



Strategies for **Promoting Gender Equity** in **Developing Countries**

Lessons, Challenges, and Opportunities

Edited by **Elizabeth Bryan**

with **Jessica Varat**



Woodrow Wilson
International
Center
for Scholars



Strategies for **Promoting Gender Equity in Developing Countries**

Lessons, Challenges, and Opportunities

Edited by
Elizabeth Bryan
with Jessica Varat

July 2008

The **WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS**, established by Congress in 1968 and headquartered in Washington, D.C., is a living national memorial to President Wilson. The Center's mission is to commemorate the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson by providing a link between the worlds of ideas and policy, while fostering research, study, discussion, and collaboration among a broad spectrum of individuals concerned with policy and scholarship in national and international affairs. Supported by public and private funds, the Center is a nonpartisan institution engaged in the study of national and world affairs. It establishes and maintains a neutral forum for free, open, and informed dialogue. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Center publications and programs are those of the authors and speakers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center staff, fellows, trustees, advisory groups, or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to the Center.

The Center is the publisher of *The Wilson Quarterly* and home of Woodrow Wilson Center Press, *dialogue* radio and television, and the monthly newsletter "Centerpoint." For more information about the Center's activities and publications, please visit us on the web at www.wilsoncenter.org.

Lee H. Hamilton, President and Director

Board of Trustees

Joseph B. Gildenhorn, Chair

David A. Metzner, Vice Chair

Public Members: James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress; Bruce Cole, Chair, National Endowment for the Humanities; Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Tamala L. Longaberger, Designated Appointee of the President from Within the Federal Government; Condoleezza Rice, Secretary, U.S. Department of State; G. Wayne Clough, Secretary, Smithsonian Institute; Margaret Spellings, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education; Allen Weinstein, Archivist of the United States National Archives and Records Administration

Private Citizen Members: Robin B. Cook, Donald E. Garcia, Bruce S. Gelb, Sander R. Gerber, Charles L. Glazer, Susan Hutchison, Ignacio E. Sanchez



**Woodrow Wilson
International
Center
for Scholars**

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
One Woodrow Wilson Plaza
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004-3027

www.wilsoncenter.org

Acknowledgements ❖❖

A number of programs and projects within the Center collaborated in the organization of this event. Special thanks go to **Cynthia Arnson**, Director of the Latin American Program; **Julie Doherty** of the Global Health Initiative; **Karin Bencala** and **Alison Williams** of the Environmental Change and Security Program; **Natalie Jackson** of the Africa Program; **Mejgan Massoumi** of the Comparative Urban Studies Project; and **Bhumika Muchhala** of the Asia Program. **Rosemarie Moreken** and **Emilia Rodriguez-Stein** of the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) were also strongly supportive of this conference. We are also thankful to **Miryang Youn**, Public Policy Scholar at the Wilson Center, and **Rosemarie Moreken**, IAF, for providing moderation at the event. **Julie Doherty** and **Michaela Hoffman** of the Global Health Initiative and **Sheree Adams** and **Marisha Peña** of the Latin American Program also provided assistance in editing this conference report.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction and Executive Summary
5	Setting the Context: Approaches to Promoting Gender Equity Jane S. Jaquette, Occidental College Aruna Rao, Gender at Work
11	New Avenues for Change Cathy Feingold, American Center for International Labor Solidarity Andrew Levack, Men as Partners, EngenderHealth Angelina Aspuac, Asociación Femenina para el Desarrollo de Sacatepéquez, Guatemala Lyn Beth Neylon, MetaMetrics, Inc.
22	The Way Forward Nyaradzai Gumbonzvanda, East and Horn of Africa Regional Office, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)*
25	Appendix I: Agenda
27	Appendix II: Biographies of Panelists and Moderators

* Nyaradzai Gumbonzvanda is currently General Secretary of the World YWCA.

Introduction and Executive Summary ❖❖

Women are key to the development challenge. Throughout the developing world, women are at a disadvantage at the household, community, and societal levels. Within the household, women have less access to and control over resources and limited influence over household decisions. Beyond the household, women have limited access to communal resources, are under-represented in public decision-making bodies; have limited bargaining power in markets (such as the labor market), and often lack opportunities to improve their socioeconomic position. Therefore, efforts to reduce gender inequality are required on multiple fronts.

Over the last several decades a number of strategies have emerged and evolved to promote gender equity in development efforts. Yet debates regarding the relative efficacy of these strategies remain. On Thursday, April 26, 2007, the Woodrow Wilson Center convened a group of experts on gender and development to address the issue of gender inequality from a variety of perspectives. Panelists reflected on past efforts to promote gender equity and discussed effective strategies for the way forward.

The first panel discussed the main approaches to promoting gender equity and the progress made towards incorporating gender concerns in development institutions. Laying out the historical context in which the Women in Development (WID) and Gender and Development (GAD) strategies emerged, **Jane Jaquette** argued that the way in which these approaches evolved has depended very much on the limitations and opportunities available at different points in time. Moreover, in practice, the projects and programs initiated under both strategies were not so different, as both faced many of the same constraints. Jaquette stressed that placing these approaches in their historical context makes it possible to transcend the debates between WID and GAD proponents, enabling development practitioners to devise creative ways to promote gender equity, and get ahead of rather than simply responding to current trends.

Discussing the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming, **Aruna Rao** stated that gender mainstreaming has been associated with more failures than successes. While there have been some positive gains for gender equity in the ten years since the adoption of the Beijing platform of action, a number of factors—including the challenging policy environment within which gender mainstreaming processes operate, inadequate resources allocated to this work, institutional features that have blocked change, and the way in which gender mainstreaming processes have been implemented—contributed to the overall failure of gender mainstreaming. While advocates of gender mainstreaming envisioned both institutional and social transformation, in practice, bureaucracies have not proven to be effective agents of social transformation. Moving forward, Rao argued, should involve strengthening the capacity of states and development bureaucracies to deliver on their own operational mandates and developing realistic strategies and workable alliances in light of the constrained institutional environment.

The second panel focused on specific arenas where gender equity is being pursued in creative ways. **Cathy Feingold** described the ongoing feminization of poverty in the global economy as women workers constitute the driving labor force behind export production and rural-urban migration. Feingold described some innovative strategies to promote gender equity; for instance leveraging strategic relationships, such as those between multinational companies and global unions, and cross-border organizing efforts, such as migrant workers unions for Indonesian workers in Hong Kong. Stressing the importance of engaging men around issues of reproductive health and gender equality, **Andrew Levack** argued it is necessary to explore some of the more detrimental constructs of masculinity and alternative attitudes and actions. He underscored the importance of effective “transformative programs” that challenge gender stereotypes, particularly in public health programs that address HIV/AIDS, gender-based violence, sexual and reproductive health, and family planning. Levack noted that the next step is to scale up transformative programming to create a larger global movement, involving non-governmental, multi-lateral bodies, and donors, in order to create a forum for sharing knowledge of male-oriented programming and gender equality.

