Unveiling Gender Bias in Budgeting: A Qualitative Inquiry into Policy and Practice

Prof. Aliyu IDRIS
Revenue Mobilisation Allocation and Fiscal Commission, Abuja, Nigeria
+2348036129108; dr.aliyuidris@gmail.com
DOI: 10.56201/ijssmr.vol.11no1.2025.pg.305.318

Abstract
*Gender budgeting is a crucial mechanism for promoting financial equity and ensuring that resource allocation addresses the diverse socio-economic needs of men and women. However, despite the increasing recognition of gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) as a policy tool, implicit budget formulation and implementation biases persist across both public and private sectors. This study employs a qualitative research approach to explore gender bias in budgeting, focusing on policy frameworks, institutional structures, and the lived experiences of financial decision-makers. Through in-depth interviews and thematic analysis, the study uncovers systemic barriers such as deeply ingrained institutional biases, limited political commitment, inadequate gender-disaggregated data, and weak enforcement mechanisms. Findings indicate that while some governments and organisations have adopted GRB policies, their effectiveness is often undermined by structural inefficiencies and resistance to gender mainstreaming. The study concludes by offering **practical recommendations** to strengthen gender-sensitive financial planning, including policy reforms, improved data collection, and capacity-building initiatives to foster inclusive budgetary processes. This research contributes to the growing discourse on gender equity in financial governance, providing insights for policymakers, scholars, and gender advocates.*

1.0 Introduction

Budgeting is a fundamental financial tool that guides resource allocation and shapes national, organisational, and institutional economic priorities. However, traditional budgeting approaches are often gender-neutral in design but gender-biased in impact, as they fail to account for the distinct social and economic needs of different genders. This oversight contributes to structural inequalities, limiting access to economic opportunities, essential services, and social welfare programs, particularly for women and marginalised groups.

Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) has emerged as a strategic approach to addressing these disparities by integrating gender considerations into financial planning and decision-making. GRB ensures that budgetary policies promote equitable access to resources, fostering economic inclusivity and sustainable development. Many governments and institutions have committed to GRB through international frameworks, such as the Beijing Platform for Action (1995), the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and various national gender policies. However, despite these global efforts, the practical implementation of GRB remains inconsistent and often superficial, particularly in developing economies where cultural norms, institutional biases, and political structures continue to shape fiscal policies.

This study seeks to critically examine the presence of gender bias in budgeting processes, analysing policy frameworks and practical challenges that hinder effective gender-responsive budgeting. By employing a qualitative research approach, the study explores the lived experiences of financial decision-makers and budget practitioners to uncover systemic barriers, identify best practices, and provide policy recommendations to foster a more inclusive and equitable financial governance system.

1.1 Statement of the Problems

Despite the increasing global recognition of gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) as a critical tool for achieving economic equity, gender bias remains deeply embedded in financial planning and resource allocation. While many governments and institutions have formally adopted GRB policies, the translation from policy to practice remains weak, leading to persistent disparities in economic opportunities and public service delivery for different genders. Budget policies often fail to address the differentiated needs of men and women, particularly in sectors such as healthcare, education, social protection, and economic empowerment, where gender gaps are most pronounced.

Several factors contribute to GRB's ineffectiveness, including the absence of gender-disaggregated data, which limits evidence-based decision-making and the ability to track progress. Additionally, institutional resistance and bureaucratic inertia hinder the full integration of gender considerations into budget processes. Many policymakers and budget officers lack the technical expertise and political will to implement GRB effectively, resulting in superficial compliance rather than meaningful change. Moreover, weak monitoring and evaluation mechanisms prevent accountability and transparency in assessing how budgets impact different gender groups.

Existing literature on gender-responsive budgeting predominantly focuses on policy design and international best practices, with a limited qualitative exploration of financial decision-makers practical challenges and lived experiences. Furthermore, most empirical studies emphasise macroeconomic analyses, neglecting micro-level insights from policymakers, gender advocates, and budget officers who engage with GRB daily. This study seeks to fill this gap by providing qualitative evidence on how gender bias manifests in budgeting processes, highlighting context-specific barriers and, offering actionable recommendations for improving GRB implementation and expanding the empirical understanding of gender bias in budgeting through a qualitative inquiry that captures the voices of key stakeholders involved in the budgeting process. Also, identifying institutional and systemic challenges that hinder the successful adoption of GRB, particularly in developing economies and enhancing methodological approaches in gender budgeting research by utilising thematic analysis to generate in-depth insights into the social, political, and economic dynamics influencing financial decision-making.

