is relevant in IDRC’s work or why it matters;
- There is often considerable talk about gender but there is an element of superficiality and there does not appear to be an internal drive to become literate on the gender issue; and
- Sometimes the message than one gets from listening to policy makers is that Africa will be saved by women. But in this agenda for action, there is not enough theory. There is a need for a conceptual framework.

These two exercises elicited a number of spontaneous comments and exchanges regarding the imperative of including gender analysis and gender sensitivity in participants’ work -- whether they were frustrated by not enough of it, or exasperated by "too much" of it. They accomplished the purpose for which they had been designed, i.e., to generate a broad-based discussion on some of the underlying reasons for gender sensitivity in the overall scheme of IDRC’s work, and to give participants a relaxed, informal moment to explore their frustrations and expectations about the possibilities of gender work. In particular, participants were able to consider the positive aspects of the Centre’s approach to gender, and what aspects needed additional work. The consensus emerging from this fruitful, freewheeling exercise was that an opportunity to air feelings, ideas, and assessments in an unstructured way, in a non-judgemental forum was a very useful, and rare, experience. Some examples of the myths, biases or concerns that emerged from these general discussions include:

1. Not enough time is spent in the regions on culturally sensitive gender issues - gender does not get factored into IDRC-sponsored research programs “as a matter of course.”
2. Usually, the entry point for gender is projects - but that is probably the wrong strategy, as a more fundamental step in connecting the IDRC message to gender should be done first, i.e., at the policy level.
3. Therefore the question becomes, “what is the role of senior management? Do they see gender as a “natural” component of the Centre’s goals, and therefore not needing constant support?”
4. Gender issues tend to migrate at IDRC to the exotic(indigenous, developing?) societies and the caring professions (health, nutrition?). It has been impossible to find people to bring gender issues to the male-dominated, “hard” development issues (macroeconomics?).
5. There is a lack of sensitivity toward Centre staff and research partners who do not have the social science backgrounds or less access to the gender discourse, and not enough effort is made to introduce gender issues and their relevance to the Centre’s work to these people.

6. There is often a tendency to focus on the failures, especially when discussing gender in the context of macroeconomics, and not enough examination of the ways in which economists are taking account of gender in macro-analysis.
Thinking about "gender mainstreaming," requires that we bring a focus on the social back into the centre of the screen. Even in research that has no apparent direct connection to the social arrangements of human beings, there are always impacts, actors -- people -- affected. This may be a truism, but the boundaries between the fields within which development work is conducted often keep practitioners from recognizing the fundamental truth. What this means is that there is a need for more rigorous conception of the social realm in all projects: there is a wealth of current social theory that talks about the relationship of the individual to the community (and the exploration of this relationship is especially urgent in the light of the dramatic changes brought about by the Structural Adjustment era, on which there is now an abundance of excellent analysis).

Conceptualizing Gender Mainstreaming

Many projects and programmes have a high level of abstraction regarding the human, economic and social aspects of the initiative being proposed, but these abstractions do not always take advantage of the wealth of understanding that could be applied. It is suggested that we do need social science, even in projects that are not social specifically. A reading list of current work on gender and development charts some of the recent achievements in analyzing and theorizing gender and development (see Appendix 4).

It thus follows that one cannot do good social science without "mainstreaming" gender analysis into social analysis. In this light, when we talk about "gender mainstreaming, we cannot simplify or treat gender only technically, which a lot of Gender and Development (GAD) has tended to do. While the need for fully operational tools is obvious, the theoretical framework and empirical knowledge base must always be kept in mind, monitored and reviewed. Rounaq Jahan's concept of "agenda-setting" vs. the "integrationist" approach (summarized in Ann Leonard's Seeds 2: Supporting Women’s Work Around the World), is a useful tool; it is used in the document recently produced by the GSD unit: "Baseline Analysis of Gender Sensitivity."

Working Propositions Regarding Gender Relations

Before exploring the methodological and technical aspects of "mainstreaming gender," it is worth considering briefly the theoretical realm in which this term has been used. Social scientists are exploring the "mainstreaming" of gender analysis in an interesting way: they are working with the concept of civil society, not in the functional way it is currently being used in development writing, but in the fashion of the Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci and his recent followers. Building on his famous work between the World Wars, most fully expressed in his Prison Notebooks, current thinkers work to understand the way the state creates and maintains hegemony via the control of the non-political sphere: religious communities; ethnic and clan groupings, women, and younger men, amongst other actors and institutions. States do not rule by coercion; they rule through the creation of hegemony, whereby all the non-political realms of society acquiesce to the power of the state. Increasing control over women and younger men has been a major means of creating a hegemonic state (whether a colonial one such as Kenya, or a current one such as Afghanistan), according to such social scientists.
One can exemplify the value of engaging in such social science analysis through the presentation of two propositions that have immediate relevance to many development projects, even ones that are overtly technical in focus. Both of these propositions emerge clearly from social science research on gender over the past three decades, and have widespread validity in spite of differences in culture and history.

