

# Factors Affecting Development of Gender-Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Humanitarian NGOs in Uganda: A Case of IRC Uganda

Grace William Maiso, David Ssekamatte & Rose B. Namara  
Uganda Management Institute

## Abstract

*This study sought to examine factors that affect the development of gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation systems in humanitarian NGOs in Uganda. The study assessed the effect of organizational and programme factors. The organizational factors assessed include organizational structure, organizational culture and leadership while the programme factors were staff gender competences, project methods and tools, programme context and how these affect the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems in a humanitarian NGO in Uganda. Using a cross-sectional survey design and quantitative methods of data collection with a sample of 147 respondents, the study found that organizational factors had a negative and insignificant effect on gender-sensitive M&E systems while programme factors had a strong and significant effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems. Therefore, programme factors were a strong predictor of gender mainstreaming in M&E and organizational factors were not. The study recommends skills training in gender mainstreaming to programme staff, while investments in organizational change management may be necessary in the long term.*

**Keywords:** Gender-sensitive M&E systems, Organizational Factors, Programme Factors, Humanitarian NGOs

## Introduction

Gender equality has been a concern for development practitioners for centuries (Dilli, Carmichael & Rijpma, 2019). This study examined gender concerns within the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems among NGOs in humanitarian work. The development of gender-sensitive M&E systems falls within the rubric of gender mainstreaming -- a concept that gained currency after the Beijing 1995 Fourth World Conference for Women and the adoption of the Platform for Action (PfA). The call at Beijing 1995 for all actors to mainstream gender in all their programmes and projects, including policies, stemmed from the realization of the shortcomings of the Women in Development (WID) approach to gender that was prominent in the 1970s. This approach had noted that development programmes had ignored and worsened the conditions of women. It sought to change women's conditions by integrating women into economic development processes through separating women offices, women projects, and units from the mainstream. Although this approach led to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) to which Uganda is a signatory, it was not sufficient to address gender inequalities as it ignored, among others, the role of men in decision-making (KFW, 2006) and had little application to Africa (Beetham & Dimitriades, 2007).

To enhance accountability to the international treaties and national legal and policy frameworks, it is clear that understanding of the link between gender and M&E is important for the comprehension of how gender-sensitive M&E systems can be developed (Madri, Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017). It is often assumed that M&E systems should be able to measure the issues of gender as impacts may differ across different targeted categories of people whom the project or programme aims to address, and programmes are never gender-neutral (FAO, 2014). Gender sensitive M&E systems are thus assumed to help in the measurement of the gender equality goals in themselves (FAO, 2014). Although Madri, Rensburg and Mapitsa (2017) have shown the linkage between M&E and gender, this linkage is still unclear in humanitarian programming.

This study was undertaken in a humanitarian NGO in Uganda, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) that started operations in the country in 1998. The study objectives were;

- 1) To establish effect of organizational factors on development of gender-sensitive M&E systems in NGOs
- 2) To establish effect of programme factors on the development of gender-responsive M&E systems in NGOs.

IRC is a humanitarian organization that responds to humanitarian crises and helps people affected by conflict and disaster to recover their livelihoods. The International Rescue Committee operates nationwide, serving Internally Displaced People (IDPs) and conflict-affected populations. The organization was chosen because it has a full gender mainstreaming programme and a long history in humanitarian and M&E systems development. Since 2011, the organization has articulated its commitment to gender mainstreaming and pledged to follow the SPHERE minimum standards for humanitarian action by conducting gender analysis in all its programme activities (SPHERE Project, 2011). It thus provided a good basis for the study on the effect of organizational and programme factors on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems. In this study, gender-sensitive M&E systems is conceptualized in terms of planning, conducting gender analysis, budget allocation and strategy/work plan, data collection, measuring gender-sensitive indicators, gendered teams, tools development, gender information management system, measuring gender-responsive reporting, dissemination and use of M&E findings. In particular, the study set out to test the following hypotheses:

- H1: Organizational factors have no effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems in NGO
- H2: Programme factors have no effect on the development of gender-responsive M&E systems in NGO

This article further entails sections such as the methodology, highlights of relevant literature, theoretical considerations, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

## Methodology

### Research design:

A cross-sectional study design was adopted using quantitative methods of data collection and analysis. Selection of the design was informed by the need to test hypotheses regarding organizational and programme factors and their effect on gender-sensitive M&E development, providing an appropriate opportunity to study the M&E systems in its natural real-life context (Pickard, 2013).

### Sampling and sample size determination:

The study population comprised M&E officers and managers, finance staff, human resource staff, gender focal persons, project officers, programme officials, senior management staff of IRC at head office and IRC field staff in the Yumbe humanitarian programme. From a population of 264, a sample of 147 respondents were selected for the study using proportionate stratified sampling technique across the stratum of the employees at IRC. The sample size was determined using the Yamane (1967) formula for calculating sample size.

### Data collection and analysis:

Quantitative data was collected using a self-administered survey questionnaire. The questionnaire using the Likert scale was structured to collect data on demographic characteristics of respondents and attitudes of employees regarding programme and organizational factors including organizational structure, organizational culture, leadership, staff gender competences, project methods and tools as well as programme context, and how these affect the development of a gender-sensitive M&E system.

Filled questionnaires were scrutinized for usability, consistence and accuracy after which they were cleaned, edited, assigned identification numbers and coded for data entry (Kothari, 2004). Quantitative data analysis was done using SPSS IBM 20 to generate frequencies, measures of central tendency as well as measures of dispersion on study variables. These included organizational factors namely: organizational structure in terms of M&E Unit, staffing and governance, organizational culture in terms of values, attitudes, commitment, models, practices and leadership in terms of vision, accountability, capacity and commitment within the organization. The programme factors included staff gender competences, integration skills, self-image and training. Other programme factors included project methods and tools for gender mainstreaming, participation, capacity and programme context conceptualized as the socio-economic conditions, attitudes, laws, and partnerships. The gender-sensitive M&E systems included: planning measuring gender analysis, budget allocation, strategy and workplan. Also considered were data collection and management, measuring gender-sensitive indicators, gendered teams, tools development, gender information management system, gender-responsive reporting, dissemination and use of M&E findings.

