

## **DRAFT**

### ***Public Hearing Globalization and Gender***

## **Mainstreaming Gender in International Organizations**

***Caroline Moser***

Senior Research Associate, Overseas Development Institute London and  
Visiting Professor, New School University, New York

### **I. Introduction: Scope of Presentation**

First, and foremost, I would like to begin my presentation by applauding the Enquete-Commission of the German Parliament for the inclusion of the issue of Gender and Globalization within their remit. This is a critical development issue and one that it is essential to address. Second, I would like to thank the Enquete-Commission for the invitation to make a presentation at these hearings. I am indeed honored to be here. Third, I would like to explain the rather complicated nature of the topic of this presentation.

I was asked to provide a briefing on Mainstreaming Gender in International Organizations. The request was made shortly after the 11<sup>th</sup> September, at a time when the critical seriousness of the global terror and violence was foremost in all our minds. I therefore requested that this topic could also be included. The result is a complex set of questions relating to two issues, important in their own right, but also interrelated. Consequently in this presentation I am grouping these as follows:

- **The track record of international organizations in gender-mainstreaming, with particular reference to the World Bank**
- **The gendered nature of terror and violence in the context of globalization and the role of international organizations in addressing this issue**

The empirical evidence for this presentation primarily is drawn from two main sources. First, from my experience as a World Bank staff member between 1990-2000 working on both urban development and social development, which in 1998 included a desk study of the World Bank's experience of gender-mainstreaming. Second, a research programme on violence I have run since 1997, both inside the Bank and subsequently at ODI, which included extensive research projects on urban poor community perceptions of violence in Latin American countries such as Colombia and Guatemala. This has provided me with an understanding of gender-based violence from which to address the second issue in this presentation.

### **II. The track record of International Organizations in Gender Mainstreaming**

#### **1. Background**

- a. What is being mainstreamed: Women in Development or Gender and Development*

Before discussing how successful International Organizations have been at gender-mainstreaming, by way of background, it is necessary to summarize some basic ‘ground rules’ relating to definitions, approaches to women and development issues and underlying policy approaches. This information may already be very familiar to you, or already identified in previous presentations, so for convenience sake the following synthesis is very brief with much of the information condensed into tables.

During the past decades just as economic development paradigms have shifted, so too, views about women’s role in the development process have undergone changes as theoreticians and practitioners alike have reassessed women’s contribution to development. In synthesis, policy

**Box 1: Brief definitions of basic Gender and Development concepts**

**Sex and gender:** While sex refers to the biological state of being male or female, gender refers to the socially defined aspects of being male or female.

**Gender relations:** This refers not to men or women but to the social relationships between them; along with relations of class, ethnicity, nationality, and religion, gender relations are socially constructed. They vary across time and culture, and are not fixed or immutable.

**Gender roles:** Those activities that are considered by a given culture to be appropriate to women or a man. In most societies women have a triple role, undertaking reproductive, productive and community managing activities, while men undertake productive and community politics activities.

**Women in Development (WID) or Gender and Development (GAD):** While WID identifies women as a special or separate interest group, GAD identifies gender as an integral part of a development strategy. The situation of women is no longer analyzed independently of, but in relation to, that of men.

*Source Moser, Tornqvist and van Bronkhorst (1999)*

frameworks for integrating, or mainstreaming women into the development process have shifted from a Women in Development (WID) approach, in which women are treated as a special interest group, to a Gender and Development (GAD) approach, in which gender is an integral part of a development strategy (Moser, 1993).

While this may seem fundamentally obvious—indeed the title of the hearing refers to gender rather than women—yet reality may still be somewhat different. To remind us, the WID approach resulted from recognition that development processes were negatively affecting women, highlighted by successive United Nations Conferences. The concept of WID identifies women as a separate interest group, and as an unacknowledged ‘untapped resource’ that must be brought into the development process. In contrast, GAD, the subsequent policy approach, identifies gender as an integral part of development strategies. GAD policy analyses the situation of women in development process is not independently of, but rather in relation to, men.

