Translating gender audit findings into practice

Alice Ridge, Policy and Advocacy Adviser, ACFID
Juliet Hunt, Independent Consultant on gender and development, project design, monitoring and evaluation, research and gender training

October 2018

Introduction

The need for development organisations to pursue gender equality through their work is now recognised as a core principle of development. Gender equality is enshrined in the Sustainable Development Goals which take a "one goal all goals" approach, including a standalone goal on gender equality and the mainstreaming of gender issues across all other goals. Closer to home, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) Code of Conduct requires members of ACFID to "promote gender equality and equity" through organisational commitments, participation in planning and decision-making processes, and monitoring and evaluation.[1]

Gender audits are used by some development organisations as a way of assessing their strengths and weaknesses on gender equality across their work, organisational policies, and culture. However, little recent research exists in the Australian context about the effectiveness of gender audits in changing organisational and development practice on gender equality, or the factors which increase the likelihood that audit findings will be owned and applied.

This practice-based research paper draws on key informant interviews with staff across six Australian development agencies who have conducted gender audits in the past 5 years, to explore the common strengths, barriers and opportunities that arise both in undertaking a gender audit and carrying forward its recommendations. We look at the scope and methods used by organisations in their gender audits – from before the initial decision to conduct a gender audit right through to the implementation of its findings. Through exploration of the risks that can arise throughout the process, we identify factors that contribute to successfully translating gender audit findings into improvements in organisational practice, which we hope will assist agencies considering conducting a gender audit in the future.

Historical context

Gender audits have been a feature of the Australian development sector since the early 2000s, with at least six ACFID member agencies conducting gender audits between 2000 and 2012.[2] However at least two studies of the way in which ACFID member organisations address gender equality in their work were conducted prior to this.

In 1985 and again a decade later in 1995, ACFID (then ACFOA – the Australian Council for Overseas Aid) surveyed its member organisations on the extent to which they were including women and/or gender issues in their programming work,[3] as well as the gender balance across their staff, leadership roles and employment policies and practices. The 1995 report, while noting some strong findings on programming work, found that there was room for improvement and laments the lack of progress overall on women's issue and gender equality over the preceding decade, noting "that agencies are more likely to deal with women's issues overseas than in their own work environment."[4] The paper

---

[1] ACFID, (no date), *Code of Conduct – Practitioners' Handbook CODE OF CONDUCT – PRACTITIONERS' HANDBOOK*, Available online:
https://acfid.asn.au/sites/site.acfid/files/11974_ACFID_Code%20of%20Conduct%20Relaunch_LOWRESSINGLES_R5%20%281%29.pdf

[2] Kilby, Patrick and Joanne Crawford, 2012, *Closing the Gender Gap: Gender and Australian NGOs*, ACFID Research in Development Series Report No 2, pg 15 Available online:
https://acfid.asn.au/sites/site.acfid/files/resource_document/Closing-the-gender-gap.pdf

[3] The 1995 report notes a recent transition in terminology from 'women in development (WID) to gender and development (GAD)'

[4] Mitchell, Suzette, 1995, *Gender and Development: Policy and Practice of ACFOA member agencies*, ACFOA Research and Information Series No 5, August 1995

makes recommendations for ACFOA to increase the provision of training on gender analysis methodologies, increase discussion on quotas for member organisations and committee structures, and facilitate sharing and learning between agencies on "affirmative action issues".[5]

Almost 20 years later, a 2011 study of 15 ACFID member agencies found that while progress had been made in raising the prominence and focus on gender equality in the sector, "attempts to mainstream gender by some agencies had been sporadic and … gender practice was variable across and within most of the agencies surveyed, with sharp differences across countries and regions in how gender was interpreted and implemented."[6] While the authors viewed gender audits as "valuable process[es] to assist in pinpointing issues on which to focus, and providing a basis against which to track progress," they identified "maintaining momentum and ensuring these gender review processes were sustained and priorities acted on and monitored" as a common challenge, as well as the risk that gender work is carried disproportionately by committed individuals who may leave or burn out.[7]

