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Structure

- **Section 1:**
  - Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations

- **Section 2:**
  - 7 promising methodologies

- **Section 3:**
  - Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
Section 1: How to improve your gender results

What can we learn about changing social norms in agriculture from evaluations and stakeholder interviews?
Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations
Second round inclusion criteria

Rigor of Methods
- Quantitative Sampling
- Qualitative Treatment
- Evidence for Findings

Gender Included in Evaluation
- None
- Section on Gender
- Woven Throughout

Social Norm Change (Outcome)
- None
- Claimed
- Present

Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations
Deep dive final sample

- Ethiopia n = 3
- Pakistan n = 4

- (Agriculture Sector Linkages Project - Phase II – ACIAR – no methodology)

Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations
Many evaluations had the same gender failures!

- Gender/context analysis missing in designs.
- Inadequate funding.
- Baseline without gender indicators.
- Gender programming choices/outcomes not explained.
  - Hypothesis: gender interventions are not evidence based nor discussed with wider project staff (sidelined).
- Gender not seen to go ‘beyond the project.’
- Even when program evaluations collect sex disaggregated data, they do not always, nor consistently report the results by sex.
Where is Gender?

Project Objectives

What role does gender play in the project? Include at highest level possible.

Expected Outcomes

How will we measure the impact of our program on gender?

Have we considered how we will assess quantity AND quality of participation?

Activities

Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations
Failing to learn

- Evaluations are not (currently) a strong mechanism for learning about gender - more of an audit/accountability to donors document.
- Unless the evaluation SOW/TOR explicitly asks to understand gender and social norm changes, evaluations will only discuss gender in basic terms to determine accountability.
- Mixed methods evaluations generate the best learning around gender.

Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations
What is more important than what we learn is how we learn it!

01  Plan for social/gender norm changes
02  Internal reflection
03  Evaluation validation workshops

Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations
Recap

• Include gender at a high level in the program (outcome/impact)
• Mixed methods evaluations
  – Sex disaggregated throughout
• ToR/SOW includes gender changes/learning
• Gender analysis at design phase
• Gender transformative indicators in baseline
• Budgets
• Gender goals go beyond the project
• Explain gender choices
• Internal learning sessions/discussions on gender
2 questions
Section 2: Gender transformative methodologies.
7 methodologies

- Identified during interviews,
- Qualitatively compared and evaluations assessed
- Global methodologies, adapted to local context
- Used within projects
- Don’t only tackle gender
By studying these methodologies we know what works

1. Gender Action Learning System (GALS)
2. Transformative Household Methodology (THM)
3. Family Life Model (FLM)
4. Community Conversation (CC)
5. Rapid Care Analysis (RCS)
6. Asset Based Community Development (ABCD)
7. Social Analysis and Action (SAA)
What do they have in common?

7 methodologies
A plan for changing unequal relations

01 Use facilitators

02 Participatory tools

03 Work with men and boys/focus on social relations

04 Driven by communities

7 methodologies
• Often recruited locally - flattens power

• Facilitators enable participants to experience the problem (see) and develop empathy (feel) and then develop strategies for change

• This enables participants to identify their own need for change and to link development outcomes to inequitable relationships
• Research methods combined in different ways and cover different topics.

• Often start with creative and open-ended tools that help communities visualize the future and analyze their current situation.

• Then move into more specific planning activities that require commitment to change.
Family Action Plan_GALS

1. Happy life top level from Session 2: Vision Journey

2. Changes in gender relations in the household middle level from Session 3 Gender Balance Tree

3. Changes in the family and community through peer training bottom level from Session 4: Empowerment Leadership Map

7 methodologies
Work with men and boys/focus on social relations

- Focus on social relations – not just on women as isolated individuals
- Involve men and boys and analyze relationships
- (re)value the skills and strengths of those who have been excluded (such as women)
• Co-creation

• Allows communities to buy into the change process and to define its pace and parameters

• Mobilize people to solve their own development problems
Why do they work?

7 methodologies
Power

- In various ways
- Sometimes covertly
- Non-confrontational

7 methodologies
Go beyond normative expectations

Types of social norms data:
• Personal normative beliefs – what do you think?
• Behaviors – what do you do?
• Empirical expectations – what do others do?
• Normative expectations – what do you think others think you should do?
• Policing – how are norms enforced?
Tackle social norms at multi levels

Policy/law/Strategy (GALS)

Community (SAA, GALS, ABCD, RCA, CC)

Household (THM, FLM, RCA, ABCD, SAA, GALS)

Self (?) (a little from THM, GALS, ABCD, SAA)

Market

7 methodologies
Put people at the center

7 methodologies
However,

• NGOs use these methodologies as practitioners
• If the data was captured and analyzed it would
  – Reveal the pace of change
  – What norms are easy to change (and generate certain results)
  – What methodology for what context
• Need an action research project so we can analyze the data and map change pathways
Concluding remarks

• Yes gender relations can change!
• Counting numbers of women participants is not enough
• But...these methodologies are not the end point
• Gender is an experiment
• Capture the data generated, learn and share
• Improve
2 questions
Section 3: Data mining

Focus is on sampling strategies and division of labor
Gender responsive research

*How to make women’s roles and needs visible in agriculture.*

- **The way we ask questions in surveys**
- **Who we ask**
- **Who is involved in developing the surveys**
- **How we sample**
- **The response range offered**

