

Gender training: the source book. Royal Tropical Institute & Oxfam GB, Amsterdam, 1998, p. 13-25

Introduction

Gender training and social transformation: an agenda for change

Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay and Margu rite Appel

The practice of gender training is more than a decade old. Today, gender training is no longer the preserve of its original advocates, the international women's movement, but is widely recognized by governments, international donors, NGOs and United Nations (UN) bodies as an important tool to bring about gender-aware change at all levels. The wider acceptance of the need for gender-aware change has not, however, led to a common understanding as to the goals of change. Thus gender training programmes vary widely in their vision and purpose, understanding of gender and the operational objectives espoused.

Gender training: the source book reviews gender training experiences from the point of view of practitioners. Contributors include gender advocates from different geographical regions (South Asia, Middle East, Eastern and Southern Africa, and South Africa) and divergent fields of work. To this rich mosaic of experience, the authors add their own experience in conducting international short courses on Gender and Development as part of the Women, Gender and Development Programme of the Royal Tropical Institute. The context-specific issues raised by each of the contributors can greatly enrich understanding of what gender training is all about, the direction of gender politics and visions of change. They provide a more nuanced insight into not only differences, but also the commonality of experience, constraints and goals.

International debates on gender training

Contests over the term 'gender'

Central to the debates on gender training internationally is the contest regarding the term 'gender'. While there is some consensus that the term refers to the social rather than the biological meaning given to being a man or woman in any given society, there is less acceptance and acknowledgment that the social differences between women and men, context-specific as they are, signify inequalities of power

and privilege. Many development institutions (government, non-government, multilateral and bilateral donors) express real discomfort in addressing issues of power in gender relations for fear that this might alienate men. The term gender, therefore, is often used as a descriptive one to delineate the different roles and responsibilities of women and men, and the resources that each has access to. The operational objective of gender training based on the above understanding is two-fold. On the one hand, the purpose is to provide exhaustive and accurate information on roles and resources by gender and point to the ways in which development interventions can target resources to make these roles more efficient. On the other hand, training strategies analyse the gender division of labour and resources to point to the disadvantages to which women are subject, especially in terms of skills, confidence, credit, and employment, and how to meet women's practical needs arising from these disadvantages. Both these training strategies, arising as they do from a description of gender as roles and responsibilities of women and men, leave untouched the unequal division of labour and resources and the resultant gender hierarchies.

Gender training as technical fix

A constant refrain in gender training programmes, especially in the context of development agencies, is the need to make training practical and not theoretical. 'Just tell us how to do it' is frequently heard, implying that like other training, gender training is about deploying the right techniques at the right moments. It goes without saying that providing analytical and planning tools and practical case examples should be central concerns in gender training. However, given that gender relations are the most intimate of social relations with which we are imbricated and about which we hold strong views and beliefs, the discrete separation between thinking and doing, theory and practice, reflection and action is illusory and only serves to obfuscate issues of power and privilege, and the assumptions and prejudices that inform our actions. This, in turn, serves to perpetuate and reproduce gender hierarchies in society.

A practical illustration of how this happens is provided by Kabeer and Subrahmanian in their analysis of the research undertaken by two different researchers at the Mahaweli Development Programme, a development programme in Sri Lanka (Kabeer and Subrahmanian 1996). This project was begun in 1975 with the objective of bringing the 'dry zone' under year-long cultivation through one of the largest irrigation projects to be undertaken in the country. According to Jayawardene, one of the key planners of the project, the distribution of project benefits, including access to irrigation, is characterized by inequalities of access to water by those located at the top end of the canals compared to those at the bottom end (Jayawardene 1983). To overcome this, the planners initiated both the formation of farmers' groups to manage the distribution of water and the provision of intensive training in water management, organization and community development. Kabeer and Subrahmanian found that Jayawardene's discussion and analysis of the problem was interesting because of its gender subtext. He assumed that men are the key economic actors and hence should be the primary focus of the planner's attention. Women were assumed to be secondary to project goals. This was most evident in his discussion of farmers' priorities which he identified as 'enhanced productivity'. Only when this is attained, says Jayawardene, will farmers participate in social, cultural, and religious activities. Thus priorities relating to nutrition, sanitation, clean drinking water, health, and day-care centres were found to be secondary priorities. Kabeer and Subrahmanian point out that this conclusion could only be reached if the farmer in question was assumed to be male, whose priorities are unquestioningly shared by the rest of the household. Women enter Jayawardene's discussion in two roles: as

farmer's wives and as mothers to be targeted by 'women and children programmes' .

