

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Gender-Sensitizing Initiatives in the Philippines

Andrea Lee Esser

Philippine Studies vol. 43, no. 2 (1995): 213–244

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Gender-Sensitizing Initiatives in the Philippines

Andrea Lee Esser



Although the “people-centered” approaches to development that emerged in the 1980s are an improvement over earlier technocratic approaches, we are now seeing the extent to which project designs are limited by their failure to incorporate gender. Besides being prone to lower success, projects which do not recognize gender as a variable often reinforce or actually increase gender inequality (Canadian Council for International Cooperation et al. 1991; Thomas-Slayter et al. 1990; Feldstein and Poats 1989; Overholt et al. 1985). This article examines the trend in the Philippines toward gender training as a means to refocus today’s vision of development in order to recognize gender inequality and to challenge the systems which perpetrate patriarchy. It analyzes the different approaches and methods that dominate training and notes factors limiting impact.

While I consciously use the term *gender* to refer to the socially constructed roles of both women and men, much of this article—and most gender training—concentrates on the need to improve women’s situations. The explanation for this lies in the low status of women relative to men and in the exclusion of women from many development programs. Although the Philippines is noteworthy among Asian societies for achieving equity in some categories, including infant mortality and school enrollment, this should not

The research for this article was conducted during an internship with the Ford Foundation in Manila from June-August 1993. The analysis and opinions presented are solely my own and are not representative of the Ford Foundation. The methodology included more than forty in-depth interviews with organizations conducting gender training, with groups which have undergone training, and with many individuals who possess expertise in the field of Philippine gender issues. My thanks to those who shared their experiences, expertise, and insights with me. Special thanks to Mary Racelis, Nikki Jones, Terry George, Nanette Garcia-Dungo, and Michael Billig for their guidance and scholarly examples.

disguise or excuse the fact that inequities do exist. While Philippine females achieve parity with males in elementary and secondary school enrollment and surpass male registration at the university level, their excellent educational standing is not reflected in the workplace. Not only are women consistently relegated to lower-status positions, they are also paid less than men for the same types of jobs, earning on the average in 1986 only thirty-seven centavos for every peso earned by their male counterparts (NSO 1986). Although the country has had a woman president, women occupy only about 10 percent of elected positions, with the lowest rates of representation at the highest levels of decision making (Aguilar 1991-92). Furthermore, emerging women's voices are just beginning to reveal the physical, emotional, and sexual abuse they endure at the hands of their partners and through acts of random violence.¹ Indeed, violence against women is one of the Philippines' most pervasive human rights problems. Thus, just as the poor are the focus of programs to bridge class inequities, women are usually the focus of strategies to achieve gender equity. This does not mean that attempts to create a more just sharing of power between the sexes can or should exclude men. In fact, it is imperative for women and men to unite to challenge systems that diminish the lives of both sexes by remanding each to a limited role in society and at home.

In this article, I recognize my perilous position as a foreigner writing about the Philippines. Discussions with different groups and individuals in the development field and the women's movement reveal that there are those who firmly believe that Filipino women and men are already equal. The above-mentioned statistics belie such assertions. In addition, studies conducted by Filipina and Filipino scholars document the persistence of inequalities in the Philippines.² Some people invoke the issue of cultural integrity, claiming that development projects, particularly those that are foreign-funded and foreign-run, should not presume to alter the cultural norms within which gender roles exist. While recognizing the importance of cultural preservation, the selectivity with which the argument is invoked suggests that it may sometimes serve as a smoke screen for preserving patriarchy. Rarely does one hear an argument for protecting traditional practices when cash cropping or modern health programs, for instance, are introduced. Furthermore, development is by definition concerned with change. It is the exceptional project that does not alter culture at some level. As inevitable harbingers of change, development practitioners have a duty to strive toward programming that

fosters change that is, to the greatest extent possible, equitable and just. Gender equity is one aspect of a more balanced vision of development.

A critical distinction is made in this analysis between gender training at the organizational level and gender training at the community level. While both forms of training are replete with emotional and intellectual issues, training within target communities poses some particularly difficult philosophical questions upon which I will elaborate later in this article.