Underlying this fundamental shift from ‘WID’ to ‘GAD’ has been recognition of the importance of focusing less on the biological differences between women and men—termed sexual—and more in terms of gender—the socially defined aspects of being male and female. Gender relations refers not to women or men, but to the social relations between them. Like relations of class, ethnicity, nationality and religion, gender relations are socially constructed. They vary across time and culture and are not fixed or immutable (see Box 1 for detailed definitions).

<b>Box 2: Gender and development : Organizing concepts</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Diversity/Differentiation</b></li> <li>▪ Biological (sex)</li> <li>▪ Social Relations (gender ) identified through</li> <li>▪ -Roles (reproductive, productive, community)</li> <li>▪ -Gender division of labor/resources</li> <li>▪ -Practical gender needs/interests</li> </ul>	<p><b>Social institutions where constraints and opportunities occur in access, power or participation.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Household: intra-household access and control</li> <li>▪ Community: village committees/councils</li> <li>▪ Market: firms, corporations, farms, labor markets</li> <li>▪ State: legal, administrative, military, police</li> <li>▪ Development Institutions</li> <li>▪ Global Level</li> </ul>
<p><b>Disparity/Access to, and control over, resources and power</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access (rights) to household and community based assets such as land and housing, labor, services, credit, knowledge</li> <li>▪ Strategic gender needs/interests.</li> <li>▪ Control (power over) of these same assets</li> <li>▪ Control (power over) of decision making</li> <li>▪ Politics</li> </ul>	<p><b>Stated WID/GAD Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Welfare</li> <li>▪ Anti-poverty</li> <li>▪ Equity</li> <li>▪ Efficiency</li> <li>▪ Empowerment/Autonomy</li> <li>▪ Equality and human rights</li> </ul>
<p><i>Source: Adapted from Moser, Tornqvist and van Bronkhorst (1999)</i></p>	

As an operational framework GAD highlights issues of diversity and differentiation, as well as disparity in access to, and control over, resources and power. It identifies those social institutions in which constraints and opportunities occur, in terms of access, power and participation (such as the household, community, market, state and global level). Understanding the social construction

<b>Box 3: Women in Development / Gender and Development Policy Approaches 1970-2002</b>	
Approach	Description
Welfare	Earliest approach, 1950-70. Its original purpose was to bring women into development as better mothers. Women are seen as passive beneficiaries of development. It recognizes the reproductive role of women and seeks to meet practical gender needs/ priorities in that role through top-down provision of food aid, measures against malnutrition and family planning.
Equity	The original WID approach, used in the 1975-85 UN Women’s Decade. Its purpose is to gain equity for women, who are seen as active participants in development. It recognizes women’s triple role, and seeks to meet strategic gender needs /priorities through direct state intervention giving political and economic autonomy, and reducing inequality with men. It challenges women’s subordinate position.
Anti-Poverty	The second WID approach, a toned down version of equity, adopted from the 1970s onwards. Its purpose is to enhance the productivity of poor women. Women’s poverty is seen as a problem of underdevelopment, not subordination. It recognizes the productive role of women and seeks to meet the practical gender needs/priorities to earn an income, particularly in small-scale, income generating projects.
Efficiency	The third WID approach adopted particularly since the 1980s debt crisis. Its purpose is to ensure that development is more efficient and effective through women’s economic contribution, with participation often equated with equity. It seeks to meet practical gender needs/priorities while relying on all three roles and an elastic concept of women’s time.
Empowerment	The first post WID approach articulated by women in developing countries. Its purpose is to empower women through greater self reliance. It recognizes the triple role and seeks to meet strategic gender needs/priorities indirectly through bottom up mobilization of practical gender needs.
Equality as a Human Right	The most recent GAD approach emerging from the Fourth Conference on Women (Beijing 1995) and widely adopted by governments and aid agencies. It introduces equality as a human right, and emphasizes that power-sharing and more equitable partnerships between women and men are political, social and economic prerequisites for sustainable, people-centered development
<p><i>Source: Adapted and updated from Moser (1993)</i></p>	

of gender relations allow us to recognize that men and women have different roles, interests and needs in society (see Box 2). Gender divisions of labor are shaped by ideological, historical, religious, ethnical and economic determinants that are spatially and temporally specific – such that they cannot be read off checklists. This has implications in the context of globalization.

