

The Influence of Internal Organizational Mechanisms on Gender Mainstreaming Effectiveness Morogoro Region, Tanzania

Lusako Alphonse Mwakiluma

PhD Candidate – The Open University of Tanzania

Chacha Matoka

Lecturer, The Open University of Tanzania

ABSTRACT

The paper sought to analyse the influence of the existing internal organizational mechanisms on gender mainstreaming effectiveness (GME). The study used cross sectional research design where a total sample of 368 respondents was drawn from population of 4481 by using systematic sampling from employees of the Morogoro Municipal Council, whereby questionnaire was the main tool used to collect data. The linear multiple and hierarchical regression models were used analyse data. The study found that a positive and significant influence of existing internal organizational mechanisms on gender mainstreaming effectiveness at Morogoro municipal council. The paper concludes that the GME was influenced greatly by the internal organizational mechanisms. Therefore, it is recommended that the Local Governmental Authorities to increase efforts of committing resources on the internal organizational mechanisms for gender mainstreaming effectiveness in the work place.

Keywords: Gender, mainstreaming, hierarchical model, organizational mechanisms

INTRODUCTION

In most developing countries, stereotypes of men difference and privilege over women are dominant (Ellemers, 2018; Idris, 2018). The difference is mostly reflected in the areas of work intensity, decision-making and access to and control of resources. Men control most resources and decision making in the family. Although women's access to and control of resources may be increased if they earned income, this is not always the case. Despite women's contribution to the country's economy as producers and household managers, they are often marginalized in the ownership, allocation of resources and decision making on what they produce. Their lack of direct access to resources, such as land, capital, credit and information reduces their net productivity (FAO, 2017).

Gender Mainstreaming (GM) refers to prioritizing equally the needs of men and women and integrates the concept in all sectors and in the policy and program cycle (URT, 2014). Gender Mainstreaming was adopted as the new approach to women in development in the mid-1990s. Gender mainstreaming has been implemented both in developed and developing countries. For instance, Canada in responding to the Beijing Declaration has prepared the action plan for gender equality which commits federal government departments to implement gender mainstreaming.

In Tanzania, women lack of access to and control of resources and this reflects poor gender mainstreaming (USAID, 2018; UNICEF, 2010). Low level of gender mainstreaming can be observed by looking the percentage of women in decision making organs. In 2019 women occupied only 36.9% of seats in national parliament in Tanzania. Idris (2018) reported that female comprises 17.4% of senior and middle management managers in the Tanzanian organizations. Idris (2018) further reported that an average monthly income for males and females in Tanzania was Tanzania Shillings (TZS) 278,748 and 165,920 respectively, indicating that women earned approximately half of males and this signifies the challenge of gender mainstreaming in Tanzania. However, the theory of change as had been used by other organizations (USAID, IrishAid, DfID, World Bank, Amnesty International and others) is extended in to explain gender mainstreaming effectiveness as the achievement of the desired outcomes in local government authorities in Tanzania (Stein and Valters, 2012). The theory of change offers a lens of explaining the tensions between structure and agency and the nature of organizational decision-making (Connolly and Dolan, 2012). Furthermore, the internal organization mechanisms which include leadership, financial and human resources, availability of appropriate procedures and processes and appropriate organizational incentives and accountability structures can influence the organization's gender mainstreaming effectiveness (GME). The influence of the existing internal organizational mechanisms influences gender mainstreaming effectiveness Morogoro Municipal Council in utilization of current resources and allocate additional resources where required, align the resources with the expected outcomes and track the utilization of resources, while paying significant attention to the creation and preservation of a positive organizational culture and gender balance within the Organisation (CAAF, 2017). UNDP (2015) admitted that advocacy is an importance element in gender mainstreaming.

