Abstract

The objective of this meta-analysis of evaluations is to ascertain factors and interventions that do or do not lead to gender-related social norm change, identify the reasons behind failures, and provide knowledge about gender programming in the agricultural sector. A meta-analysis was conducted on 41 documents, including 18 evaluation reports. Following a rigorous two-stage process only three evaluation reports reached the deep dive stage. The analysis suggests that many evaluations lack methodological rigor, and fail to capture gender norm changes. Moreover, many projects do not apply the lessons they learn and don’t share these lessons with partners or other stakeholders.

The findings identify factors that contribute to changes in social norms, including a multi-intervention design, relevance of the interventions to community needs, use of social mobilization, and initiatives to overcome constraints to women’s participation. Social accountability tools that are designed to improve participation and equality result in greater participation of women in project activities. Gender programming can be improved in the following ways: ensuring gender related indicators are set and that the theory of change includes gender norm transformation; using participatory planning and social accountability methods; working with women in groups; adopting a multi-intervention design that aims to affect change at different levels sequentially; taking a long term approach to change and project design; training project teams in gender awareness; documenting gender learning and disseminating this knowledge widely; and, incorporating such knowledge into new project designs.

Executive summary

Understanding gender as it relates to wheat-based livelihoods is the topic of a research for development project funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and implemented by the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center – CIMMYT – in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Ethiopia. The project aims to document and assess the evidence base, and to understand how gender norms influence the ability of individuals to learn and benefit from agricultural innovations.

Gender-related social norms dictate how men and women act in society, the roles they play and the behaviors they aspire towards. Social norms can be a barrier to women participating in economic activities and in agriculture innovations (new farming techniques). This meta-analysis seeks to find out what works for gender norm change in agricultural projects.

Forty-one documents were collected and of these, three evaluations fulfilled the two rounds of inclusion criteria and qualified for the deep dive analysis. This reveals that gender norm change is poorly if ever achieved. However, it is possible that social norm change occurs, but is not captured in evaluations.

The following factors were identified as influencing social norm change:

- Project design: Planning for gender norm changes and including this in logframes, theory of change and indicators is necessary for lessons to be learnt. Making an additional effort to factor gender norms into projects will increase the benefits accruing to women.

- Multi-intervention design: Social norm change is a complex process where pathways can be multi-dimensional. The interventions that followed a multi-pronged approach have proven to be more effective for social norm change than projects offering seeds alone. Coordinating with non-agricultural projects (e.g. education and market development projects) and connecting them with project beneficiaries can increase the potential for project activities to be synergistic and achieve greater efficacy.

- Initiatives to overcome challenges to women’s participation: The deep dive projects adopted strategies to deal with the limited mobility and participation of women and other restrictive social norms.

- Relevance to community needs: Project interventions that are tailored to the precise needs of the specific community more readily facilitate social norm change than those projects designed without community input.

- Include social empowerment: engaging with governance processes and multi-stakeholder forums help with women’s economic empowerment and gender-related social norm change.

- Include participatory planning: methods that involve beneficiaries in project planning and working with women in groups leads to greater efficacy for women.
These points about project design and evaluation were learned from examining the excluded documents:

- Given the heterogeneity across the country, preliminary gender research/analysis should be undertaken to assess women’s capacity and situation before completing the design process.
- An absence of gender considerations at the conceptualization stage results in less equitable outcomes for women.
- When women are invisible in the goals, objectives, indicators and targets, it generally results in a lack of sex disaggregated data collected and analyzed during the evaluation.
- The evaluation terms of reference (ToR) and the evaluation approach used has a direct bearing on the projects being able to capture gender results.
- The research design, from the rigor of methods to the representativeness of the data, determines the quality of learning that an evaluation provides, and this is done poorly in many cases.
- Evaluation reports should document how the project built upon previous learning and the authors of evaluations should effectively document their learning.
- Many evaluations are not shared, and therefore important lessons evaporate.