1.2 Research Objectives

The study aims to:

i. Examine the extent of gender bias in budgeting processes.

ii. Analyse the effectiveness of existing gender-responsive budgeting policies.
iii. Identify the barriers to implementing gender-sensitive financial practices.
iv. Explore the perceptions and experiences of policymakers regarding gender budgeting.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Issues

Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) is increasingly recognised as a tool for achieving economic equity and promoting inclusive financial governance. However, its effectiveness is often constrained by systemic gender biases, institutional barriers, and implementation challenges (Elson, 2002; Stotsky, 2016).

2.1.1 Gender Bias in Budgeting

Gender bias in budgeting refers to the systemic preference for male-dominated economic activities in financial planning and resource allocation. Traditional budgeting processes often assume a gender-neutral approach, yet they disproportionately favour sectors and initiatives that primarily benefit men while overlooking women's economic and social needs (Sharp & Broomhill, 2013). Public spending on infrastructure and large-scale industries tends to receive higher allocations than education, healthcare, and social welfare, where women are overrepresented as beneficiaries and workers (Budlender & Hewitt, 2003). Additionally, gender-blind policies fail to acknowledge structural inequalities, reinforcing existing disparities in employment opportunities, access to credit, and social protections (Chakraborty, 2016).

2.1.2 Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB)

Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) is a strategic approach that integrates gender perspectives into financial decision-making to promote equitable resource distribution (Stotsky, 2016). Unlike traditional budgeting, which often neglects gender-specific needs, GRB ensures that financial allocations actively contribute to gender equality (Elson, 2002). This process involves gender analysis of budget policies, allocation of funds for gender-sensitive programs, and continuous monitoring to assess the impact of expenditures on different gender groups (Kabeer, 2005). Countries like Sweden, South Africa, and Uganda have successfully institutionalised GRB, increasing investments in women's economic empowerment, maternal health, and education (Budlender, 2015). However, in many developing economies, the adoption of GRB remains symbolic mainly**,** with limited enforcement mechanisms and weak political commitment (Sharp & Broomhill, 2013).

2.1.3 Institutional Barriers

Institutional barriers refer to the policies, structures, and cultural norms that hinder the successful implementation of gender-inclusive budgeting. Many public finance systems lack the institutional frameworks and technical expertise to integrate gender considerations into budgeting (Chakraborty, 2016). Furthermore, deeply ingrained patriarchal norms in financial governance result in resistance to gender mainstreaming, as budgetary decisions continue to be dominated by male policymakers with limited awareness of gender issues (Stotsky, 2016). The absence of gender-disaggregated data exacerbates this challenge as policymakers struggle to identify disparities and track progress in gender-sensitive expenditures (Elson, 2002). Without institutional accountability mechanisms, GRB initiatives often fail to translate into tangible policy outcomes (Sharp & Broomhill, 2013).

2.1.4 Policy Implementation Challenges

While many governments have formally adopted gender-responsive budgeting policies, their practical execution remains a significant challenge (Budlender, 2015). The gap between policy formulation and implementation is primarily due to inadequate political will, resource constraints, and weak monitoring mechanisms (Stotsky, 2016). In some cases, GRB is misinterpreted as merely allocating funds to women’s programmes rather than ensuring gender equity in overall financial planning (Kabeer, 2005). Poor coordination among government agencies, lack of capacity-building initiatives, and minimal involvement of civil society organisations further hinder effective GRB implementation (Elson, 2002). To bridge this gap, countries must strengthen legal frameworks, improve budget transparency, and invest in gender-sensitive financial training for policymakers (Chakraborty, 2016).

2.2 Empirical Review

Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) has been widely studied across different economies, with research highlighting its potential benefits and persistent challenges. However, significant gaps remain in understanding the practical barriers to implementation and the institutional dynamics that shape budgetary decisions

Implementation Challenges and Political Commitment

Several studies have emphasised the weak implementation of GRB policies despite their formal adoption. Budlender and Hewitt (2003) conducted a cross-country analysis. While many governments have introduced GRB frameworks, their execution remains inconsistent due **to** limited political commitment and inadequate technical capacity. This aligns with Elson (2002), who argued that political will is crucial for GRB success, yet many policymakers treat it as a symbolic initiative rather than a transformative tool**.** Similarly, Chakraborty (2016) found that even in countries with gender-sensitive budget policies, actual allocations often fail to translate into tangible improvements for women and marginalised groups.