Finally, and most importantly, linked to shifts in approach to gender and development are differences in underlying policy. Historically over the past decades dominant policy approaches have changed. This has been influenced not only by shifts in macro-economic models of development, but also by both feminist political pressure and women's social movements both in the North and in the South. In synthesis a distinction can be made between six very different policy approaches, briefly summarized as follows (see Box 3)

- **Welfare**
- **Equity**
- **Anti-poverty**
- **Efficiency**
- **Empowerment**
- **Equality as a Human Right**

Recognition of the importance of some of these approaches, particularly equity, empowerment and equality has been greatly enhanced by their global endorsement by UN Conferences from Mexico through Nairobi to Beijing.

#### ***b) What does gender-mainstreaming mean?***

We know only too well that awareness of gender as an integral part of development work does not automatically result in its translation into practice. If we simply 'add women and stir', (i.e. add the word women) then all we have is an add-on to mainstream policy and practice. The real challenge therefore is to mainstream gender itself—to translate research level awareness into practical operational practice. Here a further clarification is required in order to review the experience of international organizations.

Gender-mainstreaming, previously termed 'integrating' gender, at its most simplistic means the incorporation of gender into the mainstream, or centre, of development practice. This has two constituent components briefly identified as follows:

- The **operational** procedures necessary to ensure gender concerns are mainstreamed into policies, programs and projects. These consist not only of the development of policy but also the procedures to ensure it is translated into practice
- The **institutional** structure within which operational procedures are mainstreamed

#### **i. Operational procedures:**

Building on the previous section, it is important to distinguish between separate and mainstream policies:

- Separate policies: WID or Gender policy
- Mainstream policies: The 'gendering' of mainstream development policy:

In examining efforts to introduce such policy four different stages can be identified:

- **Gender-blind policy:** Researchers and practitioners prevented from appreciating the pivotal nature of gender relations in development

- **‘Proving women are important’:** Generally undertaken within a WID policy this involves descriptively documenting the participation of women in different sectors
- **Shifting from women to gender:** This has most often taken place at the research level—and most recently includes the identification of masculinity as an equally important identity construct.
- **Policy prescription shift from GAD back to WID:** Given the sensitivity and difficulties of addressing gender inequalities, many policy and interventions shifts from GAD back to WID.

### **Institutional Structures for Gender-Mainstreaming**

When a new issue appears in the development debate the first question concerns who will deal with it. Is it necessary to create an entirely new structure or is it more appropriate to institutionalize it within existing mainstream institutions? In the first stages of gender-mainstreaming the lack of appropriate administrative structure is often identified as the main constraint. The strategy adopted is to create new structures with the specific mandate to mainstream gender issues—the so-called ‘women’s machineries’. More recently institutions have moved away from having designate specialists ‘owning’ the issue in designated structures and chosen to build up the capacity of gender-aware generalists within mainstream agencies. Both strategies have limitations, very often resulting at the end of the day in the adoption of combined strategies (see Table 1)

**Table 1: Alternative Strategies for institutionalizing WID/GAD**

Type of Strategy	Specialization	Combined Strategies	Mainstreaming
Structural location	Specifically designed WID unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ WID/GAD Unit works in collaboration with existing organizational structure to promote WID issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutionalization within existing institutional structure</li> </ul>
Targeted personnel	Gender specialists controlling WID mandate and providing expertise to others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gender specialists act as a catalyst throughout the organization</li> <li>▪ Designated WID/GAD specialists monitor each mainstream office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gender-aware specialists integrating WID/GAD perspectives into work</li> </ul>
Priority Interactions	Critical mass of gender specialists to monitor/ Watchdog the issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Providing the support for WID/GAD personnel in the mainstream</li> <li>▪ Incremental training in gender issues</li> <li>▪ Development of gender-specific tools as well as gendering of existing operational procedures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extensive training in gender issues</li> <li>▪ Gendered changes in procedures and development of new methodological tools</li> </ul>