Angelina Aspuac described her experience leading a women’s empowerment association in Guatemala. While the group originally organized to help meet the basic needs of members and the wider community, after receiving financial support from an outside donor, they were able to expand their membership and begin to tackle larger social issues, such as the low self-esteem of women. Aspuac stated that her association has inspired solidarity among the women in her community, which has the power to put an end to the history of women reproducing patriarchy. Despite the significant progress made since the organization’s inception, Aspuac highlighted several remaining challenges, including extreme poverty, lack of interest in fighting for gender equality, and bureaucratic hurdles to participating in the political process. **Lyn Beth Neylon** explored the dynamics of legal and judicial reform projects run by USAID’s Women’s Legal Rights Initiative (WLR) in Rwanda and Benin. Neylon explained how WLR works with local partners to identify gaps and inequalities between women and men in the law, and understand the processes through which changes are made. She described how her work with local judiciaries and legal institutions had to acknowledge customary traditions, which often had more salience in the society than laws. Thus, the programs incorporated public awareness campaigns and education programs for legal professionals in order to ensure that legal changes were actually implemented and observed.

The keynote speaker, **Nyaradzai Gumbonzvanda**, asserted that a larger conceptual framework is needed, which links empowerment, rights, and mainstreaming in all social spaces in order to advance the discourse on gender relations and achieve greater gender equality. Considering the realities of women’s, men’s, and children’s daily lives in a developing country context, where gender relations are influenced by poverty, insecurity, impunity, and patriarchy is also important, she argued. Gumbonzvanda pointed

to several challenges which must be addressed—top-down development approaches, which separate development issues from concerns over investment, foreign policy, and security; unequal access to services and infrastructure; and the insecure environments in which women live. Overcoming these challenges to greater gender equity requires a stronger and diverse but unified voice for change; greater accountability; and increased, targeted resources.

Setting the Context: :: Approaches to Promoting Gender Equity

Describing the evolution of the main approaches to confront gender inequality, **Jane S. Jaquette** argued there are much greater similarities between the women in development (WID) and gender and development (GAD) approaches than some advocates and many analysts, who have tended to attack WID and praise GAD, think. Rather, she said, understanding how each approach arose in a different historical context could make it possible to transcend these debates between WID and GAD proponents. How development strategies in general and strategies to promote gender equity in particular have evolved depend very much on the limitations and opportunities available at different points in time, she stressed.

Drawing on her experience at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) during the Carter Administration, Jaquette noted that the United States played a very different role in development then than it does today. At that time, the U.S. development agenda was concerned primarily with economic development, redistribution through North-South capital flows, human rights and economic limits to growth, goals which were replaced by the promotion of a pro-market agenda, then democracy and, particularly in the case of Africa, a strong emphasis on health issues, particularly HIV/AIDS. By the mid-1970s, the women's movement in the United States had peaked and there was backlash against the push for greater gender equality, as shown by the failure of the Equal Rights Amendment despite a long and frustrating campaign.



This was the environment in which the WID approach emerged. Rather than stressing issues of women's equality, the strategy of the WID office of USAID was geared towards promoting women's access to resources, using empirical evidence to show that women were economically active and relying on efficiency arguments to convince those responsible for AID projects to include rather than ignore women. Although WID has been criticized for its "add women and stir" approach and for highlighting efficiency rather than equity, Jaquette stressed there were practical reasons for the way in which this approach was implemented.

In the 1980s, the debt crisis and the widespread use of "shock" treatments and structural adjustment programs narrowed the development agenda. Programming for women became a reaction to the gender effects of structural adjustment policies, which emphasized privatization and cutting government spending, with negative impacts on employment, incomes and social programs.

During this time, Jaquette recalled, there was a desire among development practitioners to find a different model for promoting gender equity, which would encompass a broader, more multicultural approach, and one that took men into account. At the same time, women's organizational capacity around the globe had increased dramatically during the UN Decade for Women (1975–1985), bringing a new set of voices from the developing world into the debate. The more active NGOs that were capable of making demands were developing their own agendas, often critical of USAID, which was perceived as too committed to supporting “neoliberal” economic policies. These groups often developed their own projects, and were backed by various international donor agencies, including many private foundations. Thus, GAD came about as women's activism was becoming an international force, and in response to a very different set of challenges and opportunities.

Despite the different contexts in which the WID and GAD approaches surfaced, many of the projects and programs initiated under the GAD label were not all that different from earlier WID efforts. Women-specific projects, usually seen as WID inspired, remained following the shift to GAD, in part because many cultures separate women's and men's activities. Yet gender mainstreaming (making gender relevant at all levels of the donor institution and a criterion in all donor programs) was promoted as likely to be much more effective than the women-specific projects and WID offices associated with the WID approach. But, Jaquette argued, most development practitioners and scholars now agree that mainstreaming can marginalize women's programs and that disbanding gender units within donor agencies risks losing the ability to keep a focus on gender within aid bureaucracies. Those who saw WID as too uncritical of capitalism hoped for better from GAD, but GAD proponents have also been forced to operate within a capitalist context at home, where donor budgets are set, as well as abroad, where very few governments are still committed to building a socialist alternative.

Moving beyond the WID-GAD debate would enable advocates to devise creative ways to promote gender equity, and get ahead of rather than simply responding to current trends. One trend is the declining importance of official development assistance, which is far exceeded by private capital flows. These occur in response to market incentives with little regard for gender equity, yet have important gender impacts, most obviously the role of women workers in so-called free trade zones (FTZs). Gender units within foreign assistance bureaucracies and mainstreaming efforts thus have less influence than they did when foreign loans and grants were a major source of investment capital in the Global South. Whether private firms can be influenced by gender equity considerations depends on local contexts and the particular role of civil society organizations and increasingly gender-sensitive legal systems. Unfortunately, civil society organizations are no longer perceived as representing grassroots energies (the “NGO-ization” phenomenon).

A second major trend is the rise of the anti-globalization movement. Jaquette considered how the struggle for gender equity might fit into this movement and shape the way in which globalization proceeds. For instance, the new emphasis on climate change may create

opportunities for environmental feminism to advance. She expressed concern, however, that the anti-globalization movement is more interested in replacing Marxism as a viable critique of capitalism than in finding ways to influence the forms capitalism takes in ways that are more equitable.

A third trend is the shift from the redistribution politics to identity politics, which has caused academic feminists pay less attention to equality. One example of this is that today there are very few programs on women/gender in development in the United States, where the vast majority of academic curricula focus on issues of gender identity and sexuality. In some instances, conflicts arise between gender equality and identity politics, she noted. In Latin America, for example, movements to promote indigenous rights often resist efforts to promote gender equality in order to preserve cultural integrity.

Jaquette added that the U.S. war on terror has been a major distraction from the development agenda as the United States has channeled more resources and energy into security rather than development efforts. Today, the challenge for those who care about gender equity issues is to get beyond the WID versus GAD debate, and combine efforts to gain new momentum. An assessment of “where we are” to determine how the experiences with WID and GAD might be united conceptually to suggest new initiatives would be one way to start.

Examining the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming efforts, **Aruna Rao** noted that gender mainstreaming has been associated with more failures than gains. In order to move the gender equality agenda forward, she argued, it is necessary to examine the policy environment (resources, strategies, and institutional features) and problems related to implementation that contributed to the failure of gender mainstreaming.

Grounded in feminist theoretical frameworks and intended to make mainstream institutions agents of social change, gender mainstreaming refers to a wide set of strategies and processes. The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC) defines gender mainstreaming as “...the process of accessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programs in any areas and at all levels. The strategies of making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policies and programs in all political, economical and societal spheres, so that men and women, in fact, benefit equally; but that the goal of gender mainstreaming is gender equality.” Placing the emergence of gender mainstreaming in historical context, Rao noted that the Fourth World Conference in Beijing in 1995 and the UN Decade for Women that preceded it unleashed a flurry of feminist activism and women’s organization that encouraged states to sign on to gender equality commitments.