Several strategies have been tried to foster gender sensitivity in Philippine development programs. One approach has been to pass legislation mandating that women benefit from and be included equally in government projects. Both the Philippine Development Plan for Women and the Women in Development and Nation Building Act (Republic Act 7192) sought this end, but compliance has been limited by lack of enforcement and monitoring power. Nonetheless, the sheer existence of these documents serves to raise awareness. Another approach, and the one upon which this article focuses, is gender training.

The Philippines, like many developing countries, has seen a proliferation of gender training in recent years. The training programs have emerged as a means to fine-tune people-centered approaches to development that have largely ignored the gender variable. In short, gender training is a way to spread a new vision of development. It is also ultimately a way to foster a more balanced sharing of power between the sexes.

Gender-training programs can be divided into two basic types: gender sensitivity training and gender analysis training. These categories can be divided further according to target group, between sessions conducted for organizations and those for community groups.

Sensitivity Training and Analysis Training

The key goal of sensitivity training, sometimes called consciousness-raising sessions, is to expose participants to the issues of gender oppression and enable them to recognize the manifestations of gender biases and discrimination in their own lives. For example, participants may be asked to deconstruct sex-based stereotypes, explore the genesis of the stereotype, whether or not it is valid, and examine what it suggests about society. Gender divisions of labor are often analyzed to ascertain whether they are fair or just. Commonly

used techniques include interactive learning and role playing. Ideally, participants become motivated to make changes in their private and public lives to break down barriers imposed by gender roles.

Gender sensitivity training in the Philippines has been conducted at the local level for people's organizations (POs) or other community groups. At the organizational level, government organizations (GOs), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international funding agencies, development banks, and research institutions have undergone training. The sensitivity sessions may stand alone or be used as the first part of a two-part sensitivity and analysis training. At the facilitator's discretion, sensitivity and analysis modules may also be combined for a single session, although this poses a high risk of overloading and confusing the participants.

Gender analysis training is usually given to organizations only. The above-mentioned categories of organizations have all undergone analysis training in the Philippines. Sessions are designed to provide participants with the tools of gender analysis and the means to apply those tools in research, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of projects. Participants are shown how to "see" gender as it relates to their work, so that they may develop and implement programs that are gender-sensitive. Two of the most widely used techniques are the Gender-Disaggregated Activities Calendar (Feldstein and Poats 1989) and the Harvard Analytical Framework (Overholt et al. 1985). The activities calendar provides a visual representation of community divisions of labor by age and gender. This facilitates an analysis that includes regularity, seasonality, and intensity of work, allowing designers and implementors to develop projects from which participants can benefit more equitably. Similarly, the Harvard Analytical Framework provides analytical tools that help development practitioners separate access to and control over resources and benefits by gender as well as understand the situational and cultural factors that limit gender equality and the empowerment of women.

Training in the Philippines has widely favored gender sensitivity modules or a two-step sensitivity-analysis approach over a straightforward presentation of analytical techniques. Many trainers insist that a presentation of the tools of analysis is useless without first sensitizing the participants because only the personally "converted" will faithfully use the tools. This stance needs to be rethought. While individual awareness of gender issues in one's daily life is a worthy goal, formal sensitivity training is not the best means of conversion

for all groups. Gender training for organizations involved in development is ultimately meant to create more gender-sensitive programming. Employees are expected to apply tools of gender analysis where they are appropriate to their work. Modules that rely on eliciting emotional responses or personal information—as most sensitizing sessions do—not only face limitations in professional atmospheres where composure and privacy is the norm but also risk confusing participants with what is often perceived as irrelevant information. In many cases, sessions are even seen as being divisive, and an organizational backlash may emerge in the form of ridicule or overt hostility to the issues.

If a sensitivity session is desired and deemed appropriate for an organization, it should be coherently presented in conjunction with an analysis session. The linkages between the personal understanding of gender biases and the practical application of gender analysis tools should be clearly made to all participants. Sensitivity training should not stand alone, nor is it a necessary precursor to analysis training for organizations. Analysis training, on the other hand, can and often should stand alone in many organizational settings.