Changing gender-related social norms and ensuring that Pakistani women benefit equally to men can be challenging but not insurmountable. This meta-analysis identifies a number of practices that work to change gender and social norms in Pakistan’s agricultural sector. It highlights what researchers can do and how project designs and evaluations can be executed differently, in order to better capture and prove that gender norm changes deliver equitable results for men and women. Unfortunately results and knowledge from projects and evaluations are not widely shared or published. Additionally, evaluations that lack rigor miss capturing gender norm changes. This meta-analysis contributes to a literature gap on what works to change gender-related social norms in rural Pakistan.
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**Acronyms and abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AKRSP</td>
<td>Agha Khan Rural Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>Agribusiness Support Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAP</td>
<td>Balochistan Agriculture Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABI</td>
<td>Center for Agriculture and Bioscience International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Community Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoD</td>
<td>Charter of Demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoA</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRDF</td>
<td>Dairy and Rural Development Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGA</td>
<td>Economic Growth and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEG</td>
<td>Farmers’ Enterprise Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Farmer Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gilgit Baltistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE4DE</td>
<td>Gender Equality for Decent Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoB</td>
<td>Government of Balochistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC</td>
<td>Higher Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPK</td>
<td>Khyber Pakhtunkhwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDF</td>
<td>Market Development Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDA</td>
<td>Mennonite Economic Development Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Management Systems International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCO</td>
<td>Men’s Community Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSP</td>
<td>National Rural Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>North West Frontier Province (currently the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDBP</td>
<td>Pakistan Domestic Biogas Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Punjab Rural Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Satpara Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFFD</td>
<td>Strengthening Participation and Influence of Poor and Vulnerable Farmers and Fisher Folks in Decision Making Processes Related to Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>The Agribusiness Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREE</td>
<td>Training for Rural and Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>Women’s Community Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEAT R4D</td>
<td>Wheat Research for Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Pakistan has a hunger problem. Pakistan ranked 106 out of 119 countries on the 2018 Global Hunger Index.\(^1\) Pakistan’s gendered food security gap is one of the largest in the world with women scoring 11 percentage points higher than men.\(^2\) Agriculture contributes 18.9 percent to GDP and employs 42.3 percent of the labor force.\(^3\) Hence, improving women’s involvement in, and benefit from agriculture can improve the nation’s growth and food security.

Pakistan ranks 143 out of 144 countries on the 2016 Global Gender Gap, highlighting the magnitude of the challenge.\(^4\) Women in agriculture-based communities in Pakistan face the following challenges:

- Limited access to resources and services including hired labor, equipment, technology, finance and markets;
- Less exposure than men to education and training;
- Limited control over productive resources, especially land;
- Limited control and power to decide over income from production and other benefits;
- Limited participation and leadership in farmers’ organizations and the community;
- Heavy workload due to multiple responsibilities;
- Mobility constraints;
- Sexual harassment and violence\(^5,6\)

Ensuring equal rights and opportunities for women could lead to a significant increase in agricultural output, and this would reduce poverty.\(^7\)

However, current improvements in agriculture disproportionately benefit men who tend to own land and the means of production, and control income. How can these benefits be spread more evenly across the population? Understanding gender as it relates to wheat-based livelihoods is the topic of a research for development project funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic

---

1. The Global Hunger Index (GHI) is a tool designed to comprehensively measure and track hunger at the global, regional, and national levels.
Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and implemented by the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center – CIMMYT – in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Ethiopia. The project was designed with the objective of understanding how gender norms and agency affect the ability of individuals (men, women and youth) to learn about, trial, adopt and benefit from agricultural innovations, in order to lessen rural poverty and food insecurity and improve gender equity in wheat-based systems and livelihoods. Wheat is an important contributor to food security in low-income countries.

The present report is a meta-analysis of the gender outcomes in evaluations of agricultural development projects in Pakistan, and is one output of the aforementioned project.