Despite the effort in promoting gender mainstreaming in Tanzania, Idris (2018) argue that gender gaps are still observed in various areas such as small percent of women seats in the national parliament of Tanzania (36.9%), small number of female managers in Tanzania and a low level of earned monthly income for women (TZS 165,920) versus that of male (TZS 278,748). Moreover, the Morogoro Municipal report (2019) shows that women comprise 44.5% of all employees of the council. Moreover, only 49.26% of the women were allocated business stall/room (*vizimba*) in Mawenzi, Mji Mpya and Manzese Market. The data from the council signify that there is a challenge in the by-laws in the Morogoro council. Moreover, at the decision level in the municipal council, 62.5% are male while 37.5% are female. The information indicates that gender is not well mainstreamed in the municipal council decision-makers.

STUDY AREA

The study was conducted in Morogoro Municipal Council in Morogoro region. Morogoro region was selected as one of the regions where the government of Tanzania put efforts in implementing gender equality (URT, 2016) including a project known as Gender Equitable Local Development (GELD) which was implemented from 2009-2013 under UN-WOMEN, UNDCF and UNDP. GELD project intended to provide support to local government in the process of planning, budgeting and implementing various projects and programmes to ensure that women's access to productive assets, quality inputs and opportunities are enhanced. The project also was geared to sensitize women to participate in the economy and benefit fairly and make sure that land ownership, access to formal employment, markets and financial services

are easily accessed by women. From the populations of 4481 employees, a sample size of 368 respondents was drawn. This sample was determined using the formulae developed by Yamane, (1967) at 5% of desired precision.

The study used structured questionnaire since a tool has a fixed response and are appropriate for quantitative data (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). The questionnaire was comprised of information on background information of the respondents, Likert type scales on gender mainstreaming effectiveness, and internal organization mechanisms (with statements on access of opportunities such as training, participation on project circle - activities, inequalities, discrimination which hinder access and control of resources and opportunities).

However, the study computed a mean score so as to make it usable in the subsequent analyses, that is, the relationship among the dependent and independent variables and multiple regression analysis. Thus, the 3-point Likert type scale response from each statement were summed so to obtain the mean scores for each variable. This approach was applied by Fita et al. (2012) and Meena et al. (2012).

$$IOMS = \frac{\sum_{N=1}^N (NGEs) + (NTs) + (GPPs) + (GRs)}{20} \dots\dots\dots (i)$$

Where:

IOMS = Internal Organisation Mechanisms Mean Score,
 NGEs = Number of Gender Experts scores,
 NTs = Number of Training per year scores,
 GPPCs = Gender Participation in Project Cycle scores,
 GRs = Gender Responsiveness scores,

The levels obtained from the independent and dependent variables were applied to run multiple regression analysis to test the hypotheses stated in estimating the relationship and influence of a unit change in the variables. Two models were specified, namely the basic multiple regression (without the socio-demographic variables) and hierarchical linear regression (with the controlling variables) (Khaffaf, 2017). The models were specified as follows:

Basic Multiple regression model: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + e \dots\dots\dots (ii)$

Then, the socio-demographic variables were included in the multiple regression for controlling the effect of independent and dependent variables in the basic model. The hierarchical regression model was specified as:

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_s X_s + e \dots\dots\dots (iii)$

Where: Y = Score of gender mainstreaming effectiveness.

B1 = coefficients

X1 = Mean score on Internal Organisational Mechanisms

Xs = Socio-demographic factors (Age in years, Years in schooling, Original

predominate and Working experience in Years).

e = error term.

β_0 = Constant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistics of the variables included in model

Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum scores) were computed for the variables included in the models (Table 1). The results show that the maximum age in years of the respondents was 55 while the minimum was 23 years ($M = 40.096$, $S.D. = 8.176$). In the case of years in schooling, the maximum years of schooling of the sampled population was 20 years while the minimum was 13 years with a mean of 15.298 and standard deviation of 1.508. Results also show that experience in work of the respondents was that the maximum was 21 years while the minimum was 1 year with a mean of 10.215 and 4.4892 as a standard deviation. The mean score of the respondents in the Internal Organisational Mechanisms (OIM) had a maximum value of 3 and 2.9 as the minimum value, while the mean score was 1.849 and standard deviation was 0.548. The means score of GME of the respondents were 3 as maximum, 1 minimum, 1.732 mean and 0.613 standard deviation.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of variables included in the model (n=368)