While not assessing the effectiveness of gender audits specifically, the report identified several barriers and enablers to integrating a focus on gender equality within development organisations. Amongst these were the need for political will and leadership from senior staff, the value of in-house gender expertise in the form of focal points or working groups (with the lack of time made available for this work a constraint), and the way in which external imperatives (through the example of DFAT and ACFID accreditation processes) enhanced accountability. These barriers and enablers are all reflected in our own findings, however an additional barrier that didn't come up in our research was that gender equality or a focus on women's issues could be seen as a Western-led intervention.[8]

Most recently, a 2015 workshop between DFAT and the ACFID Gender Equity Working Group explored the challenges and opportunities for integrating gender policies across organisations and programs. In addition to many of the barriers and enablers identified in previous work, this forum identified the importance of taking an intersectional approach to gender issues, and identified that in addition to the challenge of women's representation in leadership roles, gendered sub-sectors and skillsets exist within development (for example, in humanitarian response) which poses additional challenges for achieving gender equality within organisations.[9]

The principles of gender audits

A gender audit is a process for assessing how gender issues are addressed in an organisation. Whereas evaluations and reviews may assess selected aspects of how an organisation is addressing gender inequalities, a gender audit has several essential features. It should aim to assess accountability to gender equality commitments, using internal benchmarks such as organisational policy, mandate or values, as well as external international standards. It should have a comprehensive scope of enquiry

---

[5] Ibid

[6] Kilby and Crawford, 2012, pg 14

[7] Kilby and Crawford, 2012, pg 19

[8] Kilby and Crawford, 2012, pg 21-22

[9] ACFID, 2015, *Challenges and Opportunities for Integrating Gender Policies across Organisations and Programs, Outcomes Paper: ACFID Gender Equity Working Group-DFAT Workshop July 2015*, Available online: https://acfid.asn.au/sites/site.acfid/files/resource_document/Outcomes-statement-ACFID-DFAT-Gender-Workshop-June-2015.pdf

across the whole of an organisation's work, both internally and in program and other outward-facing areas. To qualify as a gender audit, it should be a demonstrably robust process.[10]

These features enable a gender audit to be used to establish a baseline on organisational performance, assess changes in performance over time, and provide useful information for learning, reflection and future planning. The development of a gender action plan is not the only possible outcome from a gender audit; nevertheless, a commitment to take action to follow up on findings to improve organisational performance needs to be an explicit objective from the beginning of the process.

If well-designed, the findings of gender audits provide credible information on an organisation's strengths, in addition to highlighting gaps and challenges that need to be addressed. Often, some of the challenges raised through the process may come as a shock to management and some staff; this underlines the importance of methodological rigour, by using a mix of data collection methods that are perceived to be robust by staff.

Gender audits may be less or more participatory in approach. Participatory gender self-assessments can usually be classified as gender audits, as long as they adhere to the key principles of accountability, comprehensiveness, methodological rigour, and action-orientation to improve performance. Participatory approaches are often chosen to achieve multiple objectives from a gender audit process, such as building ownership and understanding of gender equality policy and mandate among staff, and learning on ways to improve performance in each area of work.

Gender audits may use a range of different methods. They often include staff surveys, and participatory methods such as focus groups or workshops that assess staff perceptions of performance and their views on strengths, constraints and ways forward. Document reviews are a useful tool to test and validate staff perceptions, which are often diverse and contested.

Gender auditing draws on social auditing principles. In addition to the key features described above, these include: external verification of findings; regularly undertaking audits to achieve continuous improvements in organisational culture, values, objectives, policies and performance; and public disclosure of the findings.[11] While some Australian NGOs have conducted more than one audit, there is little reliable evidence to validate the contribution that gender audits make to continuous improvement, since very few agencies have publicly shared the findings from their audit processes.

