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# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APHRC</td>
<td>African Population and Health Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWID</td>
<td>Association for Women in Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSJ</td>
<td>Centre for Health and Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>civil society organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
<td>UN Commission on the Status of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee (OECD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGE</td>
<td>Engendering Men: Evidence on Routes to Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>foreign direct investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAD</td>
<td>gender and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADN</td>
<td>Gender and Development Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrOUW</td>
<td>Growth and Equal Opportunities for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>Institute of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGLHRC</td>
<td>International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPF</td>
<td>International Planned Parenthood Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT (/I)</td>
<td>lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (/ and inter-sex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGEN</td>
<td>Men for Gender Equality Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Oxford Policy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLP</td>
<td>Refugee Law Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDD</td>
<td>Social Development Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>sexual and gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRHR</td>
<td>sexual and reproductive health and rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRISD</td>
<td>United Nations Research Institute for Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEE</td>
<td>women’s economic empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>women in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILPF</td>
<td>Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose and introduction

We here aim to outline priority directions for future research on gender and sexuality in development, which are needed to advance our understanding of gender and sexuality in an increasingly unequal, polarised and volatile world. We also aim to build support and collaboration in this endeavour, with funders, policymakers, partners and colleagues, by outlining the key questions raised and recommended ways of approaching research to provide answers in support of transformative responses for social justice. The agenda represents the outcome of a nine-month collaborative effort building on lessons from global work by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), partner organisations and networks over the past decade. It draws in perspectives from external experts and policymakers through two small targeted surveys and expert interviews, as well as discussions and consultations at a range of events during 2016.1 It comes at a time not only of major changes in global politics and trends, but also of major shifts in international development itself, following the establishment of the global goals for sustainable development or ‘Sustainable Development Goals’ (SDGs) in Agenda 2030. Below, we first situate IDS – i.e. ‘who’ we are – in terms of gender and sexuality in development. We then consider ‘why’ a new agenda is required and outline some major current trends and challenges reshaping the landscape for work on gender equality, inclusion and social justice, including shifts and trends in policy and financing of such work. We go on to propose ‘what’ we see as needed in future research – namely, a set of new directions in four key areas for further development, along with specific rationales, central questions for exploration and proposed methodologies for ‘how’ this can be achieved, and with ‘whom’, in broad terms of partnerships and stakeholders. We then elaborate links between these areas of research and propose ways of creating innovative dialogues across different streams of work. We end by laying out our way of working and how we can build knowledge mobilisation and communications for policy influence into the design of research, methods and partnerships throughout the process.

“We aim to build support and collaboration in this endeavour, with funders, policymakers, partners and colleagues, by outlining the key questions raised and recommended ways of approaching research to provide answers in support of transformative responses for social justice.”
IDS at a critical juncture in international development

Since 1966, IDS has led path-breaking work in generating research and evidence together with partners across the research process and across regions, sectors and movements. We describe this approach in our most recent strategy (2015–20) as ‘engaged excellence’. There has been a strong focus on human rights, gender equality, democratic development and citizen participation. The Institute has played critical roles in convening debates and pushing progress in gender and sexuality over the past 40 years: from influencing the shift from ‘women in development’ (WID) to ‘gender and development’ (GAD); getting sexuality, pleasure and poverty into the development discourse; politicising the field of integrating men and masculinities into gender and development; introducing a gender relations approach to environmental change; and getting the issue of undervalued ‘care work’ onto the agenda (Nesbitt-Ahmed and Edwards 2016; Leach 2016; UN Women 2014b).

Building on a long track record of projects and research programmes, the Gender and Sexuality research cluster at IDS comprises an interdisciplinary group of experts, including anthropologists, economists, social scientists and political scientists, as well as digital media, policy and communications specialists. The group possesses strong qualitative and quantitative skills in academic, operational and action research, online platform development, policy engagement, organisational training and postgraduate teaching. Across the cluster, members are proficient in more than 13 languages and work in more than 30 countries across the world.2
Examples of IDS projects and research programmes include: Pathways of Women’s Empowerment, Gender, Power and Sexuality and the Sexuality and Development programme. More recent flagship programmes include the Empowerment of Women and Girls programme, Balancing Unpaid Care Work and Paid Work (part of the Growth and Equal Opportunities for Women (GrOU) programme), Engendering Men: Evidence on Routes to Gender Equality (EMERGE), Innovations from the Field – Gender Mainstreaming from the Ground Up (Gender Hub Nigeria), the Domestic Violence in Ghana study, the Sexuality, Poverty and Law programme, and Modern Slavery in India and Nepal (with IDS’ Participation cluster). More examples of our current and recent work at IDS can be found on our Interactions site at http://interactions.ids.ac.uk
Gender and sexuality in a changing world

Both progressive and regressive forces are shaping the challenges and contestations of gender and sexuality in our rapidly changing world, and within development policy and practice itself. In the current political, economic and social turbulence we face, IDS and our partners must therefore orient new work on gender and sexuality issues in relation to these critical forces and trends, some of which we briefly discuss below.

Deepening economic inequalities

While global extreme poverty has halved over the past 20 years (United Nations 2014a), economic inequality has increased in some two-thirds of countries across the globe since the year 2000. Concentrations of deprivation are developing in increasingly fragile states and sub-state areas, as well as in middle-income countries failing to achieve inclusive growth and social protection, with little investment in urban infrastructures and mounting environmental degradation (Barder and Evans 2014). The post-2008 economic recession has further heightened concerns about inequalities and the ways in which women and other disadvantaged groups may be impacted disproportionately, including groups marginalised on the basis of sexual orientation and/or non-conforming gender identities. Furthermore, collective struggles for women’s economic rights have been somewhat sidelined in development research and policy over recent decades, as the focus has increasingly shifted to framing women as workers and contributing to economic growth as producers, farmers and consumers.
Unequal labour market participation and care economies

Despite progress in women’s labour force participation over many decades, this has somewhat stagnated globally between 1990 and 2012, with women still earning between 10 per cent and 30 per cent less than men, globally and on average (World Bank 2014). As labour markets have become increasingly deregulated, women’s participation is also disproportionately occurring in the informal economy and in lower income brackets, outside of the protection of laws and regulations for fair pay, employment conditions or anti-discrimination (UN Women 2011; Razavi et al. 2012). The same applies to sexual minorities and other marginalised groups who face additional barriers and often lack social capital or community or legal protection (Wood 2016).

In many contexts, the persistent gender pay gaps in many formal and informal labour markets and resilient divisions of tasks, jobs and roles between different types of men and women, along with ongoing pressures and new opportunities for women to enter the labour market, have led to greater concentrations of women in low-paid, often informal sectors of the labour market. This includes increasing participation in traditionally ‘feminised’ and less-regulated sectors such as domestic services and sex work. While global advocacy for policy change and for the decriminalisation of sex work has largely been related to HIV prevention and treatment, there are growing calls to address sex work as a form of work, with emphasis given to labour protections, poverty and workers’ rights (Oosterhoff, Waldman and Olerenshaw 2014).

The gendered division of labour, which assigns women primary responsibility for direct and indirect care work, has changed little over time. While there are some signs of positive change, with more men entering the care professions (e.g. nursing) and more men sharing the burden of unpaid care work, a large-scale study found that men’s share of unpaid work still did not exceed 37 per cent in any of the 20 countries studied (Edström et al. 2015). The increasing numbers of women entering the waged workforce in most countries, cuts to welfare spending in many societies, and men’s continuing resistance to taking on significant care responsibilities makes this issue an important focus of development policy.

Improving the visibility of unpaid care work and its links with economic empowerment have formed a major feature of our recent work, adding some weight and evidence to a broader push from women’s organisations and activists, which has seen results through being included as a target under SDG 5. This target highlights the need to ‘recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate [our emphasis]’.

Recent anti-poverty programmes in pursuit of the empowerment of individual women have had significant and divergent implications (both positive and negative) on work towards gender justice, not always lifting people or communities out of poverty, but sometimes enabling more freedom in people’s choices (for example, choice of occupation), women’s decision-making, and the possibility of being more ‘self-reliant’ (Edström et al. 2015). The evidence is mixed, but some studies find continued resistance from men to progress in women’s economic opportunities,

“...The fact that women are assigned primary responsibility for care work has changed little over time. ...
and no automatic translation of earnings into control and agency (Ahmed 2008; Kabeer 2007; Silberschmidt 2011). Men are largely missing from women’s economic empowerment initiatives, as indeed are most sexual minorities (Oosterhoff et al. 2014). More research is needed to better understand how to engage different types of men and other gendered or sexualised groups towards improved gender justice outcomes for all.