2.2.1 Sectorial Bias in Gender Budgeting

Stotsky (2016) analysed GRB efforts in developing economies and found that budgetary allocations often prioritise maternal health, girl-child education, and poverty reduction programmes but fail to integrate gender considerations into agriculture, trade, and industrial development. This selective approach limits women's access to economic opportunities**,** reinforcing gender disparities in employment, entrepreneurship, and asset ownership (Kabeer, 2005).

2.2.2 Gender Budgeting in Nigeria

Ogbuagu and Ewubare (2019) examined Nigeria's budgetary framework and found that women's economic empowerment programmes receive minimal allocations, leading to limited financial support for female entrepreneurs and professionals**.** Similarly, Ajakaiye and Olomola (2017) noted that while Nigeria has adopted gender-sensitive budget policies, there is no dedicated institutional mechanism to track and evaluate their impact. This is consistent with the findings of Adegbite and Akande (2021), who highlighted that gender-disaggregated data is scarce, making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of budgetary interventions. The absence of robust monitoring and accountability mechanisms further weakens the implementation of GRB in Nigeria.

2.2.3 Institutional and Structural Barriers

Beyond financial allocations, institutional and structural barriers hinder mainstreaming gender perspectives in budgeting. Stotsky (2016) argued that patriarchal governance structures and financial policymakers' resistance in many countries limit GRB integration. Similarly, Sharp and Broomhill (2013) found that public finance institutions lack gender expertise, and budget officials often **lack training** to incorporate gender-sensitive financial planning. Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) identified bureaucratic inefficiencies and political resistance as significant impediments to GRB implementation in Nigeria. These institutional barriers highlight the need for capacity building and gender-focused financial training to ensure budgetary policies reflect gender equity objectives.

While existing literature provides valuable insights into GRB implementation, several gaps remain unexplored

2.2.4 Practical Challenges of GRB Implementation

Most studies focus on policy frameworks and budget allocations**,** but few provide in-depth qualitative insights into financial policymakers' and budget officers' practical challenges in implementing GRB. There is a need to explore how decision-makers navigate institutional constraints, political resistance, and resource limitations in gender budgeting.

2.2.5 Gender Bias Beyond Social Sectors

Much of the research on GRB emphasises social welfare policies (health and education), but there is limited analysis of gender biases in economic planning, industrial policy, and infrastructure spending**.** A deeper investigation into gender disparities in non-traditional sectors **such as** agriculture, energy, and digital finance is necessary.

2.2.6 Institutional Accountability and Monitoring Mechanisms

Studies recognised the **a**bsence of effective monitoring mechanisms, yet there is little empirical evidence on how this impacts the success or failure of GRB initiatives. Research is needed on the role **of** civil society organisations, audit institutions, and international donors in ensuring compliance with GRB principles.

2.2.7 Gender-Disaggregated Data and Evidence-Based Budgeting:

The lack of gender-disaggregated data is a recurring theme in the literature, but few studies examine how data gaps affect budgetary decision-making. Further research is needed to explore how data collection and analysis can enhance gender-responsive financial planning.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in three interrelated theoretical frameworks that provide a robust foundation for understanding gender bias in budgeting:

2.3.1 Feminist Economics Theory

Feminist Economics Theory critiques the traditional economic paradigms for their gender neutrality assumption, highlighting how these frameworks often fail to recognise the differentiated economic realities of men and women (Elson, 1999). The theory argues that mainstream economic policies, including budgeting, frequently disregard the unpaid labour predominantly performed by women, such as caregiving and domestic work, which are essential for the functioning of the formal economy. Feminist economics advocates for integrating gender analysis in financial decision-making, emphasising that budgeting processes should explicitly account for gender-specific needs, constraints, and contributions to economic development. This perspective is directly relevant to the study as it underpins the critical examination of how traditional budgeting systems perpetuate gender inequalities and how gender-responsive budgeting can serve as a corrective mechanism.

2.3.2 Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory explores how organisational structures, rules, and cultural norms shape behaviour and decision-making within institutions (Scott, 2004). Applied to budgeting, the theory explains how established practices and institutional inertia can perpetuate gender bias, even in policies promoting equity. For instance, budgeting practices often reflect the dominant power dynamics and societal norms, which may marginalise gender considerations. The relevance of Institutional Theory to this study lies in its ability to uncover the systemic and organisational barriers to the effective implementation of gender-responsive budgeting (GRB). By examining institutional resistance, gaps in capacity, and structural inefficiencies, the study can provide insights into the factors hindering the translation of GRB policies into practice.