The following propositions, or assumptions, are based upon general principles regarding gender relations. These principles are based on thirty years of gender analysis in Third World countries, and represent points of consensus arrived at by scholars working in a wide range of countries and cultures, covering a deep historical span. These propositions are intended to provide working tools for thinking about the social, political, cultural, and environmental aspects of any given project or project initiative. The two given here are just some starting points; a number of others could be worked through and "operationalized" in a similar way.

Most development projects talk about the family, the community, as if the actors in each have a homogeneous approach to the objectives of the project: a common set of needs regarding the outcome, and the same relationship to the activity. As well, the impact is often assumed to be the same for all intended beneficiaries of the project (even though a statement may sometimes be made about differing impact on men and women).

**PROPOSITION 1:** This assumption of homogeneity is incorrect in almost all circumstances, from a minor degree to very major degrees. Most tasks are gender-divided in most societies, and this sexual division of labour leads to a different stake in, and different relationship to, almost all resources, activities, and opportunities. Hence, the different domains of use are contested, rather than being collaborative, in many instances. (Even where an overall activity range is a collaborative endeavour, for instance men and women engaging in different stages of the production of cloth amongst the Baule of West Africa; or men and women being responsible for herding and milking/veterinary care respectively in pastoral East African societies; once changes are introduced to the production process, through commercialization, or the introduction of new technology -- for instance powered looms; marketing of subsistence cattle or camels -- then the historically collaborative relationship is almost certain to change to a contest over the resource). As a corollary to this proposition, when such change occurs, the contest almost always leads to a loss of control or access for women.

**Using Proposition 1 to factor in gender analysis:** Using the "Apricot Project": Identify process words, or phrases, such as "marketing," "[produce] processing" or preservation," "superior packaging," "business development," "farmer participation in research and development," pose questions as to: the role of women in the process; what the women-specific knowledge is, regarding the process, if any; the consequences for women's central role in the process if the changes put men in greater control of the process -- will they lose control? will the whole process be undermined because their participation and control are undermined? Does the shift from women to men as chief actors lead to a shift from community to outside agents, as beneficiaries? We can ask a number of questions of this type regarding the Apricot project, and others. The operative phrase in the "Apricot Project" proposal (although it is not elaborated on, or referred to in the elaboration of the project), is "Apricot production is largely women's work in the Northern Areas [of Pakistan]."

In spite of the assumption of a homogeneous approach amongst actors in the development process, most development projects are based on another profound assumption that to some degree contradicts the first. It is supposed that men and women inhabit a "public" and a "private" sphere respectively, and that the
private sphere of women is a domestic world separated out from the collective decisions of society. (The private sphere is usually conceptualized on the model of an ideal Western nuclear family, or at most an extended family, where there is indeed a sharp distinction between a private, "domestic" life and the realm of public decision-making).

PROPOSITION 2: For most non-Western societies, this public/private dichotomy does not exist. A major strand of gender analysis over the past 25 years has shown this to be the case. Even in societies that practise the seclusion of women, in a way that appears to lend itself to Western notions of public and private, the so-called "private" sphere is often in fact a hub of community activity, with women playing an important decision-making role in "the local street." For the majority of women who are not secluded, women are even more prominent in local decision-making, often in ways that are not visible in the light of conventional political analyses of the "public sphere." Women's power and authority in community decision-making have emerged in a number of studies that use a different concept of the "public sphere." Women exercise their authority collectively rather than individually, and the studies reveal a division between "the community of men" and "the community of women" in public life. Yet in development research and practice, the community of men has been favoured over the community of women. Men's networks have been recognized as the sole, legitimate "public" with which outsiders should deal. This continues to occur, in spite of the identification of "women's interests" and "women's needs."

Using Proposition 2 to write gender analysis in: Using any of the working research documents provided in the workshop, speculate on the concept of "public" embedded in it, and consider how it might differ if the assumption of a public/private dichotomy in the target society were dismissed. Using the "Sustainability of Community-Managed Forests" project, investigate the use of the concept "community" to generate questions about women's public decision-making role. Are "women" implicit in the concept of "community?" If not, how can the concept be specified so that women come immediately to mind as public actors when "community" is discussed?