Training for Communities and Organizations

Sensitivity training for both communities and organizations aims to adjust individuals' personal behavior, while analysis training for organizations specifically addresses participants' job performance. This distinction merits attention because the values and attitudes on which sensitivity sessions focus are deeply held and cannot be adequately addressed in a training program. While sensitivity training may be mind-expanding for some and spark the beginnings of awakening in others (both of which are valid outcomes), true change is an incremental process that must come from within. Sensitivity training has a limited function and impact which should not be overstated. Gender analysis training, on the other hand, focuses on the more manageable realm of one's job performance. For people involved in development, it helps establish gender-fair criteria for researching, designing, monitoring, and evaluating programs. Employees are shown how to incorporate the gender variable in their work, an approach that is more realistic and straightforward.

Teaching people who are involved in development work to understand the nuances of gender inequalities and guard against

reinforcing or increasing inequities is a worthy goal. While many programs in the Philippines claim to be "gender-neutral," there is really no such thing. Given gender divisions of labor and responsibilities, women's and men's priorities within development schemes could be either conflicting or complementary, but they will not be identical (Li 1993; Rocheleau, Scholfield, and Mbuti 1991; Canadian Council for International Cooperation et al. 1991; Illo and Veneracion 1988; Illo 1987; Rocheleau 1987). Hence, programs will differentially affect women and men. The result of the gender-blind and/or gender-biased development paradigm as practiced in the Philippines has often been the increased marginalization of women. By failing to recognize women's distinctive roles and needs, programs and projects have, at minimum, failed to improve women's lot. In worse cases, they have increased women's workloads and further entrenched their oppressed status, undermining their participation in processes affecting not only their own lives but those of their families, communities, and nation as well.

Findings from a Philippine case study by Cynthia Banzon-Bautista and Nanette G. Dungo (1987) illustrate the point. Analyzing the impact of externally introduced technical changes in rice production on women and men, the authors state that while the demand for hired labor increased overall, the demand for female hired labor decreased. The consequence of this was a shifting of female labor to peripheral, unsalaried agricultural tasks, such as gathering fallen rice grains from the newly introduced mechanical thresher for family consumption. An increased competition among women, particularly poor women, was documented as they struggled to make up for deficits in the family budget. In a separate study on Siquijor Island, M. Dale Shields and Barbara Thomas-Slayter (1993) document a higher level of female representation and voice in indigenously organized groups than in externally organized ones. They suggest that government efforts at community organizing for forestry, fishery, and agricultural programs have resulted in a reduction of opportunities for women's leadership and participation.

While evidence of the effects of gender-blind development offers a compelling argument for gender training at the organizational level, community-level training raises some complex issues. Community training in the Philippines has focused primarily on creating awareness of gender inequalities as a precondition to fostering behavioral change. Some modules explicitly outline "proper" behavioral changes; some encourage participants to synthesize the information and choose

their own direction and magnitude of change. Such social "tampering" in the village setting necessarily raises questions regarding efficacy and morality. Under what conditions, if ever, is it appropriate to attempt to reorient social interactions? Who dictates what is or is not gender-sensitive behavior? Who defines equality, and how? Answers to these questions will depend upon one's values, orientation, and personal philosophy. I cannot offer any easy answers here, but I am raising these questions to illustrate the murkiness of the issues and encourage debate.

While many support the vision of empowerment and equality that underpins community gender training, training is only one means to achieve the vision and should not be viewed as a panacea. Evidence from the Philippines shows that training of villages has been highly problematic. One factor limiting impact is that training is often conducted even when no felt need is expressed by the community and no logical lead-in or follow-through of ideas takes place. This often happens as NGOs scramble to satisfy their program priorities or funding requirements. It may also occur at the hands of unskilled community organizers. The high degree of caution and communication needed to successfully introduce ideas that challenge social norms has often been lacking. Another problem with community-level training is that the concepts presented in many of the modules are externally constructed—either by foreigners or Manila elites—and do not always directly apply to local situations and constructions of reality. Community-level gender training is clearly not the solution to gender inequality in the Philippines nor is it even necessarily the best way to broach the topic. While it has its place among empowering techniques, proponents need to learn to use it more sparingly and wisely. The following examples illustrate this point.