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age in Years	23.00	55.00	40.095	8.177
Years of schooling	13.00	20.00	15.299	1.508
Original predominate	.00	1.00	.832	.375
Experience in Work in Years	1.00	21.00	10.215	4.489
Mean Score IOM	1.00	2.90	1.849	.547
Mean Score GME	1.00	3.00	1.732	.613

Source: Field data, 2018

Existing internal organizational mechanisms

The study also examined the internal organisational mechanisms in the Morogoro Municipal Council whereby frequency, percentage distribution and the average of the responses were used. The mechanisms examined included gender expertise, training provisions on gender issues, gender participation in project circle, and gender responsive strategies. Table 2 shows that the internal organisational mechanisms for this study focused on four major indicators, namely; gender experts, number of training per year, gender participation in project cycle and gender responsiveness.

The gender experts' indicator shows that 39.6% of the respondents disagreed that gender experts are sufficient at the work place. However, 51.2% agreed that gender experts were sufficient at the work place. Since gender experts are sufficient at work place, the community members have great trust to the experts in mainstreaming gender issues in different activities in work place, including female access of resources and opportunities. The measure of central tendency that is mean was 2.1 (Table 2). This means that gender experts in the study area were not sufficient thus affecting the promotion of gender mainstreaming at Municipal Council level.

Table 2 also indicates that 56.8% of the sampled population agreed that gender experts had enough knowledge on the promotion of gender mainstreaming while 26.9% of the respondents

disagreed that the experts had enough knowledge while the mean score of the response was 2.3. The findings imply that majority of the respondents agreed that the gender experts had enough knowledge on the promotion of gender mainstreaming in Morogoro Municipal Council. The mechanisms in terms of knowledgeable human resource were available but was scarce hence impeding the process of gender mainstreaming in the study area.

Furthermore, 41% of the respondents also disagreed that gender experts had succeeded in reducing gender inequality in Municipal Council. Table 2 shows further that 46.2% of the respondents agreed that the experts had succeeded to reduce gender inequality in Morogoro Municipal Council. The mean of responses was 2.1. These findings signify that majority of the respondents agreed that gender experts had succeeded reducing gender inequality in the study area.

Moreover, 35.1% and 6.5% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that gender experts had succeeded in reducing gender discrimination at Municipal Council. Whilst 26.9% and 20.9% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed respectively that, gender experts had succeeded in reducing gender discrimination at Municipal Council meanwhile, the mean score of response of the 5-point Likert type scale was 2.1. This signifies that the gender experts had not succeeded in reducing gender discrimination in the work place.

Another statement stated that gender experts had succeeded in establishing gendered power relation in Municipal Council. The findings indicate that 41% of the respondents disagreed with this statement, 48.1% agreed while 10.9% of the respondents were neutral; with 2.1 as a mean score of the sampled population's responses (Table 2). Therefore, majority of the respondents agreed that gender experts had succeeded in establishing gendered power relation in Municipal Council.

The second indicator was the number of training per year; the findings indicate that 54.9% of the respondents agreed that the number of trainings on GM promotion for female were enough. However, 35.5% of the respondents disagreed that the number trainings on GM promotion for female were enough (Table 2). The mean score of the of the respondents' responses was 2.1. The findings also indicate that 47.6% of the respondents agreed that the number of trainings provided per year had reduced gender discrimination. However, 25.6% of the respondents disagreed that the trainings had reduced gender discrimination, 26.9% of the sampled population were neutral. Meanwhile the mean score of the responses of the respondents for this statement was 2.2.

Furthermore, 44.8% of the sampled population agreed that the number of trainings provided per year had reduced gender stereotype. On the other hand, 28.8% disagreed with the statement; and 26.4% of the respondents were undecided. The mean of the responses for the statement was 2.2. Basing on the percentage distribution it can be concluded that majority of the respondents agreed that the training provided has reduced gender stereotype.

Moreover, the study findings show that 47.2% of the respondents agreed that the number of trainings provided per year had reduced gender inequality, while 39.7% disagreed that the number of trainings provided had reduced gender inequality. The mean score of the responses

of the respondents was 2.2 (Table 2). This implies that the number of trainings provided on gender per year has reduced gender inequality.