Source: Moser (1993)

## **2. Gender-Mainstreaming in International Institutions: The World Bank experience**

To assess the experience of international agencies in gender-mainstreaming has required a rather extensive contextual background explanation. This, however, makes it far easier to describe World Bank’s experience in gender-mainstreaming, as well as comparing it to other international institutions.

## 1. Operational Procedures to Mainstream Gender and Development:

The information presented here is from the 1998 review of gender-mainstreaming mentioned above, supplemented by additional information to update it to 2002. The following five findings synthesize the conclusions of the review.

**(i) Until very recently World Bank policy documents on gender have lacked a common conceptual rationale, language or underlying policy approach. Although a new Bank-wide strategy has recently been developed it is gender specific, efficiency-focused and yet to be mainstreamed across the institution.**

While there has been movement away from a 'Women in Development' (WID) to a 'Gender and Development' (GAD) approach, the World Bank has followed in the footsteps of other leading bilateral, NGOs and UN agencies, in developing both policy and operational directives on GAD. It was not until 1994 that the World Bank first formulated a specific policy on gender. Very recently, in January 2002, a new Bank-wide gender strategy was approved, though this has still to be implemented. Despite the widespread use of terms such as 'empowerment', 'equity' and 'equality', its fundamental logic focuses primarily on economic efficiency.

Despite an overall shift in approach there is still a widespread tendency to 'mix', or confuse, approaches. Although policy, programme and project documents often start by identifying a GAD framework, frequently they then shift to a WID approach, referring to women as a separate target group, rather than identifying women's priorities or needs in terms of men's. In addition the term *gender* is used interchangeably with *women*, such that the distinction between the two is not clear and the terms are often conflated.

**(ii) In the different regional vice-presidencies of the World Bank, country level gender studies, programmes and projects vary extensively in terms of their conceptual rationale, language and policy approach. Consequently the institution lacks a holistic approach to gender-mainstreaming in operational terms.**

World Bank gender and development interventions at program and project level are highly diverse. There is great variation not only in the quality of analysis, but also in the concepts and frameworks used by different regions, and within them different sectors. A review of a number of the **Country Studies Series** (1989-93) reflected such heterogeneity. Although slightly dated now, results serve to illustrate the decentralized approach to gender issues adopted with a lack of holistic overall framework in the institution, such that each regional vice-presidency developing their own often approach to gender issues

- The Kenya Country Study (1989) focuses on *women's roles* in agriculture, treating *women* as a *separate group* rather than examining their roles in relation to those of men.
- The Turkey Country Study (1993), on the other hand, analyses changes in gender relations as the economy faces a transition from agricultural production to industrialization. Key concepts such as gender *segregated labor markets*, *disparities* and *gaps* reflect an analysis in terms of differences, as well as in terms of institutions beyond the household level.
- The South Asian Country Studies (1989, 1990, 1991) introduce a very different approach to gender and development with their key concept of *inside/outside* (private/public) *dichotomy*.

Within regions, terms are not clearly defined. Consequently the same term may be used in different ways. This has made it particularly difficult to develop Bank-wide indicators. For example, OED in its evaluation of Gender in World Bank Lending Programs (Murphy, 1995; 1997) used the concept of a *gender-related activity*. Lack of a clear definition as to what

constitutes such an activity not only meant that it might refer to very different interventions, but also resulted in very unsystematic monitoring of the mainstreaming of gender and development issues into World Bank lending operations. The fact that OED was unable to use more specific indicators reflected the void in an agreed Bank-wide set of definitions of key concepts, while at the same time limited the utility of current evaluations. It is hoped that the new Bank-wide strategy will serve to address this issue