## Literature Review

### Theoretical Review

The study used the Gendered Organizational Theory attributed to Acker (1990) who examined the subtle ways that gender is established and reproduced in organizations such as overt and covert practices and processes that in themselves perpetuate gender inequalities such as “concrete activities, what people do and say, and how they think about these activities” (Acker, 1992: 420). According to Acker (1992) there are five processes for examination of gender in an organization. The first is the analysis of “production of gender divisions” and “the gender patterning of jobs, wages and hierarchies, power and subordination” (Acker, 1992: 252). This involves examining the processes that produce them and those that resist their formation and practices. The second process to examine is “the creation of symbols, images, and forms of consciousness that explicate, justify, and, more rarely, oppose gender divisions such as language, ideology, popular and high culture, dress, the press, television” (Acker, 1992:146). The third process is the examination of “interactions between individuals that enact dominance and subordination and create alliances and exclusion within and outside the organization” (Acker, 1992: 253). The fourth process is the impact of the gendered organization on the identity of the individual. The fifth is the process of creating and conceptualizing social structures such as race, ethnicity and relationships with other structures or analytically different processes (Acker 2012).

While Acker (1990) is credited with this theory, the perspectives of the theory that emerge are that it consists of three distinct attributes or perspectives as spelt out below. First, is intersectionality, i.e., how the organization interacts with the disadvantaged such as women and other minority groups and how structure, culture, class and self-image of participants interface to create new meanings and experiences that can perpetuate gender inequalities including linkage to other forms of inequality processes and practices in existence (Acker, 2012). The second perspective of understanding gendered organizations relates to examining gender, ethnicity, and culture. It could relate to how gender and ethnicity affect leadership experiences (Showunmi, Atewologun and Bebbington, 2015), or how culture in such forms as gender scripts, stereotyping influence leadership (Ayman & Korabik, 2010) and how the leadership is affected by the three perspectives of how gender inequality can be established – intra-psychic, the social structural, and the interpersonal perspectives (Korabik and Ayman (2007). The third perspective to understanding gendered organizations is to examine leadership -- focusing on the intersections of leaders and those that are led (policies, HRM practices, laws and strategies (budgets, plans etc.) that are formulated for change to take place (Britton and Logan, 2008). Thus, identifying the inequalities is not sufficient but there is need to examine the organizational structures, processes, and culture and how they interact to perpetuate inequality and linkage to socio-economic factors in/outside the organization (Metcalf, 2006). Makarem (2017) notes that in gendered research, it is important to understand how gender inequalities are built in and reproduced by social structures in order to develop appropriate and adequate gender bias-free policies.

Acker (1990) and the gendered organizational theorists have been criticized for assuming that organizations are inherently designed for male domination which is not correct. In addition, any structure that exists is often a reflection of what the society or situation is like and so

gender inequalities outside will often reproduce themselves within the organization. Despite these shortcomings the theory helps us to examine gendered practices and processes in the development of M&E such as organizational structure, culture and leadership which are key components of organizational factors, while organizational context, staff self-images are seen in their competences to identify gender inequalities and project methods that determine intersectionality between internal and external conditions of gender inequality form programme factors in the study.

## **Organizational Factors and Gender-Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**

### ***Organizational structure and development of gender-sensitive M&E systems***

Caroline Moser (2016) demonstrates and argues that organizational structures can be determinants of gender transformation or pathways in which gender relations and power can be exercised. The structure of an organization can cause an autocratic structural change where technical staff determine changes (UN Women, 2013), or a participatory and more engaging approach that enables demands from women and communities for gender transformation advocated by organizations such as Oxfam (Sweetman, 2013). USAID (2016) notes that an organizational structure plays an important role in the integration of gender in M&E systems basically through two major pathways: the human resource management pathway through staff placement, gender unit establishment and gender-responsive organizational policies and procedures pathway which provides the framework for the functionality of the staff positions and units created.

Studies show that an organizational structure influences the way change occurs, especially if the change is radical in nature such as may be introduced by the feminization of M&E systems, as this challenges the power relations and the infrastructure that supports it with implications for staff at all levels (Aruna, 2005; Moser, 2016). Batliwala (2011) has argued that an organizational structure has a direct link to the effectiveness of the M&E system to address gender issues. Nasambu (2016) has noted that an organizational structure has a positive and significant correlation to M&E performance. Njenga et al. (2008) have noted that issues of access to resources and control, decision making, division of labor and knowledge which are critical in the reduction of gender inequalities are directly linked and affected by the organizational structure. Thus for an organization to make the necessary changes such as in the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems, it must have the views of all staff taken into consideration in a participatory way and thus create space for a gendered organizational structure that also needs to be accountable.

### ***Organizational culture and development of gender-sensitive M&E systems***

The European Institute for Gender Equality (2016) cautions that organizations are not static or fixed and often have unwritten rules and undocumented behaviors that potentially affect the gender mainstreaming process. These are embedded in the organizational culture and relate to the behavior of staff and their outlook on issues especially that concern organizational change. Individuals learn the organizational culture in a socialization process and many of the

stereotypical behavior towards gender issues is learnt this way too. So, they do note that gender transformation can only take place if organizational culture is taken into account in the process of change. Kadam and Acuner (2018), writing on public sector regarding national women machinery mechanisms in Turkey averred that gender mainstreaming is a political process that requires a shift in organizational culture. Accordingly, it requires a shift of mindset and structures where budgets, staff, incentives, tools and methods and policy making are all shifted and brought on board to support gender mainstreaming and transformation. The linkage to the development of M&E systems in general is seen from the institutional processes crafted within the organization and how these can be supported by the existence of national women machineries.

USAID (2010) notes that it is the cardinal duty of all staff within an organization to reflect and question the cultural norms and practices within the organization and see how they affect their workplaces in terms of how they can integrate gender in the processes including M&E often guided by organizational policy. Policies are major instruments used to ensure that gender concerns are well integrated into the culture and operations of an organization (Mergaert and Lombardo, 2014). Resource allocation for gender mainstreaming affects the response and commitment to developing gender-sensitive systems. Mantilla (2012) argues that gender mainstreaming should be provided for with a non-discretionary, fixed budget line and not depend on extra-budgetary resources that is common in gender integration processes. Espinosa (2011), cited in Espinosa (2013), argues that the failure to allocate resources and insufficient institutional capabilities stem from lack of political will in an organization's leadership.