The study assumed that gender is mainstreamed at every project currently implemented in the municipal. However, 45.1% of the respondents agreed with the assumption while 29.3% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the responses was 2.1 (Table 2). This implies that the sampled population agreed that gender is mainstreamed at every project currently implemented in the municipal.

Table 4.5 indicates that gender participation in project cycle had five statements. The study assumed that gender is mainstreamed in project designing process at the municipal level. However, the results show that 42.6% agreed, 41.8% disagreed and 17.1% of the respondents were undecided. Therefore, the study findings suggested that there is a slight difference between those who agreed and disagreed on the statement that gender is mainstreamed in project designing process at the municipal level.

Furthermore 44.9% of the respondents agreed that the LGA mainstreams gender in the planning processes, while 39.1% disagreed with the statement. This suggested that majority of the respondents agreed that gender is mainstreamed in the project planning process at the municipal level. Moreover, Table 2 indicates that 56.5% of the respondents agreed that LGA mainstreams gender in the project implementation process. On the other hand, 28.6% disagreed with the statement. The mean of the respondents' response was 2.1. This means that majority of the respondents agreed that the municipal mainstream gender in the project implementation process.

The study also assumed that the LGA mainstreams gender in project monitoring process. The study findings show that 54.4% agreed; 28.8% of the respondents disagreed and 16.8% were undecided. The mean of the response of the respondents was 2.3. This implies that there is positive attitude towards project monitoring process at the Morogoro Municipal Council level as far as gender mainstreaming is concerned. The findings also show that 43.5% of the respondents agreed that there was gender mainstreaming in project evaluation process at the Municipal Council level. On the other hand, 33.7% of the respondents disagreed that there was gender mainstreaming in project evaluation process at the municipal level. The mean of the responses was 2.3.

Gender responsive strategies are the fourth indicator of internal organizational mechanisms, whereby five statements were used in this indicator (Refer Table 2). The findings show that 54.4% agreed that gender response-based sex disaggregated statistical data were very high at Morogoro Municipal Council, while 23.3% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Therefore, there is gender response based on sex disaggregated statistical data in the study area.

Table 2: Response distribution on the internal organization mechanisms

Items 1: Gender expert	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Mean
The gender experts are sufficient at my working place	146 (39.6%)	33 (9%)	189 (51.2%)	2.1
Gender experts have enough knowledge on GM promotion	99 (26.9%)	60 (16.3%)	209 (56.8%)	2.3
Gender experts have succeeded in reducing gender inequality at Municipal Council	151 (41.0%)	48 (13%)	169 (46.2%)	2.1
Gender experts have succeeded in reducing gender discrimination at Municipal Council	153 (41.6%)	39 (10.6%)	176 (47.8%)	2.1
Gender experts have succeeded in establishing gendered power relation at Municipal Council	151 (41.0%)	40 (10.9%)	177 (48.1%)	2.1
Item 2: Number of training per year				
Number trainings on GM promotion for female are enough	130 (35.5%)	36 (9.8%)	202 (54.9%)	2.1
Number of trainings provided per year has reduced gender discrimination	94 (25.6%)	99 (26.9%)	175 (47.6%)	2.2
Number of trainings provided per year has reduced gender stereotype	106 (28.8%)	97 (26.4%)	165 (44.8%)	2.2
Number of trainings provided per year has reduced gender inequality	146 (39.7%)	48 (13.1%)	174 (47.2%)	2.2
Gender is mainstreamed at every project currently implemented in Municipal Council	108 (29.3%)	94 (25.6%)	166 (45.1%)	2.1
Item 3: Gender participation in project cycle				
The LGA mainstreams gender in the designing processes	154 (41.8%)	57 (15.6%)	157 (42.6%)	2.2
The LGA mainstreams gender in the planning process	144 (39.1%)	59 (16%)	165 (44.9%)	2.0
The LGA mainstreams gender in the implementation processes	105 (28.6%)	55 (14.9%)	208 (56.5%)	2.1
The LGA mainstreams gender in the monitoring processes	108 (28.8%)	62 (16.8%)	200 (54.4%)	2.3
The LGA mainstreams gender in the evaluation processes	124 (33.7%)	84 (22.8%)	160 (43.5%)	2.3
Item 4: Gender responsive Strategies (RGR)				
The gender response-based sex disaggregated statistical data is very high at Municipal Council	86 (23.3%)	71 (19.3%)	211 (54.4%)	2.1
Sex disaggregated statistical data are available for effective use at Municipal Council	76 (20.7%)	77 (20.9%)	215 (58.4%)	2.3
RGR has positively changed the relation among male and female	87 (23.6%)	111 (30.2%)	170 (46.2%)	2.3
There are gender responsive strategies to gender resource planning at Municipal Council level	106 (28.8%)	70 (19%)	192 (52.2%)	2.2
There are gender responsive strategies in gender budget at Municipal Council level	99 (26.9%)	68 (18.5%)	201 (54.6%)	2.2