A very different picture is provided by Schrijvers in her research on the same project and its beneficiaries (Schrijvers 1988). Her findings highlight the operation of class and gender relations in producing inequalities in access to project benefits. Her starting point was the existence of higher levels of undernourishment among children in the project area than nationally. This was an unusual outcome since the whole purpose of the project was to increase productivity and ensure availability of food throughout the year. Schrijvers discusses some of the reasons why this might have happened. She shows that the dam was built in a drought-prone context in which households had always held food security as a priority. Food security was managed through a gender division of labour in agricultural production in which men grew paddy (an unreliable crop because of lack of water) and women undertook slash and burn agriculture and produced the more drought-resistant crops. The latter crops tided the family over in times of food shortage. Women also enjoyed equal rights to land under customary laws.

The project introduced a set of rules and practices which changed this distribution of responsibilities and resources in favour of men. Irrigated allotments were allocated per family with a small plot for the homestead. It was specified that there should only be one heir to the land. Since paddy, a traditional male crop, was the main crop to be grown, the heir was inevitably male. Women had some access to *chenna* land (slash and burn land) but it was so far away from the project area that they could no longer cultivate it. Women were reduced to growing a few fruit trees in the homestead plot - of which little was left once the house and latrine had been built. Women, having no independent access to land to grow their drought-resistant crops, could no longer feed their children. The gendered outcomes of the project were constituted in the context of unequal class relations in the area.

Pre-existing class inequalities obtaining in the area were a major factor in determining access to irrigation water and other project benefits. As poorer families diverted the project loans for consumption, they ended up losing their land to better-off farmers and becoming wage labourers. Women earned two-thirds of the wages men earned and had to buy food, while inflation was eroding the value of their wages. Schools and medical facilities were situated far away from the project area and this put additional burdens on poor women's time. Child care was too expensive for low income mothers because the day-care centres demanded that the children should have adequate clothes and one home-cooked meal.

Kabeer and Subrahmanian conclude that the high welfare costs of this form of gender-blind planning is undeniable but that some of the intangible equity costs are less acknowledged. The project design and implementation led to the erosion of the independent production capacity and economic autonomy enjoyed by women. The project norms and practices deprived women of their role as independent producers with long-standing, community-sanctioned rights to land, and redefined them as dependent housewives, the normative ideal of the urban middle class bureaucrat. This case is a good example of how what are assumed - from the perspective of a specific social position - to be the 'proper' roles of women and men can affect the way individuals perceive and act, ultimately shaping development policy and development projects. For further discussion on this subject, see Gianotten et al. 1994.

The generic aim of gender training, therefore, is to consciously introduce gender as a category of analysis (as opposed to description), to point to the differing needs and interests of women and men and their unequal representation, and to increase awareness and reduce the gender-bias which informs the actions of individuals and institutions.

Contexts related to mainstreaming

Another important issue in gender training being debated internationally is the need to 'mainstream' gender issues into all processes, rather than to focus on women's issues. Mainstreaming also implies working with men and women rather than providing separate spaces for women, and working within existing structures rather than setting up separate structures. Mainstreaming seems an appropriate strategy given that gender is never absent from any situation. First, development programmes allocate a small proportion of resources to women-specific programmes while the lion's share is expended in gender-blind and often male-biased programmes. Second, women's subordination not only affects women but it is a structural problem with an impact on society as a whole. Despite these arguments, mainstreaming remains a contested term with various definitions, depending heavily on the context in which it is used. Many development institutions, for example, have interpreted mainstreaming to mean that their organizations do not need to maintain separate gender units or departments but that all individuals and departments have to address gender concerns. Others organizations refer to working at project level with women and men as mainstreaming while some interpret the concept as meaning that the separate needs and interests of women and men should not be mentioned.