What is gender mainstreaming? Methodological and Practical Issues

The purpose of this section of the workshop was to enable participants to focus on some of the practical constraints they face in attempting to incorporate gender concerns into their research projects and to engage in some “hands on” gender mainstreaming exercises. The starting point for these exercises was a description of gender mainstreaming. It was explained that gender mainstreaming is a process. It embodies many gender and development concepts and techniques as follows:

1. It is based on the gender approach, which emphasizes the need for gender sensitivity, gender awareness and gender balance in planning and implementation;
2. It requires the assessment of impacts of development policies, programmes and projects on women and men;
3. It relies on gender analysis as a tool and analytical framework for planning, decision making, implementation and monitoring;
4. It enables development practitioners to identify the obstacles and opportunities that women and men each face and to plan accordingly;
5. It requires them to determine whether the policies and programmes that they implement provide the same opportunities for women and men and to meet their needs equally; and

6. It offers a dynamic way of determining and enhancing the development potential of both men and women.

Participants were asked to think of gender mainstreaming in terms of a methodology rather than as an objective. This methodology involves integrating gender concerns into all development policies and programmes as a matter of course. It also has some built-in prerequisites to ensure the development of appropriate tools for programming and implementation, such as:

- the generation, interpretation and use of sex-disaggregated statistics;
- gender analyses; and
- the development of guidelines and checklists based on gender considerations, and other appropriate tools for programming and implementation.

Each institution needs to determine its own definition of gender mainstreaming within the context of its policies. Even within an institution, different offices may consider it appropriate to identify their own methodologies for mainstreaming gender in their work.

Following these conceptual and methodological background discussions on gender, participants then broke out into two working groups to discuss the two project documents selected for analysis. The following summaries of the group discussions include the set of four questions geared to each proposal that were used as a starting point or focus for the discussion. One project proposal (the “Forest Sustainability” project) was of an evaluative nature, exploring the results of earlier research and assessing methods, procedures and concepts already in use. The other proposal complemented this with its more direct, primary development research focus. While the first group thus ranged over a wider set of topics than the second, they both converged in their concern about the underlying assumptions about how gender should be built into projects, and about the nature of IDRC’s engagement with the GAD, and the issue of attitudes amongst IDRC researchers. Of particular interest was the sentiment emerging from both sessions that the "conscientization" of researchers by IDRC was an important but subtly difficult task.

The detailed discussions in each of the Working Groups are summarized on the following pages.
"Testing of Criteria for Assessing the Sustainability of Community-Managed Forests," CIFOR

This research proposal aims to expand and deepen an earlier study that developed a conceptual framework "for the analysis of the social dimensions of forest sustainability," and developed methods and field procedures for "testing the social science criteria." The following questions were prepared to assist participants with the discussions:

a) How relevant are gender concerns for the objectives of this research project?

b) Which gender-specific needs can the project meet if these gender concerns are incorporated in the research.

c) How will different phases and components of the research be differently formulated to sharpen the gender-analytical aspects?
   -- conceptual framework components? (Phase I)
   -- research methodology components?
   -- organizational components?
   -- the budget?

d) Are there additional issues that should be addressed?

The aim of this proposal was to better understand “how sustainability can be observed, measured and evaluated in community-managed forests.” Participants discussed various interpretations of what exactly the project was designed to measure:

- sustainability in general;
- sustainability of the process behind the resources;
- sustainability of the resources; or
- how people interact and use forest products.

It was agreed that it was not clear what the researchers were trying to measure, but for brevity sake, an assumption would be made that they were measuring the community’s use of the resource. An earlier phase of this project had come up with three key components of the social dimensions of sustainability, each of which consisted of the essential elements listed in brackets:

1. Well-Being (economic opportunity, recognition and respect for property, cultural heritage and identity, justice and safety and health).
2. Actions of People Likely to Lead to Sustainable Management (boundaries, capacity to protect the resource, decision-making mechanisms, conflict resolution, monitoring, group size, incentives and benefits, inputs, and conservation value or commitment to sustainability).
3. Intergenerational Benefits (stability of people’s well-being and the maintenance of “social
capital,” inheritance systems, tenurial security and youth).

The second phase was now being developed to examine in more depth these social elements and to refine them further. The discussions focussed on these social dimensions of sustainability, with participants agreeing that there was a need to ask two fundamental questions: who benefits from the project; and whether the research is looking at the right concepts, i.e., is well-being enough? What about the whole spectrum of opportunities? To what extent do the criteria listed measure all the complexities of race, culture, class, etc., and also measure changes in these complexities over time? And to what extent do any of the key elements capture or reflect the role of women in the power structures of the society in question? It was felt that as an initial step, this project needs analysis at the community level before the research intervention.