Yet gender mainstreaming is neither a clear agenda for institutional transformation nor a clear agenda for gender transformation and social change. Thus, in practice, gender mainstreaming has often involved adopting a gender policy, creating a gender unit to work on organizational programs, mandatory gender training, and increasing the number of women staff and managers. In the worst cases, gender mainstreaming has been used to stop funding for women's empowerment work, and to dismantle many of the institutional mechanisms such as women's units and advisors created to promote women in development in the name of integration. This shows, Rao argued, that the transformational change expected to result from gender mainstreaming has not occurred.

Theoretical insights on gender and development, and engagement with state institutions convinced gender mainstreaming advocates about the role of bureaucratic institutions as agents of change, she remarked. In hindsight, it appears that this naïve view did not take into account the limitations of institutional roles and functions—bureaucracies are not agents of social and political transformation. Rather, bureaucracies have emphasized mainstreaming and planning at the expense of social transformation, yet both need to be done, she argued.

Despite the overall disappointment with the results of gender mainstreaming, Rao acknowledged the many gains since the adoption of the Beijing platform of action, ten years ago. A number of strategic partnerships have been forged between women's movements and policy reformers which have placed equity and women's human rights at the heart of global debates in such areas as the international criminal court; the Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security; and in the Millennium Project Taskforce on Gender Equality. In many places around the world, gender equality is enshrined in constitutional provisions, and in public policy and legal frameworks. In some regions, such as South Asia, women have made striking gains in elections to local and national government bodies, as well as in entering public institutions. Girls' access to primary education has improved and women are increasingly entering the labor force. Moreover, access to contraception is much more widespread and violence against women has been recognized as a human rights issue, and has been made a crime in many countries.

These positive examples have been the exception rather than the norm, Rao emphasized, due to the insidious ways in which the mainstream resists women's perspectives and rights. She attributed the overall failure of gender mainstreaming to the challenging policy environment within which gender mainstreaming processes operate, inadequate resources allocated to this work, institutional features that have blocked change, and the way in which gender mainstreaming processes have been implemented.

Decreased government spending on social sectors, tightened macroeconomic and fiscal policies, privatization of state owned enterprises and basic services, and liberalized trade are some aspects of the policy environment that have had harmful effects on women. Moreover, government reform efforts have focused on administrative and fiscal reform while neglecting to consider ways in which institutions can better support poor women and address accountability failures.

With regard to resources, investment in women has been the lowest priority, Rao argued. The amount of funds allocated by governments, multi-lateral agencies, trade unions, and civil society organizations of all kinds has been miniscule compared to spending in other areas. Between 1999 and 2003, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) determined that total bilateral spending on gender equality equaled approximately five percent of total bilateral aid. Of the five percent of total official development assistance (ODA) allocated in 2004 (about 79 billion), only 4.2 percent went directly to women's organizations and networks. UNIFEM's budget in 2002 totaled only about 36 million dollars compared to 373 million for the United Nations Population Fund, 64 million for the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and 1.4 billion for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). She noted, however, that most mainstream agencies are unable to track the amount of money spent specifically on gender equality goals or women's empowerment. This is also a problem at the national level as new aid modalities such as basket funding, budget support, and sector-wide approaches make it extremely difficult to track spending on gender equality goals and hold governments accountable.

Rao highlighted several institutional features that have also blocked change. First, although in many institutions there is a policy mandate to work for gender equality, policy often gets "lost in translation" when it percolates down to the level of action. This occurs because of the gender bias of institutions, the lack of influence and voice of "femocrats" (women's activists within organizations) and women's units, a lack of accountability, and a lack of support of top leadership.

In terms of implementation, Rao asserted that gender mainstreaming efforts such as gender training, organizational development efforts, and planning for gender equality often have no clear connection to change that is meant to occur on the ground. Moreover, strategies to promote gender equity have needed to accommodate to institutional cultures and agendas, which are uneasy with notions of social transformation. Therefore, these strategies get "instrumentalized" or packaged in terms of efficiency arguments. For example, gender equality objectives get broken down into advocacy for girls' education due to the links with fertility reduction and micro-credit schemes targeted towards women due to the high development payoff. Such programs can be easily managed within bureaucratic policy and practice but their link to addressing the fundamental feminist vision of social transformation is not very clear.

At the same time there is a lack of clarity around what gender mainstreaming entails, which can endanger the implementation of gender mainstreaming strategies. Therefore, Rao argued, gender advocates should frame mainstreaming objectives in practical terms in consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of particular kinds of bureaucracies. For instance, health ministry officials in developing countries should not be chided about not working on gender equality goals, but should be asked how they can improve healthcare services for women, which they would view as falling within their purview. An added challenge is measuring progress. Tracking relative contributions to different goals within

the same project is difficult. This requires social impact analysis during the design phase of the project, and sophisticated tracking mechanisms and gender disaggregated data to examine program impact.

The way forward, Rao argued, should involve strengthening the capacity of states and development bureaucracies to deliver on their own operational mandates and developing realistic strategies and workable alliances in light of the constrained institutional environment. In addition, the range of diverse strategies all termed gender mainstreaming—including policy reform, advocacy, capacity building, analytical frameworks, program development, and monitoring systems—should be disaggregated and analyzed in terms of their particular gains and failures. This would facilitate strategic thinking about what particular institutions are well positioned to accomplish, and what they can be held accountable for, she said. Demand for change should also come from civil society, including women's organizations and networks. This would hold institutions accountable and help to ensure that their commitments are achieved.

New Avenues for Change ❖❖

Cathy Feingold pointed to the labor movement as an alternative pathway for addressing the needs of women in the global economy while promoting gender equality. Working towards global justice through unions, she argued, is a countervailing force against the negative effects of globalization on women in the labor force.

In 1985, the global economy included 2.5 billion people. Following the fall of communism and China and India's emergence in the global market, an additional 1.5 billion new workers entered the global economy. Now there are 6 billion people in the global economy—a population explosion for which neither the labor movement nor the development field were prepared. The sudden emergence of a global economy dominated by cheap labor led to the formation of new economic development strategies which have serious implications for women workers, she said.

One consequence is rural-urban migration, Feingold noted. In Mexico, for example, some women moved from rural areas to export manufacturing zones along the urbanized Northern border with the United States. These women migrated to find employment, which in turn provided them with a new sense of independence, autonomy, and individual resources; they obtained “low-status” jobs and were unable to lift themselves out of poverty or provide for their families. In short, Feingold argued, the negative consequences for these women workers far outweighed the real opportunities presented by globalization.

The global economy has produced not only the feminization of poverty but the “feminization of working poverty,” she asserted. Although more women than ever participate in today's workforce, the great majority occupy low-status jobs and are unable to lift themselves out of poverty. More women take jobs in the informal economy that lacks job security, benefits, or protection. Around the world, women are working in export processing zones, as domestic workers, as street vendors, or as suppliers at the bottom of a multinational supply chain. Feingold argued that grassroots strategies are needed to address problems related to the fact that women are used as a source of cheap labor as part of an economic development strategy, while labor standards around the world are declining.