Community Information Planning Systems (CIPS) is one approach to rural development that has been modified in the Philippines to include gender training at the local level. Community gender sensitivity sessions are followed by the training of a core group of community members who will undertake a gender analysis of local problems and will formulate and carry out a development plan. While the CIPS approach has many strengths, including local control over development and hands-on analysis of gender issues, some of the methods employed are questionable. CIPS proposes using data from gender analysis to target quantifiable changes in community behavior. For example, if men are shown to work an average of two hours per day on household chores, they might be targeted to work

four hours per day. Project benefits may be linked to a family's success in meeting established gender-sensitive targets. Therefore, a family may be denied access to project credit if, for example, a husband refuses to help with child care or if he beats his wife. This approach is coercive and artificial in village settings. Quantifying and assigning value to people's activities is not only highly theoretical, it also risks denying project benefits to those most in need. While the goal of practicing gender-sensitive development is a valid one, coercive means cannot be justified.

Contrast CIPS with the approach of Mandiga Ob-Obbo, a small NGO working in a Kalinga community. Mandiga does not conduct formal training on gender sensitivity. Instead, it addresses the issues when they emerge in the context of shifting gender roles as women become engaged in projects outside the home. Rather than relying on set training modules, Mandiga's community organizers work with women informally to help them analyze and address their situation. Gender sensitivity is thus developed within the existing and emerging social, cultural, political, and economic systems, and modules evolve from current situations. The issues surrounding community gender training are complex and value-laden. The examples of the Mandiga and CIPS approaches are cited to illustrate some of the issues and to encourage dialogue.

Gender Training in the Philippines

There are three main schools of thought regarding women's inclusion in development programs. These are commonly referred to by their acronyms: WID for women in development, WAD for women and development, and GAD for gender and development. The three perspectives warrant brief discussion because a facilitating group's training style and content are affected by the school of thought to which the group subscribes.

The WID perspective is tied to the modernization paradigm, which assumes that industrialized economic growth will lead to benefits for all segment of society. WID projects have often focused on how women can directly contribute to and benefit from economic development. Recognizing that women have been regularly overlooked in development programs, the WID approach seeks to integrate women into projects, often with the creation of separate women's components. Training typically emphasizes the practical needs of women as mothers and as livelihood earners.

The WAD approach stems from the Marxist feminist movement. Women's conditions are defined within the framework of international and class inequities. Change for women is seen as necessarily occurring within global class and economic structures. WAD seeks to both identify structural inequalities and challenge the supporting institutions. Widespread social reorganization is the overarching vision. Projects generally focus on fundamentally reeducating women to recognize and challenge systems which prevent their self-determination. Those most disempowered—poor women, women from indigenous communities, peasant women—are often the focus of training sessions.

The GAD school of thought challenges the socially constructed roles of males and females, pointing out that women have been assigned subordinate status in these roles. On a continuum, GAD would be situated between WID and WAD. GAD considers the condition and position of women by looking at both the material state and the political, economic, and social standing of women relative to men. The approach makes a distinction between women's practical needs (e.g., health care, food, shelter) and their strategic interests (e.g., participation in political processes, control over resources). While projects may be designed to address practical or strategic concerns, the ultimate goal is social transformation. To this end, exercises that challenge gender roles and stereotypes are built into training programs (Licuanan n.d.).

Gender training will highlight different elements depending on whether the WID, WAD, or GAD perspective dominates the facilitating group's ideology. It is, however, important to note that the three schools of thought are not exclusive of one another. Groups can be influenced by two or all of the perspectives, and a training program may combine components from more than one ideology.

Gender training in the Philippines occurs within the country's diverse and dynamic women's movement. Women's groups are clustered into networks that are aligned according to ideologies and program areas (e.g., health or indigenous women). In 1984 an attempt at forming a broad coalition of women's groups, under the General Assembly Binding Women for Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action (GABRIELA), failed as groups splintered on ideological lines. Pilipina, one of the founding members of GABRIELA, left the coalition in 1985 to focus on a more general political goal of supporting Corazon Aquino against President Marcos. Comprised primarily of professional women, Pilipina went on in 1989 to organize its own network called

the Women's Action Network for Development (WAND). GABRIELA, which claims to represent the poor and disempowered, is now a member of the Group of 10 (G-10) formed in 1988.