Studies in organizational management show that deliberate recruitment of women and the closing of gender gaps in countries like New Zealand has led to the rise in GDP by 10% (Borkin, 2011). Where the gender gap is reduced at the senior management level, cases of increased and better performance have been realized (Desvaux, Devillard & Sultan, 2010; Whelan & Wood, 2012); and in other cases, there has been increased organizational efficiency, profitability and effectiveness (Borkin, 2011; Desvaux, Devillard Hoellinger & Meaney, 2008; Fitzpatrick, 2011). How this can be linked to M&E is still a grey area

Indeed, Taylor-Powell and Boyd (2008) show that several motivators such as leadership opportunities, professional development in the career path and recognition by peers can be strong motivators for increased engagement in evaluation practices. Thus, the attitudes of people regarding gender in itself are critical to ensure gender-sensitive M&E systems are developed. In the case of the growth of EvalPartners and the eventual resolution on gender equity in evaluation processes in the UN in December 2014, the past experience of Mr. Segone in UNICEF and the amiable support from his mentor ensured that gender concerns were integrated into UNICEF work (Catsambas, 2015), but also led to donors such as Finland to adopt gender sensitive M&E systems that were considered a risk, triggering a movement that today has a membership of more 140,000 (Catsambas, 2015).

Staff who have residual knowledge on how to tackle gender inequalities gained from previous experiences or practices within organizations are often an important strategy for effective gender mainstreaming in M&E processes (Hankivski, 2008; Squires, 2007).

Hoole and Patterson (2008) have argued that the process of building evaluation capacity in organizations requires infrastructure to support it and a learning culture. The learning culture is established through strategic learning -- a process which is “the integration of evaluation and other feedback into decision making about strategy...using evaluation and evaluative thinking to learn in real-time and adapt their strategies to the changing circumstances about them” (Coffman & Beer, 2011). According to Hoole and Patterson (2008), feedback that consists of stakeholder input and incorporation of external evaluation expertise is critical in the development of a learning organization.

### ***Leadership and development of gender-sensitive M&E systems***

In the development of gender-integrated and responsive systems, the successful story of the development of the Eval Partners, a network of evaluators globally, clearly shows that leadership is central. Segone and Oksanen are credited with providing the leadership that not only led to the Chiang Mai declaration on evaluation but also adopting a resolution on evaluation by the UN in December 2014 and declaring 2015 a Year of Evaluation (Catsambas, 2015). Scholars (Brennan & Major, 2011, Carman & Fredericks, 2010; Taylor-Powell & Boyd, 2008) show that leadership, organizational culture -- including support for evaluation -- are important pillars in developing evaluation culture and that sharing of gendered evaluation experiences among key leaders (Preskill & Boyle, 2008) helps to build capacity to enhance the uptake of gender mainstreaming.

Where organizations may not have gender specialists to direct or lead the process of causing gender-sensitive M&E systems, Taylor-Powell and Boyd (2008) and Oxfam Canada (2012) suggest that leadership can champion new policies and resources and provide ability to withstand setbacks to the development of M&E processes that could be caused by the absence of a champion or model through influence over peers and possession of particular skills and interests. The bolstering of champions within organizations can be reinforced by the formation of networks of role models and committed staff to catalyse change (DANIDA, 2008) such as in the case of EvalPartners (Catsambas, 2015). There is need to understand how Leadership, for example, influences the uptake of gender approaches, tools and practices among staff and lead to an ethos that is reinforced and voluntarily taken on by all M&E staff within an organization.

Ivankovich and Faramand (2015) argue that whereas organizational gender strategies, tools and policies can be in place; but if they are not communicated effectively and perceived as a critical mission by the leadership, gender mainstreaming can have considerable challenges. For example, the lack of women representatives in leadership positions can affect the effectiveness of the gender mainstreaming process. According to these scholars, gender mainstreaming requires to be given the due space and support and prioritized in all organizational activities by the leadership. This can be through communication to all staff, providing support in terms of resources, time, commitment, participation (Harvey, 2010) and policy reform to enhance gender-sensitive M&E systems.

In his research, Canyon (2017) found that organizational structure, culture and leadership are intertwined in the development of gender inclusion within the security sector. He notes that erstwhile positions that were earmarked for women within the armed forces were open to

women as a result of leadership and transformation of the structure of the organization. But this could only be done with the reorientation of the culture of the organization and not just toeing the line. The leadership of any organization plays a crucial role in changing the culture of an organization and initiating policies that help to restructure the organization and shape the attitudes of those for and against gender inclusion in all processes including M&E systems.

## **Programme Factors and Development of Gender-sensitive M&E Systems**

### ***Staff gender competences and development of gender-sensitive M&E systems***

In studying gender inequalities that exacerbate food insecurity and under-nutrition, McNairn (2011), cited in Ivankovich and Faramand (2015), has averred that building capacity in gender and behaviour change communication can enable gender transformation to take place. In the light of the fact that most project staff have their own experience and attitudes towards gender, it is important that they are trained in principles of gender integration in projects to help them develop competences sufficient to enable integration of gender in programmatic processes (Ivankovich and Faramand, 2015). Newly recruited project staff require training in order to enhance their skills and competences to understand gender issues and apply appropriate approaches for gender mainstreaming. In addition to building the capacity, there is need for commitment of staff on integration of gender into processes. USAID (2010) has argued that in order to successfully ensure integration of gender into programme activities, project staff at all levels need to have skills in gender mainstreaming and be responsible for gender integration in addition to staff having access to rebuilding their skills through training. However, how these skills can be sustained in cases of humanitarian aid that is often transitional in nature is still poorly researched.

### ***Project methods, tools, and development of gender-sensitive M&E systems***

Holvoet & Leslie (2013) note that the adoption of appropriate M&E approaches should be able to show what changes must take place in the organization and the results of those changes that ought to be realized as premised on the theory of change. Scholars show that the majority of capacity building interventions focus on one-off trainings and workshops and, in some cases, technical assistance in terms of project management expertise (Datta et al., 2012) and advice, often leaving the higher intangibles of organizational change such as power and incentives unaffected, and not even measured due to difficulty in indicator identification and measurement (Ubels, 2010). Gender mainstreaming has often been done in workshops and one-off trainings or sometimes payment of salaries for gender specialists who are expatriates, thus leaving many projects and organizations with limited capacity and desired change at the organizational level.