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
Intersectionality theory

• Looks at how different forms of inequality compound to create deeper forms of exclusion and marginalization
  – e.g. racism, sexism, classism, ageism…
• How inequality and poverty is reproduced
• Relationship between knowledge and power
Sample size of the household head

- Bannu: 11
- Bunir: 7
- Charsadda: 28
- D I Khan: 11
- Haripur: 2
- Jaffarabad: 18
- Jhal Magsi: 13
- Karak: 10
- Kohat: 12
- Killa Saifulalah: 7
- Lakki Marwat: 3
- Loralai: 1
- Malakand: 9
- Mansehra: 12
- Mardan: 23
- Nasirabad: 14
- Nowshera: 66
- Peshawar: 19
- Pishin: 11
- Sibi: 10
- Swabi: 16
- Zhob: 14

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
CIMMYT - Pakistan dataset
Division of labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Carried out by whom</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Carried out by whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplanting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results - CIMMYT Pakistan

### Labor division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sowing activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading activity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoeing activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilization activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
CIMMYT - Ethiopia panel dataset
Sample size by sex & region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eth Female HH head</th>
<th>Year 2011 26.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amahara</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female: 154(7.8%)
Male: 1824(92.2%)

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
Total labour (family and hired) use in person-days

Intercrops: record harvesting and threshing/shelling separately (by comma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land preparation &amp; planting</th>
<th>Weed control</th>
<th>Harvesting</th>
<th>Threshing or shelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
## Results - CIMMYT Ethiopia

### Labor division on agricultural activity

#### Labor division difference on workdays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Male Workdays</th>
<th>Female Workdays</th>
<th>MHH Reported</th>
<th>FHH Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land preparation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeding activity</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting activity</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshing/Shelling activity</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year**

2009/10

---

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
IFPRI – Ethiopia Pilot Input Voucher
sample size by sex & region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Shewa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gojjam</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gojjam</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
IFPRI – Ethiopia Pilot Input Voucher
Division of labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel number</th>
<th>Plot Number</th>
<th>Crop Code</th>
<th>Land preparation</th>
<th>Planting</th>
<th>Weeding</th>
<th>Applying chemical fertilizer</th>
<th>Applying manure &amp; other organic inputs</th>
<th>Pest control</th>
<th>Harvest &amp; post-harvest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13m</td>
<td>E14m</td>
<td>E15m</td>
<td>E16m</td>
<td>E16f</td>
<td>E17m</td>
<td>E17f</td>
<td>E18m</td>
<td>E18f</td>
<td>E19m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13f</td>
<td>E14f</td>
<td>E15f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In growing the (crop) on this plot, please identify how many total male and female work days were used for each identified activity.
Results IFPRI - Ethiopia

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
Getting to gender responsive research

• IFPRI survey provided the most rigorous gender responsive data.
  – We need survey designs to involve women (ATA gender unit commissioned), female enumerators, multi-disciplined.
  – and to factor in how women understand and answer questions/gendered terminology (great research idea!);

• Using Likert scales or asking for the number of hours/days
  – Generates more accurate data & makes women visible.

• *Do we need to over sample women to make women visible?*
Table 2 Distribution of Average per kg cost of fertilizer-UREA- across regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Average per Kg cost</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIGRAY</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMHARA</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OROMIA</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Distribution of Average per Kg cost of fertilizer-UREA- by SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Average per Kg cost</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 Distribution of Average per litre cost of herbicide across regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Average per litre cost</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIGRAY</td>
<td>84.89</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>110.15</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMHARA</td>
<td>126.97</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OROMIIA</td>
<td>184.71</td>
<td>512.35</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165.55</td>
<td>436.41</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5 Distribution of Average per litre cost of Herbicide by SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Average per litre cost</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>181.07</td>
<td>44.73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>164.43</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0.2113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165.55</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intersectionality

• Need comparable samples by age, sex, spouse, marital status, region, religion, etc.,
  – Not just about weather, yields & farm size
• Intersectionality lens good at design & analysis phase – tells us who misses out, is exploited, helps understand poverty pathways.
• Women’s work is not ‘seen’ by men = Women not visible if only interview HHH.

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
What else have we learnt?

• Many units of analysis within a household.
  – We need to interview more wives, female heads, old/young;
  – Before women were FHH they were spouses; before men were MHH they were youth – poverty/capacity pathways;
• Government lists miss FHH = hard to find.
• Define what a FHH is for enumerators (absent spouse, divorced, widowed…).
  – Length of time single matters.

• If we want more gender friendly policies we need more gender responsive surveys.
Gender responsive research

How to make women’s roles and needs visible in agriculture.

The way we ask questions in surveys

Who we ask

How we sample

Who is involved in developing the surveys

The response range offered

Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys
Recap

• Section 1:
  – Qualitative assessment of agriculture evaluations: internal learning events, specific gender indicators (baseline + evaluation ToR + objective level), budget, mixed methods, mainstream.

• Section 2:
  – 7 promising methodologies: gender relations can change in a cohesive manner. Need to capture change pathways.

• Section 3:
  – Learning around capturing gender responsive data in surveys: go beyond headship, ask gender-responsive questions
Thank you for your interest!