International migration is another economic development strategy that has implications for women. Many countries have recognized that offering cheap labor as an anti-poverty strategy is insufficient to generate economic growth and have encouraged migration to increase inward remittances. In 2005 alone, global remittances amounted to \$167 billion. This number is even higher when one considers the informal channels by which people send money. Women often leave their families to become domestic workers abroad, leading to the breakdown of the family and other social problems.



International migration can also be detrimental for the women who migrate. Feingold recalled the bombings in Lebanon as an example of the discord that can result from migration. During the bombings, Bangladeshi domestic workers who wanted to leave—lacking knowledge of the language, legal documentation, or support from their embassy—were stuck in Lebanon. Since the Bangladesh government saw these workers as part of an economic development strategy, they did not want the domestic workers to leave Lebanon because they relied on their remittances.

Feingold highlighted several ways to address problems related to internal and external migration and women's employment in the informal sector or substandard jobs. One way to support women is to encourage them to become part of the labor movement, she said. This allows women workers to monitor the conditions of their own workplaces and make sure people are being treated fairly. Although workers are the best-acquainted with their workplaces, usually outside organizations attempt to monitor workplaces to ensure fair treatment. However, workers tend to place their trust in their coworkers, rather than in outside organizations. Thus, these organizations suffer a disadvantage when attempting to effectively analyze a work environment.

Feingold also described how women's organizations can be used to address the concerns of women in the global economy. For example, a working women's committee in Mexico consists of female former factory workers who promote awareness of health, occupational safety, and pregnancy discrimination, among other issues.

Another strategy the Solidarity Center utilizes is economic literacy training. This gives women the tools to comprehend and critique the policies that affect their working lives. With the help of partner organizations, the Solidarity Center helps workers and union members offer their own perspectives on structural adjustment policies, such as privatization, that have an impact on their lives. Importantly, this forum asks workers to analyze potential policy impacts before the policies are implemented.

The rapid movement of people around the world requires a unified labor movement strategy, Feingold asserted. Unions around the world, such as the United Steel Workers, are coming together to form a larger global movement. In particular, she highlighted female labor unions that undertake innovative work within the informal economy. One such group, Women in the Informal Economy, Globalizing and Organizing (WEGO), supports global networks of street vendors and home-based workers. These networks counter the social discrimination of home-based work as simply an extension of female "domestic duties"—since cooking, cleaning, rolling incense, and sewing are not considered formal work. These networks bring women together so they can collectively analyze their rightful position as part of a global supply chain.

Another example of a successful program is the Indonesian Migrant Workers' Union for domestic workers in Hong Kong, which successfully supports women immigrants. This group assists Indonesian women who do not speak Cantonese by informing them of their rights even before they migrate—thus limiting their exploitation. In the United States, this

strategy has been used to assist Mexican agricultural workers migrating to work in the farms or poultry factories of North Carolina.

Global networks give women more power to negotiate contracts with their employers, Feingold stated. For instance, in Durbin, South Africa, an organization of street vendors successfully negotiated with the municipality. Network formation is part of Solidarity Center's strategy for small business development and investment micro-credit. This strategy centers on collective power by supporting women's efforts to organize into unions, which has been difficult as many societies have historically perceived of unions as male-dominated institutions.

The global union movement can use its relationships with policymakers and companies to advocate for the rights of women in countries where female workers endure dismal working conditions. For example, during a gathering of international unions in Cambodia, the former Cambodian Minister of Women's Affairs mentioned that women who serve in Cambodia's beer gardens are not even considered workers; rather, they are considered part of the major beer companies' advertising budgets. Since many of the unions had relationships with the beer companies, they were positioned to ask why the companies were treating these Cambodian workers—who were often forced into having sexual relationships with patrons—differently from those workers in the United States or the Netherlands. This approach capitalized on the unions' ability to negotiate with major corporations.

Feingold added that it is important to include men when addressing concerns of women in the global labor market. In particular, men can play an important role in addressing the sexual exploitation of women, she said. Solidarity Center projects in the Philippines and East Africa train truck drivers to recognize signs of human trafficking. These drivers are trained to contact NGO call centers when they notice suspicious behavior. This strategy has a multiplier effect as information is disseminated through the hierarchy of truck driver unions. Truck drivers in East Africa are also being taught about HIV/AIDS in conjunction with groups like Empowerment in Gender Health and Family Health International. This effort targets those truck drivers who drive across borders, have different sexual partners, or engage in other risky behavior.

The labor movement, through its partnerships with workers' centers and women's organizations, addresses the changing needs of women workers in the global economy. By responding to the changes resulting from new economic development strategies, the labor movement offers alternative solutions to challenges related to gender and development.

Andrew Levack spoke about the importance of engaging men around issues of reproductive health and gender equality. Men as Partners (MAP) works to increase men's awareness of reproductive health issues and increase men's support for their partner's reproductive health decisions. MAP also explores and imple-



ments ways that men can take an active stand for gender equality and against gender-based violence. Speaking from a programmatic perspective, Levack touched on the reasons for working with men in gender programming, examples from his work with EngenderHealth, and an overview of the existing evidence gathered from programs currently working with men and boys.

He noted that there is a clear mandate around the need to work with men and boys to achieve gender equality that has been recognized by numerous international conferences and declarations and supported by women's organizations and the women's movement. One of the main driving factors of this mandate, said Levack, is the recognition of how gender inequalities fuel the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Levack explained how gender socialization leads to the development of complex masculinities, which vary by culture and community. Masculinities bear heavily on a range of social issues, he said, including: age hierarchies, social and cultural norms, experiences of conflict and violence, dynamics of addressing gender issues in civil society and government, and poverty and a man's ability to earn income.

While men are conceived of in some positive ways, as financially independent, providers, husbands, and fathers, Levack noted, there are also negative and harmful messages about what it means to be a man, including withholding emotions, exerting power, using violence, not asking for help, having multiple sexual partners, risk taking, substance abuse, violence, misogyny, and homophobia. Increased political, economic, and religious fundamentalism has led to the development of rigid norms of expected male and female behavior. The concept behind working with men and boys, Levack argued, is to question some of the more detrimental constructs of masculinity and explore alternative attitudes and actions.

A number of studies have found clear associations between gender socialization norms and health outcomes. Men with more traditional concepts of masculinity are shown to be more likely to report physical violence towards female partners, to be involved in delinquency, to have a higher number of sexual partners, to experience sexually transmitted infections, and to use and abuse alcohol and drugs. However, emerging evidence shows it is indeed possible to challenge the more traditional and harmful constructs of masculinity, and replace them with alternative models, which promote equality and lead to improvements in health for both men and women.

The first step towards achieving this goal, Levack said, is to use a framework for evaluating gender programs developed by Geeta Rao Gupta of the International Center for Research on Women. This framework places development programs on a spectrum according to the extent to which these programs are gender sensitive. At one end of the spectrum are programs that reinforce negative messages about gender. An example of this type of program is an advertising campaign in South Africa involving the promotion of a condom called "Conqueror Condom." While attempting to promote condom use, these ads reinforced the concept of male dominance.

Next on the spectrum is gender-neutral programming, he said, which is common in many large-scale HIV prevention programs. Such programs promote HIV prevention, he explained, but make no room for a discussion of how abstinence, monogamy, and safe sex are experienced differently by men and women and the realities of men and women's lives in a cultural context.