Funders of projects are some of the major stakeholders that affect the development of M&E. The rigor with which organizations mainstream gender in M&E processes is determined in many respects by the perceptions and interests of the donors who sponsor or fund projects. For instance, a study by GEO (2012) showed that evaluations served internal audiences as demanded by donors and concluded that funders were not living up to their



promises of ensuring that evaluation results should be communicated and used as a platform for learning in the gender process. The power relations between grantee and grantor have had serious implications on the conduct of evaluations and affected the mainstreaming of gender in evaluation processes.

The challenge with mainstreaming is partly affected by the perception that organizations attach to the evaluation process. A study by The Center for Effective Philanthropy found that grantees of funding perceived evaluations as a wastage of resources and a distraction (Buteau & Chu, 2011) rather than a helpful learning exercise. Participation of stakeholders such as women in M&E activities have an impact on what outcomes emerge from the exercises as a gender evaluation of World Bank programmes shows (IEG, 2010). The evaluation found that when women participate less in project design or evaluation exercise then they benefit less from the project. Similarly, according to two studies in Bangladesh (Naved et al, 2006) the disregard of women in the project processes soon gave way to men controlling project activities. Harvey (2010) argues that however good a policy change or shift may be often resistance may emerge and it requires the participation of people to enhance reception and understand the purpose and benefits of a gender mainstreaming process. Multi-stakeholder participation requires tools and methods that utilize and enhance the spaces for participation. How tools and methods can be effectively applied seems to be a grey area in the literature reviewed.

### ***Programme context and development of gender sensitive M&E systems***

The level of gender integration in M&E systems is determined by donor conditions as most NGOs' M&E systems are established to provide accountability to donors or sometimes designed with support of peer organizations (Szper and Prakash 2011) to meet society requirements or regulations of governments that now require transparency to counter the growing concerns of the quality of NGO work (Murtaza, 2011). Thus in such scenarios, if gender is not budgeted for or emphasized by the donor then gender-responsive M&E systems are hard to develop given the financial constraints. Evaluations are often done but as part of contract compliance for the donors; and even when there are lessons to learn such as the challenges of gender mainstreaming, the lessons are not taken as they have implications for the fundraising for the organizations if the weaknesses have a significant impact on their reputation. According to Gulrajani (2013), the demand for gender mainstreaming by donors in funding or aid modalities is more emphasized and used in project selection than in implementation or results/outcomes as a whole.

Mainstreaming of gender including in M&E systems would require sufficient resources, building capacities, among others, but like Ogden et al. (2008) note, mainstreaming ends up as 'gender as usual', a scenario where commitments to address gender equality are not supported with processes of staff capacity development, allocation of adequate financing, and adequate monitoring and evaluation of results. According to Sen and Östlin (2010) the failure of gender mainstreaming is, among others, caused by organizational plaqueless where they are traditionally encrusted by usually male-dominated organizational relationships, values and approaches to work while on the part of African Development Bank (2011) it is the problem of looking at gender mainstreaming as more of a process than targeting outcomes of the process.

According to Grown (2014), the other reason for the difficulty in attaining effective gender mainstreaming stems from the multi-dimensionality of the gender equality concept and the fact that there is mismatch between different donors in approaches across different sectors and resources allocated for the exercise in relation to policy commitments. Financing of gender mainstreaming is crucial and Grown (2014) has noted that whereas there has been no agreed amount of the budget to be allocated to gender mainstreaming, they suggest that 15% of budget should be an ideal allocation but unfortunately that has not been the case as many donors have only emphasized gender mainstreaming without budget allocations for it (Grown et al., 2005). So, the efforts to mainstream Gender in M&E systems become difficult.

## Summary of the Literature Review

The literature is largely fragmented and addresses issues of gender mainstreaming in general but with little on M&E systems development specifically and limited study on development of gender-responsive M&E systems in Uganda. In addition, much of the literature is not within the humanitarian action sphere, which presents a limited understanding and appreciation of how gender-sensitive M&E systems ought to be developed, a grey area that needs to be researched upon. This is why this research became cardinal to provide new insights into the whole process and thus contribute new knowledge in the field of M&E.

## Study Findings

### Response Rate

The researchers distributed 147 questionnaires to respondents and a total of 120 questionnaires were returned. The response rate is presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Response Rate for the Study**

Instruments	Targeted	Actual	Response Rate
Questionnaires	147	120	81.6 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>81.6 %</b>

According to Nulty (2008), a response rate above 50% is acceptable in social research and thus the rate attained was sufficient to subject the data to analysis.

## Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The following were the background characteristics of respondents as presented in Table 2 below:

**Table 2: Respondents Demographic Characteristics**

Item	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age of respondent	Below 30 years	73	61.9
	Between 30 and 40 years	43	36.4
	Over 40 years	2	1.7
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.0</b>
Sex of respondent	Male	73	61.9
	Female	45	38.1
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.0</b>
<b>Marital Status</b>	Married	74	62.7
	Single	41	34.7
	Widowed/widower	3	2.5
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.0</b>
Academic qualification	Bachelor's	82	69.5
	Master's	6	5.1
	Diploma	30	25.4
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.0</b>
Time of service in the organization	Below five years	107	90.7
	Between five and Ten years	9	7.6
	Over ten years	2	1.7
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.0</b>

Source: Primary data

Majority of respondents (61.9%) were below the age of 30 years while 36.4% were between the ages of 30 and 40 years and 1.7% were above 40 years. This shows that IRC had a young staff profile in its humanitarian programmes. Majority of the staff interviewed, constituting 61.9%, were male while the females were 38.1%. In addition, 62.7 % of the staff interviewed were married while 34.4% were single. It was also noted that 2.5% were widowed. The large number of the married shows that the respondents consisted of persons having the appropriate background experience to respond to a gender study. Also, the fact that the majority of respondents were below 30 years and many were married shows that marriages could have been nascent, which provides lessons to learn on issues of gender as these respondents were likely to be sensitive to the gender concerns at the workplace and organization (KII, 2018).