Methodology

This research was conducted through key informant interviews with relevant staff from Australian development NGOs who had conducted gender audits in the past 5 years. The interviews were conducted over several months from late 2017 to early 2018, with emerging findings based on interviews with three agencies presented at the Australasian Aid Conference in February 2018.[12] Following this presentation, three additional agencies were identified and added to the sample,

---

[10] Hunt, Juliet, 2013, *Participatory Organisational Gender Auditing and Assessment: Training Workshop*, Finucane Consulting, Melbourne. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304741041_Participatory_Organisational_Gender_Auditing_and_Assessment_Training_Workshop_Presentation

[11] Hunt, Juliet, 2000, *Institutionalising gender equality commitments in development organisations and programs,* Report to the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia.

[12] Ridge, Alice and Juliet Hunt, 2018, *Translating Gender Audit Findings Into Practice*, Presentation to Australasian Aid Conference, Available online: http://devpolicy.org/2018-Australasian-Aid-Conference/Presentations/Ridge&Hunt.pdf

bringing the total to six agencies: ACFID, Australian Lutheran World Service (ALWS), CARE Australia, Plan International Australia, TEAR Australia, and WaterAid Australia.

In all cases, interviews were conducted with staff who were involved in conducting the gender audit and implementing its findings. The timeframes for audits varied, with the most recent audit not yet finalised at the time of interview (although all the key stages of the methodology were complete) and the others ranging up to 5 years since completion. Two of the six agencies had completed a gender audit of their organisation previously; for all others it was the first audit that staff were aware of.

Interviews were conducted via phone using question guide, which was trialled and modified to ensure it would elicit the required information for the research. While all questions were open-ended, a select number included mandatory prompts which were used consistently in all interviews. Interviews were shared between the two researchers, recorded for accuracy, and transcribed.

Limitations include the relatively small sample size, with only six organisations included; however the size of the agencies varied both in terms of organisational budget and staffing footprint. An additional consideration is the involvement of the researchers in three of the audits studied. Alice Ridge was both an interview subject based on her involvement with the ACFID gender audit and conductor of the research; a second interview was conducted with another ACFID staff member involved in the gender audit. Juliet Hunt was engaged as a consultant on three of the six gender audits, but was not interviewed about her role in these processes, and did not conduct interviews with these agencies.

Findings and discussion

The discussion of findings is divided into two sections: first, we lay out the why, how, who and what of gender audit processes; second, we explore some of the risks that emerge at the critical juncture where findings are translated into practice.

Gender audit processes

Why?

The six agencies interviewed for this research had all completed gender audits recently. This ranged from anywhere between 5 years since the audit was completed, to ones which had only been completed recently or, in one case, was still ongoing. While for most it was their first gender audit two had completed gender audits previously in their Australian offices; for one of these agencies, their first audit was too distant to provide a useful baseline, however the other was able to use their second audit to assess progress. For two other organisations, a gender audit had been done in another office of their international federation; this was a motivating factor influencing their decision to conduct an audit.

All organisations, regardless of whether they had done a gender audit before, wanted to understand their current performance on gender equality and where they could improve. Four of the organisations mentioned gender equality policies, strategies or commitments that were already in place, and wanted to test their performance against these. Several of the organisations mentioned staff learning as an objective.

However, stated objectives were not always the whole picture. In several cases, the staff driving the gender audit mentioned that their motivation came from their analysis of the organisation's performance, or frustrations they were experiencing as they promoted gender equality internally;

conducting a gender audit was viewed as a means to formalise or provide evidence for these analyses and experiences, and build political will to drive change. This may also indicate that having commitments or strategies in place is not sufficient to drive cultural change. Additionally, years of activism on the part of gender specialists now means that there is an expectation on development agencies to have commitments on gender equality and demonstrate their progress. In a context of competition for a share of diminishing resources and an increased emphasis on gender equality from DFAT, conducting a gender audit is one way agencies can demonstrate their credentials; this was used in several cases as a strategy to get leadership buy in.

