

Gender Planning Frameworks

- attempts to translate the ideas of academic gender analysis and/or feminism into practical tools and guidelines for development planners and practitioners
- used to train people who are not gender/women in development specialists about WHY gender is an issue in development, as well as HOW gender is an issue in development, usually in the context of very short courses - one to three days
- used as a basis for gender policy in many development agencies. Increasingly the frameworks are being used in combination to suit institutional and development needs
- aiming to equip development planners and practitioners with a common understanding and language to analyse important gender issues in their work
- quite different from one another. They have different priorities, uses and limitations.

Need to use frameworks with care

While they aid analysis, raise awareness and assist in thinking through the planning process:

- none of the gender planning frameworks say all there is to say about gender analysis.
- It is important that frameworks are used to stimulate rather than restrict thinking about gender issues.
- it can be useful to look at a number of frameworks in order to think through which approach best suits a particular situation.

Three Common Frameworks

- Moser: distinguishes between practical and strategic interests in planning for empowerment and focuses on concerns about workloads of women.
- Harvard: Concerned with making gender divisions of labour, roles in decision-making and levels of control over resources, visible.
- Longwe: Directly concerned with creating situations within which inequality, discrimination and subordination are addressed.

The Harvard Framework- focus on households

Concepts and Tools: Details data needed for planning. Implies women's gender concerns are to close the gaps (in workloads, decision-making etc.) between themselves and men. Suggests there are three main data sets required:

- Who does what, when, where and in how much time? Called an 'activity profile'
- Who has access and control (i.e. decision-making) over what resources? Called an 'access and control profile'
- Who has access and control over benefits? (benefit? food produced etc.)

Uses and Strengths of Harvard

Uses/strengths:

- micro/community level analysis for project planning - practical, hands on
- establishes detailed base line information
- neutral/non-threatening “entry point” into gender analysis - focuses on tangible, objective facts, and on men as well as women, on difference rather than inequality
- easy to communicate to people who are not gender specialists
- examination of tangible but not intangible resources, eg social networks etc.

Limitations of Harvard

Limitations:

- Differences between men and women read as disadvantage i.e. gaps that must need be filled/ gender issues to be addressed, in order to achieve:

increases in productivity/ production

gender equity (50/50 % work/asset divisions?)

resource access and control (decision-making)

(Can 'we' give access and control over resources and benefits?)

i.e. women's empowerment?

Limitations of Harvard (2)

- over-simplifies what are usually complex relations – what is ‘ownership’ in different contexts & between men and women in different social relations?
- Suggests a level of permanency in gender roles that denies the possibility and reality of changing gender relations as a result of:
 - education
 - shifts in legal rights/
 - negotiation and bargaining between parties concerned
 - roles as part of wider exchanges between kinsmen/ marital partners etc.

Conceptual Framework for Analysing Changing Gender Relations in Natural Resource Research and Projects. Catherine Locke and Christine Okali. UEA. Norwich. 2000

Conceptual Understandings	Generic Questions
Dynamic Analysis: Gender relations are formed and constantly renegotiated and reconstructed by individuals and groups in direct confrontations or through every day events.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the historical directions of change in gender relations? 2. What is the nature of local gender relations? 3. What aspects of local gender relations are currently relatively 'accepted' and stable? 4. What aspects are currently highly contested, fluid or changing?
Relational Analysis: The experiences and strategies of men and women and their negotiations around separate and joint interests, both within household and supra-household institutions, are integral to a gender analysis.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do women and men maintain and renegotiate gender relations? 2. How are gender relations shaped by other social identities? 3. What is the nature of gender relations in different institutions? 4. How do women and men use these institutions to maintain and renegotiate gender relations?
Social Analysis: Cultural constructions of gender are pervasive but also highly specific and socially variable. Gender is an organising concept for all aspects of social reality but the particular gender meaning of an act cannot be read off from behaviour but depends on situational details.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are local values about gender roles, resource allocations and authority? 2. What are cultural perceptions of agricultural services and technologies? 3. How are these two related?
Strategising: Women and men strategise to optimise their separate and joint livelihoods and security, and junior and disadvantaged individuals resist and contest powerful individuals. Strategies may not reflect local cultural values about appropriate and acceptable behaviour.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the shared and separate livelihood interests of women and men? 2. What strategies do women and men employ to advance their joint and separate livelihood interests?
Bargaining: The relative bargaining power of women and men is determined by concerns about household survival, extra-household networks, economic variables and local understandings about legitimate acts. Bargaining processes draw on and redefine cultural meanings.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the local understandings of the relative bargaining positions of women and men? 2. How do women and men use these understandings in their bargaining strategies? 3. How is this worked out at an individual level?
Valuing Outcomes: Women and men interpret and value the outcomes of bargaining processes and interventions with respect to their own needs and interests and their ongoing negotiations. Apparently similar outcomes may have different implications and valued outcomes may be unrelated to project objectives.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do women and men strategise around interventions? 2. How do women and men experience and value outcomes?

Operating Principles - 1

VIGOROUSLY RESIST the notions that:

- the rural population is a collection of isolated, atomised individuals with only individual interests
- farmers, producers & others are neutral actors with no gender, age, class or other identities
- all rural areas are the same (shared history; similar rates of change etc.)

Operating Principles - 2

QUESTION dominant narratives about:

- women & men in agriculture
- gender relations
- households & household decision-making

Operating Principles - 3

ALWAYS REMEMBER that:

- gender disadvantage is about social **structure**
- gender relations are maintained & re-negotiated via **dynamic processes**
- men and women have **multiple identities**
- changes in gender relations are **intrinsically ambiguous**