The split between Pilipina and GABRIELA demonstrates the divisiveness that persists within the Philippine women's movement. While the movement may be characterized as moving away from a WID toward a WAD perspective, the WID perspective still permeates the thinking of Pilipina. GABRIELA subscribes more strongly to the WAD and GAD ideologies. Predictably, the two groups' training programs differ. Training offered by GABRIELA is usually designed for female-only participants. Sessions focus on women's strategic interests, seeking to empower them to examine their status and seek equality. On the other hand, Pilipina's gender training stresses meeting women's practical needs by integrating their concerns into institutional programs. Strategic issues may be addressed but usually in a nonconfrontational manner. Training may be for women or (more rarely) mixed groups.

The National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women (NCRFW) is a government agency formed in 1975, at the start of the United Nations Decade for Women. The NCRFW plays an important role in Philippine gender training as it has assumed the formidable task of sensitizing the entire government bureaucracy. Although the NCRFW works closely with WAND (in part because many Pilipina members are also commission members), it operates independently. Working within the confines of the government bureaucracy, the NCRFW espouses an integrationist WID ideology. While the commission is responsible for the basic strategies regarding government agency training (i.e., whom to target, how many sessions), it has had little control over many of the actual training programs, which have been handled by consultants.

Persistent rifts within the women's movement in the Philippines tend to undermine an atmosphere of sharing and cooperation. While the NCRFW and the NGO networks may sometimes present a united front for certain causes, differences in ideologies and strategies remain deep and divisive. Thus, groups and networks work independently of one another, each developing its training modules based on its respective philosophy and audience. GABRIELA, Pilipina, and the NCRFW have each had their own workshops on developing gender-training modules. Other networks and organizations, such as the Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (PhilDHRRRA) and the Asian Institute of Management

(AIM), have done the same. Some groups have developed their own gender-training modules with little network support, using available literature and employing a trial-and-error formula.

A significant attempt to bring together diverse groups was the NCRFW-sponsored BIGAT (Basic Gender Awareness Training), which united GOs and select NGOs for a sharing session. However, the assessment of participants suggests that BIGAT had little real impact. It did not effectively stimulate cooperation among groups as evidenced by the continued exclusivity of these organizations' operations. This may partly stem from there having been no synthesis of or follow-up to the meeting. Nevertheless, while BIGAT's impact was limited, the concept was valid. The many groups conducting training in the Philippines have a collective wealth of experience. Most have relied heavily on Western models and analytical tools, while some have tried experimental forms. A forum where groups offering gender training can step outside their networks and learn from other groups' experiences is needed. It is time for groups to come together to synthesize the current direction of training, determine what has been effective, identify the barriers to success, and study how models can be fine-tuned.

Factors Limiting Training Impact

Gender training in the Philippines tends to be more dependent on the trainer's module (which is influenced by the trainer's ideology) than on the actual needs of the participants. While group needs and contexts vary widely, trainers are often unable or unwilling to scale their approach to better suit the audience. In other words, many facilitators in the Philippines rely on modules that they are not prepared to modify, regardless of the needs or constitution of the group to be trained. This is not solely the fault of the trainers. There are enough groups conducting training in the country with a variety of approaches and ideologies that the person organizing the training session should be able to choose trainers that are appropriate for the audience. A lack of awareness about available training choices may partly account for an organizer's failure to do so. A sourcebook of consolidated information on groups conducting training would facilitate the process of selecting trainers.

A pretraining appraisal should always be conducted to help facilitators understand the needs and composition of the group that

will undergo training. This will help in designing sessions that will most effectively reach participants. Commonly, however, no prior appraisal is made, and trainers simply present their format regardless of whether the group is single or mixed-sex, or whether a felt need for training exists or not. Sometimes, this is because of time constraints, although even a cursory inquiry would be helpful. However, it seems that conducting pretraining appraisals has simply not been a widespread practice, and some trainers have not been innovative. This is not to imply that all groups have overlooked this issue; some have worked hard to develop pretraining organizational analysis and determine the most effective way to reach audiences in different contexts.

A pragmatic vision of gender training, one which aims to effectively reach as many people as possible with a salient and applicable message, is called for. While the ultimate issues may be equity and empowerment for women, trainers should not pursue what may be perceived as radical advocacy at the peril of offending, dividing, or confounding the audience. If a session that highlights how projects can be made more efficient by factoring in the gender variable will be better received by the audience than one that focuses on the personal manifestations of gender bias, then the former approach should be pursued. Imperfect and partial change are the means to greater change.