As these criteria focus on the social dimensions, another crucial question is how far does one disaggregate some of the elements? It was felt that disaggregating is at the core of gender sensitivity. The best route to take would be to put on the “gender goggles” and disaggregate on the basis of sex. A suggestion was made that “peoples” should be disaggregated in terms of gender and class. It was admitted that taking this step would have implications for the cost of the project and might lead to two options: One option would be to go with the list as planned (the less expensive option); another would be to take a smaller sample and conduct a thorough assessment of each of them from all the various gender, race, class perspectives (the more expensive option). Whichever option is taken, IDRC bears the full consequences and cost implications - the latter obviously being the better option in the interest of the greater good that such a broader-based focus would bring.

The greatest challenge in pursuing the second option is changing the mindset of the researchers, and not the terms of the proposal. IDRC’s commitment to social justice needs to come out at the forefront of many of these projects. For each of the elements of social sustainability, asking the researches to “genderize” them would involve a fair amount of conscientizing. The crucial question therefore becomes “is it not necessary for IDRC to put this gender goal up front and say to researchers that they need to see people as women and men?” They (Programme Offices) can introduce gender in a utilitarian context, rather than as an equity issue.

These questions led to a discussion on the extent to which IDRC can continue to play a “boy scout” role on this issue and keep promoting gender, even at the expense of changing the nature of proposals. It was felt that as part of the conscientization effort, IDRC needs to come to terms with the cost implications and argue in support of some overall principles and goals. The starting point may always have to be IDRC principles which should guide the research (with IDRC staff stopping short of doing the research themselves, but rather leading in the appropriate manner that brings out the conscientization). The Centre’s role should always be to offer guidance, and then follow up with concrete suggestions.
The aim of this proposed research was to improve the quality of apricots in the Baltistan region of Northern Pakistan "so as to market them internationally, in a manner that is most advantageous to the producer communities." In 1987 an Aga Khan project introduced improvements to the traditional processing and preservation methods in this area. The specific objectives of the proposed phase of the project were to build on the earlier successes through: developing new marketing and processing protocols; targeting business development opportunities for the crop; and encouraging participation in the research and development processes by both farmers and the Baltistan Apricot Marketing Association (BAMA).

Participants discussed both the specifics of the proposal and its conceptual frame and underlying assumptions. While women were specifically targeted ("... since most of the apricot processing is done by women, [the entrepreneurial work of the project] can help them make important economic and social advances"), participants noted the lack of depth to the inclusion of women. They proceeded from this insight to identify an array of weaknesses in the proposal not just in regard to women, but in regard to the socio-economic context as a whole.

With regard to question a), the relevance of gender concerns, this project was striking for its obvious relevance to women's role in the economy. Yet, as participants noted, there is no gendered discussion in the proposal until page two, and as a whole the proposal takes many factors for granted. Moreover, there was no breakdown of who does the work (question b), beyond the indication that "apricot production is largely
women's work . . . while men do the marketing of the dried fruit." (p. 3 of the project document). In light of the latter, participants found it fundamentally problematic that the research proposes no analysis of the land tenure system or of social organization, including relations of gender in regard to agriculture in general, and apricot production in particular. Further conceptual and methodological problems were noted. Although women had just been identified as the principal producers, the proposal's discussion of "farmers" bore no mark of recognition of this fact. The multiplier effect of increased apricot profits was noted, but the benefit of this was unclear to participants in the light of an absence of data on income distribution. No needs assessment for women was proposed, and it was not clear that the researchers intended to talk to the growers themselves. Participants noted that other development research has revealed marked gender-based differences in the multiplier effect in many cases, with greater benefits to families and communities when women's income is directly improved; conversely, the shift of income receipt from women to men with production and marketing changes has often proved to undermine returns to the locality.

In the light of this, it was noted that when a project aims to change systems of production, it is imperative to consider in advance the impact of such change on the specific lifestyles of both men and women. No such impact assessment was included in the proposal. From this point a discussion arose regarding unintended consequences of changes brought about by projects, and regarding the wider "politics of development." In that the project's aim was to increase income from apricots, one must ask, first, how the added value is to be divided amongst processors and marketers: will the change undercut women's share and control of the product and enhance men's, as happens in so many cases of this kind? Second, one must look for unforeseen consequences of technological progress; often when a new technology is bought, outsiders come in such situations and dispossess the producers, as the very profitability of the enterprise attracts wider entrepreneurial interest. Participants indicated that ultimately, the new inequity can cross borders, with the Northern country providing the new technology benefitting at the expense of the recipient Southern country. Participants reflected on the issue of the value of development projects for Canada, and noted that this is a structural point of contention, both for long term policy, and at the micro-level.