In terms of academic qualifications, 69.5% of the respondents had Bachelor's degree, 25.4% had diploma and 5.1% had Master's. This means that the respondents had the requisite knowledge and competences to comprehend the questionnaire and thus take part in the study. The majority (90.7%) of the staff interviewed had spent less than five years in the organization while 7.6% had spent between five and ten years, and 1.7% had spent over ten years in the organization. The time spent in the organization was sufficient for respondents to be able to recollect organizational issues that were relevant to answering of questions posed in the study, especially that most emergency projects last between one and three years.

## Description of Dependent Variable: Genders-sensitive M&E System

The questionnaire measured the dependent variable (DV), gender-sensitive M&E system, with 18 items scaled using the five-point Likert scale where, 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. It consisted of three constructs namely, Planning (PN), Data collection and Management (DCM) and Reporting (RP).

## Gender-sensitive M&E System Index

In order to analyze further the gender-sensitive M&E system variable, an average measure of GSME was derived from the three components (PN, DCM and RP) in order to get an overall picture of how the respondents rated GSM, and an average index was computed for the 18 items that constituted 7 items for PL, 7 items for DCM and 4 items for RP.

**Table 3: Summary Descriptive Statistics for Gender-sensitive M&E System**

Item		Statistic	Std. Error	
Gender sensitive M&E System	Mean	3.6560	.06559	
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.5258	
		Upper Bound	3.7862	
	5% Trimmed Mean	3.6990		
	Median	3.7460		
	Variance	.409		
	Std. Deviation	.63925		
	Minimum	1.46		
	Maximum	4.67		
	Range	3.21		
	Interquartile Range	.65		
	Skewness	-1.107	.247	
Kurtosis	1.761	.490		

Source: Primary data

The results in Table 3 above show that the mean = 3.66 was close to the median = 3.72. Therefore, despite the negative skew (skew -1.107), the results were normally distributed. The mean and median close to 4 suggested that the gender-sensitive M&E system was realizable basing on the scale used that shows that the code 4 corresponded to agree. It also showed that the respondents were certain about the gender mainstreaming process in M&E systems in IRC in the emergency and recovery phases of humanitarian aid. Thus, it seemed plausible to note that the ingredients of a gender-sensitive M&E system were in place.

## Description of independent Variable: Organizational Factors

The independent variable (IV), organizational factors, consisted of and was measured using three constructs namely, organizational structure, organizational culture and leadership. These items were derived from the first objective of the study that sought to establish the effect of

organizational factors on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems. Organizational structure was measured using 6 items; organizational culture was measured using 7 items; and Leadership measured using 6 items on a five-point Likert scale where, 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. In order to regress, a composite mean for variable of Organizational Factors was computed and results are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Summary Statistics for Organizational Factors**

Item		Statistic	Std. Error	
Organizational Factors	Mean	3.9313	.05853	
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.8149	
		Upper Bound	4.0476	
	5% Trimmed Mean	3.9608		
	Median	4.0159		
	Variance	.301		
	Std. Deviation	.54908		
	Minimum	2.21		
	Maximum	4.90		
	Range	2.70		
	Interquartile Range	.74		
	Skewness	-.800	.257	
Kurtosis	1.208	.508		

Source: Primary data

The results in Table 4 show that the mean = 3.93 was almost close to the median = 4.02. Therefore, despite the negative skew (skew -.800), the results were normally distributed. The mean and median close to code 4 used in the scale showed 'agreed' and thus suggested that there was general agreement across the organization that the factors analysed were important to gender mainstreaming in the organization.

## Description of Independent Variable: Programme Factors versus Development of Gender-sensitive M&E Systems

The independent variable (IV) Programme factors consisted of and was measured using three constructs namely: staff gender competences, project methods and tools, and programme context. Staff gender competences was measured using 5 items; Project methods and tools was measured using 5 items; and Programme was measured using 4 items on the five-point Likert scale where, 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. In order to find out the overall view of how the respondents rated the variable of programme factors in the development of gender sensitive M&E system, a composite mean of programme factors was computed for all the three sub-constructs of the variable: staff gender competences (5 items), project methods and tools (5 items) and programme context (4 items). The summary of the statistics on programme factors is presented in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Summary Statistics for Programme factors**

Item		Statistic	Std. Error	
Programme Factors	Mean	3.4594	.05773	
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.3450	
		Upper Bound	3.5739	
	5% Trimmed Mean	3.4903		
	Median	3.5333		
	Variance	.353		
	Std. Deviation	.59433		
	Minimum	1.40		
	Maximum	4.50		
	Range	3.10		
	Interquartile Range	.80		
	Skewness	-.925	.235	
Kurtosis	1.629	.465		

Source: Primary data

The results in Table 5 show that the mean = 3.46 was almost the same with the median = 3.53 and so despite the negative skew (skew -0.925), the results were normally distributed. The mean close to 3, which is neutral, and median close to Code 4, that in the scale represented 'agree', suggested that programme factors were moderately positive in the process of gender mainstreaming.

## Inferential Analyses

In order to determine whether a relationship existed between organizational and programme factors on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems, inferential analyses in the form of correlation and regression were undertaken and the results are presented in the sub sections below.

### Correlation of Organizational Factors and Development of Gender-sensitive M&E system

In order to establish whether the organizational factors namely: Organizational structure, Organizational culture and Leadership had a relationship with the development of gender-sensitive M&E system, correlation analysis was carried out using Pearson product Correlation coefficient and the results are presented in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: Correlation Matrix for Organizational Factors and Gender-sensitive M&E systems**

Correlations		Gender-sensitive M&E systems	Organizational Factors
Gender-sensitive M&E systems	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	95	
Organizational Factors	Pearson Correlation	.695**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	78	88

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results from Table 6 show that organizational factors had a strong positive and significant relationship with the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems ( $p = 0.00 < 0.05$ ). This therefore led Hypothesis 1 to be supported and the alternative hypothesis to be rejected.