Urbanisation and migration

Increasing urbanisation is a significant feature of economic growth and a majority of the world’s population now live in urban and peri-urban areas. This can mean new freedoms for women — but also for young men — and changes in kinship structures, which often have major implications for norms and options around gender and sexuality. It can also mean greater exposure to violence and rights violations for women and marginalised groups, as documented in Brazil, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Liberia and Nepal (Taylor 2011).

In recent years there has been a major increase in the visibility of international migration, variously explained by environmental degradation, conflict, or discrimination, as well as by continued social and economic inequalities between countries. Large-scale movements of people are reshaping gender relations and norms in both ‘sending’ and ‘receiving’ communities in ways that remain under-researched.

We know that the ‘feminisation’ of labour migration has been accompanied by a growing recognition of the violence faced by female migrants and other minorities at all stages of their ‘journey’ (Piper 2003), and by exploitative conditions of work, such as long working hours, non-payment, beatings, forced confinement, rape, sexual abuse or exploitation (International Organization for Migration 2009). Gender and sexuality play major roles in determining the causes, conditions and outcomes of unsafe migration, and understanding how this operates is key to developing prevention, mitigation and emergency responses that are both equitable and inclusive. There is limited awareness about the nature of migration and challenges faced by those marginalised on the basis of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression, as highlighted by IDS’ own work with partners (Wood 2016).

Political polarisations and transformations of sociocultural spaces

Over recent decades we have seen a downsizing of the role of the state in many settings and, more recently, a general increase in populist politics, often with nationalist overtones; a resurgence of religious movements with conservative agendas on gender and sexuality, alongside a resurgence of male supremacist ideologies, has been observed in many parts of the world (Hassink et al. 2015). In many countries we have also registered a ‘democratic deficit’ and lacklustre participation rates in elections, while popular political mobilisations are increasingly de-linked from formal party politics. Feminist political mobilisation within the context of development programming has also dissipated into a broader range of more issue-specific and instrumental projects, often de-linked from a deeper social justice agenda (Fraser 2009), although there are important exceptions and movements in the global South.

Socioculturally, we have seen major new trends changing the landscape and language of gender and sexuality, both positively and negatively. On the one hand, the rise of social media and internet connectivity has opened up new spaces for expression, community building and mobilisation (Gurumurthy 2013). On the other, it raises questions about whose voices are being heard, and it has created new vulnerabilities – to surveillance and to exposure – increasing risks for women, sexual minorities and other marginalised groups in different settings (Tactical Technology Collective 2014).

In tandem with these transformations of social spaces, we have also seen an increased visibility of certain ‘men’s rights movements’ and male backlash against women’s empowerment in many contexts (Hamaus, Edström and Shahrokh 2015). While there are strong identifications with more equitable masculine identities...
‘new men’ – in certain countries, we have also seen an increased glorification of ‘militaristic masculinity’ and a valuing of violence in many areas. This has been accompanied by a rise in the visibility and reporting of homophobia and a backlash against sexual minorities and human rights in some countries (Jjuuko and Tumwesige 2013).

Linking economic justice with sexuality and gender justice

The global landscape on gender, sexuality, and sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) has changed rapidly. An unprecedented number of countries have decriminalised same-sex relations and outlawed marital rape in their criminal codes (UN Women 2011), while transgender identity is increasingly recommended to be taken off the list of mental health disorders (Robles et al. 2016; WHO 2016). New medical technologies – such as medical abortion, self-injectable contraceptives, post- and pre-exposure prophylaxis and HIV home testing – are increasingly available, while increased access to the internet and other information and communications technologies (ICTs) is giving many more women and girls more control over their bodies than in the past. Yet, there is also a growing backlash against sexual health and rights, as well as against hard-won rights of marginalised groups (such as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT), young people, disabled people and sex workers).

Although sexuality is clearly an essential part of sexual and reproductive health rights for all persons, sexual health programmes still often focus on family planning for women and girls presumed to be part of monogamous, heterosexual couples. There are few if any signs that sexual violence is decreasing in war zones, or beyond, and 1.2 billion women will have married as children by 2050 if there is no reduction in child marriage, while ‘anti-trafficking measures’ have been abused to ‘rescue and rehabilitate’ sex workers against their will.

“...We have also seen an increased glorification of ‘militaristic masculinity’ and a valuing of violence.”
Shifting policy discourse and priorities

Second-wave feminists of the 1970s and 1980s got ‘redistribution’ and ‘representation’ (i.e. women’s ‘work’ and ‘voice’) into the then prevailing ‘women in development’ (WID) agenda. They did so by revealing the systemic subordination of women in the global economy and calling for gender ‘equality’, reframing the issue as ‘gender and development’ (GAD). Subsequently, the impacts of the 1980s–1990s’ contestations around HIV and SRHR forced debates on sex and sexuality (i.e. the ‘body’) more squarely into development discourse, especially in terms of rights, identity, and new, more positive approaches to pleasure, sex and sexuality by the mid-2000s. Concurrently, research and action on masculinities emerged from the mid-1990s, leading to a gradual ‘inclusion’ of men and boys in work on gender and sexuality, with new contestations about violence, power and ‘safe spaces’.

Along with this progress in research and understanding, policy and practice has also followed its own dynamics in the recent era. Many feminists critiqued the framing of gender equality in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as ‘instrumentalist’ and focused on a few quantitative targets, while others have pointed out the significant gains made in those important areas at least. The MDGs were also pursued within a post-9/11 period of changing narratives and a ‘securitisation’ of certain parts of the development agenda, within a context of resurgent nationalisms, conflict and insecurity, along with an apparent rise in the movement of people, all increasingly falling outside of the traditional frames of development policy in gender and sexuality. It was in this context that sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) was raised on the agenda as something not meaningfully addressed in the MDG framework, by activists, women’s groups (such as the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as Save the Children and the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), civil society organisations (CSOs) such as Sonke Gender Justice, the White Ribbon Campaign, IDS and Instituto Promundo, and a number of development agencies (including UN Women, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), Norad, the Department for International Development (DFID) and others). There has also been an increasing recognition of the interconnectedness and intersectionality of problems of inequality in gender and sexuality over the past decade, along with their ‘structural barriers’ and ‘drivers’ (Eduards and Nesbitt-Ahmed 2016).

Agenda 2030: principles, priorities and politics

Following more than two years of intense negotiations, the UN’s member states reached consensus on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations 2015a) to end poverty by 2030 and universally promote shared economic prosperity, social development and environmental protection. ‘Agenda 2030’, as it is also known, was adopted at the September 2015 UN Summit on the post-2015 development agenda in New York. Through 17 goals and 169 targets, Agenda 2030 strives to tackle the structural barriers to social and economic change in favour of gender equality, which were left...
largely untouched by the MDGs. Most of the strategic demands voiced by women’s groups made it into SDG 5: to ‘Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls’. Sexuality remains less visible, however, but the key principles underpinning the SDGs – indivisibility, universality and inclusivity – do signal a significant shift towards a more holistic development paradigm, with implications and potential for more transformative formulations of and responses to issues of both gender and sexuality.

Under SDG 5, one of the hardest-fought and most transformative targets relates to recognising and valuing unpaid care and domestic work – an agenda which IDS has been taking forward together with partners and networks for several years. Other examples of advances include new targets on: women’s greater leadership at all levels of economic, public and political life; eliminating all forms of violence against all women and girls in public and private spheres; and ensuring women’s equal ownership and control over land and property.

Aside from SDG 5, however, there are also some progressive targets on gender and sexuality issues under other goals, such as SDG 8 on employment, which calls for the achievement of full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value. However, while strong on highlighting key sites for pushing on women’s empowerment, SDG 5 remains rather silent on issues of sexuality in gender, or how men and masculinities need to be addressed for progress on equality.