Further along the spectrum is gender-sensitive programming, continued Levack, which takes into account that men and women have different realities and that different strategies are often required to reach men and women. Gender-sensitive programming often includes design features that make services more male-friendly. However, he emphasized that even gender-sensitive programs can still fall short of transformative programming.

Levack explained that transformative programming takes on negative societal messages about what it means to be male and female, and challenges those in an attempt to create a more equitable society, which can support healthier behaviors in the future. Challenging the direct cause of gender inequality—harmful gender socialization—makes it possible to address the spectrum of health issues, including gender-based violence, HIV, reproductive health, family planning, men's role in maternal health, issues of fatherhood and care-giving, and issues of violence, he argued.

Turning to the ways in which MAP uses transformative programming, Levack noted that MAP's programs consistently ask men to talk about equitable relationships and men's role in promoting gender equality; and challenge men to create a new masculinity that involves taking a stand against gender based violence in the community. The majority of transformative programs have focused on reaching out to men individually or in small, intensive group settings, forcing them to consider what it means to be male and how notions of masculinity may have a negative impact on their societies. Levack explained that while these programs were successful in changing individual attitudes, knowledge and behaviors, the next step is to expand to the societal level, where there can be a greater, more sustainable impact on gender socialization.

He highlighted a new "ecological model" which aims to move transformative programs beyond the workshop approach to support men when they return to a patriarchal society where there is often not sufficient support for new concepts and constructions of masculinity. In order to break down societal barriers, ecological transformative programming includes community action teams, led by men who have been through the workshops and then go out and communicate and engage in community activism around gender issues. While quite promising, Levack added there is still little research available to determine if the ecological model is truly effective in changing societal norms in the long run.

Looking forward, Levack reiterated that transformative programs should be scaled up and taken on by new actors. Often large-scale programs tend to view men as a target group, and focus on promoting messages about a particular issue, he said, without taking the steps needed to challenge social norms. Acknowledging the difficulties in confronting thousands of years of patriarchy, he argued that the clear challenge of taking this work

to scale is building the capacity of organizations and social institutions in order to attain sustainability. Individuals must confront their own issues concerning gender and identity before they can challenge the broader social situation, he said. Accomplishing this work within institutions requires significant time, effort, and support.

Gender programming at the health level is focused on improving the quality of services and making them more accessible to men. For example, in South Africa, only 20 percent of those tested for HIV are men. Changing this requires large-scale media campaigns, and new or reformed policies and legislation. It also involves engaging the public sector and increased funding to promote gender equality.

Noting that men often attend MAP workshops, not because they are interested in challenging gender norms, but in the hope that it may present an economic opportunity, Levack urged that more work should be done to address the broad socioeconomic conditions that can influence men and their behaviors. If men are unable to provide for their families, he said, they may feel disempowered in their role as men and resort to some of the more harmful constructs of masculinity, which include dominance over women, use of violence, and risk-taking behaviors.

Transformative programs have demonstrated that individual change is possible, Levack said. Many men who have gone through critical reflections of gender have come out on the other side espousing more gender progressive attitudes, and engaging in more protective behaviors. The next step is to move beyond local institution building, to create a larger, global movement. Networks that bring together various organizations—such as non-governmental, multi-lateral bodies, and donors—can create a forum for sharing knowledge of male-oriented programming and gender equality.

Angelina Aspuac described the challenges of women's grassroots organization, drawing on her experience as director of the Woman's Association for the Development of Sacatepéquez (AFEDS), in Sacatepéquez, Guatemala, the mission of which is to elevate women's role in society and improve women's quality of life by ensuring that their basic needs are met.



Discussing the evolution of the organization and the transition from the private to the public sphere, Aspuac remarked that the organization was created by chance. She recalled that her father belonged to a local cooperative with around 2,000 members. Women, the daughters and wives of the members, were invited to meetings of the cooperative, not to participate in decision-making, but to prepare food for the gatherings. Although this situation did not raise women's social consciousness, she said, it did facilitate their organization during a time when there were almost no women's organizations.

After several years of observing how the men were developing economically through the cooperative, the women decided to organize

themselves and asked the cooperative to support them with skills training. These women later became interested in community development after they attended a presentation of an economic poll performed by a foreign institution, which highlighted the main problems of the community such as women's illiteracy and child malnourishment. Hence, AFEDES was established to address the basic needs of the community. In 1994, the year it was legally established, a livestock project was implemented. With support from a Dutch agency, each woman bought a cow in order to provide milk to children.

At this early stage, the main challenge was organizational weakness due to lack of training and inexperience with project administration and the handling of funds. The organization was ineffective at meeting project requirements and projects proved to be unsustainable. There were also weaknesses in terms of follow-up as projects were not evaluated. At one point, she said, AFEDES almost collapsed as the women were not interested in struggling to keep the organization afloat.

However, the organization entered its second stage in 2001 when a three-year plan was devised that received funding from the Inter-American Foundation. Noting that agencies often only fund groups that are already well-founded, Aspuac noted how happy the women were to obtain this support. This institutional connection enabled the group to coordinate with and receive support from a broader group of actors such as creditors, commercial houses, state institutions and other civil society organizations. AFEDES also began to attract more women and, with some organizational training, the group was able to expand.

At this stage, it was no longer enough to focus solely on meeting women's basic needs; the group realized it must also address the low self-esteem of women in order to survive. Thus, they began to focus on social change and women's empowerment in order to achieve their goals. With greater financial and technical support and stronger organizational capacity, the group also began to support women's productive capacity. In addition, AFEDES sought local political power and began to become familiar with the law. In 2004, another three-year plan was created which incorporated these elements—women's empowerment, strengthening productive capacity of women, and supporting women's psychological, social and reproductive health. These projects were implemented without the support of creditors or foundations but using AFEDES's own funds.

Today, it is apparent that these efforts have had an impact on women in both the private and public domains, Aspuac asserted. Women feel more encouraged to speak and voice their opinions. Whereas previously, women were engaged in domestic activities, which were unremunerated, women's productive activities have generated new sources of income, which have increased women's economic autonomy. The organization has also encouraged women to speak out against domestic violence and assist women who suffer from abuse.

In addition, AFEDES now has a position in the System of Councils for Urban and Rural Development of the government at community, municipality and national levels. AFEDES has also facilitated the emergence and involvement in these development councils of more women's groups that want to have an impact on their communities. Often AFEDES

members are called on to act as consultants. Although, she added, this is likely done as a requirement, not because officials feel it is necessary to include women's perspectives.

AFEDES is currently working on formulating a strategic plan for the next several years, taking into consideration the main obstacles the organization has faced and the experience it has gained in the past. Aspuac noted that often AFEDES is often questioned for focusing on productive projects rather than strategic objectives. The organization takes this approach, she said, because, initially, women are less interested in the politics of the community than in having their basic needs met. Only after women's basic needs are addressed does the organization introduce other themes such as community participation. Moreover, she stressed that the productive activities of women are done with respect to the cultural identity of the country and drawing on indigenous knowledge.

She outlined several areas in which AFEDES is planning to work in the coming years. The organization is working to formulate proposals for gender equity with the participation and in consideration of the positions of all its members. It will also continue to promote the political participation of women, particularly in the System of Councils for Urban and Rural Development, as women are best able to make decisions regarding what they want and need. Another goal is to contribute to the mental, emotional, sexual and reproductive health of the women.