Another assumption was sex disaggregated statistical data were available for effective use at Municipal Council level. The findings show that 58.4% agreed with the assumption meanwhile 20.7% disagreed and 20.9% were neutral. The mean score of the responses was 2.3. Therefore,

majority of the respondents agreed that gender-based sex disaggregated statistical data are available at Municipal Council level.

The study also assumed that gender responsive strategies had positively changed the relation among males and females. Findings show that 46.2% of the respondents agreed with the assumption, while 23.6% of the respondents disagreed and 30.2% were undecided. The mean score of the response was 2.2. Thus, findings suggest that gender responsive strategies had positively changed the relation among males and females.

The findings also indicate that 52.2% agreed that gender responsive strategies in gender resource planning, while 28.8% disagreed, and 19% were undecided that there were gender responsive strategies in gender resource planning at Morogoro Municipal Council level. Therefore, majority of the respondents agreed that there were gender responsive strategies in gender resource planning in the study area. Moreover, Table 4.5 shows that 54.6% agreed that there were gender responsive strategies in gender budget at Municipal Council level; while 26.9% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. The mean of the response was 2.2. Thus, the findings suggest that gender responsive strategies had positively changed the relation among males and females.

Gender Mainstreaming Effectiveness

The measure of central tendency was used to determine whether the total responses imply effectiveness or ineffectiveness of GM. In order to determine where most values in a distribution fall, the study used mean score of the responses. This is because the responses were continuous data and the distribution of the total response's score on GME was symmetrical (Frost, 2019).

Basing on the mean of the score of the respondents on GME, the study obtained a mean of 1.66 as a cut-off point. The scores below the mean were considered ineffective while those who were above the mean were effective. Table 3 shows that 58.7% of the respondents were above the mean while 41.3% were below the cut-off point. From the findings it is clear that majority of the respondents' mean score on gender mainstreaming were effective.

Table 3: Gender mainstreaming effectiveness

Category	Frequency	Percent
Ineffective Gender mainstreaming	152	41.3
Effective Gender mainstreaming	216	58.7
Total	368	100.0

Correlation among the variables

The correlation table (Table 4) contains three pieces of information: First is the size of the correlation (the "r" statistic), which has a range between -1 (perfect negative correlation) and 1 (perfect positive correlation). Second is the level of significance for the correlation (a level of .05 or smaller is considered "statistically significant"). Third is the strength of association among the variables which can be small or weak association (if the absolute value of 'r' is less than or equal to 3), medium or moderate (if the absolute value of 'r' is more than 3 and less than or equal to 5) and large or strong correlation (if the absolute value of 'r' is greater than 5) (see

Taylor, 1990). Therefore, findings from Table 4 show that the mean score of IOM is also moderately and positive statistically significant related to the mean score of GME ('r' = .368).