“‘There are also some progressive targets on gender and sexuality issues under other goals.”’
'Leave no one behind' suggests that no goal will be considered met unless it is met for everyone; yet, this appears to not always mean quite everyone. The language on the goals being met for ‘all social and economic groups’ was watered down late in the negotiations, to be replaced by the phrase ‘all segments of society’; a nuance reflecting a refusal from some governments to recognise the rights of people oppressed on the basis of non-normative sexual orientation and gender identity and expression (Esplen 2015).4,5 Despite this marginalisation of non-normative identities, a recent IDS review of how the SDGs relate to the social exclusion of people on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression (Mills 2015) has helped to identify available entry points for tackling this social exclusion – in part based on a language of ‘other status’ – within the SDG targets, across seven development priority areas (Haste, Overs and Mills 2016).6 Agenda 2030 has several other limitations when it comes to issues of sexuality and gender justice. We should perhaps be wary of the potential for de-politicisation of the ‘leave no one behind’ principle itself, of the risks of presenting women as a ‘vulnerable group’, or of framing empowerment as something we ‘do’ or ‘grant’ to people rather than a process that women or others ‘own’ or claim, and which requires fundamental shifts in power structures. For all the welcome attention to inequalities in SDG 10, there is not a single reference to the need for redistributive policies, and the most contentious target on what is now framed as ‘sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights’ effectively excludes sexual rights. An accountability framework based on voluntary national reviews is another concern and the language of ‘accountability’ was actually vetoed by some member states. As several targets remain deeply controversial and are already qualified by the clause ‘as nationally appropriate’, this also affects SDG 5 itself and effectively gives governments an ‘opt-out’ (Esplen 2015). So, with development entering a new post-2015 era, in the face of deep and broad global shifts and increased volatility, it is indicative that narratives and framings of development are also changing, and perhaps partly so in recognition of the increasingly outdated approach taken at a time of more positive outlooks around the millennium. Yet, change is not linear and we see much resistance to increased equality on bases of gender and sexuality, as well as on other scales of social oppression. In order to assess the changing context, we also need to briefly consider the scale and dynamics of the resources required for the significant changes pledged in these international agreements.

Relating resources to stated commitments

The wide range of goals and targets set by Agenda 2030 beg the question of what will be prioritised (and by whom). It takes for granted key elements of our inherited dominant economic model, reflecting a heavy interest in market-oriented approaches and the strong presence of the private sector. While this is a reality that we have to negotiate, this has gender implications, driving instrumentalist logics around empowering women and girls as economic agents, as noted by Fraser (2009) among others. The notional emphasis on women’s economic empowerment is encouraging, but it focuses primarily on getting women into the labour force, without attention to required transformations in sociocultural norms and supportive institutions.

Furthermore, current development aid in support of gender equality remains concentrated in the social sectors of health and education, in line with earlier priorities set by the MDGs (OECD 2015a), while the gender focus is weakest in the infrastructure sectors such as energy and transport. Concerns about prioritisation are even more acute in view of the fact that this ambitious set of commitments has not been matched by a commitment to ambitious new levels of development financing.
In the run-up to the agreement on Agenda 2030, heads of state and government representatives gathered in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in July 2015, at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in order to address the challenge of financing and creating an enabling environment for sustainable development. The resulting Addis Ababa Action Agenda (United Nations 2015b) gives a broad sense of priorities on the minds of donor countries.

While there are a wide range of commitments in the Agenda to work on gender equality, these should be understood in the context of the apparent priority given to what is called a ‘global social compact’, focused on providing essential public services for all, universal secondary education, elevated infrastructure efforts, women’s equal economic rights, and improved municipal finance. But the Addis Ababa Action Agenda also recognises the changing realities of development finance, focusing not just on aid but on domestic finance, foreign direct investment (FDI) and other ‘means of implementation’, including trade and technology.

While overseas aid still has a role to play in low-income countries, it will only ever be a drop in the ocean of total financing on development; meanwhile, aid accounts for just 0.3 per cent of the average gross domestic product in middle-income countries where great poverty and inequality often persists (Barder and Evans 2014). With an increasing focus on ‘smart aid’, supporting the establishment and monitoring of national gender equality priorities and gender-responsive public financial management systems will be critical.

An increasingly relevant role for development actors and movements – as well as for development research – may lie in shaping, monitoring and reporting on such processes and structures at the national level. However, it is important to note here that these roles appear to be increasingly constrained in that little funding is directed to organisations and groups focused on transformative, long-term and long-lasting work through organised collective action, with a noted trend of less and less funding going directly to women’s rights organisations in the global South (Esplen 2016; OECD 2015b).

“Little funding is directed to organisations and groups focused on transformative, long-term and long-lasting work.”
IDS’ new directions for gender and sexuality

Agenda 2030 and the Addis Agenda do appear to represent a new reframing of development, while recent trends present both challenges and opportunities for moving forward on these agendas. Members of IDS’ Gender and Sexuality cluster have reviewed the above trends and reached out to partners, policymakers and other stakeholders to explore implications for the future. Below, we lay out our proposed directions for new research, knowledge co-construction and communications for influence on gender and sexuality in development.

As the above context makes clear, it is not merely that our approaches may need updating in light of new international agreements: rather, new directions for gender and sexuality are primarily needed because the significant trends and shifts in the world today are making traditional ways of understanding and addressing inequities of gender and sexuality increasingly outdated. In this process of review and exploration, it became clear that several constraints within established development policy on gender need to be addressed in more holistic, complex and dynamic ways, which resonates with fundamental principles of Agenda 2030 such as indivisibility, universality and inclusivity, expressed in the phrase ‘leave no one behind’.

In relation to the principle of ‘indivisibility’, we see work on equality, sustainability and inclusion in gender and sexuality as necessarily multidimensional, covering political, sociocultural and material dimensions. This underpins our understanding of inequalities and exclusions as embedded in complex political, economic and social systems (variously patriarchal and sexist in nature) and also underpins the importance of interdisciplinary research. For example, the way we understand and analyse women’s empowerment links work, incomes and economic empowerment with social empowerment (addressing undervalued care roles and work) as well as political empowerment (through collective action as well as policy/institutional reforms).

We also explicitly ground our outlook on ‘universalism’, in that we locate gender and sexuality in relations and dynamics of power, which cross borders and boundaries as well as public and private spaces, from local to global levels. Universalism, we believe, refers to development being applicable to all countries, in both the global North and South. We therefore see it as involving people with different degrees of gendered power or privilege everywhere, making it personal and political, for the disadvantaged and the powerful alike. For example, our work on men and masculinities increasingly explores intersectionality in different men’s complex relationships to privilege and power, as well as dynamics and accountabilities between men’s organisations and women’s movements at different levels, and between the global North and South.

‘Inclusivity’ has been fundamental to our work in terms of challenging the marginalisation of certain groups and identities, by highlighting gendered diversity and challenging overly simplistic gender-binary and heteronormative constructions and assumptions. Clearly, people have multiple identities beyond gender, emphasising the need for attention to diversity within different gendered categories. However, understanding the associated intersecting bases for discrimination or

“Traditional ways of understanding and addressing inequities of gender and sexuality are increasingly outdated.”
privilege (e.g. how their sexuality, race, class or nationality intersects with gender) is also important. In particular, this is crucial to linking specific groups’ situations, identifications, ideologies and actions with systemic sources of exclusion or inclusion. Our work on sexuality, in particular, highlights the need for more systemic inclusion of groups that are marginalised on the basis of – or through association with – sex and sexuality within economic as well as social and political processes of development.

These principles need to be applied with a focus on understanding social change as complex, adaptive and contested in order to forward a transformative vision. During the process of review, we established a range of working groups to explore the implications of the above shifts for existing and new work in the Gender and Sexuality cluster. These focused on:

- the evolution of gendered violence and conflict;
- formal–informal gender dynamics of institutions;
- ‘intersectionality’ and links between social movements;
- insecure migration;
- implications of a growing digital space for gender and sexuality;
- the shifting roles of faith in gender and sexuality;
- changing ways of accessing and mobilising knowledge and research.

By considering the positive and negative influences of current trends on progress or regress in sexual and gender justice terms – and conceiving of directionality and dynamics within complex adaptive social systems – we have built on past areas of strong work to outline four major streams for further investigation. That is, the findings of the working groups were related to IDS’ strengths from past and ongoing work to prioritise and cluster questions into four major streams. Each stream incorporated lessons and ideas from a number of the different working groups listed above (at least two in each case). The four main streams with new directions are:

- securing women’s social and economic empowerment;
- men and masculinities for equality, peace and justice;
- sexuality, poverty and inclusion;
- gender, sexuality and digital development.