**(iii) World Bank staff perceive a need for the development of a common rationale, and language on gender and development, as well as for common tools and training packages to facilitate mainstreaming gender into operations.**

Consultations undertaken for the review showed that World Bank task-managers experience problems as a consequence of the confusion in World Bank's rationale and language on gender. In one Central American country, for instance, country clients experienced problems when different task managers—working within the same project—used different justifications and language for gender. While some viewed women as a separate 'vulnerable group', emphasizing a welfare approach, others recognized the importance of incorporating women into the project to ensure project effectiveness. Staff argued that they could only communicate clear messages on gender and development to government NGOs and civil society in operational countries, if the World Bank in Washington was clear on its gender rationale and language.

**(iv) Most bilateral and multilateral have adopted a policy approach to gender that integrates equality and people-centered sustainable development, reflecting a combination of the messages from the Rio/Copenhagen/Beijing Summits.**

By way of comparison, the review also examined the rationale, language and policy approach to gender and development of a diversity of bilateral and UN agencies. This revealed that, as with different parts of the World Bank, the level to which a clear rationale has been developed varies between and within different agencies.

Nevertheless a number of informative trends can be identified. First, an institution-wide common mission statement or guiding principle is considered an essential starting point by all agencies, crafted after considerable discussion and debate to ensure institutional consensus. At this level there appears far less preoccupation with the importance of emphasizing regional difference than is the case in the World Bank

Second, the current rationale on gender and development in such agencies has been heavily influenced by the concepts introduced in the three recent UN conferences addressing socio-economic issues, that culminated with the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women. Key concepts from each of these international conferences are reflected in the final Beijing document.

- The UN Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, for example, identified the concept of '*sustainable development*', bringing environmental concerns to the core of the development process;
- The Social Summit, held in Copenhagen in 1995, introduced '*people-centered development*', reflecting the need for a participatory approach in development.
- The Beijing Platform for Action incorporates stated policy of *empowerment* at all levels, and introduces a rationale of *equality as a human right*:

While bilateral and UN agencies maintain their own individual rationale on gender, to varying degrees, they have adopted the policy of Beijing Platform for Action, in recognizing the

important of equality as a human right in people-centered development. The following examples highlight some of rationale, language and policy approaches adopted by other agencies.

- The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) treats *gender relations* and differences within an *equity* and *efficiency* approach.
- The Development Action Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and its counseling body on gender, has adopted *equality* as a development goal, as has the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA), and the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida).
- The Netherlands in contrast, uses the concept of '*autonomy*' as the pillar of its policy. However, all these institutions identify *equality at all levels in society*.
- Both DAC and Sida in introducing the concept of *human rights*, stress that gender is a *societal* issue.

## **2, Changes in the World Bank's institutional structure to mainstream gender and development**

In the last reorganization of the structure of the World Bank the importance of Gender and Development as a priority was reflected in the new institutional structure. A Gender and Development 'family' was established, and located within REM (the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network)—with the three other families consisting of Economic Policy, Public Policy and Poverty Reduction. In the new matrix management structure of the World Bank this has meant a director level position in the Anchor as well as WID/GAD positions linked through the sector board in the PREM networks across the six regional vice-presidencies.

The fact that such a new structure is in place does not guarantee the gender-mainstreaming occurs. The following issues highlight some of the constraints:

- The choice of a specialization strategy in which gender specialists 'own' the issue may act as an important constraint in gender-mainstreaming (see Table 1).
- In the regions the status, importance, and institutional positions of the GAD specialists not only vary widely but also are highly vulnerable to budget cuts. Even in the most successful regions they rarely have more than two or three GAD permanent staff positions
- The fact that they 'own' gender issues means that in the highly competitive 'turf-bound' structures that prevail in many parts of the institution such staff are often reluctant to let go of their ownership—that are a pre-condition of mainstreaming strategies .
- Gender-mainstreaming can be highly threatening if it results in their loss of budgets, power and position. This results in a reluctance to prioritize capacity building or training or the recognition of the gender-mainstreaming contributions of non-gender specific staff.