The discussion of the Apricot Project thus broadened out to a subtle and fruitful exploration of some important general themes bearing on development research: these can be classified in the category of wider analytical and policy context; and IDRC approaches and practices. The following are specific points made by the participants:

The wider context
- Different techniques and approaches are necessary at the different levels, of project, program and policy. Palestinian women provide one example: their politicization by their recent history leads them to a more political stance towards GAD: they are sensitive to the aspect of foreign domination in it, and say "stop the occupation of gender training." In this and other examples one can see a dialectical process at work between politics and responses to the GAD initiative.
- It is important for IDRC staff to shy away from seeking simple solutions to complex socio-historical issues; and in taking complexity into account, one can identify in each case where one can make a difference: trade, debt, child prostitution -- it will differ from case to case. There is a need to start to develop strategic interventions, and help to inform policy in a continuous, subtle way.

IDRC approaches and practices
- What is lacking is an analysis of the role and effectivity of GAD; across IDRC there is no guarantee down the road regarding outcomes when gender is factored in at the proposal stage.
• However it must be remembered that IDRC’s mandate is research, not effects. By all means IDRC staff should go out to determine needs regarding gender issues, and then articulate them back into the Centre’s research design.

• It is surprising how narrowly focused IDRC projects are. Sometimes there are even blinders on: you don't want to know the empirical details. "Multidisciplinarity" is the flavour of the day, but it hasn't been internalized by many Centre staff. It is important to watch out for it being carried to an extreme -- a kind of internal PC -- which can oversimplify the issues.

• It is highly desirable to enrich projects that are technological in orientation with a socio-cultural dimension, but it must be recognized that this research package is more expensive.

• The point emerging here is the need for a gender practice. Analysis of what needs to be done to mainstream gender is not enough. The knowledge in fact exists as to what is needed, but how to share this knowledge in the organization is the question.

• No-one reads the "best practice" documents that exist at the Centre, and then there is anger when a project is held up.

• What is needed is an affirmative action project that would have positive effects -- the Apricot Project would be a good one. The key lies in the choices made at the outset. Moreover, it is not how one does things (i.e., how you fit gender in), but what one selects to do (i.e., build a project with gender at the foundations). It is a question of what problems we choose to address in the first place -, i.e., a from the ground up approach.

• A useful edict for this ground-up approach is: "Don't retrofit projects with gender!"

• The current reorganization of IDRC presents an opportunity: for Centre staff to work to reinsert the gender mandate and practice in the beginning stages of any initiative. It is important that the social scientists act as facilitators of this endeavour.
Section Three
Building Gender Considerations into Programme Initiatives

The afternoon session focused on the Programme Initiatives. The "Corporate Program Framework to the Year 2000" provided a mandate for thinking about gender analysis and gender research in the context of the organization's new strategy for conducting its work: on p. 10 it states that "the Centre intends to practice and promote a holistic approach to the use of knowledge resources for sustainable and equitable development." The document goes on to talk about the "growing severity, intractability, and urgency of the problems related to global poverty" as a justification for the new approach. Thus, putting gender into the Programme Initiatives is not just a question of being more fair to women: it is a question of getting at the heart of the "intractability" of development problems.

The goals of the afternoon session were by definition more free form and speculative, and the working groups sparked a wide-ranging, vigorous, and sometimes contentious debate about the goals of IDRC, the current reorganization, and the nature of development research. The intention to stimulate imagination and provide an opportunity for creative criticism was amply fulfilled. The aims of these discussions are:

1) to allow those who work within the context of the PIs to conceptualize their wider framework regarding gender analysis.

2) to equip the PI teams and designers with preliminary ideas for the fulfilment of the IDRC gender-sensitivity mandate in their Work plans.

3) to provide hypothetical gender statements for the PIs, which can serve as models for other and future PIs in IDRC.

Two ongoing PIs had been selected for these exercises (with the generous approval of the PI team leaders): Alternatives to Poverty-Driven Resource Degradation (ALT) and the Micro Impact of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP). These two had been selected for reasons similar to those underlying the thought exercises, i.e., one for its obvious connections to gender, especially the feminization of poverty, and the other because of its often stated lack of legitimate connections to gender except at the very micro level. The workshop broke out into the same two groups as the morning break out groups. The aim was to build on the synergy created in the morning sessions; the format differed in that both groups discussed both PIs, rather than each group taking one.

Rationale for the Exercise

The ultimate objective of these exercises was to attempt, at the very “macro” level at which PI work plans are drawn, to isolate these obvious and not so obvious links and to convey them in a meaningful way in the PI work plan without having them become merely formal acknowledgments of the importance of gender. These exercises were also thought by the GSD Unit to be important because in a recent baseline analysis of gender sensitivity in a sample of IDRC-funded projects during the 1995-1996 period, it was recorded that “40% of the funded projects in this sample neglected the importance of people in explaining and legitimizing the project’s potential development impact.” This baseline analysis called for a revaluing and rethinking of the way the Centre engages in development and some of the assumptions and biases that
Centre staff and their research partners bring to their work. An explicit focus on gender at the PI level may be one of the ways in which this process of revaluing may begin.