WHY agencies chose to conduct an audit	- Assess work and organisational culture - Assess performance against existing strategy/commitments - Increase staff awareness, technical capacity, and ownership of gender equality outcomes - Three audits also addressed sexual orientation and gender identity
HOW audits were undertaken	- Mixed methodology (staff survey, participatory focus groups/workshops, desk review of key documents) - Covered all aspects of the organisations' work (international programs, policy and advocacy, communications, internal policies) and organisational culture
WHO was involved in the audit	- Mix of in-house staff and consultants - Taskforces of staff from different teams - All staff participation encouraged - Two extended to country offices
WHAT were the findings?	- Mandate: Organisational mandate and leadership were generally supportive - Technical: Work output and staff's skills on gender equality were uneven between teams/departments - Structural: Staff knowledge of human resources policies needed strengthening (and in some cases the policies themselves) - Attitudinal: Staff attitudes and beliefs about gender equality reflect cultural context

How?

All the audits were fairly comprehensive and covered both external and internal work of the organisation (such as international programs, policy and advocacy, communications, internal policies and culture). This is in line with the literature on best practice for gender audits addressed in earlier sections. However, the depth of focus tended to vary, with international programs usually considered the best studied area of work. Three of the organisations focused only on gender equality, two explicitly expanded the scope to include sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI), and one included SOGI as well as other forms of diversity in their mandate. However, this tended to be focused on the internal operations of the organisations, rather than the extent to which the organisation was including SOGI in their programming or other work.[13]

---

[13] While some development agencies now understand "gender equality" to go beyond equality between men and women to equality between people of all genders, we have not assumed this to be the case. Similarly, while sexuality is not the only intersectional quality that affects experiences of gender, because of its close relationship to gender and the increasing focus on sexuality within development, we chose to prompt for SOGI as a particular type of diversity. See for example: Fletcher, Gillian, 2015, "Gender, Sexuality and Inequality" *DLP Concept Brief No 5,* Available online:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280446910_Gender_Sexuality_and_Inequality

The InterAction *Gender Audit Handbook* methodology – which includes staff surveys and focus groups to inform the development of a gender action plan – was the most commonly referenced methodology, however all agencies who used it did so with adaptations and often in conjunction with other methodologies or tools. Desk audits were the most commonly added stage, involving an internal or external robust assessment of documents using gender analysis tools. Several agencies described their rationale for including a desk audit was to increase the objectivity of the process, or contrast people's opinions or experience of the organisation with what was actually on paper. Another common reason for agencies' chosen methodologies was to maximise staff participation, with the view that this would increase ownership over the findings and agreed actions.

> *"Our organisational culture is very strong and people are very close in our organisation, and it is a strong/positive culture on gender equality and family friendly practices – but … organisational culture and practices were not really mirrored in our policies. I was aware of that, and that was one reason for suggesting the desk audit, to highlight those weaknesses and put processes into place to address them."*

Who?

The extent of staff participation varied across the stages for different agencies; all agencies aimed for full participation in the survey stage (with several noting participation was expected, but not mandatory) and most achieved full or near-full completion rates, but participation in focus groups and action planning was more varied. Those who wanted full participation mentioned strategies like holding focus groups on existing all-staff meeting days to set the expectation that it was relevant for all roles within the agency. Two agencies who included overseas staff in their scope noted it was harder to secure participation with these groups, although one agency successfully completed a focus group in-country – this was credited to alignment of timing and priorities, as the consultants engaged on the audit were conducting other gender-related research in-country at the same time. Three organisations involved their Board directly through the survey and/or focus groups, and two more noted the Board endorsed the process and/or were kept informed of progress and findings. None involved other stakeholders; including volunteers was considered by several agencies but not selected as a viable option due to resource or other constraints.

Most audits were driven by staff from programs teams, and in some cases, gender teams within the programs department. Technical experience and a personal interest in gender equality were common, with most noting gender equality was either the whole or part of their position. All the organisations brought in external consultants to complement their own expertise, but chose different skills to supplement. Several noted focus groups and staff discussions about gender action planning as areas where they brought in support, to provide a neutral moderator for difficult discussions, or expert facilitation skills. Support on data analysis seemed more important for large agencies. Some noted that having external support also increased the (perceived) rigour of the exercise. One agency linked the consultant's role back to their learning objective, specifically to build the technical gender analysis capacity of staff leading the process.