2. **Key definitions**

**Social norms** are group beliefs about appropriate behavior and expected actions for members. Social norms can refer to the ideas held by a group of individuals and the actions they elicit in individuals, and how individuals are sanctioned by their surrounding community if they break a social norm. Changing social norms then requires altering what is, and is not, acceptable at a community level and also requires the presence of willing individuals able to ‘break’ social norms through their actions.

**Gender norms** typically operate on an ideological level and an individual level. In other words, gender norms represent perspectives on what gender relations ‘should be like’ and how individuals of particular genders ‘should behave’ through their gender role. Gender norms are often connected to broader social norms.

3. **Rationale for the assessment**

Rigorous and independent evaluations commissioned by projects are important learning resources. They are rarely published in peer-reviewed journals and may not even appear on project/company websites. This means that a vast majority of stakeholders do not benefit from the findings. There is also a scarcity of peer-reviewed articles that describe effective methods of gender norm change in the agricultural sector. Consequently, this meta-analysis of agricultural program evaluations was undertaken to consolidate knowledge around gender norm changes in Pakistan. Gender norms and agency, especially in various agricultural communities and regions,

---

8 Project Fact Sheet: Understanding gender in wheat-based livelihoods for enhanced WHEAT R4D impact in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Ethiopia. International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT).
need further research, to provide a strong evidence base for future policy interventions. These findings will be used to inform future programming for CIMMYT and other stakeholders.

4. **Methodology**

The methodology was completed in four steps (Fig 1). Step 1 involved setting the research questions:

- What approaches and interventions affect change in gender-related social norms? What doesn’t work?
- What insights into how efficacy was, or was not achieved can be identified?

Step 2 involved setting the inclusion/exclusion criteria based upon an initial review of evaluation literature. Inclusion criteria was set in two phases:

- Phase 1: Document type (only evaluations were selected); independence (only evaluations completed by an independent evaluator/consultant were selected); the evaluation had to have collected data on gender and from women; and evaluations had to fall within the timeframe of 2011-2017. When an evaluation did not state its timeframe then the evaluation date was used.
- Phase 2: Rigor of methods (See Box 1 for the criteria used to determine rigor); gender needed to be woven throughout rather than restricted to a separate (and limited) section; social norm changes had to be demonstrated.

**Box 1: Rigor of methods criteria**

Quantitative sample: What is the quantitative sampling strategy? Does strata include women or female-headed households? Is it statistically representative? Are sampling methods and survey procedures explained?

Qualitative treatment: How are qualitative samples taken? Do they involve women? Is qualitative data presented in a systematic and rigorous manner?

Evidence for findings: Is the analysis and presentation of evidence credible? Are the results disaggregated by sex? Are evaluative claims supported by empirical data?

Step 3 involved an internet search using the keywords gender, agriculture, evaluation and Pakistan to develop the initial sampling frame. The organizations appearing from this search were then contacted via email and telephone for evaluation documents. In cases where the evaluation document was found online, the organization was contacted to see if the online version of the evaluation was the most current. This process created a sampling frame of 41 documents.
Step 4 involved assessing each document according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria set at round two. Out of the 41 documents, 27 were disqualified in the first round of screening (Fig 2 shows the reasons for disqualification). Project completion reports, end of project reports, learning documents, situation analysis and social assessments were not counted as evaluations.

Out of 41 documents, 14 documents qualified for round 2 screening. During round 2, most reports did not meet the ‘rigor’ criteria. Due to this, much gender-related documentation appears to be ‘anecdotal’. For example, ‘case studies’, ‘stories’ and ‘selected beneficiaries’ were often found, without an exploration of how their experiences of the project activities may or may not have been representative of others who benefited from the project. However, the evaluations that used mixed methods better documented learning around gender outcomes, highlighting the value in strengthening qualitative data collection and reporting.