We also identified other areas of work coming out of the working groups that need more time for exploration to define IDS’ potential contributions, such as on faith, gender and sexuality, or applying a gender and sexuality lens to the issue of unsafe migration. Furthermore, while we did not establish separate working groups on (for example) climate change or urbanisation, certain working groups touched on these trends and issues, which are also being addressed in different research clusters at IDS and with whom we foresee making connections for linking the work and future exploration. Since many of the new issues explored in this process also cut across existing areas of work going forward, we have identified a number of promising ways of cross-pollinating learning and making linkages across the different streams of work, as well as across partnerships and other colleagues at IDS and beyond. The new directions for these streams, explorations and cross-linkages are laid out in separate subsections below.
Securing women’s social and economic empowerment in contexts of migration

Over the past few decades, migration flows (both internal and international) have increased (Goldin, Cameron and Balarajan 2012) – trends which are expected to increase over the next few years. The reasons behind increased migration flows are many, and the impact these flows have on both host and sending countries are varied. Internal economic migration related to urbanisation and international migration through legal and informal channels can, in economic terms, be perceived as a positive trend that reduces income inequality and contributes to economic growth in sending countries/communities and fills skills gaps and labour shortages in host countries. While effects of both internal and international migration may be economically beneficial, they may also lead to tensions between migrant and host communities. This is particularly the case when displacement is induced by development or natural disasters leading to increased migration to urban centres, or intra-state and international conflicts causing movements of large numbers of people seeking refuge in other countries that are not experiencing conflict. These forms of movement bring questions around economic opportunities and distribution to the forefront, as host and migrant communities are (or are perceived to be) competing over resources, assets, state services and access to markets. We define these contexts where there are sudden and unpredictable economic uncertainties, and heightened competition (real or perceived) for resources, coupled with increased volatility in the social and economic system (including markets and prices affected) as economically insecure. Increased economic insecurity in many instances leads to a rise in xenophobia among the host population, and also contributes to host and migrant communities congregating around ethnic/race/religious identities.

While there are studies on how migrant and host communities cope in economically insecure contexts and their attitudes towards other communities, fewer studies explore the different strategies used by migrant women and women from host populations living in economically insecure contexts to negotiate gender roles, particularly around care arrangements, and how women can be economically empowered in such contexts. Women’s participation in the market and their experience of economically insecure contexts are different compared to men in their communities for several reasons. First, migrant women take on a disproportionate burden of care, as care-sharing arrangements are disrupted because of migration – that is, when other ‘care-sharers’ (extended family members, husbands, etc.) are absent in their new context. In addition, migrant women and women from host populations alike often need to participate in market activities, which in turn leaves less time for care work. Second, women’s ability to participate in the market economy may be limited because of the increased volatility in prices and competition in the job market, as well as heightened safety concerns, particularly concerns around gender-based violence in situations with heightened social tensions. Third, women may also have constraints (real or perceived) on their ability to mobilise and collectively bargain to secure their economic interests in such volatile contexts. These aspects of women’s experience in economically insecure contexts need special focus, in order to understand how economic insecurity has specific impacts on care arrangements and possibilities for collective bargaining, as well as on the design of interventions that are effective in ensuring women’s economic empowerment.

Questions on women’s economic empowerment and security in contexts of migration

Effective women’s economic empowerment (WEE) programmes optimise women’s participation in economic activities, share the gains of the empowerment within and across families, and are sustainable after the programme ends and passed onto next generations. They give women the ability to choose and control resources and assets, expand their opportunities and choices – personally as well as collectively – which in turn leads to positive engagement in the market and care economies (this is what we term the ‘double boon.’)
Our focus on economic insecurity and women’s economic empowerment evolves from our previous work with multiple partners in South Asia (e.g. India, Bangladesh, Nepal), sub-Saharan Africa (e.g. Ghana, Tanzania, Rwanda), the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) (e.g. Egypt) and Latin America (e.g. Brazil) on different issues. This focus has evolved from our previous work on women’s economic empowerment, including work on: unpaid care work (GrOW); social safety nets and conditional cash transfers; and on women’s participation in formal paid work and its links to empowerment (Pathways of Women’s Empowerment).

IDS researchers from the Gender and Sexuality cluster and partners will aim to investigate women’s economic empowerment and economic insecurity from a micro-level perspective. At the heart of the research will be this question:

**How can UEE programmes effectively empower women in economically insecure contexts among and around migrant populations?**

The research will be guided by three broad sub-questions:

- What types of UEE programmes exist in contexts of economic insecurity? How do they differ from UEE programmes in economically secure contexts?
- What mechanisms and processes are triggered by UEE programmes to empower women in economically insecure contexts?
- What makes UEE programmes effective in economically insecure contexts?

Different methodologies need to be employed in order to answer these types of questions. To get a better overview and understanding of the types of UEE programmes implemented in economically fragile contexts, a literature review is needed in combination with a mapping of various programmes for different contexts, which can be supported by engaging key informants (e.g. academics, implementing organisations and policymakers) throughout. To understand what mechanisms and processes are utilised and supported by UEE programmes, a promising approach will be to deploy a combination of qualitative comparative methods and analysis across sites, including: (1) conducting key informant interviews within communities; (2) documenting case studies with women participating in the programmes as well as with non-participants and family members; and (3) process tracing. Finally, to understand what drives effectiveness in programmes, there is a need to investigate differences in design and approach, and the roles of different actors and stakeholders, as well as to map the contexts of structures and institutions across sites. This should involve a combination of: interviewing programme staff; studying programme documentation; conducting stakeholder mappings and participatory research; participant observations; and small community surveys.

As state-led UEE programmes in current fragile contexts of migrant and host populations are very rare, our aim will be to focus on programmes implemented by non-state actors, such as NGOs, donors and development agencies or the private sector. We aim to conduct comparative country studies in the MENA and South Asia regions, selecting these based on geographical location and types of migrants; sites will be chosen to capture different levels of economic realities and insecurities within particular countries. This allows for comparison within and between countries, yielding a rich portrait of factors that make UEE programmes effective in economically insecure contexts. Our work and findings on economic insecurity, agency of migrant women, and comparison between state-led and NGO-driven UEE programmes will be informed by and will contribute to research by other IDS clusters, including Business, Markets and the State; Participation; Governance; and Power and Popular Politics.

**Sustainable Development Goals**

This work stream contributes directly to **SDG 5** (gender equality), **SDG 8** (decent work) and **SDG 10** (reduce inequalities). Our focus on unpaid care and economic empowerment of marginalised groups of women is linked to **SDG 5**. Ensuring financial inclusion and economic participation of women are targets within **SDG 8, SDG 10** focuses on reducing inequalities in income as well as inequalities based on age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status within and across countries. This links to our focus on the issues of economic insecurity, gender and migration.
We have seen some good progress in the field of integrating men and boys in work on gender equality and, indeed, some positive shifts in terms of their attitudes to women’s empowerment, in the face of a number of broader trends (Hassink et al. 2015). Yet, we have also witnessed more worrying recent trends challenging such progress, as already discussed. For example, in the context of rising economic inequalities and polarising social and political tensions, along with efforts targeting the empowerment of women, we have witnessed the emergence of ‘male backlash’, ‘militarised masculinities’ and new expressions of misogyny, limiting progress on women’s economic empowerment, or safe and equal participation in work and in public and political life (Edström and Shahrokh 2015; Hamaus et al. 2015).

Furthermore, the noted shrinking of civil society space may be weakening grass-roots movements (Harcourt 2012), and a co-option of many women’s rights and social justice movements into less progressive agendas (Fraser 2009) may compromise work with men and boys to engage meaningfully with women’s agendas and other social justice agendas. At a global level, this calls for challenging the corporate capture of certain development and gender equality agendas and some recent ‘securitisation’ of development and gender itself, perhaps particularly within the women’s peace and security agenda.9

IDS has a long track record of convening critical debates and conducting research together with partners on masculinities since the turn of the millennium, including efforts at ‘Politicising Masculinities’ (in 2007), ‘Undressing Patriarchy’ (in 2013) or ‘Reframing Men and Boys in Policy for Gender Equality’ (in 2015). Long-term allies and partners include the Centre for Health and Social Justice (CHSJ) in India, the Refugee Law Project (RLP) in Uganda, the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) and Men for Gender Equality Now (MEGEN) in Kenya, Sonke Gender Justice in South Africa and Promundo in the USA. Based on a recent major collaborative review of evidence (Edström et al. 2015), eight case studies and an international workshop between researchers, activists and policymakers, key future directions identified between IDS and partners (Edström and Shahrokh 2016) include:

• exploring ‘intersectionality’ as a key element for working with men and women jointly on gender and other social justice issues, and for making linkages across social movements;
• treating gender as simultaneously relational and multidimensional;
• focusing more on power in gender and on the role of the powerful;
• linking the personal and the political and holding men accountable to women’s calls for gender justice;
• moving beyond project-based modalities toward longer-term, adaptive approaches.

Questions for the future on men, boys and masculinities

Research to better inform work with different types of men on positive and equitable masculinities now needs to build better knowledge and evidence on effective processes and political strategy, beyond individual attitudes and behaviour (Jeukes, Flood and Lang 2015; Edström and Shahrokh 2016). It needs to do so within contextualised understanding of such work and within institutional settings (homes, workplaces, public

“We have witnessed the emergence of male backlash, militarised masculinities and new expressions of misogyny.”
bodies, etc.), processes and programmes. Methods and tools also need to be further developed and combined for capacity building across groups, movements and programmes to support such work and to strengthen men’s accountability for gender justice.