2.3.3 Public Choice Theory

Public Choice Theory examines how political and bureaucratic interests influence decision-making in the public sector, often prioritising personal or political gains over collective welfare (Buchanan & Tullock, 1962). This theory is particularly relevant to budgeting as it sheds light on how competing interests among politicians, bureaucrats, and other stakeholders can marginalise gender considerations. For instance, budget allocations may prioritise sectors or projects that offer immediate political benefits, sidelining long-term investments in gender equity. The study draws on Public Choice Theory to investigate how power dynamics, resource allocation trade-offs, and political incentives shape gender bias in budgeting practices.

Understanding these dynamics is essential for identifying strategies to align political and bureaucratic interests with the goals of GRB.

2.3.4 Relevance to the Study

Integrating these three theories provides a comprehensive framework for analysing the persistence of gender bias in budgeting. Feminist Economics Theory establishes the normative foundation for why gender-responsive budgeting is essential for equitable resource allocation. Institutional Theory offers insights into the systemic and structural barriers that undermine the practical implementation of GRB policies. Public Choice Theory provides a lens to explore the political and bureaucratic dynamics that influence budgetary decisions, revealing how these interests can either advance or hinder gender equity objectives.

Combining these theoretical perspectives, the study addresses critical gaps in understanding the interplay between policy frameworks, institutional practices, and political incentives in perpetuating gender bias. This multifaceted approach enriches the analysis and contributes to the broader body of knowledge on gender-responsive budgeting by highlighting actionable pathways to overcome institutional and political barriers.

3.0 Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design to explore gender bias in budgeting, focusing on how policies and practices reinforce or mitigate gender disparities in financial allocation. A qualitative approach is appropriate for this study because it provides deep insights into the lived experiences, perceptions, and institutional factors influencing gender-responsive budgeting (GRB). This section outlines the research approach, data collection methods, analytical techniques, ethical considerations, and triangulation strategies to ensure data validity and reliability.

3.1 Research Approach

This study employs a case study and phenomenological approach to capture the real-world experiences of policymakers, financial planners, and gender advocates.

3.2 Data Collection Methods

To ensure a comprehensive exploration of gender bias in budgeting, multiple data collection methods are employed:

- **Case Study Method**
  This approach enables an in-depth examination of budgeting processes in selected government institutions, revealing institutional practices, policy frameworks, and implementation challenges related to GRB. By focusing on specific cases, the study can provide a contextualised understanding of how gender bias manifests in budgeting.

- **Document Analysis** – Budget policy documents, financial reports, and gender-responsive budgeting frameworks are analysed to assess the extent of gender considerations in fiscal planning. This includes reviewing government budgets, expenditure reports, and gender audits conducted by relevant agencies.

3.3 Data Analysis

The study employs thematic analysis to analyse qualitative data systematically. This involves:

i. **Coding** – Identifying recurring themes, patterns, and relationships in policy documents.
ii. **Categorisation** – Grouping codes into broader themes related to gender bias, institutional barriers, policy implementation challenges, and potential solutions.
iii. **Interpretation** – Analysing the findings in the context of theoretical frameworks (Feminist Economics, Institutional Theory, and Public Choice Theory) to draw meaningful conclusions.

3.4 Trangulation of Documents and Data

Data triangulation enhances the validity and reliability of the study by cross-verifying findings from multiple data sources to ensure consistency and credibility.

i. **Method Triangulation** – This study integrates case study, and document analysis to validate findings. The insights from budget analysts are compared with budget reports to determine alignment between policies and actual financial allocations.
ii. **Data Source Triangulation** – Perspectives from different stakeholders (government officials, CSOs, financial experts, and gender advocates) are compared to identify discrepancies or commonalities in budgeting practices.
iii. **Theoretical Triangulation**–– The study interprets findings using multiple theories (Feminist Economics, Institutional Theory, and Public Choice Theory), providing a well-rounded explanation of gender bias in budgeting.

4.0 Results and Discussions

Case Study 1: Gender-Responsive Budgeting in Rwanda – A Model for Africa

Background

Rwanda is often cited as a success story in gender mainstreaming due to its strong political commitment to gender equality. In 2008, the country institutionalised Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB), integrating gender considerations into national and sectorial budgets.

The extent of Gender Bias in Budgeting

Despite Rwanda's progress, budget allocations for women-led enterprises and social welfare programmes remain lower than those for male-dominated industries like construction and energy.