Eight of the evaluation reports did not aim for, nor report on, social norm changes and thus were excluded. However, five of these eight documented that social norms were a barrier to project implementation/success. None of the evaluations mentioned that the policy context was in support of gender norm change, although they did mention interventions focused on identifying and highlighting/lobbying policy gaps and their impact on women and men farmers. When gender was explicitly mentioned in the evaluation’s Terms of Reference (TOR) then the evaluation
reported on gender-related results. Ten out of fourteen evaluation reports had gender woven throughout and only three had a specific section on gender.

Figure 2 Reasons for document disqualification

Three evaluations qualified for Step 5, the deep dive phase. During this phase, the evaluations were analyzed for evidence of gender norm change and knowledge about gender-related project interventions.

5. **Limitations**

Few evaluations met the criteria for inclusion. As a result, (and because the purpose of the research was to learn what works) additional explanations about why evaluations are not a good source of learning for gender programming was added to the research, and this included aspects from disqualified gender assessments and internal learning documents.

A limitation with regard to the analysis was the lack of detailed information available regarding the interventions of Gender Equality for Decent Employment (GE4DE) and Economic Growth and Agriculture (EGA) Program. These were both meta reviews, consequently, a detailed assessment of the effectiveness of individual interventions in terms of social norm change could not be gauged. However, the evaluation report broadly provided insights into what worked to change social norms. Additionally, GE4DE was written by one of the writers of this meta-analysis report (Sidra Minhas). To ensure full disclosure and objectivity, the lead technical advisor Dr. Kristie Druca peer reviewed this evaluation’s analysis in detail. An additional benefit from including the
evaluation report in this deep dive was that an inside view of the challenges in developing such reports was gained.

6. **Introduction to learnings**

This section documents learnings about successes and failures and is structured as follows:

i. Section 6.1 discusses learnings from the deep dive evaluations with respect to gender-related social norm change;

ii. Section 6.2 analyses the evaluations that were not included in the deep dive to reveal the reasons for failure to provide learning around gender.

**6.1. Deep dive learnings**

Three evaluation reports met the qualifying criteria for a deep dive analysis (Table 1). The difference found in the three deep dive evaluations, compared to the excluded evaluations, is that they factored gender norms into their design, rather than viewing gender norms (such as women’s segregation from men and society, lower education and lower access to resources and assets) as a barrier. These evaluations highlight the challenges of addressing culturally-defined gender roles and norms to deliver gender-equitable results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Interventions and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep dive project details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Balochistan Agriculture Project (BAP) – Final Evaluation | USAID | Mustang, Loralai, Killa Saifullah, Quetta, Zhob, Pishin, Musakhail, and Sherani | Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) | BAP is the third phase of a 10-year agricultural development project that started in 2005. The pilot phase started with three districts and subsequently developed to include eight districts of Balochistan. The pilot phase focused on community development and food security. The second phase focused on increasing surpluses and connecting farmers to markets, and the third phase (BAP) emphasized helping beneficiary farmers to transition to commercially-oriented business enterprises. This strategy was implemented through capacity building, technological innovation, farm management, and value chain development. The project also included a policy component to work with the Government of Balochistan (GoB). The activities covered are:  
- Community organization  
- Community and market development,  
- Water, crops, livestock and women-focused activities. |
| Impact Assessment of Skills Development Programmes of Gender Equality for Decent Employment (GE4DE) Project | CIDA | Skardu in Gilgit-Baltistan (GB); Lasbela and Hub in Balochistan; Charsadda and Naran in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP); Lahore, Rahimyar Khan, and Sialkot in Punjab; Thatta and Karachi in Sindh. | Multiple local partners including Government Departments like the Higher Education Commission (HEC), NGOs, Welfare Trusts and Societies. | GE4DE was a six-year program, spread across Pakistan. The main interventions were:  
1. Trainings for more than 11,000 men and women, for the provincial labor department officials on gender mainstreaming, and for local experts to develop industry competency standards, based on the International Labor Organization (ILO)’s Training for Rural and Economic Empowerment (TREE) methodology.  
2. Advocacy sessions for employers to promote gender-equality measures.  
3. Trainings for media personnel on gender-responsive reporting. |
| USAID Economic Growth and Agriculture Portfolio Impact Assessment - Assessing the Theory of Change and Impact of USAID/Pakistan’s Economic and Growth and Agriculture (EGA) Program | USAID | Four International firms: Agribusiness Support Fund (ASF); Dairy and Rural Development Foundation (DRDF); Mennonite Economic Development Associates (MEDA); Chemonics International | | The four EGA projects included in this evaluation are Agribusiness Project, the Dairy Project, the Entrepreneur’s Project and the Firm’s Project. The duration of each project was between three and five years and the projects were implemented in KP, Sindh and Punjab (the Agribusiness Project was also implemented in GB). The specific interventions of the projects aimed to bring policy reform, improve access to markets, workforce development, and introduce new technology and agricultural best practices. |