> *"Intergenerational feminist mentoring was vital and a critical enabling factor."*

All the agencies set up an internal working group to support the process, and several linked this decision to increasing staff engagement and ownership of process and findings. While all agencies noted their working groups were mostly women, all had at least one male member, and several also included senior staff.

What?

The strengths and weaknesses identified in gender audits varied between organisations, however there were some commonalities. Technical capacity to implement gender focused work or apply a gender analysis lens to work varied between teams/departments. Awareness of core gender equality concepts across staff was similarly patchy, and in some cases, it was noted that staff's views of gender issues are a reflection of society more broadly. For example, there were sometimes differing views on agency performance by gender, with women more likely to be critical of agency performance on gender equality across some key areas, and men tending to be more positive; however this was not uniformly expressed and there was also diversity in the views of both men and women.

Several organisations identified their organisational culture as a strength, particularly in terms of "flexibility" and "family friendly" practices, however in these same organisations staff awareness of organisational policies was low, and the policies themselves did not reflect the strengths of their culture. Similarly, several organisations highlighted supportive leadership as a strength, but these same organisations noted that women were underrepresented in leadership and decision making spaces. These findings point to a common weakness, in that organisations are reliant on their current leadership to support gender equality and set a positive culture for the organisation in this regard, which is subject to change and in itself not equal.

While the specific activities varied across organisations, all but one of the organisations interviewed had developed (or was intending to develop shortly) a gender action plan, covering multiple areas of the organisation's work and operation.[14] Another common outcome was increased awareness amongst staff on gender issues, as well as formal gender training being implemented for staff. Several organisations revised their organisational and human resources policies, and a handful implemented new or revised tools for gender analysis in their work (particularly in programs departments). One agency which had conducted more than one audit noted the value of including an understanding of key gender concepts in recruitment and induction processes; this helped build awareness and ownership of the organisation's commitment to gender equality amongst a new cohort of staff.

While few negative outcomes were identified by interviewees from their gender audit processes, several noted that the process of conducting the gender audit led them to the realisation that despite their best efforts, there would be some people who would never get on board with gender equality issues. Additionally, while none had yet experienced this, several agencies noted the potential for staff's view of the audit to turn negative if there was not sufficient follow though or leadership from senior staff.

Translating to practice

The first risk identified was that competing priorities within the organisation, or a lack of political will, delay the decision to start an audit or implement its findings. Almost all the organisations experienced delays in their process at some point, but these were able to be overcome in various ways. For example, internal advocacy and persistence by dedicated staff, combined with external accountability from Boards, international offices or donors was effective, as was working with champions in senior positions within the organisation. On the other hand, some organisations deliberately delayed their process, for example by shifting the date of staff workshops in order to maximise participation. This

---

[14] The interviewee from the organisation who had not developed a gender action plan expressed regret that they hadn't been able to do this, and reflected that despite not having a formal plan, they had done many of the things they intended to. In this case, the lead on the gender audit went on to a more senior role within the organisation, so it may be the case that they were able to affect change from this position in the absence of a formal plan.

was considered critical to ensuring staff felt ownership over the process, and were brought along on the journey.

A second risk was insufficient resources allocated to the audit. Most people interviewed felt that they had sufficient financial resources to conduct their audit, but that human resources were under valued. To contextualise this finding, it's worth noting that expectations and actual amounts of financial resources were low – this may be because staff did not expect to be able to harness much budget, and so planned from the outset for a low cost initiative. In terms of human resources, staff got around this challenge in several ways; strategic use of consultants to take on part of the workload, or complement the skills of key staff, was mentioned by several agencies. However at the end of the day, it was the commitment and tenacity of key staff that ensured audits were kept moving, with several noting they had to go over and above to deliver their gender audit. This was mitigated where the gender audit was formally recognised in the workplan of key staff, or where supportive senior staff helped manage prioritise and carve out space to focus on the gender audit.