Mainstreaming has to be based on an understanding of which new and transformed vision of gender relations is being introduced into the mainstream. Since gender is present in all social situations, it is also present in some form in all mainstream processes, institutions and structures. In the case study cited above, it is clear that gender was present in the analysis and programme implementation of the Mahaweli Development Project. In this case, however, gender relations were interpreted in such a way as to place women in a subordinate position to men within the context of unequal class relations, with disastrous consequences for poor people in general. Placing a new and transformed vision of gender relations, based on equality, into the mainstream would require working to improve the specific situation of women in tandem with that of men. To achieve this, new organizations and institutions will be needed, together with gender training programmes which work with general strategic planning processes and processes that focus on institutional culture.

The institutional context of gender training

The institutional context in which gender training takes place has always been important for several reasons. This context generally sets the priorities, defines the agenda and constrains or enables the transformatory potential of such training. The institutional context has recently acquired added significance given the movement of gender training out of its original home in women's movements and organizations and into the arena of development bureaucracies, educational institutions, trade unions and other organizations. Increasingly, therefore, it appears that gender training alone cannot achieve the desired result of transforming gender relations within an organization or its programme unless it is part of a total organizational strategy for equitable change.

The institutional context of gender training defines the agenda of such training in two interrelated ways. A number of large development bureaucracies have taken on gender as an important tool for making their work more efficient. There has been a growing realization that women are food producers, front-line health care workers, environmentalists and small entrepreneurs whose income directly contributes to family welfare. Thus, increasing women's efficiency is effective in the long term. The objective of gender training in this sort of institutional context is to increase the professional skills of the agency workers, which will make their own work more efficient. Although commitment to bringing about gender equity through their development programmes is not ruled out, it is not their primary aim. Gender training in this instance might impart skills to some people in the organization, sensitizing them to the differing interests and needs of women and men, and may even contribute to more effective planning or be instrumental in redistributing

development resources between women and men in a fairer way. However, in the absence of rules, norms and procedures which hold agency workers accountable for their behaviour and practices, including gender actions, the outcomes are dependent on the agency of individual, committed actors.

Another interrelated problem is that (at least in NGOs) gender training is often offered to lower echelons of staff, who are generally powerless to effect changes at an organizational level. In addition, many lower echelon staff happen to be women. A division of labour on the basis of gender which reflects wider societal norms of 'women's work' and 'men's work', with the concomitant lack of value attached to the former, may already obtain in these NGOs. In these contexts, initiatives to challenge gender inequality acquire the cultural connotation of 'soft' work, suitable only for women.

There is considerable discussion about the need to institutionalize good gender practice in organizations. The precise significance of institutionalization is, itself, highly debatable. Institutions are sites for the production and reproduction of gender and other forms of inequality. The norms, practices and power relations within institutions allocate responsibility and resources unequally by gender, class and race. Gender discrimination and male privilege are, themselves, institutionalized. This applies to a variety of social institutions: the household and state organizations, development and educational organizations, as well as trade unions and business institutions. If institutions are to be made more gender sensitive, the power relations which are embedded in the plurality of relationships and practices within them will have to be addressed to bring about change. Only through the introduction of new practices, setting up new norms, against which people's performance is judged and ensuring resource allocation that reflects the new regime of gender fair practice and norms, can this change be effected. The role of gender training in this context is both to develop understanding of gender power relations within organizations and to develop strategies and techniques for action and change.