Table 4: Correlation between dependent and independent variables

		Age Years	inYears schooling	ofOriginal predominate	Experience Mean Work in Years	Mean Score IOM	Mean Score GME
Age in Years	Pearson Correlation	1	.248**	.235**	.867**	.092	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.079	.709
Years of schooling	Pearson Correlation	.248**	1	.157**	.193**	.096	-.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.003	.000	.066	.302
Original predominate	Pearson Correlation	.235**	.157**	1	.216**	-.014	.109*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003		.000	.785	.037
Experience in Work in Years	Pearson Correlation	.867**	.193**	.216**	1	.069	.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.186	.128
Mean Score IOM	Pearson Correlation	.092	.096	-.014	.069	1	.368**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.066	.785	.186		.000
Mean Score GME	Pearson Correlation	.020	-.054	.109*	.080	.368**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.709	.302	.037	.128	.000	

****.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

***.** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Results of Multiple regressions Analysis

Results also indicate that internal organizational mechanisms mean score was positive and statistically significant influencing the mean score of gender mainstreaming effectiveness at $p < 0.01$, when the control variables were excluded in the model (Table 5).

Table 5: Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1	(Constant)	.969	.105		9.209	.000
	Mean Score IOM	.413	.055	.368	7.569	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Mean Score GME

Hierarchical Model

The output generated from this analysis is similar to the previous output, but with some extra pieces of information. In the Model Summary box there are two models listed. Model 1 refers to the first block of variables that were entered (Mean Score of IOM), while Model 2 includes all the variables that were entered in both blocks (Mean score IOM, age in years, years of schooling, original predominate, Experience in work in years).

The R Square values in the first Model summary shows that after four variables in Block 1 (Age in years, years of schooling, original predominate, experience in work in years) have been entered, the overall model explains 3.1% of the variance (.031 $\times$ 100). When Block 2 variables (mean score IOM) have also been included, the model as a whole explains 17.6% (.176 $\times$ 100). It is important to note that this second R square value includes all the variables from both blocks, not just those included in the second step.

To find out how much of this overall variance is explained by our variable of interest (mean score IOM) we need to look the R Square change. In the output presented (Table 6) the R square change value is .145. This means that mean score by-laws, mean score IOM and mean score advocacy explain an additional 14.5% (.145 $\times$ 100) of the variance in mean score of GME, even when the effects of age in years, years of schooling, original predominate, experience in work in years, responding are statistically controlled for. This is a statistically significant contribution, as indicated by the Sig. F change value for this line (.000) (Table 6).

Table 6 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Sig. Change	F
					Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		
1	.177 ^a	.031	.021	.60704	.031	2.943	4	363	.020	
2	.420 ^b	.176	.165	.56051	.145	63.764	1	362	.000	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Experience in Work in Years, Years of schooling, Original predominate, Age in Years

b. Predictors: (Constant), Experience in Work in Years, Years of schooling, Original predominate, Age in Years, Mean Score IOM

The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole (which includes both blocks of variables) is significant (F (7, 360) = 15.52, $p < .0001$) (Table 7).

Table 7: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.338	4	1.085	2.943	.020 ^b
	Residual	133.763	363	.368		
	Total	138.102	367			
2	Regression	24.371	5	4.874	15.515	.000 ^c
	Residual	113.730	362	.314		
	Total	138.102	367			

a. Dependent Variable: Mean Score GME

b. Predictors: (Constant), Experience in Work in Years, Years of schooling, Original predominate, Age in Years

c. Predictors: (Constant), Experience in Work in Years, Years of schooling, Original predominate, Age in Years, Mean Score IOM

The evaluation of the independent variables is summarized by the coefficients table in the Model 2 row. Table 8 shows that six variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution (less than .05). In order of importance (according to their beta values), they are: Mean score IOM (beta = .30), experience in work in years (beta = .24), Mean score by-laws (beta

= .21), original predominate (beta = .14), age in years (beta = -.21) and years in schooling (beta = -.11). The mean score of Advocacy did not make a unique contribution to the mean of GME.