### Regression model of organizational factors and development of gender-sensitive M&E System

At the confirmatory level, to establish whether organizational factors have an effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems, a regression analysis was carried out and the results are presented in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: Regression model for organizational factors and gender-sensitive M&E systems**

	Standardized Coefficients Beta ( $\beta$ )	Significance (p)
Organizational Factors	.695	.000
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = 0.477 F = 71.166, p = .000		

The regression results from Table 7 above show that organizational factors only account for 47.7% (adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.477) of the variation in gender-sensitive M&E System variable and 43.3% is accounted for by other factors. The standardized coefficient ( $\beta$ ) of 0.695 ( $p = 0.000$ ) shows that organizational factors have a strong positive and significant relationship with the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems and thus we accept Hypothesis 1 and reject the alternative hypothesis.

### Correlation of Programme Factors and Development of Gender-sensitive M&E System

In order to establish whether the programme factors namely: staff gender competences, project methods and tools and programme context have a relationship with development of gender-sensitive M&E system, correlation analysis was carried out using Pearson product Correlation coefficient and the results are presented in Table 8 below.

**Table 8: Correlation Matrix for Programme Factors and Gender-sensitive M&E System**

Correlations		Gender-sensitive M&E Systems	Programme Factors
Gender-sensitive M&E Systems	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	95	
Programme Factors	Pearson Correlation	.796**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	86	106

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results from Table 8 above show that programme factors have a positive and significant relationship with the development of gender-sensitive M&E system. Thus Hypothesis 2 is supported and the null hypothesis not supported.

### Regression model of Programme Factors and Development of Gender-sensitive M&E System

At the confirmatory level, to establish whether programme factors have an effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems, a regression analysis was carried out and the results are presented in Table 9 below.

**Table 9: Regression Model for Programme Factors and Gender-sensitive M&E Systems**

	Standardized Coefficients Beta( $\beta$ )	Significance (p)
Programme Factors	.796	.000
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .628 F = 144.800, p = .000		

Results from Table 9 show that programme factors account for 62.8 % (Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = .628) of the variation in gender-sensitive M&E systems variable and the remaining 31.2% is explained by other factors. The standardized coefficient ( $\beta$ ) of .796(p =0.000) shows that programme factors have a positive strong and significant relationship with gender-sensitive M&E systems. Thus Hypothesis 2 is accepted, and the null hypothesis rejected.

### Discussion

#### Research hypothesis 1: Organizational factors have an effect on the Development of Gender-sensitive M&E Systems in a Humanitarian NGO

The descriptive results on organizational factors showed that the mean was 3.93, suggesting that the relationship between organizational factors and development of gender-sensitive M&E system was good. Results from regression analysis showed that organizational factors had a positive and significant relationship with the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems.



The hypothesis that organizational factors have an effect on development of gender-sensitive M&E systems was therefore accepted and the alternative hypothesis not supported.

The findings revealed that the first hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) to the effect that organizational factors have an effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems was supported and thus accepted and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) rejected. This could be because of leadership and structure matching with Mukhopadhyay (2014) in a study on theoretical exploration of gender mainstreaming approaches in which the author found that the absence of institutional mechanisms had led to the failure to attain gender mainstreaming in all processes. It also reflects what Neumann (2014) found in a PhD study in developing a framework for monitoring critical success factors to enhance strategic change within organizations.

The findings of organizational structure, culture, and leadership as critical organizational factors in the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems also match what Canyon (2017) found in his research that organizational structure, culture, and leadership are intertwined in the development of gender inclusion within the security sector. What seems unclear and what the current study also fails short on, however, is the fact that a combination of culture, structure and leadership often produces an organizational climate that can lead to gender inequalities including non-gender-sensitive M&E systems. This is what Acker (1992) notes as the subtle manifestations of gendered issues that eventually lead to self-identity. So how organizational climate leads to gender-sensitive M&E systems is not fully understood and needs further exploration, whether as a mediating or intervening variable.

Findings show that organizational structure was favourably rated among the constructs of organizational factors and this matches with UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER, 2014) study on gender equality in Aid which found that for mainstreaming of gender to be effective, it has to be embedded in the institutional processes and the organization should take it as a business. The study concluded that gender mainstreaming has to be an organizational culture and ethos to get effective results. The high rating of organizational structure for the development of gender-sensitive M&E resonates with the conclusions of USAID (2016) and Batliwala (2011) who have argued that organizational structure plays an important role in the integration of gender in M&E systems either through a structured process such as in human resource management practices in terms of competences or pooling skills or through an organizational ethos that is articulated in the mission or vision statements of the organization. It also confirms theoretically what Acker (1992) recommends that one way to study gender in an organization is to examine its mission statement and other processes that define its structure.

Evidence within IRC showed that while gender training had been undertaken, there was limited use of the training as staff lacked confidence. There was also no evidence to show the use of gender findings for social justice as recommended by Acker (2012), Batliwala (2011), Van Eerdewijk and Dubel (2012) and Wong (2012). Indeed, IRC seemed to fall into the one-off trainings that scholars such as Datta et al. (2012) and Ubels (2010) warn about. These trainings have limited empowerment effect as they are not directly linked to organizational change in the long term. This partly explained why IRC staff seemed not confident on gender analysis although they acknowledged that the practice was commonplace.

It was also found that the existence of a gender focal person among senior management was an important driver of change in the organization especially in the process of gender mainstreaming in M&E. This finding agrees with what DANIDA (2008) and Catsambas (2015) found out that champions or models are important to ensure that the gender mainstreaming agenda takes place and is effective. Indeed, as Cho and Perry (2012) have noted, the existence of these technical persons allows the articulation of the vision of gender mainstreaming within the organization that in turn builds the tempo for the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems.

The study findings of organizational culture being crucial in gender mainstreaming echo what the European Institute for Gender Equality (2016) notes, viz, that organizations are not static or fixed and have organizational cultures that often display unwritten rules and undocumented behaviors that potentially affect the gender mainstreaming process. While in IRC it was seen that the culture promotes gender mainstreaming, the researcher was unable to investigate further the inter staff relations and socialization processes that Acker (1992) recommends in her theory of gendered organizations. Thus, the socialization process within the organizations as a mediating or moderating variable could be a good area for further investigation.