Key questions that should be asked in a pretraining appraisal include the following:

- What are the group's expectations from the training?
- What is the current status of gender concerns within the organization/community?
- Who will attend the training?
- What is the motivation for the training?
- What style or message is apt to gain greatest acceptance among the group?

The following example illustrates the misdirected sessions that can occur when formats are not tailored to the group that will undergo training. A four-hour workshop was conducted at a national staff meeting of a law group. While the trainer was well versed in gender-sensitizing techniques, she apparently had not given any thought to her audience, which consisted primarily of lawyers. The session's content did not specifically address the field of law but focused instead on the participants' personal lives. This was clearly a case where

concentrating on personal issues was not the best way to educate the audience; many chose to maintain their professional veneer. The participants indicated that they did not see how the content of the session was applicable to their work.

This example reveals several common factors limiting training impact in the Philippines. The separation of technical specialists from gender specialists often leads to training that is not clearly or directly applicable to the workplace. In the case just cited, the training would have been more effective and appropriate if the trainer had, for instance, prepared a session about violence against women and how the participants, as lawyers dedicated to social action, can help break down barriers to women's equal protection under the law. If a lawyer had facilitated or cofacilitated, the issues may have been presented more persuasively. Allowing more time for finding an appropriate trainer and for conducting a needs assessment of the organization could have increased the session's impact. As is often the case in the Philippines, the training was held not because of any felt need within the group—it came at the suggestion of a funding organization. Furthermore, the training design did not include any follow-up sessions.

The motivation for a training is a particularly important factor to consider as it will often shed some light on the current status of and attitude toward gender concerns within an organization. Pressure points that propel groups toward training may emerge either from within or outside an organization. Within an organization, a core group of committed individuals who believe in the efficiency and efficacy of gender analysis could push for training, especially if the committed personnel hold important positions within the hierarchy. While the push may begin with a single individual, a critical mass must be reached to shift the group toward a new vision of development. This "critical mass" concept is difficult to operationalize, and further discussion about finding or fostering that critical mass within an organization is needed.

In the Philippines, donor agencies also influence the process of gender sensitizing by subtly, or sometimes forcefully, pressuring grantee organizations to undergo training. This is increasingly common. While there are those who may be uncomfortable with donor agencies' power to control some dimensions and directions of development in the Philippines, it bears repeating that development is about change and all agencies have a responsibility to work for change that is equitable and just. The inclusion of the gender variable

is a way of balancing the benefits of development more fairly. Organizations philosophically opposed to measures of control that funding agencies utilize (and it should be noted that gender training is just one of the ways by which agencies shape development processes) may choose not to pursue such funding. Some donors stipulate that grantees must undergo training; others just make informal recommendations. In either case, one may create a situation where an organization undergoes gender training even when no marked need for it is felt. Sentiments of animosity or ridicule may emerge if the group does not believe in the saliency of the issues. Thus, trainers should be aware of how the impetus for a training may affect the atmosphere they are entering so that they can adapt their approach suitably.

Target Groups

Among those conducting training in the Philippines, there is no general agreement as to the best target group from which to effect change. Some have developed their training only for women; others have worked with all-male groups. Some refuse to work with mixed-sex groups because of previous negative experiences (i.e., walkouts, insults, threats); others find mixed groups dynamic and challenging. One NGO has even done experimental work with couples and families. This is an area where discussion among trainers would be useful to synthesize ideas and learn from one another's experiences.

What is the most effective target group? Women or men? Implementors or top-level decision makers? The entire institution or a program/project area? Ideally, these would not be "either/or" questions in the organizational setting, but limited funding often requires groups to make these choices.

In the Philippines, top management has been favored over implementors as a target group. The rationale behind this is that if the former is "sold" on the idea, then progressive thought will trickle down to lower levels. Full institutional conversion has been the common objective. Paradoxically, women are more likely than men to be selected to attend training sessions, even for sessions for the male-dominated field of top-level managers. This occurs as managers send their female subordinates to the training sessions due either to the assumption that gender training is for women or to their own lack of interest in the topic.