The organization continues to face several challenges. First, due to extreme poverty, many women have a lack of interest in education as a tool for advancement. Illiteracy is high among women over 32 and women's family duties often prevent them from remaining in school or concentrating on their studies. Many women that approach the organization are simply interested in improving their socioeconomic status without receiving any training. A second challenge is the low level of social consciousness and lack of interest in fighting for gender equality. Moreover, there are few resources within the government for promoting gender equity that can be tapped into, even though the government has set up institutions to tackle this issue.

A third challenge is divisions and discrimination among the women within the group. Rather than encouraging each other, women who are beginning to succeed will often be held down by other members of the group or their families. Fourth, women's organizations are often manipulated by political parties, which can distract these organizations away from their original missions. The final challenge is the large number of bureaucratic hurdles that women's organizations must deal with in order to remain active and participate in the political process. She argued this process should be streamlined in order to facilitate the participation of women and increase their status in society.

Lyn Beth Neylon discussed legal obstacles to gender equity, drawing on her experience as project manager for Women's Legal Rights Initiative (WLR) programs in Rwanda and Benin. WLR, an initiative of the U.S. Agency for International Development, works to strengthen and promote women's legal rights and participation by enhancing opportunities for women to meaningfully participate in the economic, social, and political dimensions

of society. This involves not only reforming laws that prevent women's participation, but also addressing the lack of laws to support women, and promoting implementation of laws at the government, community, and individual levels, she argued.

Neylon noted that WLR only operates in countries that asked it to participate in the project, in order to ensure adequate support for the initiative. After joining the initiative, assessments of the legal infrastructure, the judiciary, civil society, and level of public awareness were conducted to tailor the program to the specific needs and context of each country. The project teamed up with indigenous human rights groups already operating in the country, which had identified the issues they considered important and the resources needed to tackle these issues. Rather than targeting women as a separate group, men were integrated into all project activities.

Legal assessments focused on identifying gaps and inequalities between women and men in the law, and understanding the legal processes through which changes are made. Using this information, strategic legal initiatives were implemented in each project country. One challenge of legal initiatives, Neylon pointed out, is that although reforming or drafting new legislation often takes years to complete, projects are usually only funded for a shorter amount of time.

Neylon described a successful legal reform initiative in Benin, where the WLR project team worked with local non-governmental organizations to craft anti-sexual harassment legislation. While the WLR team did not focus exclusively on this issue, she said, local organizations identified sexual harassment as a particular problem that contributes to girls' school dropout rates and women's poor performance in the workplace, and prioritized this area for legal reform. Therefore, WLR Benin hosted a Sexual Harassment Legislation Development Workshop, to which a broad range of stakeholders was invited. Within one week, the workshop participants drafted an anti-sexual harassment law that protects against sexual harassment in schools, in the workplace, and at home. Within one year, after WLR conducted educational workshops on the harmful consequences of sexual harassment with deputies in the National Assembly, the law was passed by the legislature without any changes, and signed by the new President of Benin. Neylon attributed the success of the initiative to the perseverance and commitment of WLR's local partners who knew the legal process and which issue to prioritize in the current social and political context.

The second area in which WLR worked was the judiciary and other legal institutions. After assessing the level of knowledge of judges, the independence of the judiciary, and the formal and informal court systems, and other aspects of local legal systems, WLR, in collaboration with local partners, provided training on women's legal rights for legal professionals, including judges, magistrates, prosecutors, lawyers, and paralegals who, in Benin and some other African countries, are traditional, informal legal advisors to their communities. In some countries,



the WLR teams also worked with law schools to integrate gender issues into courses, or offer particular courses in women's rights or gender. In Rwanda, for example, WLR hired two local lawyer consultants, and worked with them to develop a curriculum on gender and domestic relations for a new law school being created by the Ministry of Justice. The course focused on how men in Rwanda are socialized, how Rwandan law and tradition treats men and women differently, and how these factors affect the decisions of lawmakers and judges.

Other WLR activities include developing legal materials aimed at legal professionals, such as bench books and legal manuals for judges and lawyers, and simplified legal materials for paralegals and others in the legal sector. In Benin, WLR explored the possibility of supporting impact litigation, which are cases that have broad social ramifications beyond the parties involved. Stressing the social and legal importance of impact litigation, Neylon noted that all types of legal systems, whether civil, common, or customary, rely to a certain extent on precedents. Thus, if important cases are decided in favor of women's rights and gender equity, these decisions would provide guidance for future cases. In some countries, such as Benin, the formal court system seems open to such cases—rather than having to exhaust all legal possibilities, cases can be brought directly to the Constitutional Court. Unfortunately, funding for WLR was cut before the impact litigation project was implemented, Neylon added.

In practice, Neylon said, the third and fourth areas in which the WLR initiative worked—civil society and public awareness—often overlapped, as NGOs did much work in raising awareness about gender issues and the traditional and customary laws that discriminate against and disempower women. WLR emphasized these areas, she said, to ensure that changes to the law would actually be implemented and respected on the ground, and the legal process led to real improvements in women's daily lives. For example, in Benin, WLR seized the opportunity to promote women's rights through public awareness of a recently enacted family code. The family code was an indigenous effort not focused exclusively on women. However, many aspects had positive implications for women. For example, the family code outlawed polygamy and child marriage, changed some unfair property and inheritance laws, made dowry symbolic but not required, and encouraged parents to make joint decisions regarding their children.

WLR's approach in Benin was to generate public awareness at both the individual and community levels and among different groups, such as NGOs, local, traditional, and religious leaders, government officials, and court personnel simultaneously, in order to create widespread support for the family code. However, given limited resources, this meant WLR could not tackle the entire country, but had to limit their efforts to smaller geographic areas. This tradeoff was made, Neylon said, because educating only women about their rights would not improve their situation if their families and the wider community did not understand or support those rights.

As part of the strategy to generate public awareness, WLR teams and their local partners developed general informational materials in local languages in all of the countries where they worked. In Benin, illustrated local language materials on the family code and on sexual harassment were distributed at community meetings, in city halls, at trainings, and to local

literacy councils, and literacy teachers were trained to answer questions about the law. WLR also created and distributed educational DVDs to be shown in schools, churches, mosques, and community centers. In addition, recognizing that girl babies were often not registered at birth, making them ineligible to vote or apply for university later in life, the initiative trained midwives on the requirements of the new family code, to ensure that all babies were properly registered. City hall workers were also trained, and were encouraged to work with the midwives, so that they would report the proper information when babies were born.

Working simultaneously with multiple groups creates a virtuous circle, Neylon said. Building an awareness of rights encourages women to exercise their rights; trainings position people in the community to help individuals enjoy their rights; and a knowledgeable and active constituency motivates lawmakers and judicial sector workers to protect the rights through court decisions, new laws, and enforcement.

❖ The Way Forward

In order to advance the discourse on gender relations and achieve greater gender equality, **Nyaradzai Gumbonzvanda** argued that a larger conceptual framework is needed, which links empowerment, rights, and mainstreaming in all social spaces. It is also crucial to consider the realities of women's, men's, and children's daily lives, she said. In a developing country context, gender relations are influenced by poverty, insecurity, impunity, and patriarchy. Looking towards the future, achieving gender equity requires a stronger and diverse but unified voice for change; greater accountability; and increased, targeted resources.