Risk	Enablers
Competing priorities or **lack of political will** delay the decision to start an audit or implement its findings	• Internal advocacy and persistence of staff • External accountability from Boards, international offices or donors • Champions in senior positions • Ensuring timeframes facilitate staff participation and ownership
Insufficient resources are allocated to the audit	• Strategic use of consultants • Formal recognition in workplans • Support from senior staff in prioritisation
Staff or management resistance to the process or findings	• Ensure staff and management have realistic expectations and are open to difficult discoveries • Staff representation on working group • Formal and informal communication methods • Rigorous methodology
Gender audit becomes the end of the process instead of the beginning	• Develop a gender action plan with monitoring and accountability mechanisms • Commit to conducting another gender audit in the future to track progress • Align gender action plan with organisational processes such as MEL and reporting cycles

A third risk was that staff or management would be resistant to the process of conducting a gender audit, or the findings that were uncovered by the process. In several cases, this was particularly true for human resource departments, who were commonly among the least receptive to findings relating to their area of work. Additionally, there was variation in the way that senior staff responded to gender audit findings, which seemed to be linked to the extent to which senior staff held an expectation that their agency was performing well on gender equality, or had low or no expectations about their performance. For example, two agencies who reported overall positive findings, with some areas for improvement, had very different reactions from senior staff. In one case where there was an expectation that the agency would perform well, the few (but not insignificant) negative perceptions unearthed by the audit were not readily accepted as justified; in the other, findings aligned more closely to leadership's expectations and as such were more readily accepted. This points to the

importance of ensuring leadership know what to expect from a gender audit process, and are truly willing to discover new and perhaps difficult things about their organisation.

Extensive communication to both leadership and staff more generally was commonly recognised as a strategy to mitigate pushback. As well as formal communication such as emails from the CEO, newsletters, and presentations to management and staff, informal communication in the form of casual conversations with staff and leadership was considered to be critical to disseminating information about the process, findings, and next steps. Staff representation in working groups was one way to achieve this, as these staff were able to act as envoys to different parts of the organisation.

Having a rigorous methodology was another factor in mitigating resistance, as it enabled staff to push back on the perception that the audit findings were merely subjective, and not representative of reality. In addition, having a participatory process assisted with building ownership amongst staff and leadership over the process and findings. Finally, the approach of those leading the audit process or facilitating discussions was critical: being able to recognise your own baggage, find ways to make the process relevant to each person, and meeting people where they are in their understanding of the issues.

> *[Talking about the factors that contributed to the success of the process] "Probably the way we've chosen to work with this issue in the organisation – not to make it a matter of confrontation, and to starting where people are at, rather than trying to start from a different principle or point; recognising that all of us absorb the mainstream culture and we bring it into the organisation, although we may not fully realise that. And we don't realise the extent to which we pick and choose what we see and believe out in the media."*

The final risk identified was that the gender audit would be the end of the process, instead of the beginning. As noted above, while this was not considered to have been the case for any of the participating organisations, several could foresee that the process could turn sour if people did not believe findings were being adequately addressed or leadership held accountable to the commitments they made. Developing a gender action plan with built in monitoring and accountability mechanisms or making a commitment to hold another gender audit after a fixed period of time were effective strategies to mitigate this risk and ensure ongoing attention to the issue. Aligning the implementation of the gender action plan with other organisational processes such as monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting cycles was also found to be effective, as were establishing multiple levels of accountability (such as a staff working group, regular reports to or by management and the board). Ongoing engagement with staff on organisational values, and on how social norms on gender relations play out in the organisation was critical to keeping the issues live and at the front of people's minds. One issue which was not addressed in the interviews was whether or not the agency published the results of their gender audit; this is a key principle of social audits as outlined in section 3, and a potential method to increase accountability.[15]

---

[15] Hunt, Juliet, 2000, *Institutionalising gender equality commitments in development organisations and programs,* Report to the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia.