Focusing on three thematic areas – of responding to gender-based violence, equalising and valuing domestic care work, and increasing women’s participation in politics and public life – we propose the key central question:

Alongside women’s (and other social justice) movements, how do we work better with men and boys to build positive strategies to transform negative masculinities and patriarchal processes?

Specific questions for this research agenda are as follows.

• How can positive ways of working with men and boys towards gender equality be improved by using ‘intersectionality’ in building their critical consciousness of gender inequality and social justice (as linked to class, sexuality or other identities)?
• How can such men be supported to play positive roles in the reform of patriarchal institutions and processes?
• How can networks and organisations engaged in work on men and masculinities be supported to relate more positively to the work and ambitions of women’s movements (and other social justice struggles) for peace and equality?

Research into these questions will be co-constructed with partners and will draw on a mix of research methods. Aside from starting with reviews of existing research and mapping of evidence on good practice, answering these questions will require: basic grounded community research with partners on gender dynamics and realities within institutions and movements; action research with partners on ‘how to do it better’ within processes aimed at fostering social change, including methodological research on tools and guidance; and facilitated mutual learning processes with programmers, researchers and policymakers.

The modes of working need to be inclusive and balance different approaches, such as: specific cross-regional collaborations for anthropologically ‘thick descriptions’ and case studies, to elaborate and compare contextualised realities; co-convening of spaces for critical reflection to advance debates with policymakers; accompaniment with research attached to activists’ work, to describe and better guide processes for change; and targeted capacity building for activist-driven documentation and sharing (video, digital stories, online learning and short courses, etc.).

Using a combination of detailed strategies to work in communities and on local governance and broader efforts aimed at influencing national, regional or global processes, we will aim to build a programme of research with partners across Africa, Asia, Europe and the Middle East. While direct and intensive collaborations will most likely remain limited to two or three sub-regions, we will also aim to engage with broader networks for exploring men’s groups’ accountability to women’s movements, for convening formative debates, as well as for communicating research and leveraging new knowledge generated through the collaborations. Furthermore, this research will aim to draw lessons from and also contribute to the research of other IDS clusters, on Participation, Governance, and Power and Popular Politics.

“Work with men needs better evidence on processes and political strategy, beyond individual behaviour.”

Key areas of development work where patriarchal resistance to gender equality persists include: gendered violence; women’s work and a more equal sharing of care work; and women’s greater participation in politics and public life. These areas are highlighted in three targets within SDG 5 on gender equality, albeit with little reference to men or masculinities. Furthermore, addressing men’s roles in gender equality is also linked to SDG 10, which focuses on reducing inequalities in income as well as those based on age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status.
Gender, sexuality and digital development

The growing prevalence of mobile technologies and expansion of digital spaces are transforming not only the ways in which people navigate their personal and sexual lives, but also how they experience the state and engage as citizens in activism. Digital spaces have opened transformative opportunities for connection, anonymity and the accessing of vital information and resources. Yet at the same time, concerns about democratic legitimacy and questions about whose voice is being heard in digital spaces are continuing to grow. Addressing the safety and security implications for those in contexts with cultural sensitivities around issues of sexuality and gender such as lesbians, gays and bisexuals, or unmarried young people, is becoming particularly urgent.

The IDS Gender and Sexuality research cluster has already conducted research with partners into how digital engagement has impacted on their lives. This work builds on innovative participatory methods to combine online and offline research, digital storytelling and data visualisations that focus on LGBT communities, women’s empowerment, sex workers and young people (Oosterhoff 2014). We have produced online platforms such as the Sexuality and Social Justice Toolkit to equip activists and policymakers with tools for practical advocacy and created the Gender Hub, which works to disseminate Nigerian gender research, provide e-learning courses drawn from local expertise and build communities of practice for a diversity of domestic audiences.

A new direction for questions and research

Building on this base, we will seek to work with partners and stakeholders to leverage the positive opportunities of digital development, alongside collaborations to reduce the risks posed to oppressed or marginalised communities on the basis of sexuality and gender. We will aim to help grass-roots organisations to use and navigate the technology more safely, sustain their activities, and protect themselves while influencing broader audiences and policymakers more effectively.

Two key questions lie at the heart of our research agenda, which relate to agency and constraints. Each is supported by certain sub-questions for exploration.

How are gender and sexual rights activists engaging with digital spaces to develop political strategies and express their identities?

Indicative sub-questions to help us explore this include:

- How does this online engagement impact on people’s real lives and freedoms, and are there any unintended consequences, including security risks?
- What are the tensions between transnational online mobilisation and local activism and when is international clicktivism productive?
- What are the wider implications for solidarity campaigns across international borders?
- How are state and commercial gatekeepers mitigating these voices?

“Addressing the safety and security implications for those in contexts with cultural sensitivities around issues of sexuality and gender such as lesbians, gays and bisexuals, or unmarried young people, is becoming particularly urgent.”
What are the causes and consequences of digital sexual and gender-based violence, and what can be done to reduce it?

Suggested sub-questions to help us explore this include:

- How can we reduce digital sexual and gender-based violence?
- Should our efforts be focused on mobilisation and awareness-raising among users, on policy, or on developing technological interventions, or combinations of these?
- How can we promote a positive and respectful approach to sexuality and sexual relationships, as well as the possibility of having pleasurable and safe sexual experiences in digital spaces, free of coercion, discrimination and violence?

Our experience to date has highlighted an interest in navigating a range of digital spaces to pose some of these questions to new audiences and making best use of the tools increasingly available, while remaining cognisant and critiquing some of the limitations of social media as a research tool. To support our new direction and address the questions raised, our further research needs to accomplish a number of things. First, there is a need for capacity building of grass-roots organisations working on sexuality and sexual rights by conducting participatory action research on the opportunities and barriers they face in, for example, crowdfunding and social media marketing of their work. Social media analytical research is also needed to examine the impact and ethics of transnational LGBT activism on social media platforms for local activist networks within politically conservative contexts. Furthermore, we need participatory action research methods and affective engagement with young people on the power dynamics underlying the production and distribution of online gender-based and sexual violence (including revenge porn), in order to develop interventions that reduce digital violence and improve digital literacy. Finally, there is a need for a critical yet positive engagement with porn producers, social media companies, messaging service providers and sex educators on the unintended effects of censorship on access to vital public information, including sex education, and the effects of privacy restrictions on vulnerable populations.

The field of digital research is developing fast and allows us to undertake research that is both grounded in evidence while retaining space for experiential approaches. The recent establishment of a new, vibrant Digital research cluster at IDS has created new avenues of interdisciplinary collaboration. Our aim is to combine traditional methods of research such as classic literature reviews and context analysis with social media and social network analysis. We will conduct qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods research with innovative digital components such as big data sets. We have a strong track record of collaboration in producing research together with sexual minority communities, such as the transgender community in Vietnam. Where appropriate, the resulting data will be visualised for use by a number of audiences, such as policymakers, donors, activists and academic audiences in ways that broker connections for political change. We also have a proven track record in building, understanding and reflecting networks in the real world, in ways that pay attention to the particular ethical considerations, need for confidentiality and digital security implications faced by these marginalised groups. Part of what we offer to this work is marrying knowledge of how these issues operate in conjunction with the newer digital spaces and brokering these connections to achieve practical, political change with our networks of partners, such as the Tactical Technology Collective, Love Matters, the UK Lesbian & Gay Immigration Group and the Center for Creative Initiatives in Health and Population.

Ensuring that political inclusion and participation in digital spaces remains inclusive contributes both to SDG 10: ‘Reduce inequality within and among countries’ and to SDG 16: ‘Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels’.
IDS has had a long trajectory of influence in the field of sexuality and development and on linking sexuality and poverty, starting with Cornwall and Jolly’s adaptation of Robert Chambers’ Web of Poverty framework, which interlinks multiple dimensions of poverty (Chambers 2005, cited in Cornwall and Jolly 2006: 4–5). The Sexuality, Poverty and Law programme built up a qualitative evidence base that has influenced global debates, and has been taken forward in quantitative studies by others, including the World Bank. IDS’ work on sexuality has also focused on marginalised groups such as LGBT and sex workers. They experience specific disadvantages based on sexuality with regard to ascribed and legal inferiority; lack of education, information and political influence; barriers to institutions and public access; spatial marginalisation; insecurities and other types of material poverty.