Leadership in IRC has played a crucial role in promoting gender mainstreaming in being accountable and participatorily encouraging staff and sharing their vision for gender mainstreaming. This finding is in line with what studies by Brennan and Major (2011), Carman and Fredericks (2010), Catsambas (2015) and Taylor-Powell and Boyd (2008) who have found that leadership, when combined with other factors, becomes a pillar in the development of gender integration within the M&E systems. However, this study's findings of leadership being crucial in gender-sensitive M&E systems do not agree with the findings of the ADB (2012) study that undertook synthesis of gender mainstreaming in evaluations done between 1990 and 2010 and made a number of conclusions including one that leadership was not providing the impetus for gender mainstreaming in evaluations by the multilateral agencies or even donors or organizations. It also concluded that in the absence of accountability (a key aspect of organizational culture) and sufficient resources made it difficult to undertake the integration of gender into organizational activities.

## **Research Hypothesis 2: Programme factors have an effect on the Development of Gender-sensitive M&E Systems in a Humanitarian NGO**

The summary descriptive results of programme factors showed that the mean was = 3.46, suggesting that the relationship between programme factors and the development of gender-sensitive M&E system was not good. Results from the regression analysis showed that programme factors had a strong positive and significant relationship to the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems. The hypothesis that programme factors have an effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E system was therefore accepted and the alternative hypothesis rejected.

The findings revealed that the second hypothesis ( $H_2$ ) to the effect that programme factors have an effect on the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems was supported and thus

accepted and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) rejected. Findings from respondents during interviews also show results of moderate to high level of appreciation for the linkage between programme factors and gender-sensitive M&E systems. The sub-constructs of programme factors included staff gender competences, project methods and tools and programme context. These findings are in tandem with the findings of other scholars such as Kenny and O'Donnell (2016) who found in their study of World Bank projects that gender integration varied and largely depended on clearly defined objectives and targets. The approaches used to a large extent determine the level of gender integration including processes of determining the outcomes needed in programmes.

The findings of programme factors having an effect on gender sensitive M&E systems also match those of FAO (2014) who in their assessment of factors crucial to gender-sensitive M&E found that programme factors, particularly participatorily engaging stakeholders in M&E, were more important, in addition to a reflective and learning M&E process. It also agrees with findings from other studies by SIDA (2015), Sudarshan and Sharma (2012) who found programme factors important in developing gender-sensitive evaluations.

Findings from the study show that IRC staff were not familiar with methods and tools for gender analysis and were not able to integrate them into project activities, as the mean was 3.03. This contradicts another finding within the same study where they noted that gender analysis was always done. This could point to the use of consultants as findings showed that the organization often conducted independent gender studies. These findings contradict with SIDA's (2015) and USAID's (2016) findings that show that staff competences are very important requisites if gender-sensitive M&E systems are to be attained. While the staff skills were low, findings show that IRC had been able to attain a high level of developing gender-sensitive M&E systems which could be as a result of other factors. It is important to continuously build capacity of both men and women to ensure that both genders meaningfully participate in project M&E processes and programmes.

Findings from qualitative data analysis of stakeholders outside the organization not effectively provided with capacity to gender mainstream had implications on the overall attainment and sustainability of gender mainstreaming in M&E systems. These findings contradict what Espinosa (2013), Catsambas (2015), USAID (2016), World Bank (2010) have shown that the success to gender mainstreaming in M&E processes, among others, needs a holistic approach that also considers the building of capacity of those outside the organization. Thus, it can be pointed out that there was less utilization of gender data and findings within IRC to attain social justice within the communities as demanded by feminists advocating for taking gender beyond just statistics (Espinosa, 2013). It is important to include in further analysis those gender impacts anticipated by the project and thus correlate these with the M&E systems to examine the linkages.

In programme context, donors play the biggest role in ensuring that an organization's M&E system is gender-sensitive such as in humanitarian setting. DFID's funding to IRC over the 2013-2017 period had clear demands on gender-disaggregated data reporting. This finding corresponds to what scholars (Caren Grown, 2014; Gulrajani, 2013; Szper and Prakash, 2011) have found that the approach to gender mainstreaming is a donor-driven process and

the many approaches that organizations take to gender mainstream are often dictated by the donors themselves. In some instances, as Catsambas (2015) has shown, donors can completely transform an organization's gender mainstreaming approach and pathway. However, in the case of IRC, there was little evidence to suggest that the donor approach would be sustainable given the transitional nature of the served communities and the attitudes of the communities who saw gender equality as not an essential ingredient of development, according to the respondents. In addition, given the transitional nature of the workforce being recruited largely in emergencies it shows that gender-sensitive approaches in M&E may take time to take root.

## Conclusions and Recommendations for Practice

The findings clearly showed that organizational factors, particularly organizational structure, culture, and leadership as sub constructs, are not significant predictors of the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems in emergency and recovery phases of humanitarian aid in NGOs in Uganda.

More practical and hands-on experience and support is more important for the development of gender mainstreaming in M&E systems than just an articulation of policy and guidelines although these are also crucial to the process as they determine budget allocations and lines of accountability.

It also emerged that programme factors, specifically staff gender competences, project methods and tools and programme context, are predictors of the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems in emergency and recovery phases of humanitarian aid in NGOs in Uganda.

It is clear that there are other factors that contribute to the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems within the humanitarian context that are not of organizational or programmatic nature. This is because both organizational and programme factors explain not more than 65% variation in gender-sensitive M&E systems, according to the findings.

Findings show that organizational aspects of gender mainstreaming, though crucial, have less significance on gender mainstreaming in emergencies and recovery aspects of humanitarian aid; and so, the researchers recommend paying more attention to building programme factors as they easily enhance gender mainstreaming in M&E.

There is a need to provide more field-based and hands-on training on how to integrate gender into project activities. More investment should be made in enhancing staff competences in gender mainstreaming and training them on project methods and tools that enhance gender mainstreaming in M&E.

Evaluators and other specialists in M&E should be keen on contextual issues and how they affect the development of gender-sensitive M&E systems. These issues include how donors, partners and other stakeholders perceive gender mainstreaming. Efforts are needed to develop ownership of gender mainstreaming efforts by all stakeholders at all levels of project design and implementation, especially in humanitarian work.