Groups facilitating gender training should reconsider the top-down approach to full institutional conversion, especially in light of the 1991 Local Government Code which devolves some line-agency staff and programs to the local level. It may be more effective to target a particular program and aim at sensitizing both top-level personnel and field implementors working in that program area. This is especially true for large bureaucracies, like government agencies, where it is unrealistic to expect to convert the entire staff simultaneously and previous attempts at top-down conversion appear to have been largely ineffective.

Gender-sensitization of a project has three key strengths: First, it is a relatively manageable target that allows training of both top- and bottom-level personnel, permitting the incorporation of gender concerns into all program stages. Secondly, sensitization is an ongoing process that extends beyond the initial training, providing for hands-on application of gender analysis tools. Finally, the integration of gender concerns into a project that links gender analysis to program success can provide synergy for the inclusion of gender issues in other programs.

Conclusion

This article highlights the distinctions between gender sensitivity and gender analysis training, and between community- and organizational-level training. The tendency in the Philippines to favor sensitizing modules has not led to a clear dissemination of information on how to operationalize a gender-sensitive development vision. Analysis modules should be further emphasized, and the linkages between the two types of training should be more clearly presented. While a compelling case exists for gender training within organizations as a means to reform development initiatives that have contributed to or reinforced women's lower status, community-level training raises some deep and potentially divisive questions. Groups that conduct community training as well as funding agencies that mandate or urge local training should thoroughly review their positions on the issues.

As discussed in this article, there are several factors that limit the effectiveness of gender training in the Philippines. All groups would benefit from open discussion and sharing of strategies and experiences.

Key areas that should be addressed include ascertaining the best target group from which to effect change and ensuring that a trainer's style and approach are adapted to maximize the impact on the audience. A strategy for following through on ideas elucidated in training sessions is also needed.

The movement in the Philippines to institute gender as a variable in the development process echoes a worldwide trend. While the trend can certainly be placed within the larger context of the women's movement, it can also be viewed as a refocusing of the understanding of development, which previously overlooked women's conditions and positions. In the case of the Philippines, the primacy put on the image of a tranquil family life where women play a central and glorified role presents special obstacles to the trend. A vision of society that questions or shatters traditional roles is not easily accepted. However, one must remember that a paradigm shift is truly a process. Thus, rocky and uneven though it may be, the Philippines is today fully engaged in that process.

Notes

1. Philippine newspapers report almost daily on acts of rape and murder that show a disturbing pattern of male political and military elites using their power against women and girls. The most sensational case in 1993 was that against Calauan Mayor Antonio Sanchez. However, numerous lower-profile cases involving fishermen, teachers, fathers, neighbors, and strangers show that rape is a pervasive issue in Philippine society. At least two rape cases are reported daily in the Cordillera region alone (Labog 1994). Bautista and Rifareal (1990) expose violations of women's human rights with a collection of articles that address various aspects of abuse against women.

2. For a comprehensive look at women's situations in the Philippine rural setting, see any of Jeanne Frances I. Illo's works (particularly Illo and Uy 1992; Illo and Polo 1990; and Illo 1988). Elizabeth Uy Eviota (1993) analyzes the sexual division of labor in the Philippines to reveal political, economic, cultural, and historical influences on gender inequities. The National Commission for the Role of Filipino Women (1991a, 1991b, 1991c) documents the status of women in various sectors of society. Patricia B. Licuanan (1991) gives a good overview of discrimination against women in five realms of Philippine society: education, employment, participation in government, health, and marriage and family. Bautista and Rifareal (1990) offer a compilation of articles that address violations of women's human rights in the Philippines. For a male perspective on the patterns of Philippine patriarchy and the ideological make-up of the women's movement, read Contreras (1991-92). Delia D. Aguilar (1988) questions the notion that Filipinas are not in need of liberation.