At the same time across the institution widespread cynicism or ignorance of the importance of gender issues remains—with pockets of excellent good practice. 'Bureaucratic resistance' provides an even more important constraint or blockage to gender-mainstreaming. In an institution that remains deeply structured by male privilege, and to date still dominated by economists, many individuals share the general institutional ambivalence to gender-redistributive policies. Here it is important not to conflate women with a gender perspective. Young, very bright 'femocrats' moving up the ladder fast and competitively often may be less willing to tackle gender issues than are more established male colleagues—in case it slows down their careers.

In contexts where globalization has increased the power of global international institutions this has important implications for gender-mainstreaming. One of the current priority concerns both in the World Bank, the IMFs and bilateral institutions are the debt-relief, poverty reduction strategies measures currently being designed and implemented in the HIPC countries. The PRSPs

as they are called provide an important new entry point for gender-mainstreaming. Yet the results to date show that there is a long way to go:

- The PRSP Manual treats gender as a separate issue with its own chapter, rather than mainstreaming it throughout the different chapters
- Country-level PRSPs to date have shown very little attention to gender—as shown in a recent World Bank review
- Where PRSPs do include gender concerns, largely as a result of lobbying from in-country civil society this tends to be treated as a separate concern, and discussed separately. In the Bolivia PRSP, for instance, gender along with indigenous issues and environment are identified as three mainstream issues yet discussed separately in the document and not integrated into the main sector chapters.

## **II. The gendered nature of terror and violence in the context of globalization: the role of international organizations in addressing this issue**

Increasing levels of terror, conflict and political violence, as well as many ongoing 'simmering' national-level confrontations, provide critical challenges for development practitioners alike. While the appalling tragedy of the 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001 have highlighted the global nature of such terror, numerous countries have endured decades of armed conflict, others live under the permanent, less acknowledged, menace of political violence. Indeed, in those countries that have signed peace accords, levels of violence have often increased, particularly during the very fragile transition period to 'permanent' peace. At the same time levels of global crime, reducing the significance of national boundaries, the incidence of crime, robbery and gang violence, as well as gender-based domestic violence are all now recognized as development constraints, as well as society and individual well-being.

Gender issues cut across all sectors of society, regardless of political, economic or social context, with their articulation in situations of political violence and armed conflict often particularly marked. Consequently, a key issue concerns the gendered nature of terror, conflict and violence, and its impact on gender relations and gender equality.

To date, terror, political violence and armed conflict have been identified largely as 'male domains', executed by men, whether as armed forces, guerrilla groups, paramilitaries or peace-keeping forces. This includes simplistic portrayals of division of roles with men as perpetrators (in defense of the nation and the protection of their wives and children), and woman as victims, particularly of sexual abuse and forced abduction. This gender-blind representation of the causes, costs and consequences of terror and violence has resulted in far less focus on the unavoidable, as well as the deliberate, involvement and participation of women in violent conflict situations and the de-linking of women from passive, peaceful stereotypes. This has important implications for conflict and development assistance. Although recent analysis has expanded the focus to include such issues as women's human rights abuses during conflict (often in their roles as mothers or wives) and the vulnerability of women refugees or internally displaced as victims of war), much of the focus remains gender-blind in focus.

Gender-mainstreaming of issues relating to armed conflict and political violence incorporate a gender perspective in the range of violence reduction initiatives – peace negotiations, post-conflict reconstruction and solutions to build sustainable long-term peace and development. This

requires recognition that terror and conflict are gendered activities. Because of ideologically ascribed male and female gender roles, relations and identities, stereotypically, this means that:

- Women and men as social actors each experience terror, violence and conflict differently, both as victims and as perpetrators; and
- Women and men have differential access to resources (including power and decision making) during conflict and conditions of violence

A gender-mainstreaming perspective also recognizes that peace is gendered. This is relevant in violence reduction and peace-building strategies because:

- Women and men as social actors often have different roles, relations and identities in peace building and violence reduction initiatives as well as different needs and interests in terms of solutions.