Table 8: Results of Hierarchical multiple regressions model

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	2.267	.351			6.464	.000
	Age in Years	-.015	.008	-.199		-1.883	.061
	Years of schooling	-.028	.022	-.069		-1.285	.200
	Original predominate	.187	.087	.114		2.140	.033
	Experience in Work in Years	.033	.014	.240		2.314	.021
2	(Constant)	1.752	.330			5.305	.000
	Age in Years	-.018	.007	-.241		-2.470	.014
	Years of schooling	-.041	.020	-.100		-2.020	.044
	Original predominate	.216	.081	.132		2.673	.008
	Experience in Work in Years	.035	.013	.253		2.635	.009
	Mean Score IOM	.431	.054	.384		7.985	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Mean Score GME

The paper hypothesized that the internal organizational mechanisms in the study area have positive and significant influence on gender mainstreaming effectiveness. The hierarchical multiple regression model results, however, revealed a positive coefficient of 0.301 and statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.

These results present a positive and significant influence of the mean score of the existing internal organizational mechanisms to the mean scores of gender mainstreaming effectiveness in the study area. Therefore, we accept the hypothesis that internal organizational mechanisms have significant influenced the gender mainstreaming effectiveness in the study area. However, a positive influence implies that internal organizational mechanisms have contributed effectively to GM in the study area. The findings affirm with the theory of change due to the fact that the inputs injected lead a positive outcome (anticipated outcomes). However, regression model results are contrary to that of Abraham (2013) who found that having more women in power (as leaders) did not guarantee reducing gender inequality in workplace. Female managers contributed less to gender inequality among employees who reported to them direct.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper concludes that internal organizational mechanisms such as increasing number of gender experts enhancing gender knowledge in work place through training, equal gender participation in project circle (designing, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) and gender responsive strategies in Morogoro Municipal Council with a visible balanced distribution of power and resources and shared responsibilities between female and male within society had contributed to gender mainstreaming effectiveness in Municipal Council level.

The findings of the study indicate that the internal organizational mechanisms in the study area have contributed to gender mainstreaming effectiveness in Morogoro Municipal Council. Therefore, the paper recommends that the municipal and other LGAs should look on how they can improve the attitude of their workers and should implement policies and acts the government of Tanzania have agreed and signed. The internal organizational mechanisms should be enforced and adopted so as to ensure visible balanced distribution of power and resources in sharing responsibilities as well as opportunities among male and female in the society.

Reference

- Abraham, M. (2013). Does having women in positions of power reduce gender inequality in organisation? A direct test. [https://mackinstitute.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Abraham-Mabel_Women-in-Management.pdf]. Accessed on 24/06/2020.
- CAAF (2017). Practice guide to auditing the United Nations Sustainable Development [<https://womendeliver.org/publications/practice-guide-auditing-united-nations-sustainable-development-goals-gender-equality>]. Accessed on 23/12/2019.
- Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, (69),275–98
- FAO, (2017). Gender Mainstreaming Framework and Strategy. Rome, 22.
- Fita, L., Trivedi, M.M. and Tassew, B. (2012). Adoption of improved dairy husbandry practices and its relationship with the socio-economic characteristics of dairy farmers in Ada'a district of Oromia State, Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 4(14), 392-395.
- Frost, J. (2019). Introduction to Statistics: An Intuitive Guide; [[https:// statisticsbyjim.com/basics/measures-central-tendency-mean-median-mode/](https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/measures-central-tendency-mean-median-mode/)] Accessed on 24/11/2019.
- Idris, I. (2018). Mapping women's economic exclusion in Tanzania. K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies. 15.
- Khaffaf, D. (2017). A Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis investigating the association between Religion, Mindfulness and Personality on Stress and Anxiety. Manchester Metropolitan University. 25.
- Taylor, R. (1990). Interpretation of correlation coefficient: A basic review, *Journal of Diagnostic Medical Sonography*, 1: 35-39
- UNDP (2015). Evaluation of UNDP contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment. [<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/te/gender.shtml>], Accessed on 21/08/ 2020.
- UNICEF (2010). Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children's lives. UNICEF, New York.
- URT (2014). The National Guidelines for Mainstreaming Gender into Environment. Vice President's Office. Dar es Salaam, 88.
- URT (2016). Tanzania Country Gender Profile. Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children. 139.
- USAID (2018). USAID FACTS. [https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1860/Gender_and_Youth_Fact_Sheet_2018_ENGLISH_FINAL.pdf] Accessed on 12/02/ 2019.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*, 2nd Edition, New York: Harper and Row.