References

- Aguilar, Carmencita T. 1991-92. Profile of women politicians in the Philippines. *Review of Women's Studies* 2, no. 2.
- Aguilar, Delia D. 1988. *The feminist challenge—initial working principles toward reconceptualizing the feminist movement in the Philippines*. Manila: Asian Social Institute.
- Banzon-Bautista, Cynthia, and Nanette G. Dungo. 1987. The differential impact of farm technology on men and women: A case study of two Philippine villages. In *Woman farmers and rural change in Asia: Towards equal access and participation*, edited by Noleen Heyzer. Kuala Lumpur: Asian and Pacific Development Center.
- Bautista, Liberato C., and Elizabeth B. Rifareal, eds. 1990. *And she said no! Human rights, women's identities and struggles*. Quezon City: Program Unit on Human Rights, National Council of Churches in the Philippines.
- Canadian Council for International Cooperation, MATCH International Centre, and Association quebecoise des organismes de cooperation internationale. 1991. *Two halves make a whole: Balancing gender relations in development*. Ottawa: Canadian Council for International Cooperation, MATCH International Centre, and Association quebecoise des organismes de cooperation internationale.
- Contreras, Antonio P. 1991-92. Political ideologies of Western feminism in the context of the women's movement in the Philippines. *Review of Women's Studies* 2, no. 2.
- Eviota, Elizabeth Uy. 1993. *The political economy of gender: Women and the sexual division of labour in the Philippines*. London: Zed Books.
- Feldstein, Hilary Sims, and Susan V. Poats. 1989. *Working together*. Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press.
- Illo, Jeanne Frances I. 1987. *Impact of irrigation development on women and their households: The case of the Aslong Project*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- . 1988. *Gender issues in rural development: A workshop report*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Illo, Jeanne Frances I., and Jaime B. Polo. 1990. *Fishers, traders, farmers, wives: The life stories of ten women in a fishing village*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Illo, Jeanne Frances I., and C. C. Uy. 1992. *Members but not leaders: Finding a niche for women in cooperatives*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Illo, Jeanne Frances I., and Cynthia C. Veneracion. 1988. *Women and men in rainfed farming systems: Case studies of households in the Bicol region*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Labog, Juliet M. 1994. Thousands mark International Women's Day with marches. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 9 March.

- Li, Tania Murray. 1993. *Gender issues in community-based resource management: Theories, applications, and Philippine case studies*. Laguna: De los Reyes Printing Press.
- Licuanan, Patricia B. 1991. A situation analysis of women in the Philippines. In *Gender analysis and planning: The 1990 IPC-CIDA Workshops*, edited by Jeanne Frances I. Illo. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Licuanan, Victoria S. n.d. Approaches to development: WID, GAD, WAD. Article for Asian Institute of Management, Makati.
- Moser, Caroline O. N. 1989. Gender planning in the Third World: Meeting practical and strategic gender needs. *World Development* 17, no. 11.
- National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women. 1991a. Women: Government and public participation.
- _____. 1991b. Women: Health and nutrition.
- _____. 1991c. Women: Labor and employment.
- NSO (National Statistics Office). 1986. *Integrated survey of households, fourth quarter*. Manila: NSO.
- Overholt, Catherine, Kathleen Cloud, Mary B. Anderson, and James E. Austin, eds. 1985. *Gender roles and development projects*. Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press.
- Rocheleau, Dianne. 1987. The user perspective and the agroforestry research and action agenda. In *Agroforestry: Realities, possibilities, and potentials*, edited by H. L. Gholz. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Rocheleau, Dianne, Karen L. Scholfield, and Njoke Mbuthi. 1991. *People, property, poverty, and parks: A story of men, women, water and trees at Pwani*. ECOGEN Case Study Series. Worcester, Mass.: Program for International Development, Clark University.
- Shields, M. Dale, and Barbara P. Thomas-Slayter. 1993. *Gender, class, ecological decline, and livelihood strategies: A case study of Siquijor Island, the Philippines*. ECOGEN Case Study Series. Worcester, Mass.: Program for International Development, Clark University.
- Thomas-Slayter, Barbara, Andrea Lee Esser, and M. Dale Shields. 1993. *Tools of gender analysis: A guide to field methods for bringing gender into sustainable resource management*. ECOGEN [paper]. Worcester, Mass.: Program for International Development, Clark University.
- Thomas-Slayter, Barbara, Dianne Rocheleau, Mary Rojas, and Dale Shields. 1990. *Concepts and issues linking gender, natural resources management, and sustainable development*. ECOGEN Project Concept Paper. Worcester, Mass.: Program for International Development, Clark University.