This publication

As mentioned above, this publication reviews the experience of gender training from the point of view of practitioners. The term 'practitioners' is used in its broadest sense to include those involved in gender education and training, as well as research. Here, practitioners from the South speak about the regional and national contexts of gender training and its impact, and describe methodologies and frameworks for understanding and transforming gender relations. The arena of gender theory and practice has, to a large extent, been dominated by academic and development institutions in the North, despite the widespread criticism from Southern organizations and women's movements in the 1980s. The privileged location of Northern institutions provides advantaged access to publishing and publications, dissemination of ideas, and forums so that theory and practice generated is made to look as if it represents women worldwide. Gender training has, however, also been undertaken and developed by gender specialists and practitioners in the South. Further, it is increasingly acknowledged that local and regional experiences are of growing importance to the development of the sub-discipline as a whole. In whatever small and modest way, this publication hopes to contribute to reversing this power relationship, giving Southern practitioners the opportunity to describe the situation in their particular regions. These regional studies are complemented by a case study from South Africa which is a particularly interesting case given the historical background and racial diversity of the country. The issues regarding gender training raised in this national case study find their resonance in other contributions to this publication. More importantly, each of the

contributions helps contextualize these issues and points to strategies to deal with them.

The last section of the book provides various resources relevant to gender training. In addition to a list of abbreviations and acronyms, an annotated bibliography (with author and subject indexes) is given in four parts: workshop publications, manuals and analyses; gender training methodologies; case studies and gender training applications; and bibliographies. A list of organizations and networks involved in gender training, analysis, research and documentation activities follows, including World Wide Web addresses for websites, discussion groups, conferences and networks. Finally, selected journals and serials are listed.

South Asia

In the first regional study, Ranjani K. Murthy reviews the experience of gender training in South Asia, concentrating primarily on gender and development training. The South Asian region is characterized by high levels of poverty and gender inequality. Gender inequality is demonstrated by the fact that although females have a biological advantage at birth, men outnumber women in all the countries of this region except Sri Lanka. Further, gender discrimination is intertwined with inequalities based on the social relations of class, caste, religion and ethnicity. Although increasing numbers of governmental and non-governmental institutions are expressing concern and building programmes to address this situation, the policies, procedures and practices of these institutions as well as the staff of ten reflect and perpetuate gender hierarchies in society. Murthy shows that despite heightened concern about gender inequalities and the espousal of gender training by both governmental and non-governmental institutions in the 1990s, development programmes vary widely in terms of their vision and goals, understanding of gender and operational objectives.

Murthy distinguishes three different approaches to gender in development training available in the region. The first, gender-neutral training, seeks to provide accurate information on the existing gender-based division of labour and resources so that development objectives are met in the most efficient way possible by targeting resources at the actors appropriate for realization of pre-determined goals. Gender enters these training courses as a descriptive term; the power relation that underpins gender relations is not addressed. The second approach, gender-ameliorative training, seeks to provide an understanding of the gender-based division of labour and access to skills and resources, not for its instrumental use in increasing efficiency of development interventions, but to highlight women's secondary status in society and to strengthen strategies to improve the condition of women in society. This approach is popular with NGOs, governments and donor agencies pursuing gender-specific objectives, such as policies enhancing women's access to resources and skills which leave issues of control and division of labour intact. Gender is discussed as a descriptive term rather than at an analytical level. Thirdly, gender-transformative training seeks to provide an understanding of gender at an analytical rather than a descriptive level, emphasizing the political point that women occupy a subordinate position in society not because they are the problem but because of the socially constituted power relation between men and women, played out within different institutions of society: households, communities, markets, nation-states and global bodies. Emphasis is on gender relations rather than gender roles as analytical tools, and these gender relations are seen as leading to unequal distribution of resources, responsibilities and power between women and men. Murthy makes a powerful case for gender-transformative training as the only way to ensure equitable outcomes for both women and men in development. She clearly articulates the ultimate goal of gender transformative training as being the 'empowerment' of women and the 'humanization' of men. Reviewing the experience

of gender-transformative training in the South Asian context, she finds that it has three broad objectives: sensitization, mainstreaming gender in policy and planning, and strengthening the women's movement. Each of these approaches addresses specific target groups. She further details the current approaches available in South Asia, including a discussion of the way gender debates are initiated in gender-transformative training, the content of training, and the profile of trainers and participants for each approach. One of the shortcomings of gender-transformative training in the South Asian context is the standardization of approaches by training organizations, irrespective of the differing needs and interests of the groups being addressed. Discussing strategies to institutionalize gender-transformative training, she shows that although many organizations have initiated intra-organizational gender training or appointed gender training coordinators, fewer attempts are being made to institutionalize gender concerns in all training programmes. She shows that merely establishing structures and organizing training programmes without a coherent policy at the organizational level may not be enough to ensure the desired outcomes from gender training.