The standard format for most of IDRC PIs, in all their rich diversity, is a useful outline of components, e.g., objectives, activities, etc., (see list in box). These components provided a useful starting point or focus for the discussion in this session. Rather than starting with the goals, where it would be difficult to operationalize gender -- beyond the most general "motherhood" statement pronouncements -- one can work upwards, "engendering" each component of the PI, towards a set of statements that together, could comprise the gender statement for the PI. The questions and background information provided to participants to assist them in the discussions are reproduced in the box below. Although participants engaged in a very general discussion and did not follow the guidelines suggested or give specific answers to the questions posed, these exercises are presented in this report as a practical guide to stimulate discussions on other PIs. The issues, concerns and topics raised during the group discussions on these PIs are summarized on the following pages.

Building Gender Into Program Initiatives
Exercises for the MIMAP and ALT PIs

Most PIs (such as ALT) follow a useful standard format containing the following components:

- Objectives
- Activities
- Inputs
- Outputs
- Reach
- Impact
- Revenue generation
- Decision-making/accountability/evaluation
- Operational procedures

a) Which of these components provide easier entry points for the insertion of gender analytical statements?

b) In which components is it more difficult to insert gender analytical statements?

c) What language would you add to each component to create a gender statement?

d) For PI work plans that document work in progress (such as MIMAP), what is the appropriate means for inserting gender language and statements?

e) In order to advance the goal of inter-disciplinarity that underlies the PI approach, how can existing PIs take aboard gender analysis, research and expertise midstream?
PI # 1: Alternatives to Poverty-Driven Resource Degradation (ALT) - Discussions

The goal of this PI is “to assist Latin American governments and civil societies to better understand the complex interactions between the incidence of poverty and resource degradation, enabling the design and implementation of improved policies and technologies to halt degradation and reduce poverty.” Participants felt that generally, there was not much gender sensitivity in the PIs, and there did not appear to be a real understanding of what the society looks like. They reiterated the need for a broad statement on gender or social issues in the PIs work plan as a whole.

Also, there was agreement that the question of what IDRC’s role is should be paramount at the preparation stage - this will provide important input into the critical thinking that is necessary for the articulation of broad goals in the PI level. Participants also noted that, on a more generic level, there appears to be a tension between culture (gender roles) and the some universal values across cultures and how to become sensitive to these differences. These appear to pose the greatest challenges to PI work plans and the Centre’s work. It was also suggested that all PIs have an underlying paradigm and ultimately, it is these paradigms that should be looked to for guidance on where and how specific the gender statements should be in the work plans.

PI# 2: Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP) - Discussions

The goal of the PI is to “support national capacities for macroeconomic and adjustment policy analysis, policy formulation and policy dialogue and to improve understanding of the interactions between these policies and human welfare.” Participants pointed out that finding the research entry point for gender is the key. The difficulty posed by attempting to integrate gender into the PI is that it is not clear whether all the sections of the work plans need specific gender statements. Attempting such a comprehensive treatment of the subject runs the risk of reducing the gender exercise to a bureaucratic function of merely fitting in the requisite gender language.

Some options to dealing with this problem may involve adopting a multi-stakeholder approach and explain all components of the PI in terms of the beneficiaries, such as the poor, the marginalized, the landless, etc. Participants pointed out that it was important to be aware of the consequences of being this specific in the work plan - one becomes committed to show a focus on these specifics during implementation as well as in the assessment of results. Participants felt that probably the best entry point was the methodology - to ensure that Programme Officers focus on these issues in the implementation of the PI.

It was suggested that rather than focusing on where to incorporate gender in the PI, a more satisfactory approach might be to place emphasis on the capacity of the recipients and researchers to learn new gender analysis tools and to use that criterion to incorporate gender issues. If this guideline is used, the sections of the PI describing the activities, the inputs and outputs provide the ideal entry points for gender considerations.

Outcome of PI Exercises

As anticipated these exercises stimulated debate on some of the fundamental issues involving the need for a broad overarching specific emphasis on gender. Participants raised questions as to whether there was a need for a gender statement on the PI’s as a whole. Both sets of discussions highlighted the difficulty of introducing gender at this macro level - and some even went as far as questioning the validity of such an
exercise, pointing out the main pitfalls - that it might end up trivializing the exercise by just tagging gender onto different components of the PI work plan as a mere bureaucratic exercise. However, there was general consensus that it was necessary to identify the logical entry points for gender issues. It was agreed that concentrating on the methodological aspects of the research would ensure that all the gender issues are adequately and fully treated.