## References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & society*, 4(2), 139-158.
- Acker, J. (1992). *Gendering organizational theory. classics of organizational theory*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Acker, J. (2012). Gendered organizations and intersectionality: problems and possibilities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 31(3), 214-224.
- African Development Bank. (2011). *Mainstreaming gender equality: a road to results or a road to nowhere? An evaluation synthesis*. Tunis: African Development Bank.
- Alonso, A. (2016). Who learns what from whom? Implementing gender mainstreaming in multi-level settings. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 24(2), 174-188.
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 157-172.
- Batliwala, S., & Pittman, A. (2010). *Capturing change in women's realities: a critical overview of current monitoring and evaluation frameworks and approaches*. Toronto: Association for Women's Rights in Development.
- Britton, D. M. & Logan, L. (2008). Gendered organizations: progress and prospects. *Sociology Compass*, 2(1), 107-121.
- Canyon, D. (2017). *Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific center for security studies*. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep14005>
- Catsambas, T.T. (2015). Creating a global movement in evaluation: the story of Evalpartners. *American Journal of Evaluation* 2015, 36(2), 256-269.
- Datta, A., Shaxson, L. and Pellini, A. (2012). *Capacity, complexity and consulting: lessons from managing capacity development projects*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Desvaux, G., Devillard-Hoellinger, S., & Meaney, M. C.(2008). *A business case for women*. McKinsey Quarterly. [http://www.rctaylor.com/Images/A\\_Business\\_Case\\_for\\_Women.pdf](http://www.rctaylor.com/Images/A_Business_Case_for_Women.pdf)
- Espinosa, J. (2013). Moving towards gender sensitive evaluation? Practices and challenges in international development evaluation. *Evaluation*, 19(2), 171-182.
- Grown, C. (2014). *Position paper on aid and gender equality*. Helsinki: UNU-WIDER.
- Grown, C., Gupta, G.R., & Kes, A. (2005). *Taking action: achieving gender equality and empowering women*. London: UNMillenium group.
- Gulrajani, N. (2013). *The challenge fund aid modality: assessing the potential for tackling gender challenges in development*. Helsinki: UNU-WIDER.

- Ivankovich, M.B., & Faramand, T. (2015). *Enhancing nutrition and food security during the first 1,000 days through gender-sensitive social and behavior change: a technical resource guide*. Washington DC: CORE Group.
- Kenny, C. & O'Donnell, M. (2016). *Do the results match the rhetoric? An examination of World Bank gender projects*. Washington DC: Center for Global Development. <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/do-results-match-rhetoric-examination-world-bank-gender-projects>
- Madri, S., Van Rensburg, J., & Mapitsa, C.B. (2017). Gender responsiveness diagnostic of national monitoring and evaluation systems - methodological reflections. *African Evaluation Journal*, 5(1).
- Mantilla, F. (2012). *Review of gender mainstreaming in UNEP*. UNEP Evaluation Office. Retrieved from <https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/270>
- Metcalf, B. D. (2006). Exploring cultural dimensions of gender and management in the Middle East. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 48(1), 93-107.
- Moser, C. O. N. (2017). Gender transformation in a new global urban agenda: challenges for Habitat III and beyond. *Environment and Urbanization*, 29(1), 221-236.
- Murtaza, N. (2011). Putting the lasts first: the case for community-focused and peer-managed NGO accountability mechanisms. *Voluntas*, 22(1), 1-17.
- Natalie, H. & Glaister, L. (2013). *Feeling for the intangible: a framework for donor's monitoring and evaluation of capacity development interventions*. Antwerp: Universiteit Antwerpen, Institute of Development Policy.
- Naved, R. T., Azim, S., Bhuiya, A., & Persson, L. Å. (2006). Physical violence by husbands: magnitude, disclosure and help-seeking behavior of women in Bangladesh. *Social science & medicine*, 62(12), 2917-2929.
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314.
- Oxfam. (2012b). *The power of gender-just organizations: framework for transformative organizational capacity building for gender justice*. Ottawa: Canada. Retrieved from [http://www.oxfam.ca/sites/default/files/Ox-Gender-Framework\\_final-web.pdf](http://www.oxfam.ca/sites/default/files/Ox-Gender-Framework_final-web.pdf).
- Podems, D.R. (2010). Feminist evaluation and gender approaches: there's a difference? *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation* 6(14): 1-17.
- Rao, A. (2014). *Organizational change for gender equality*. (Conference Presentation) Engendering organizations: integrating Gender from within.
- Rao, A. & Kelleher, D. (2005). Is there life after gender mainstreaming? *Gender and Development*, 13(2), 2005.
- Sen, G. & Östlin, P. (2010). *Gender equity in health: the shifting frontiers of evidence and action*. New York: Routledge.

- Selin, D., Carmichael, S. G. & Auke, R. (2019). Introducing the Historical Gender Equality Index. *Feminist Economics*, 25(1), 31-57. DOI: 10.1080/13545701.2018.1442582
- Showunmi, V., Atewologun, D., & Bebbington, D. (2015). Ethnic, gender and class intersections in British women's leadership experiences. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(6), 917-935.
- Sweetman, C. (2013). Introduction, Feminist Solidarity and Collective Action. *Gender & Development*, 21(2), 217-229. DOI: 10.1080/13552074.2013.819176
- Szper, R., & Prakash, A. (2011). Charity watchdogs and the limits of information-based regulation. *Voluntas*, 22(1), 112.
- Ubels, J., Acquaye-Baddoo, N.A., & Fowler, A. (eds.). (2010). *Capacity development in practice*. London: Earthscan.
- UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research. (2014). *Aid and gender equality*. Finland: UNU-WIDER
- USAID. (2010). *Gender integration index*. Washington DC. USAID
- USAID. (2016). *Guidelines for integrating gender in monitoring and evaluation systems and policies*. Washington DC. USAID
- Van Eerdewijk, A., Dubel, I. (2012). Substantive gender mainstreaming and the missing middle: a view from Dutch development agencies. *Gender & Development* 20(3), 491–504.
- World Bank. (2005). *Gender issues in monitoring and evaluation in rural development: a tool kit*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank, FAO, IFAD. (2009). Gender issues in monitoring and evaluation. (Module prepared by P. White) in *Gender and Agricultural Livelihoods Sourcebook*, Washington D.C.
- Yasmeen Makarem. (nd). *Gendered organizations: a critical review*. Texas: College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University