Major issues arising from the sudden expansion in the 1990s of gender training in the region include access, agency and accountability. Access to gender training is not always equitable. For example, there are fewer training courses at community level and few courses aimed at men. Regarding agency, Murthy makes the point that substituting 'participation' for agency (including the power to make one's own decisions) has greatly undermined impact. Organizations often compel their workers to attend gender training as a result of donor pressure; thus participants are not always willing and do not have clear needs and interests. Trainers have to learn to work with this and to build methodologies to tackle it. The issue of accountability refers to self-conscious assessments of impact made by training organizations and programmes, in which they identify weaknesses and improve quality. Murthy claims that the impact of training courses is often not assessed and very few evaluations of training outcomes are available.

Murthy ends with a key recommendation that gender trainers in all regions should share their experiences to enhance learning and improve impact.

Middle East

The second regional review in this collection comes from the Middle East, a generally neglected region when it comes to international debates on gender. Lina Abu-Habib begins her review by apologizing that her exposition refers only to gender work in the Mashrik region of the Middle East, whereas the most promising work in this field is at present taking place in the Maghreb. Despite this disclaimer, she analyses the main debates in the region regarding gender training. The first difficulty is related to the contested term 'gender' which, as in many other languages, has no equivalent in Arabic. This is often used as an excuse by those opposed to gender equality who point out that the concept of gender is foreign and has no place in Arab culture. However, gender activists have argued that this ignores the reality of age-old struggles of women in the region for equality. Some feminists argue that the introduction of the concept of gender has diluted the term feminism which conservative societies feel to be threatening, drawing attention and resources away from women's struggles for equality. Development activists have, however, made some headway in 'Arabizing' the term gender and making it more acceptable in training situations. However, as Abu-Habib points out, there has been an inability to accompany this with regionally generated and context-specific frameworks for analysis, leading to over-reliance on imported frameworks which further leads to the accusation that gender is a foreign import.

Reviewing the work of development organizations and the training programmes that they offer, Abu-Habib finds a relative absence of a gender perspective and

attributes this to a number of factors. On the one hand, organizations have little political commitment to institutionalizing gender as part of the agenda. On the other hand, there are few well-trained gender trainers, there is a paucity of training materials, and gender research has not developed in the area, making it difficult to draw upon regional and context-specific data.

This paper on the Middle East also reviews existing gender training programmes in the region offered by UN organizations, public sector institutions and international NGOs, identifying gaps in this coverage. One of the key findings is the scattered and isolated nature of training initiatives, which make it very difficult to discern outcomes. Further, a major weakness is that gender training programmes are not part of a total strategy for organizational change. Most training initiatives also lack a strong in-depth gender analysis and tend to reinforce the existing gender roles and responsibilities. The relationship between developing a critical body of literature for the region and the quality of gender training initiatives is emphasized very strongly. Like Kasente in the following paper, Abu-Habib points to the need to be inclusive in defining gender training as being about gender analysis, gender research and gender training. To build on the fledgling attempts in the region to develop a gender training strategy, an assessment of opportunities needs to be undertaken along with support for local and regional gender analysis. Regional gender resource and training centres need to be built up and more sharing across the region must be promoted.

Eastern and Southern Africa

In her review of approaches to gender training in Eastern and Southern Africa, Deborah Kasente gives a comprehensive and inclusive definition of gender training as referring to gender studies, gender analysis, gender-focused research and gender training. The impact of gender training is then discussed within a framework that looks at both the external and internal factors that impinge on the training situation. One of the clear gains made by gender training in Eastern and Southern Africa is that it has highlighted women's participation in production and provided a challenge both to the definition of work and to the methods of data collection used for generating official statistics. The external factors that impinge on the impact of gender training include the availability of social policies, specifically gender policies, financial support and training programmes. Most countries in the region have developed national machineries to address gender discrimination which has provided an enabling environment for gender training. Financial support to gender training is still heavily dependent on donor support which may ultimately make these efforts unsustainable. However, there are initiatives to broaden the base of support, and gender training institutions are trying to raise their own resources by selling their programmes. The growing popularity of these training courses is attributable to the fact that many institutions are realizing that gender-sensitive practice is also efficient. Kasente points out that there is, however, subtle resistance to the rationale of gender training for equity and empowerment.