These exercises confirm the difficulties of integrating gender at the level. The main conclusion that participants noted was that how gender-sensitive the PI is depends on the PI group, and that ultimately, while it makes sense to insert some explicit statement on gender in the PI work plan, the most important question is why this is necessary. Centre staff should be able to provide this two-pronged answer with conviction - because it is an obligation for the Centre AND ALSO because it is the obvious and right thing to do.
Section Four
Conclusions and Next Steps

The Workshop provided an opportunity for participants to consider ways in which gender was relevant to various aspects of their work - from the overall policy perspectives in the PI work plans, to specific project proposals. The initial objective to come up with PI gender statements was not achieved - mainly because of the impossibility of this task given the limited amount of time available. However, this was not considered to be a failure. Rather, it confirmed the need for such an exercise to be an ongoing process.

The Workshop discussions addressed a variety of key topics relating to the gender theme, including, WID/WAD/GAD approaches and their relationship(s) to feminism, gender analyses, gender mainstreaming, and the need for dialogue and education on these issues between Centre staff and their research partners in developing countries (IDRC’s “conscientization” role). Also discussed was the need to link gender concerns with other social concerns, such as race and class. A recurring topic was the relevance of the gender theme to the Centre’s mandate and mission. Participants felt that the centrality of this theme and its underlying objective (gender equality or efficiency of development research) were not as clear as they could be in the Centre’s policy document - the Corporate Programme Framework, thereby confirming the currency, relevance and appropriateness of the following key questions:

- What are the “development” issues of a PI?
- Who are the beneficiaries?
- Who will be affected IF the results of the research are achieved?
- Will there be differential impact for women, men and children?

Participants identified the need for more clarity of language in the Centre’s corporate documents, and for other concrete manifestations of senior management’s commitment to promoting this theme in all aspects of the Centre’s work. Also discussed were the institutional aspects of gender mainstreaming, including especially the need to either scale down research proposals/projects or scale them up by making funds available to ensure adequate and thorough treatment of their gender components. This was the only way in which IDRC’s “conscientization” role could be reinforced in any meaningful and practical way.

The practical focus of the exercises undertaken - concentrating on two projects being considered by the Centre and two ongoing Programme Initiatives - provided the basis for “hands-on” evaluation of research activities and thematic areas of focus through the medium of the gender lens (“gender goggles”). Key lessons learned from this Workshop include:

- Gender mainstreaming is a process, to be thought of in terms of a methodology rather than as an objective;
- Each institution needs to determine the key elements of this process within the context of its mandate, mission, policies and programs;
- There is a need to operationalize what gender mainstreaming means so that Centre staff can objectively measure their progress in the process of mainstreaming;
- The need for an appropriate gendered perspective may require, in some cases, a necessary scaling up or scaling down of some research projects or proposals, with the attendant policy and financial implications; and
At the senior policy making level, the Centre needs to articulate these implications and provide support to Centre staff to enable them to carry this message across in all aspects of their research, especially in their interactions with their research partners in the developing countries.

The overall conclusion is that if one is engaging in development research (as IDRC does) then one must integrate the social science research into the political and economic processes. This is a crucial step in the revaluing and rethinking that was recommended in the 1995 baseline analysis conducted by the GSD Unit. IDRC’s daily work needs to connect to, and forge relationships with, work in the field - beyond mere partnering - to include its important rethinking, agenda setting or “conscientization” role. This conscientization role is crucial in the individual contexts in which the Centre is operating, and the gender issues that are pursued in association with this role should have the necessary breadth and depth to be able to inform research development and provide some meaningful advancements in the field.

A major challenge resulting from these conclusions is how the Centre can put mechanisms in place to develop monitoring criteria. These criteria are necessary so that IDRC-sponsored research projects and programmes can advance the state of knowledge in sector-specific topics, e.g., gender and biodiversity, gender and macroeconomics, gender and environment, and other relevant Centre thematic areas of focus.
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Appendix 1
List of Materials Distributed at the Workshop


♦ IDRC Project Proposal, “Protocol Development or Apricot Processing and Marketing in Northern Areas, Pakistan” (5 pages).

♦ IDRC Program Initiative (PI) Work plan for “Alternatives to Poverty-Driven Resource Degradation - ALT” (5 pages).


♦ Selected Bibliography (see Appendix 4).
Appendix 2
Participants’ Evaluation of Workshop
Summary of Evaluation Responses

This is the first draft of the “raw” evaluation data from the PRM gender workshop. Of the total 31 participants, 16 responses have been received.