LGBT are a highly diverse group, something that is often overlooked in development literature. Sexual minority issues, to a large extent, found their way into development ‘via’ the global HIV response, where there was some recognition of diversity but primarily in relationship to HIV prevention. This literature was initially largely ignored by development studies and research and vice versa. When LGBT are recognised at all, their gender and other internal differences are still often skimmed over, along with their related conflicting political and economic differences. For example, gender norms and expectations can lead to dramatically different livelihood options for transgender men and women. Different discriminations faced by gender-dissident or non-conforming youth in homes, communities and school can lead to dropout and serious disadvantages in terms of their future livelihood prospects. The frequent tendency to associate transgender issues with sex work may be relevant only for trans women, but not so for trans men, and is not helpful in understanding how gender and economic (dis)empowerment work.

In many countries, most people are employed in small or micro-businesses – LGBT included – where families often play a key role. This has important consequences for policy to promote economic inclusion of LGBT, as it means that a focus on families as economic units and with small or micro-businesses needs to challenge heteronormative assumptions of what families are, or how they work. Social capital is key in understanding the different opportunities of start-up entrepreneurs and self-employed contractors looking for ‘gigs’ (i.e. part-time jobs without traditional benefits such as health care, or paid leave), which tend to put women at a disadvantage due to gender roles and norms. Research in Vietnam suggests that these gender disadvantages particularly affect transgender women’s aspirations and livelihood options.

The economic trajectories of sex workers are helpful in understanding the broader economic dynamics of increasing self-employment and the ‘gig’ economy. Research in India showed that many sex workers previously worked in the informal economy with very poor conditions and pay before deciding that sex work was a more viable option (Sahni and Shankar 2013). As they often belong to lower castes, they have also typically faced multiple forms of caste-based discrimination and exploitation in the labour market. Sex workers in Cambodia and Ethiopia made similar

“LGBT are a highly diverse group, which is often overlooked in development literature.”
Hard gained sexual rights of LGBT, young unmarried people and sex workers often disappear during man-made, natural or health crises.

rational economic choices, but all too often their economic and practical concerns (including housing or education for their children) have been ignored in development policies. Instead, they have been given HIV prevention packages or have been ‘rehabilitated’ – often against their own will and better judgement – from well-paying ‘gigs’ back to poor-paying informal employment.

A small but growing body of research shows that hard-gained sexual rights of LGBT, young unmarried people and sex workers often disappear during man-made, natural or health crises. For example, government and relief agencies failed to address the needs and vulnerabilities of sexual minorities following the tsunami in Tamil Nadu (Pincha and Krishna 2008) and the earthquake in Haiti (IGLHR and SEROvie 2011). Sexual minorities were inadvertently excluded from disaster relief in both cases, and their health and physical safety was compromised because of their sexual orientation or identity. In another example, ignoring the sexual and reproductive health realities of unmarried young people led to increased unwanted pregnancies in Sierra Leone (Elston et al. 2015). When schools opened after the Ebola emergency, pregnant girls were denied school access, which will have long-lasting effects on their economic potential.

New questions on poverty and sexuality

Given the basis of this emerging work on sexuality, LGBT, sex work and poverty, as well as the shortcomings in how it has tended to be treated in development (when acknowledged at all) and the shifting dynamics of social change in a development context, three sets of questions emerge as high priorities for further research. The first relates to mapping the linkages and dynamics between sexuality and poverty. The second interrogates connections between political projects of research and advocacy. The third challenges us to adapt research and lessons in this area to humanitarian emergency settings:

What are the causes and consequences of economic exclusions based on transgender identity, sex work, sexual orientation and/or sexuality of other women and men? And, of different intersecting combinations of marginalised identities?

Can transgender men and women’s economic and political interests be linked to feminist, masculinities and other queer research and political agendas on economic and social inclusion? And, what are some promising directions and tensions for exploration or resolution?

How can sexual and economic rights of LGBT, young unmarried people and sex workers be maintained and promoted in humanitarian responses to conflict, man-made and natural disasters, or health emergencies?

These questions can be usefully explored using mixed methodologies in both online digital and offline spaces usually combined with visual, interactive and participatory methodologies and approaches. As a consequence of the impact of poverty among so many indicators of human development, this area of work cuts across a number of research clusters at IDS, such as Health and Nutrition, Conflict and Violence, Participation, and Power and Popular Politics. New research needs to focus on LGBT and economic inclusion in small businesses and in
the informal economy, and bring ‘gender’ back into transgender research, as a recent literature review has shown that much of the literature on transgender people is limited to their risks of contracting HIV during sex work (Oosterhoff et al. 2014). While HIV prevalence rates among trans women sex workers are alarming, this focus has ignored the role of gender in their impoverishment and marginalisation, and paid virtually no attention to transgender men. Trans women have many similar concerns as other women beyond HIV risks, which would argue for collaborations of trans women with feminist movements, in addition to LGBT organising around HIV and human rights. Research is needed to clarify the nature and content of distinctions as well as the connections between LGB and T to develop more inclusive practical and strategic development strategies. In a similar vein, feminist movements have had long-standing difficulties with sex work and sex work organisations. Research that recognises sex work as one of the many responses and options of women living in increasingly informal and unregulated economies could help to build bridges between sex work activists and feminists and develop strategies for inclusive economies. In a volatile world where the distinctions between development, emergencies and protracted emergencies are increasingly blurred, research is also urgently needed to understand how the sexual and economic rights of LGBT, sex workers and young people are affected by these transitions and what can be done to maintain or promote them.

These questions and issues on poverty, inclusion and sexuality call for comparative research that allows us to make comparisons within regions or between countries that have similar economic histories. We have particular regional expertise in South Asia and Southeast Asia (e.g. in India, Nepal, Vietnam, Cambodia and the Philippines), in West Africa (in Sierra Leone, Ghana, Senegal, Togo, Ivory Coast and Nigeria), in East Africa (e.g. in Kenya and Uganda) and, increasingly, in the Middle East (e.g. in Lebanon and Palestine). Organisations such as GALANG, the Center for Creative Initiatives in Health and Population, Nirantar, Sonke Gender Justice and Pink Space have been critical in shaping and framing the exclusions faced by sexual and gender minorities. Not only do we need new evidence, we also need partnerships on the ground to take action and demonstrate that marginalisation, exclusion and traditional heteronormative views and approaches can change.

Ensuring that attention is placed on reducing the compounded inequalities faced by sexual and gender minorities contributes to SDG 10, ‘Reduce inequality within and among countries’ and, more directly, to SDG 1: ‘End poverty in all its forms everywhere’.
Adding value to the directions

New frontier areas for exploration in gender and sexuality

In addition to updating, reframing and redirecting existing streams of work, it is also important to create space for new topics that have not been substantively addressed in our collaborations on gender and sexuality in development. Important areas identified include unsafe migration, climate change, and faith, gender and sexuality. Some of these do come into our work in different ways, but there is not yet a critical mass in the cluster to establish these as streams of work, although we hope to collaborate with others to reach that point in the coming five years.

In terms of faith, gender and sexuality, analysis of research on gender, sexuality, conflict and social movements has found that faith leaders and communities play an important but often under-examined role in shaping social norms and advancing equality. We will aim to explore opportunities for developing new research on faith, gender and sexuality in: (1) politics and policy; (2) conflict and civil society; and (3) informal institutions and social norms. In the area of ‘unsafe migration’, we are learning that unsafe migration and the refugee crisis reinforce existing global gendered structural inequities, as well as creating new inequities and some opportunities for change. Here we plan to explore opportunities for developing new research on (1) bonded labour and trafficking; and (2) sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) among refugee and displaced populations.

Cross-pollination and cross-stream linkages

Drawing an important lesson from past programmes, such as our three-year programme on Gender, Power and Sexuality with Sida (Sweden), the Pathways of Women’s Empowerment programme and our five-year Accountable Grant with DFID (UK), we have learned that future development and creative progress relies not only on doggedly pursuing distinct work streams through their own steps and logic (crucial though that is), but also requires learning and reflection across streams of work to draw broader lessons and renew approaches for greater overall impact and development. For the next period, and building on the collaborative process already started, we thus aim to create specific opportunities and moments for learning and reflection – both across the streams and reaching out to partners and policymakers. Some of these can be anchored in how the fundamental principles may be reflected differently across the work, while others will focus on the ‘hows’ of our approach to research, partnership and co-construction.

Over a period of five years, we will aim to create a regular series of major spaces and opportunities for cross-issue learning, anchored in fundamental principles of Agenda 2030 and linked conceptual tools and ideas at the forefront of research in sexuality, gender and development.