Discussing the internal factors that impinge on the outcomes of training, Kasente refers to the training culture: resources available, the quality of trainers and the curriculum. One limitation she points to is the ill-defined objectives of most gender training programmes. This, in turn, reflects the lack of planning for training, resulting in course content which has been put together haphazardly. The quality of such training is thus of ten in question. The proper planning of training programmes almost always seems to take place when the trainers are consultants, hired by large NGOs and donors, because such trainers are themselves better trained and the future of their careers is dependent on the quality of the training they produce.

Regarding trainers' perceptions of their gender training experiences, Kasente points out that although her survey revealed a great deal of job satisfaction among trainers, a number of challenges nevertheless pose themselves. The key challenge facing most gender trainers is institutional resistance which has become more

sophisticated and subtle in marginalizing gender concerns. For example, gender officers can be marginalized by placing them in positions where they cannot influence high-level decisions. The more vocal gender advocates become, the more enhanced and subtle the mechanisms for their marginalization.

A problem faced by many trainers is the use of foreign gender frameworks to which they cannot relate. Another set of challenges has to do with the degree of agency allowed to training programme participants. Many participants from government and NGOs do not attend training courses from choice but because their donors and organizations have demanded it. Kasente points out that this causes so much resistance that the impact of training is minimized.

Referring to the general approaches to gender training in the region, she mentions that there is a growing movement away from the women in development (WID) approach with its emphasis on incorporating women in the development process and towards mainstreaming gender in policy and towards planning.

Kasente found it very difficult to assess impact with respect to the key objective of gender training, namely the betterment of the lives of marginalized women. The professional activities of individuals who have been trained at gender studies institutes, whether or not they are active in promoting gender parity, provides a key to assessing impact. She expresses satisfaction that many of her students, for example, show a high level of participation in gender issues. More generally, gender training in the region has achieved broad sensitization regarding gender concerns. Evidence of this is widespread: most countries have established national machineries, the number of NGOs addressing specific gender interests has grown, and research agendas now require the inclusion of gender analysis. Kasente, like Murthy in South Asia, ends with a plea for better coordination between those doing gender training in the region, exchange of information and experience, and strengthening assessments of training to improve quality.

South Africa

Shefer and Friedman provide a national case study on gender training in South Africa. Their account brings home the fact that gender training refers to a wide range of educational initiatives being undertaken by a host of institutions to challenge gender inequality. The discussion is thus not limited to development organizations and how they integrate gender concerns in development, nor is it limited to gender training as a professional category of work which is a new trend in South Africa. Instead, challenging gender discrimination is seen as part of a wider political goal to democratize the new, post-apartheid South Africa.

Gender training has developed within a particular context in South Africa. The main struggles have, until the recent past, been waged against class and racial oppression. Although women's organizations have long existed in South Africa, of ten within the context of the broader struggle against apartheid, the emergence of the gender struggle in the 1990s does constitute a departure. Gender training in the South African context has been called a variety of names ranging among women's leadership, women's empowerment, gender and popular education, women in development, gender and development, and so on. It takes place within diverse contexts and focuses on a number of forms of oppression. It is often integrated into another form of educational intervention altogether or into an organizational strategy for an alternative social goal, such as worker's rights. For each of these diverse contexts, cases provide empirically rich examples which help contextualize gender equality in that particular context, the issues to be examined in training, and the role of trainers. As Shefer and Friedman succinctly summarize, 'gender education in South Africa can be divided into two main groups: those which focus primarily on women and their empowerment, whether economic, political, social, or psychological; and those which challenge sexist practices, gender inequalities, and

the unequal relationship between men and women. While this appears to be a dualistic divide, it is in practice a continuum, with some organizations being involved in both forms of work.'