Categorizing violence in terms of a threefold holistic continuum of political/institutional, economic and social violence shows that because different types are closely interrelated, they cannot be treated separately, if sustainable peace is to be achieved (see Table 2). Such a continuum is particularly critical because of the widespread tendency to categorize all gender-based violence as ‘social’ or ‘domestic’ in nature, without recognizing its presence in both political and economic violence. In reality women and men’s positioning in terms of all three types of violence is shaped by dominant gender ideologies in society, whether as perpetrators or as victims.

International institutions have a critical role to play in addressing this issue for a number of reasons. To summarize from a complex agenda, in the time available, these may include, for instance:

- The global or regional nature of so much of current terror, conflict and violence
- Terrorism, conflict and violence is increasingly recognized as one of the biggest constraints on development this affects not only national development but also at the international level

**Table 2. Categories of Violence**

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Manifestation</i>
Political/ Institutional	The commission of violent acts motivated by a desire, conscious or unconscious, to obtain or maintain political power.	Terrorism; guerrilla conflict; paramilitary conflict; political assassinations; armed conflict between political parties; rape and sexual abuse as a political act
Economic	The commission of violent acts motivated by a desire, conscious or unconscious, for economic gain or to obtain or maintain economic power.	Street crime; carjacking; robbery/theft; drug trafficking; kidnapping; assaults including killing and rape made during economic crimes.
Social	The commission of violent acts motivated by a desire, conscious or unconscious, for social gain or to obtain or maintain social power.	Interpersonal violence such as spouse and child abuse; sexual assault of women and children; arguments that get out of control.

Source: Moser (2000, 36)

- The costs and consequences of conflict and violence cross national boundaries differentially affect the population in terms of such criteria as gender, age, ethnicity, race and religion. This relates not only to economic or infrastructure costs, but also in terms of the manner in which conflict and violence erodes or reconstitutes physical, human, natural and social capital and their associated assets.

- International institutions may be better positioned to formulate an integral policy approach that recognises the role that all social actors must play in peace process at international, national community and household level.

### **A Note on references**

This briefing paper is based on a number of recent publications by the author on both gender and development, and on the issue of violence. These all contain detailed bibliographies on an extensive range of related issues. These include the following:

Caroline Moser (2001) 'The Gendered Continuum of Violence and Conflict: An Operational Framework', in Caroline Moser and Fiona Clark (eds) *Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*; London Zed Press

Caroline Moser (1998) 'The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction Strategies', *World Development*, Vol. 26, No. 1 pp. 1-19

Caroline Moser (1995) 'Evaluating Gender Impacts', *New Directions For Evaluation*, No 67, Fall, pp. 105-118

Caroline Moser (1993) *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training*, New York and London, Routledge

Caroline Moser (1987) 'Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs', *World Development*, Vol. 17, No. 2.

Caroline Moser with Oscar Antezana(2001) Social protection policy and practice in Bolivia: Its implications for Bolivia's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), *Overseas Development Institute Working Paper No*, London, Overseas Development Institute

Caroline Moser and Cathy McIlwaine (2001) *Violence in a Post-Conflict Context: Urban Poor Perceptions from Guatemala*, Washington DC, World Bank Publications

Caroline Moser and Cathy McIlwaine (2000) *Urban Poor Perceptions of Violence and Exclusion in Colombia*, Washington DC, World Bank Publication

Caroline Moser, Annika Tornqvist and Bernice van Bronkhorst (1999) 'Mainstreaming Gender and Development in the World Bank: Progress and Recommendations' *Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Social Development Papers*, Washington DC, World Bank

Caroline Moser and Jeremy Holland (1997) *Urban Poverty and Violence in Jamaica World Bank Latin American and Caribbean Studies: Viewpoints*, Washington DC, World Bank