For example, at the level of contextual gender analysis, we aim to create and convene spaces for exploring what we can understand by ‘indivisibility’ – or ‘multidimensionality’ – in sexuality, gender and development. That includes comparing and exploring how the different areas of work link social, economic and political justice in our work – both how our analyses account for the multidimensionality of inequity and how multidisciplinarity can be enhanced for stronger analyses, explanations and evidence. Such multidimensionality is not limited to the three dimensions of society, economy and politics, but should include the dimension of identity and embodiment in relation to gender and sexuality (as is becoming clear through work on supporting mental and psychosocial healing and wellbeing of female and male survivors of SGBV in conflict-affected and humanitarian settings).
For bridging analysis, policy and action, we plan to create joint explorations with partners across the work on the principle of ‘universality’, by exploring ‘power’ in terms of gendered power dynamics permeating and crossing borders, spaces and levels as well as linking formal and informal aspects of institutions. We need to explore different approaches to institutional analysis, for unpacking the (formal and informal) ‘rules of the game’ and how gendered power operates, or agency is expressed, within institutions and structures and at various levels from the local to the global. This also involves exploring reflexivity and ‘researching up’ to understand gender dynamics at higher levels of power and politics.

In terms of identities, marginalisation and the principle of ‘inclusivity’ for leaving no one behind, we intend to further explore ‘intersectionality’ across different streams of work, in order to support broader learning and analyses of agency and activism in relation to structural injustice, process and accountability. Comparisons on approaches to intersectionality will not be limited to how gender links to class, sexuality or ethnicity (for example), but will also explore the diversity that exists within any group (recognising that intersectionality can divide constituencies as well as allowing for solidarities and alliances across groups).

**Comparing intersectionality across themes can support broader learning on ‘inclusivity’ and activism in relation to structural injustice.**

**Uses and modalities of cross-stream linkages and comparisons**

In order to link a universal approach to gendered power with intersectional analyses for inclusivity, we are interested in comparing research on intra-movement power dynamics in sexual rights organising with how masculinities research explores certain men’s groups’ conflicted engagements with women’s movements. We also want to juxtapose this with research on how class and caste divide some feminist constituencies, while allowing others to ally with other groups for shared social justice objectives.

Such broader lessons are important to supporting work aimed at forging and sustaining linkages across movements, and making spaces for engagement and accountability. We will aim to explore how learning on intersectionality can support better ways of forging linkages across movements in social justice activism. In sharing and comparing work on gender and institutional change, we can help to inform strategies and processes that can lead to gender-equitable institutional change, both by deepening our understanding of gender dynamics of institutional change and by identifying what leads to gender-equitable institutional change in different contexts. Finally, such cross-stream lessons will also inform the needs for updating research directions in itself.

We will deploy several different modalities for linking and connecting research and debates across streams of work, and for maximising the learning from this. Depending on resources and opportunities, we foresee (for example):

- organising focused international symposia;
- co-convening conference sessions and panels with partners across the streams;
- facilitating e-discussions and webinars;
- commissioning papers and publishing edited volumes;
- designing and delivering training;
- facilitated study exchanges.

Important to the cross-stream component of our directions is to co-construct a process – across streams and partnerships – with structure and direction, as well as one with iterative review and in-built flexibility and adaptability of the approach itself.
Engaged excellence: our approach to knowledge mobilisation and influence

We believe that:

... research results are outputs that only become outcomes and impacts in practice, by means of transmission of knowledge. The extent to which knowledge is ultimately channelled into action depends not only on how the knowledge transfer is organised, but also on how the research results are received and taken up in specific contexts. (11 Principles 2016)

IDS has developed a distinctive approach to constructing and sharing knowledge for development, engaged excellence (IDS 2015), which is embedded across all our research, teaching and learning, and communications and impact work. Engaged excellence means that the high quality of our work (excellence) is dependent upon it linking to and involving those who can help bring about progressive change. The approach is articulated in a recent IDS Bulletin issue (Leach, Gaventa and Oswald 2017).

In our knowledge mobilisation and partnership activities we move away from conventional approaches to research communication (i.e. the pure act of communicating research results in the form of outputs) to ensure that the way we do research and share its findings makes a transformational impact, empowering ourselves and all stakeholders throughout the process.

In a turbulent world where progressive and regressive forces are shaping the challenges and contestations of gender and sexuality, our approach to knowledge mobilisation not only enables research processes to respond to unforeseen change but is designed with agility in mind. This opens up opportunities, ensures our work is relevant and timely, and mitigates against threats.

We embrace the opportunities new digital tools and settings offer, work in and across multiple language contexts, adopt innovative methodologies, and mutually build capacity with our partners in ways that reflect differentials in power. This makes it easier to reach our intended audiences and makes it more engaging for others. By involving organisations, policymakers, donors and academics as well as less commonly represented stakeholders (such as human rights defenders, social entrepreneurs or media professionals) from the start, they are able to help inform and shape our work and ultimately affect social change. These include policymakers at national levels (e.g. in political forums, commissions, or institutional mechanisms for gender justice) and at the international level (e.g. UN Women, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, ‘like-minded’ governments in the OECD, women’s rights organisations, other social movements, and private sector actors).

“Our approach to knowledge mobilisation is designed with agility in mind.”
Our approach means we can better reflect our values and principles around the way we work: a process whereby knowledge is generated, processed, articulated and shared by multiple stakeholders as part of a broader and interconnected research programme.

Our approach thus incorporates the following elements:

1. **We situate**: the effectiveness of our work is dependent on it speaking to the context in which our stakeholders are located, and involving those who are at the heart of the change we wish to see.

2. **We co-construct**: knowledge is produced together: it is built, shaped and carried through jointly with partners and driven by the perspectives, capacities and needs of stakeholders at the different stages of the research process.

3. **We share**: the findings are packaged using multiple formats and media, produced using different methodologies, and distributed via multiple communication channels and to destinations where our audiences are present.

4. **We learn**: the learning from the process of undertaking the research and knowledge mobilisation is as important as the findings generated. We seek to consistently test assumptions and power relations, evaluate outcomes and impact at different levels and at all stages – before, during and after research activities are completed.

Figure 1 (on page 29) details this distinctive approach and its improved outcomes, as rippling out from a diverse set of activities through examples of platforms and means of sharing the knowledge generated.

A range of examples are linked in to the diagram and include:

- **EMERGE**: Engendering Men: Evidence on Routes to Gender Equality
  - [http://menandboys.ids.ac.uk](http://menandboys.ids.ac.uk)

- **GrOW**: Growth and Equal Opportunities for Women
  - [http://interactions.eldis.org/economic-empowerment](http://interactions.eldis.org/economic-empowerment)

- **Sexuality and Social Justice Toolkit**
  - [www.spl.ids.ac.uk/toolkit](http://www.spl.ids.ac.uk/toolkit)

- **Love Matters music awards**
  - [http://spl.ids.ac.uk/blog/winners-love-matters-music-awards-announced-kenya](http://spl.ids.ac.uk/blog/winners-love-matters-music-awards-announced-kenya)

- **Transgender peoples and livelihood options in Vietnam**

- **Gender Hub e-learning**
  - [http://masculinities.genderhub.org](http://masculinities.genderhub.org)

- **Interactions health e-discussion**

- **Unpaid Care Work animation**

- **Interactions Live**
  - [http://interactions.eldis.org/global-events](http://interactions.eldis.org/global-events)

- **GBV in Sierra Leone**

By involving a range of stakeholders from the start, they help to shape our work and ultimately affect social change.
Figure 1 Activities, examples and outcomes of IDS Gender and Sexuality knowledge mobilisation work

**Activities**
- **Co-construct**
  - More widely
  - Learning
- **Learn**
  - Media
  - Research
- **Engage**
  - Media
  - Learning
- **Landscape**
  - Pathways
  - Women
- **Embrace**
  - Women
  - Leadership
- **Explore**
  - Women
  - Leadership
- **Engage**
  - Women
  - Leadership

**Examples**
- Gender Hub e-learning course on ‘Engaging Men’
- Gender & Sexuality Toolkit co-construction using Wiki
- Global advocacy and influence
- Legacy relationships strengthened
- Social change
- Increased capacity for partners and wider sector
- Re-usable content for generating new knowledge
- Interactions Live
- Interactions e-discussion on improving health outcomes re: gender in urban areas
- Gender & Sexuality Toolkit co-construction using Wiki
- Partnership methodology
- Pathways of Women’s Empowerment
- Gender Hub e-learning course on ‘Engaging Men’
- Partner-designed comic strips
- Interactions Live

**Outcomes**
- Chances of buy-in to research findings increase
- Awareness raising
- Building shared vision
- Recruit advisory groups
- Engage at events & retreats
- Learning labs
- Engagement at events & retreats
- Data publishing
- Contextualise knowledge
- Reflections on feminist methodology
- Mentoring
- Feedback and review points
- ‘Live’ reporting across social media channels
- Publishing in multiple formats and styles
- Video interviews with participants
- Photo exhibitions, music competitions
- Joint editing
- Issues brought to bear on perspectives can be a multiplicity of
- Legacy relationships
- Interactions with unusual suspects
- Interactions with unusual suspects
- Broader, more inclusive engagement
- Brussels, Brussels
- Mobile and participatory methods
- Mixed and participatory methods
- Partnership methodology
- Pathways of Women’s Empowerment
- Gender Hub e-learning course on ‘Engaging Men’
- Partner-designed comic strips
- Interactions Live

**Engaged Excellence: Our Approach to Knowledge Mobilisation and Influence**

REFRAMING GENDER JUSTICE IN INEQUAL, VOLATILE WORLD
Next steps

Having set out these initial directions for the future, IDS’ Gender and Sexuality cluster is embarking on a series of steps to communicate these directions and the connections between them, as well as updating and strengthening our partnerships and internal capacity, while exploring strategies for resourcing the work.