Illustrating the reality of one woman's life, Gumbonzvanda told the story of Rozaria. Rozaria was born in 1923 and only attended school through the third grade. She married at 16—not to the man of her dreams, but to the son of her father's best friend, because her father wanted to show how he valued his friendship. Rozaria gave birth to 13 children: six of them are living now—two of whom suffer from mental health problems—and two died of AIDS. She also fostered and adopted five children. In all, Rozaria cared for more than ten orphans. And although she lived as a widow for more than 28 years she managed to send all of her children to school.

Rozaria was an active member of her village community: always present at school board meetings and at local meetings to sort out problems when the village head was absent. She died at home as an elderly woman, an unsung heroine, a mentor with unfulfilled potential. Gumbonzvanda shared that Rozaria was her mother, who died in 2006.

Discussing the meaning of gender equality, Gumbonzvanda said it is partly about an accountability framework, which is grounded within normative legal and political instruments. Currently, the accountability framework consists of several agreements at the global level, such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and People's Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa, the Beijing Platform for Action, the Millennium Development Goals, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, gender equality is not just related to human rights, but also women's empowerment, she stressed. Specific measures are needed to respond to existing inequality and to champion the empowerment of women in order to increase women's opportunities and capabilities. Women's empowerment also requires mainstreaming the gender equality agenda in institutions and processes in a way that transforms social values that have sustained gender inequality.

Gumbonzvanda also described several challenges to greater gender equality. The first challenge concerns current development approaches, which tend to separate development issues from concerns over investment, foreign policy, and security. In addition, current development approaches are increasingly top-down—focusing on policies, institutions,

and processes, without an adequate focus on community empowerment and social movements—and, therefore, do not have a large impact on people's everyday lives. Furthermore, the centralization of power and resources has negative implications with respect to gender equality, because in the parliament, cabinet, chief courts, or among elders of the clan, where power is defined and decisions are made, there is a dearth of women's participation.

The second challenge is limited access to resources in a technologically-defined world. Gender equality requires equal access to services and infrastructure such as roads, electricity, water, and communication tools. Without access to such resources, women with tremendous knowledge, expertise, and passion are not given an outlet to use their knowledge and skills, keeping them at a disadvantage. Technological tools are particularly important as they enable women to use their time, energy, and expertise more efficiently. The third challenge is the context of poverty, violence, disease, and patriarchy in which women live. Gumbonzvanda stressed that gender equality cannot be achieved as long as women live in insecure environments, whether due to an abusive partner, militias, or a threatening neighbor.

Turning towards future strategies, Gumbonzvanda argued that development practitioners should shift their focus from poverty reduction to wealth creation. By focusing on poverty reduction, women are viewed as subjects of poverty rather than as producers and generators of wealth. Women's arts and crafts should be adequately valued as a reflection of their knowledge and skill, she said. Similarly, governments should offer support to women for their role as caregivers and nurturers, rather than treating them as subsidy providers for basic social services such as health.

She stressed that greater participation of all women—rich, poor, working women and housewives—in decision-making spaces, academic and research institutions, advocacy and public awareness initiatives, political debates, the private sector, and within households would create one collective voice for change. The voice of leadership at the international and national levels is also needed to call for greater investment in gender equality and women's empowerment.

Future strategies must also be built around accountability for gender equality, she said. Advocates of gender equality must seek greater accountability through legislative and policy strengthening; reform and harmonization; resources; an end to impunity; political governance; and greater private sector investment and responsibility. Donor governments should be held accountable for the aid they provide—such aid should be directed towards people as generators of wealth, through investments in basic services.

More public resources are needed to make strategies to promote gender equality successful. Mobilizing greater resources for gender equality requires a system of taxation that does not overburden the poor, and gender-responsive budgeting. It is also important to consider ways resources can be mobilized under the Paris principles of donor coordination, donor harmonization, results, and effectiveness.

In addition, the issue of gender equality should be brought into the discourse on resource management and investment in natural resources, because poverty in many developing countries is not due to lack of resources. The integration of gender equality issues and women's political participation in post-conflict areas should also be examined more closely, she said.

In closing, Gumbonzvanda reiterated that the will to fight for greater gender equality is strong. Women simply need proper mechanisms for financing their initiatives for equality and rights.

Appendix I: Agenda ☼

Strategies for Promoting Gender Equity in Developing Countries

Lessons, Challenges, and Opportunities

Thursday, April 26, 2007, 8:30am–1:00pm

6th Floor Flom Auditorium
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (Ronald Reagan Building)

PANEL 1: 8:30am–10:00am

The Evolution of Strategies Aimed at Achieving Gender Equity

Jane S. Jaquette, Occidental College

The Effectiveness of Gender Mainstreaming Efforts

Aruna Rao, Gender at Work

Moderator: **Miryang Youn**, Public Policy Scholar,
Woodrow Wilson Center

PANEL 2: 10:15am–11:45am

Empowering Women Workers

Cathy Feingold, International Programs Department,
AFL-CIO

The Other Half of Gender

Andrew Levack, Men as Partners

Grassroots Efforts to Promote Gender Equity

Angelina Aspuac, Asociación Femenina para el
Desarrollo de Sacatepéquez, Guatemala

Overcoming Legal Obstacles

Lyn Beth Neylon, Women's Legal Rights Initiative

Moderator: **Rosemarie Moreken**, Inter-American
Foundation

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: 12:00pm–1:00pm

The Way Forward

Nyaradzai Gumbonzvanda, East and Horn
of Africa Regional Office, United Nations Development
Fund for Women (UNIFEM)*

* Nyaradzai Gumbonzvanda is currently General Secretary
of the World YWCA.

Appendix II: Biographies of Participants ❖❖

ANGELINA ASPUAC is Director of the Women's Association for the Development of Sacatepéquez (AFEDES). She was elected to represent and present the demands and proposals of women's organizations at a number of venues including: the Municipal Counsel for Development of Santiago Sacatepéquez, the Departmental Counsel for Development of Sacatepéquez, the Regional Counsel for Development in region 5 (including Chimaltenango, Escuintla, and Sacatepéquez), and the National Counsel of Urban and Rural Development that covers all regions of the country. She is a student of Juridical and Social Science in the Law Department at the University of Mariano Galvez. The fifth among nine siblings, Ms. Aspuac is of Maya Kaqchikel descent.

ELIZABETH BRYAN is a Senior Research Assistant in the Environment and Production Technology Division of the International Food Policy Research Institute where she works on projects related to climate change adaptation and water resources management. In addition, she worked with researchers in the Food Consumption and Nutrition Division of IFPRI to examine the impact of government transfer programs on women's empowerment in Bangladesh. Prior to joining IFPRI, she worked as a consultant to the Poverty Reduction Group of the World Bank where she helped compile a database of impact evaluations. From 2002–2007, she was Program Assistant in the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. During summer 2006, she conducted research on gender mainstreaming at the Inter-American Foundation. Elizabeth completed a Masters in International Development with a concentration in Development Economics from American University in May 2007.