Effectiveness of Gender-Responsive Budgeting Policies

Rwanda's GRB policy has improved gender equity in public finance, particularly education and health. However, challenges persist in ensuring equal access to economic opportunities.

Barriers to Implementation

Bureaucratic resistance and lack of gender-disaggregated data make tracking the impact of gender-sensitive budgeting difficult.

Perceptions of Policymakers
While most policymakers support GRB, some view it as a political agenda rather than an economic necessity, leading to inconsistent implementation.

Case Study 2

Gender Bias in Budgeting for Women's Economic Empowerment in India

Background

India introduced gender budgeting in 2005 as part of its national development strategy. However, concerns remain about the actual impact of these policies on women's economic empowerment.

Discussions

The extent of Gender Bias in Budgeting

A review of India's Union Budget reveals that less than 5% of total budget allocations are directly targeted at women, with funding for sectors like agriculture and labour markets predominantly benefiting men.

Effectiveness of Gender-Responsive Budgeting Policies

Some ministries have adopted GRB tools, but enforcement varies. Women-led entrepreneurship programmes, such as Mudra Yojana, have improved access to credit, yet funds often favour urban women over rural beneficiaries.

Barriers to Implementation

A lack of training among budget officials and weak institutional frameworks limit the integration of gender perspectives into financial planning.

Perceptions of Policymakers

Policymakers acknowledge the importance of GRB but argue that competing fiscal priorities make it difficult to allocate more resources specifically for women.

Case Study 3

The Challenges of Gender-Responsive Budgeting in South Africa

Background

South Africa was one of the first countries to adopt gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) in the late 1990s. The Women's Budget Initiative (WBI) was created to ensure gender equity in public spending.

Discussions

- **The extent of Gender Bias in Budgeting**
  Although gender considerations are embedded in budget planning, economic programs for women remain underfunded compared to those targeting infrastructure and industrial sectors.
- **Effectiveness of Gender-Responsive Budgeting Policies**
  Some progress has been made in gender-sensitive allocations in health and education, but gender-based violence (GBV) interventions remain inadequately funded**.**
- **Barriers to Implementation**
  - Inconsistent government commitment
  - Lack of gender-disaggregated expenditure tracking
  - Resistance from male-dominated financial institutions
- **Perceptions of Policymakers**
  Many policymakers recognise the importance of GRB but argue that gender-focused allocations should be **mainstreamed rather than treated as separate budget items**.

South Africa's case highlights the need for stronger enforcement mechanisms and more transparent accountability structures to ensure that gender-responsive budgeting translates into tangible economic benefits for women.

Key Takeaways from the Case Studies

1. **Political commitment is essential but insufficient** – Rwanda's case shows that strong implementation frameworks must back policies.
2. **Gender budgeting often lacks enforcement mechanisms** – India's case demonstrates how GRB policies can be symbolic without adequate institutional support.
3. Systemic issues with budget allocations persist despite formal policies. South Africa's experience highlights the need for continuous monitoring and accountability.

Gender Bias and Budget Allocation

The study confirms that gender bias in budgeting persists despite global and national efforts to integrate gender perspectives into financial planning. As highlighted in previous research (Budlender & Hewitt, 2003; Stotsky, 2016), budgetary decisions often reinforce existing economic disparities by prioritising male-dominated sectors while neglecting investments in women's economic empowerment.

Institutional Challenges and Policy Implementation Gaps

Institutional barriers remain a significant impediment to the effective implementation of gender-responsive budgeting. Consistent with the findings of Ogbuagu and Ewubare (2019), bureaucratic inertia and limited capacity in public financial management contribute to weak GRB enforcement. The study also found that budget officers and policymakers often lack the technical training to integrate gender analysis into budgeting processes.

The Role of Data and Monitoring in GRB

The absence of gender-disaggregated data is a critical limitation, making it difficult to evaluate the impact of budget allocations on men and women. This aligns with Stotsky's (2016) argument that without accurate data, budget planners cannot effectively address gender disparities in public finance. Strengthening data collection mechanisms is essential for evidence-based policy reforms.

Political Will and Commitment to GRB

A recurring theme in the study is the inconsistency between policy intent and political action. While governments and policymakers support gender-responsive budgeting, limited enforcement mechanisms result in suboptimal implementation. This supports previous research findings that political commitment is a determining factor in the success of GRB initiatives (Budlender & Hewitt, 2003).