Communicating the directions and interactions

Complementing this report and its accompanying four-page briefing, we have rebuilt the website ‘Interactions for Gender Justice’ (http://interactions.ids.ac.uk/) in a way that highlights the linkages between the different streams of work (plus some linkages to other work), which has contributed to our thinking on these new directions and vice versa.

We will also be communicating this agenda and priority linkages identified through a range of policy forums and communications strategies. For example, we will aim to convene opportunities for policymakers to engage with researchers and activists to share perspectives on these issues and questions to influence specific policy development directions for policy and research. In addition to engaging with UK-based stakeholders, for example at UK Gender and Development Network (GADN) meetings, we aim to present and share the outlines of these new directions for IDS at meetings of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), also distributing the summary four-page briefing. Complementing in-person presentations, dialogues and exchanges, there will be a range of communications activities such as:

- conducting horizon-scanning and environment mapping to refresh our knowledge of the key existing stakeholders;
- harnessing IDS central communications social media channels for promotion and engagement globally;
- monitoring online fora (e.g. The Guardian global development professionals network) and stimulating discussion with messages drawing on questions and priorities raised here.

As part of the ‘Interactions’ relaunch, we will also showcase these directions, and produce blog posts for each area, highlighting the linkages between the areas of work and between related SDGs, and why they are crucial areas of exploration and resourcing.

“Highlighting the linkages between different streams of work has contributed to our thinking on these new directions.”

Thematic connections showing how our work cuts across different thematic areas.

- Economic empowerment
- Gender, conflict & violence
- Unpaid care work
- Masculinities & patriarchy
- Public, political & digital participation
- Sexuality & poverty
- Health & SRHR
REFRAMING GENDER JUSTICE IN AN UNEQUAL, VOLATILE WORLD

NEXT STEPS

Updating partnerships and strengthening capacities

As an immediate priority, the Gender and Sexuality cluster at IDS will be reaching out to existing and new potential partners, based on the streams we have presented here for future bids, both to collaborate in proposal development and to enrich existing work. We aim to bring the identified questions and linkages into related work with partners, as well as with colleagues across IDS in a range of ways. These might include: attending meetings of other IDS clusters to present summaries of these new directions and invite discussion about potential collaboration; approaching colleagues at the University of Sussex to include this agenda within their seminars and other informal gatherings; and using intelligence gathered in these activities to identify and map out ‘linkages’ between these research agendas and other projects at IDS and the University of Sussex.

In 2017, IDS is starting the recruitment of an additional and experienced Research Fellow in Gender and Sexuality, who will have significant expertise within at least two of the thematic areas we cover. We are also undertaking analysis of our current partnership landscape, identifying gaps and actively recruiting prospective replacements. In this effort, we aim to consolidate a range of advisory groups from past and existing programmes and projects into a more cross-cutting group that will mirror our identified priority cross-theme linkages, and complement internal capacity.

Resourcing the research

In the later stages of this process, and going forward in early 2017, we have started a range of consultation meetings with different development cooperation agencies and other funders to present our new directions, and to gauge their own priorities and interest. We have so far met with staff from DFID, Sida, Norad, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Finland, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and others, while visits are continuing in Europe and will also take place in the US in connection with the CSW 2017. Through these meetings, and engagement with policymakers at various fora described above, we will also explore new modalities for resourcing this work through partnerships and collaboration. Likely strategies include attending meetings of the DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET) in Paris to share agendas with representatives from bilateral agencies, approaching consultancies with shared interests (e.g. Social Development Direct (SDD), Itad and Oxford Policy Management (OPM)), or approaching consortia managers, to highlight IDS knowledge and research services that could meet their needs in the areas identified, as well as utilising IDS Alumni databases and drawing on former staff to identify individuals for guidance on how to get these directions profiled in the most relevant places.

Finally, we will be using our understanding of the gender and sexuality landscape and challenges presented here as a background when designing new projects. For new funding bids on specific projects, we will endeavour to include some efforts to draw in one or more of these directions in the design.

So, after 50 years at the forefront of international development and some 40 years of contributing to key debates and the generation of knowledge on gender and sexuality, IDS invites like-minded partners, allies and supporters in all forms to join us in refreshing our approaches for addressing the complex challenges of this historical moment, and for creating new opportunities for co-constructing transformative knowledge on gender and sexuality in an increasingly unequal and volatile world.

Join and support us in addressing the complex challenges to gender justice in our increasingly unequal, volatile world.
Notes

1 These events have included an international IDS consultation workshop, and a MenEngage donor consultation workshop at Sida (the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), in June 2016; a Satellite panel at the 50th Anniversary Conference of IDS (on States, Markets and Society) in July 2016; and the International Conference of the Association for Women in Development (AWID) in September 2016.

2 Bangladesh, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Laos, Liberia, Mozambique, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, the occupied Palestinian Territories, the Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, the United Kingdom, Vietnam and Zambia.

3 Girls Not Brides
www.facebook.com/GirlsNotBrides

4 Sexual orientation refers to ‘each person’s capacity for profound emotional, affection for and sexual attraction to, and intimate sexual relations with, individuals of a different gender or the same gender or more than one gender’ (Yogyakarta Principles, Preamble).

5 Gender identity and expression refers to ‘each person’s deeply felt internal and individual experience of gender, which may or may not correspond with sex assigned at birth, including the personal sense of the body (which may involve, if freely chosen, modification of bodily appearance or function by medical, surgical or other means) and other expressions of gender, including dress, speech and mannerisms’ (Yogyakarta Principles, Preamble).

6 These include; poverty, health, education, gender equality and women’s empowerment, economic growth and opportunity, safe and sustainable cities, as well as justice and accountability.
We regard universality not as necessarily meaning ‘universal’ solutions and blueprint policies; nor a focus just on so-called ‘developing countries or the global South’. Rather, we see development as universal, progressive change for all – without losing sight of people’s diverse local priorities and realities – which recognises that challenges of poverty and vulnerability; reducing inequalities; and building more sustainable, inclusive and secure futures for people and societies are matters for everyone, everywhere.

While social change has variously been conceptualised either in terms of multiple changes at the individual level resulting in aggregate societal changes or – conversely – in terms of structural social and economic ‘drivers’ impacting and changing individuals, more recent understanding of ‘complex adaptive systems’ sees more interactive dynamics, which allow for multiple systemic structures simultaneously and mutually shaping people, as well as vice versa (e.g. Walby, Armstrong and Strid 2012). Put more simply perhaps, we see social transformations neither (instrumentally) as the sum total of individuals changing, nor (deterministically) as the inevitable outcomes of broader structural forces on people, but as complex interactions between people and social forces/changes, between groups, systems and projects.

The Global Study on the Implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (UN Women 2015) emphasises how little progress has been made on this agenda, but also notes with concern that this agenda is increasingly focused on ‘security’ at the expense of ‘peace’, with an emphasis on women as victims of violence rather than as agents of peace. It insists that attempts to ‘securitise’ issues and to use women as instruments in military strategy must be consistently discouraged. Tracking the ways in which this securitisation is operating and being contested is clearly a priority.

In Asia, we would look to India and potentially Pakistan (or other countries), engaging with long-term partners such as CHSJ and hopefully new partnerships with groups such as Rozan, in Pakistan, or others. In Africa, we are keen to build on past collaborations with RLP in Uganda, Sonke Gender Justice in South Africa, APHRC and MEGEN in Kenya, as well as new partnerships in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) or Zimbabwe. We are looking to establish new collaborations with potential new partners in the Middle East (e.g. in Egypt, Lebanon or Palestine) and/or in Latin America.

Likely networks and peers to engage at this level include particularly the Global MenEngage Alliance (MenEngage) and Just Associates (JASS), including linking with their regional hubs across men and women’s movements. We will also aim to develop new linkages and engagements with organisations and networks in the Women’s Peace Movement.
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