CONTENT

1. Which aspects of the content of the discussion were the most relevant or useful for your work, and in what ways?

- Discussion was relevant to project development and PI review concerned broad development issues, stimulated intellectual curiosity 4
- Afternoon session was better which focussed on integration between gender in the PIs 3
- Gave an operational understanding of gender mainstreaming 2
- Conceptual aspects of gender analysis are difficult to promote 2
- Theory helped to establish broader parameters of gender but how to process? 1
- Participants expectations from workshops reflected the diversity of the participants 1
- Broader philosophical discussions on programming approaches and its relation to restructuring were emphasized. Resolution of macro issues are important to provide framework for the process 1
- Group discussions provided opportunities to research PIs from a gender perspective 1
- Workshop offered room for conceptual thinking about integrating gender mainstreaming 1

2. What aspects of the content of the discussions were the least relevant or useful for your work, and in what ways?

- Overall thought busters, were useful, a learning and sharing process with other participants 4
- The introductory session was relevant 2
- None, it is only a process 2
- Discussions did not provide explicit analysis of how the PIs could be restructured to be inclusive of gender analysis 2
- Discussion on feminism was not relevant 1
- Too general 1
- Concept of first presentation was abstract and missed practical issues related to gender mainstreaming 1
- Could not grasp the tools and methods for gender consideration 1
- Focus of workshop was not apparent 1
- PI reviews distracted from the theme of the workshop 1
3. Were the cases selected for review and discussion appropriate/not appropriate? Why/why not?

- Cases had good departure points 4
- Diverse, contrasting cases were chosen 2
- Any PI could have lead to a similar discussion 2
- Discussions at times tended to stray from task of gender analysis of research proposals and PIs 2
- Appropriate way to check the groups learning strengths 1
- It highlighted that gender considerations must be made explicit 1
- Good to have gender considerations within project contexts 1
- Cases were an entry point but tended to divert from gender question 1
- The Apricot project was easier than the other 1
- Not appropriate 1

FORMAT

4. Was the case study approach helpful/not helpful? Why or why not?

- Helpful and concrete, focused and supportive to work task 6
- Hands on approach to gender analysis and thoughtful targeting of social groups 2
- Case studies were not clearly focussed in design 2
- Sessions were not clearly directed by facilitators 2
- Afternoon case study session was helpful compared to the morning 1
- Would prefer to work on own project focus 1
- Given inadequate time, gender dimension presumptuously taken for granted 1
- Full length case studies could be given to the participants a day advance 1

5. Were the group exercises useful/not useful? Why or why not?

- Increased participation, discussions and interactions in non-threatening environment 8
- Difficult to draw a summary because time was too short 4
- Unstructured and no specific focus or clear approaches were focussed 2
- Facilitator needed to be articulate and specific on PI focus discussion 1
- Group was not theoretically clear 1

DURATION

6. Was the one-day session too long/too short/of the right duration?

- Right duration 9
- Too short but within PRM Ok. 6
- Difficult to be longer unless participants bring innovative ideas 1
7. *Was there any portion of the one-day session that was too long/short?*

- Just right for a weekend workshop 5
- Would have liked to explore the theory more in depth 5
- Introductory presentation was too short and general 3
- Too short, concluding session needed to indicate the accomplishments to date and follow up actions 2
- Too short. More inputs into practical methods to do gender analysis is difficult/not so obvious that project cases are desirable 1

**SIZE**

8. *Was the group size too big/too small/the right size?*

- Right size for participation 8
- Seating structure was not conducive to participatory discussion 8

9. *Additional comments*

*Please add any comments and/or suggestions that you consider to be pertinent or useful for future activities.*

(Respondents gave more than one reply)

- Group of 5 with one common facilitator appropriate for participation 5
- An excellent workshop but only projects or PIs should have been discussed 4
- Case studies with or without gender analysis and to show utilitarian value to provide tools to discuss with recipients 4
- Were provisions to plan and reflect on further steps both individually and collectively 3
- GAD should identify Tools for taking Gender into consideration at IDRC context and follow up more workshops 2
- Require constant reinforcement via discussions 2
- GAD unit should review all PIs considering the budgetary provisions and should rethink IDRC’s shifting focus to “development and livelihood” rather than “opportunistic development” as characterized in past projects and ask whether IDRC is a development organization 2
- Academic and intellectual touch along with translation into practical terms is important to make workshops not just interesting but relevant 2
- The conference presenters were fabulous, would like to maintain consistent contact with both of them 1
- Conference and workshop leaders represented gender imbalance 1
- Gender mainstreaming is an ongoing process and requires continuous and systematic workshops which would build on lessons learned through implementation at PI level 1
• Workshop on “Culture and its Role in Gender” would be appropriate for future PI meetings
• WID is a better focus than GAD
• The workshop did not move forward as it started at a basic level—participants had various levels of understanding
• It was more like an Agenda for Action than an action oriented training/sensitization exercise
• More analytical presentations can make long lasting impact on participants
• Close ended or rated types of evaluation forms are preferred
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