5.0 Findings

The study reveals significant insights into gender bias in budgeting, highlighting systemic challenges, institutional barriers, and implementation gaps in gender-responsive budgeting (GRB). The key findings include:

Persistent Gender Bias in Budgeting

Despite policy frameworks promoting gender-responsive budgeting, financial allocations still favour male-dominated economic activities, with limited consideration for gender-specific needs. Women's economic empowerment programmes remain underfunded, particularly in entrepreneurship, agriculture, and technology.

Institutional Barriers to GRB Implementation

Bureaucratic resistance and limited technical expertise hinder the effective implementation of gender-responsive budgeting policies. Institutional norms prioritise traditional budgetary frameworks, resulting in limited integration of gender perspectives.

Inadequate Gender-Disaggregated Data

The lack of comprehensive gender-disaggregated data impedes informed budget allocation decision-making. Many government institutions do not track expenditures based on gender impact, making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of GRB initiatives.

Weak Political Commitment and Monitoring Mechanisms

Although policymakers acknowledge the importance of gender equity in budgeting, there is often a lack of political will to enforce compliance. Monitoring and evaluation systems are weak, leading to a gap between policy adoption and execution.

Opportunities for Gender-Inclusive Financial Governance

Growing awareness and advocacy for gender-responsive budgeting present opportunities for policy reform. Collaboration between government agencies, civil society organisations, and international development partners can strengthen GRB implementation.

`6.0 Conclusions

The study highlights persistent gender bias in budgeting, where financial allocations continue to favour male-dominated sectors, leaving women's economic empowerment programmes underfunded. Institutional barriers, including bureaucratic resistance and limited technical expertise, further hinder the effective implementation of gender-responsive budgeting (GRB). Additionally, the lack of gender-disaggregated data limits informed decision-making, while weak political commitment and inadequate monitoring mechanisms create gaps between policy intent and execution. However, the growing awareness and advocacy for gender-inclusive financial governance present an opportunity for policy reform. Strengthening collaboration among government agencies, civil society organizations, and international partners is essential for enhancing GRB implementation and achieving equitable resource allocation.

7.0 Recommendations

To address the challenges identified in this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Strengthening Institutional Capacity for GRB Implementation

- Establish dedicated gender budgeting units within ministries and government agencies.
- Train budget officers and policymakers on gender analysis and GRB principles.

Enhancing Gender-Disaggregated Data Collection

- Develop comprehensive data tracking systems to monitor gender-sensitive expenditures.
- Mandate all government institutions to report on gender-responsive budgeting indicators.

Improving Political Commitment and Accountability

- Establish legal frameworks that require government agencies to comply with gender-responsive budgeting guidelines.
- To monitor GRB implementation and strengthen oversight mechanisms, including parliamentary committees and civil society organisations.

Increasing Budget Allocations for Women's Economic Empowerment

- Ensure equitable distribution of financial resources across sectors to support gender-inclusive growth.
- Expand funding for women-led businesses, skills development programmes, and gender-sensitive infrastructure projects.

Strengthening Collaboration with Civil Society and Development Partners

- To promote GRB awareness and implementation, foster partnerships between governments, non-governmental organisations, and international agencies. To advance gender-inclusive budgeting practices, leverage technical assistance and funding support from global development partners.

References

Buchanan, J. M., & Tullock, G. (1962). *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press.

Budlender, D., & Hewitt, G. (2003). *Engendering budgets: A practitioners' guide to understanding and implementing gender-responsive budgets.* Commonwealth Secretariat.

Chakraborty, L. (2016). *Asia: A survey of gender budgeting efforts.* International Monetary Fund.

Elson, D. (1999). Gender and macroeconomic policy. *World Development, 27(3)*, 611–627. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(98)00155-2

Elson, D. (2002). Gender-responsive budgeting in practice: A review of existing tools and approaches. *World Development, 30(3),* 545–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00110-0

Kabeer, N. (2005). Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third millennium development goal. *Gender and Development, 13(1)*, 13–24.

Ogbuagu, M. I., & Ewubare, D. B. (2019). Gender-responsive budgeting and women's economic empowerment in Nigeria. *International Journal of Gender and Development Studies, 2(1),* 45-60.

Scott, W. R. (2004). Institutional theory: Contributing to a theoretical research program. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *Great minds in management: The process of theory development* (pp. 460–484). Oxford University Press.

Sharp, R., & Broomhill, R. (2013). A case for gender-responsive budgeting? *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 25(2),* 200-223.

Stotsky, J. G. (2016). *Gender budgeting: Fiscal context and current outcomes.* International Monetary Fund.