Conclusion

This research has identified many barriers and enablers to translating gender audit findings into practice, which can be roughly summarised in three principles: organisational readiness, communication and accountability.

It's important to recognise that conducting a gender audit may not be the right step for a given organisation at a particular time, and that the process for gaining support for a gender audit may take several years. Establishing readiness includes ensuring an organisation has the necessary expertise – both in-house and, if required, by allocating resources for outside support – and political will in the form of support from the CEO and leadership team. Ensuring leadership are on board with the process of undertaking a gender audit and understand the reasons behind it is critical to securing their support at later stages of the process. On the other hand, if there is organisational readiness and commitment to follow up, a gender audit can help increase the pace of change.

Communication was identified as one of the most important strategies to build and maintain this support, as well as ensuring understanding and buy in across the organisation. Early conversations with leadership to make sure they fully understand what the process involves, the difficult issues it might raise, and the importance of staying the course, are critical to securing the necessary political will to carry the audit from start to finish, and ensure the findings are accepted as credible. This is imperative, because gender audits raise expectations that actions will be taken to address any gender issues identified, and if this does not occur, the risk to organisational credibility and potential negative impact on staff commitment are high.

Finally, having both internal (in the form of staff or Board buy in) and external (such as donors or international offices) accountability was critical to making sure that changes inspired by the gender audit were acted on. Linking changes to other organisational processes, like donor monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) and reporting, was also key to embedding change. Scheduling a follow-up audit can also increase accountability and monitoring, and demonstrate positive results.

Ultimately, changing policies and procedures alone is not enough to move the needle on gender equality. Social norms around gender are deeply embedded, and it's particularly important for gender specialists to remember that people's views are shaped by the culture that surrounds them. Meeting people where they are and taking them on a journey will be the only effective way to truly shift attitudes, behaviours, and practices. The power of gender audits is that they can shine a light on the way that cultural and social attitudes affect our views, and on our implementation of policy commitments across all areas of organisational work and practice, and provide a basis for organisations to work towards lasting change.

References

ACFID, (no date), *Code of Conduct – Practitioners' Handbook CODE OF CONDUCT – PRACTITIONERS' HANDBOOK*, Available online:
https://acfid.asn.au/sites/site.acfid/files/11974_ACFID_Code%20of%20Conduct%20Relaunch_LOWR ESSINGLES_R5%20%281%29.pdf

ACFID, 2015, *Challenges and Opportunities for Integrating Gender Policies across Organisations and Programs, Outcomes Paper: ACFID Gender Equity Working Group-DFAT Workshop July 2015*, Available online: https://acfid.asn.au/sites/site.acfid/files/resource_document/Outcomes-statement-ACFID-DFAT-Gender-Workshop-June-2015.pdf

Kilby, Patrick and Joanne Crawford, 2012, *Closing the Gender Gap: Gender and Australian NGOs*, ACFID Research in Development Series Report No 2, pg 15 Available online:
https://acfid.asn.au/sites/site.acfid/files/resource_document/Closing-the-gender-gap.pdf

Hunt, Juliet, 2000, *Institutionalising gender equality commitments in development organisations and programs,* Report to the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia.

Hunt, Juliet, 2013, *Participatory Organisational Gender Auditing and Assessment: Training Workshop*, Finucane Consulting, Melbourne. Available online:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304741041_Participatory_Organisational_Gender_Auditi ng_and_Assessment_Training_Workshop_Presentation

Mitchell, Suzette, 1995, *Gender and Development: Policy and Practice of ACFOA member agencies*, ACFOA Research and Information Series No 5, August 1995

Ridge, Alice and Juliet Hunt, 2018, *Translating Gender Audit Findings Into Practice*, Presentation to Australasian Aid Conference, Available online: http://devpolicy.org/2018-Australasian-Aid-Conference/Presentations/Ridge&Hunt.pdf

Fletcher, Gillian, 2015, "Gender, Sexuality and Inequality" *DLP Concept Brief No 5,* Available online:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280446910_Gender_Sexuality_and_Inequality