Much of the gender training in South Africa has been designed to facilitate women's empowerment within the structure of diverse organizational goals or within a particular sector or focus area. The Gender Education and Training Network (GETNET) is distinguished by having set itself up primarily as a gender training organization. Gender training is seen by this organization as a strategy for transforming power relations between men and women in the context of the broader democratic transformation in South Africa. With this goal in mind, the network's major areas of activity include training, networking, lobbying and advocacy for gender training. It also has a pool of ten trainers, four of whom are men. Training takes place at three levels: training of gender coordinators, gender trainers, and policy development.

Some key challenges in the field of gender training in South Africa are highlighted. An important and challenging issue in this particular context (as in many others) is how to deal with the power situations implicit in dominant representations of gender inequality. In a racially divided society like apartheid South Africa, black women have been represented by white women. Further, gender trainers have predominantly been white. Changing this situation involves dealing with difference, respecting it and working towards shared common ground.

Another key challenge discussed is the question of integration versus separation, namely whether women's issues and concerns should find a separate place in organizations and educational structures or be integrated into gender and other structures. The integration debate refers to the process of working with men and women, as well as working within existing structures or setting up separate structures. The authors suggest that integrating gender is of ten 'accomplished' simply by implying that gender is not an issue in the place where it is meant to be integrated. However, gender relations exist everywhere; integration should refer to a new, transformed meaning of gender which will fundamentally change the nature of the structure/organization. Finally, the growing trend in South Africa as well as internationally towards seeing gender issues in a decontextualized, depoliticized, 'technicist' way also remains a challenge.

Conclusions

A number of common issues regarding gender training, its practice and theory, can be identified in the following chapters. Some of these are highlighted below, although readers are requested to draw their own conclusions based on the chapters because a summary of the issues covered cannot do justice to their rich detail.

- All the contributors use the concept of gender as an analytical term, referring to the differing roles and responsibilities of women and men and the differential access that each has to societal resources within the framework of unequal power relations obtaining between them. Women occupy a subordinate position in society, not because of any deficiencies in themselves but because of the socially constituted power relation between men and women played out within different institutions of society: households, communities, markets, nation-states and global bodies.
- The goal of gender training, despite the differing contexts and diverse situations in which it takes place, is to transform gender relations based on equality between men and women, equity and empowerment for women.

- All the contributors emphasize the importance of institutionalizing good gender practice and the need to mainstream gender concerns in policy and planning, but also equally highlight that integration should refer to a new, transformed meaning of gender that will fundamentally change the nature of the structure/organization.
- For most contributors, gender training refers to a wide range of activities including gender analysis, gender research and gender education. All point to the need for sharing gender training resources and strategies across regions, to prevent fragmented and isolated efforts and enhance the effectiveness of gender training. Evaluating and assessing the impact of gender training and sharing the results with organizations and individuals involved in gender training is also seen by the authors as a necessary and important strategy to improve quality and increase impact.

References

Gianotten, V. Groverman, E. van Walsum and L. Zuidberg, *Assessing the gender impact of development projects. Case studies from Bolivia, Burkina Faso and India*. Amsterdam, Royal Tropical Institute, Leusden, ETC International BV and London, Intermediate Technology Publications, 1994.

Jayawardene, J., 'Planning and implementing a development programme for the poor: a case study from the Mahaweli Development Programme in Sri Lanka'. In: K. Puttaswamaiah (ed.), *Poverty and rural development: planners, peasants and poverty*. Oxford and New Delhi, IBH Publishing, 1983.

Kabeer, N. and R. Subrahmanian, *Institutions, relations and outcomes: framework and tools for gender-aware planning*. Brighton, Institute of Development Studies, 1996.

Schrijvers, J., 'Blueprint for undernourishment: the Mahaweli River Development Scheme in Sri Lanka'. In: B. Agarwal (ed.), *Structures of patriarchy: state, community and household in modernising Asia*. New Delhi, Kali for Women, 1988.