CATHY FEINGOLD is the Director of Public Outreach for the Solidarity Center, a non-profit organization that assists workers worldwide to protect their rights and build strong unions. Previously, she worked for the AFL-CIO where she developed and coordinated strategic campaigns on foreign policy, trade, women's rights, HIV/AIDS, and child labor with labor and allied organizations. She worked for the Ford Foundation in New York City developing programs on international human rights, women's rights, gender and trade, and peace and security issues and helped to create the New Voices Fellowship Program. She has worked with the United Nations developing programs on trade and conflict prevention in New York, Vietnam and Guatemala. As a Fulbright scholar, she lived in Nicaragua and researched the effects of World Bank and IMF policies on women workers and developed popular education materials for women living in the former conflict zone. She has spent many years living and working in Mexico, Nigeria, and throughout Central America where she has worked with women's rights organizations and examined the effects of trade policies and IMF and World Bank programs on women. She received her B.A. in Political Studies and Gender Studies from Pitzer College and her M.A. in Public Administration from Columbia University.

NYARADZAI GUMBONZVANDA is currently the Secretary General for the World YWCA. Prior to this, she was Regional Program Director for the UNIFEM East and Horn of Africa Regional Office. During her tenure UNIFEM strengthened its partnership with IGAD and the East African Community, built UNIFEM program portfolios in Kenya, Somalia, and Sudan and strengthened partnerships with donors and development actors in the area of gender equality and women's human rights. Notable recent achievement include the UNIFEM's organizational lead in post conflict programming for gender justice in Somalia and Sudan and the sustained advocacy in the region on ending violence against women. Ms. Gumbonzvanda has worked with UNICEF as a Human Rights Officer and Chief of Section: Rights, Promotion and Communication in Liberia, and as a National Child Rights Advisor in Zimbabwe. She has also worked in the Zimbabwean government as a law officer (state attorney/prosecutor). Mrs. Gumbonzvanda has vast experience in gender and human rights training, research and professional rapporteuring, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, using participatory methods, gender and development, and on rights based Programming. Mrs. Gumbonzvanda is active within the women's rights movement and is a member of such organizations such as WiLDAF, Zimbabwe Women Lawyers Association, and the World Conference on Religion and Peace. She holds a Masters in Private Law with a specialization in Constitutional Property Law from the University of South Africa. She also has a post-graduate diploma in Conflict Resolution from Uppsala University, Sweden, a Bachelor of Law (Honours) Degree from the University of Zimbabwe, and a Certificate in Gender and Development from Bossey Institute (Switzerland).

JANE S. JAQUETTE is Bertha Harton Orr Professor of Politics at Occidental College. She joined the Occidental faculty in 1969, received a promotion to full professor in 1992, and was named to the Orr Professorship in the Liberal Arts in 1996. In addition to her work on the politics of development and women in development, Dr. Jaquette has published on women in politics in Latin America and is now working on a project on women and democratization worldwide. She is finishing a book manuscript on power in Machiavelli and Hobbes. In 1979–80, Dr. Jaquette worked as a social scientist in the Women's Development Office at USAID in Washington D.C., where she played an active role in planning the United Nations Decade for Women meeting in Copenhagen. Dr. Jaquette is a member of several professional associations and served from 1990–2 as President of the Association for Women in Development, and from 1995–7 as President of the Latin American Studies Association. She is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Pacific Council on International Policy. Dr. Jaquette received her B.A. from Swarthmore College (1964) and her Ph.D. in Government from Cornell in 1971.

ANDREW LEVACK is the director of EngenderHealth's Men As Partners® (MAP) Program. He has been involved in MAP since the program's inception in 1998. Mr. Levack is also the co-director of MenEngage, a global alliance of nongovernmental organizations working to engage men and boys in gender equality. In addition, Mr. Levack holds a clinical faculty appointment at the University of Washington's School of Public Health and

Community Medicine, where he teaches a course on reproductive health and gender. Mr. Levack began his career in public health 13 years ago as a sexuality educator in the United States. Since then, Mr. Levack has lived in Thailand and South Africa and has worked in more than 15 countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. His work addresses adolescent reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, gender-based violence, quality improvement, and reproductive health counseling. Mr. Levack holds a Master's in public health from the University of Washington.

ROSEMARIE MOREKEN is Analysis and Evaluation Specialist at the Inter-American Foundation where she heads IAF's gender initiative. Prior to joining IAF, Rosemarie worked with CARE where she covered emergency and development work in the Sudan, Iraq, and Mozambique. She first became concerned with gender issues and the self-esteem of women while working with the Overseas Education Fund in Costa Rica and serving as a Peace Corps volunteer in Guatemala. She has also worked and volunteered with Second Chance Employment Services, for at-risk women and their dependents. She holds a Masters in International Affairs from Columbia University.

LYN BETH NEYLON is a legal and gender specialist at MetaMetrics Inc. in Washington, DC where she has been subcontracted by Chemonics International to lead the activities of the Women's Legal Rights Initiative of USAID in Benin and Rwanda. From 2003 to 2004, Neylon was Associate Director of the Washington Kurdish Institute (WKI), Washington DC, a nonpartisan nonprofit that promotes awareness of, and solutions to problems facing Kurds, especially in Iraq, Iran, and Turkey. She was also Director of the Human Rights USA initiative, a national project funded primarily by the Ford Foundation, which aimed to achieve a new level of awareness about the relevance, meaning, and scope of human rights in the United States, and to use a human rights framework to encourage and assist community action to guarantee these rights. Neylon holds an LL.M in international and comparative law from Georgetown University (1996), a J.D. from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco (1988), and a B.G.S. in political science from Roosevelt University, Chicago, (1985).

ARUNA RAO is a gender and institutional change expert with over 25 years of experience addressing gender issues in a variety of development organizations, primarily in Asia. She is the Founder and Director of Gender at Work, a new knowledge and capacity-building network focused on the links between gender equality, organizations, and institutional change. She has served as President of the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) and she is currently a Commissioner of the Commission on Globalization convened by State of the World Forum. She has served as Vice Chair on the CIVICUS for the past three years. From 1994 to 1990, Rao coordinated a Population Council program of research in five Asian countries on gender issues in rural development program planning and implementation and worked with national training institutions to integrate gender perspectives into their capacity building programs. She organized leading world conferences on gender training and development planning. Beginning in 1994, she

led a team that pioneered a new approach to gender and organizational change in BRAC in Bangladesh. She has consulted widely with UN organizations, academic institutions, and development NGOs both internationally and nationally on gender and development and organizational change issues.

MIRYANG YOUN was a Public Policy Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in 2007 and the summer of 2008, writing a book on North Korean women. Dr. Youn has worked for 19 years for the Ministry of Unification. Dr. Youn served as director of the ministry's politico-military dialogue division, social exchanges division, separated families division, economic dialogue division, and policy planning division. She served as a representative of South Korea in several inter-Korean dialogues, including Ministerial Talks, Military Talks, Maritime Affairs Talks, and Red Cross Talks. She also has been a visiting professor at the Korean Institute of Education on Labor and the Graduate School for North Korean Studies, Kyung-Nam University. Dr. Youn's publications include *Changes and Continuity in the North Korean Society* (Seoul, South Korea: Han-UI Publisher, 2006) and *Controversies in North Korean Studies I* (Seoul, South Korea: Han-UI Publisher, 2005). Dr. Youn has a Ph.D. from the London School of Economics, a Masters in Public Policy from Seoul National University, and a B.A. from Chungang University.