12 See table 3 for the methods used
6.1.1 Enhancing impact on social norm change

In reviewing the three deep dive evaluation reports, some key factors influencing social norm change were identified.

Multi-interventions design
Change is complex and slow, and change pathways can be multi-dimensional. Two of the projects, the Balochistan Agriculture Project (BAP) and Economic Growth and Agriculture (EGA), had interventions with a multi-pronged approach. In the BAP, interventions consisted of creating access to improved mobilization, capacity-building inputs and market linkages. The provision of resources e.g. seed, in addition to skill development, was vital to allow women to benefit from the income-generation trainings and marketing strategies.

The EGA Portfolio Impact Assessment demonstrates that coordinating with non-agricultural projects such as access to education, markets and services, etc. can increase the potential for synergistic impact for targeted beneficiaries, i.e. smallholder farmers and entrepreneurs in agricultural and non-agricultural value chains. Although the EGA program interventions did not involve direct coordination with other non-agricultural projects, the interventions were designed to target economic opportunity and empowerment and social empowerment broadly. The EGA Portfolio Impact Assessment states:

“although EGA does not fund access to primary education, EGA beneficiaries have a greater tendency to ensure access to education for their girls than non-beneficiaries.”
EGA Portfolio Impact Assessment, page 39

This indicates that project participation inculcated a sense of awareness about women’s right to education and the benefits of education more generally in areas where girls' education is not a priority. Multi-dimensional agricultural project design can therefore, lead to wider changes concerning social norms for poor rural farmers (fig 3).

Relevance to community needs

13 The terms ‘project’ and ‘program’ are used interchangeably and differently in different evaluations. The general trend is that a program is a collection of projects and a project is a collection of activities. However, for some evaluations, a program has a large design or theory of change to provide structure and coherence to the projects, and some do not.
Projects should be tailored to the local culture and circumstances, be responsive to community needs, and move at a pace of change that is comfortable for the community. In traditional communities, women are limited to the domestic sphere and have specific roles. Changes in social norms can thus be facilitated by the relevance of project interventions to community and household needs.

"...because empowerment is a multifaceted phenomenon, and because Pakistan has a diverse society, the particular ways women are empowered or disempowered varies in different economic, social and cultural contexts....economic development, particularly among lower-middle-income households, has a potentially negative impact on women’s autonomy, mobility and social status. When lower-income households achieve middle-class status, they are able to withdraw women from remunerative work..."

Economic Growth and Agriculture Portfolio Impact Assessment, page 14

BAP interventions were made relevant to the needs of beneficiaries by assessing farmers’ needs during meetings and through the formation of Community Organizations (COs).

"COs also provided the vehicle for gathering people together to discuss community, household, social, and livelihood needs."

BAP Evaluation, page 5

By facilitating communication and accountability channels with beneficiaries, the project was able to meet emerging community needs. Additionally, relevance to farmers’ needs was achieved through capacity building for commercializing agriculture and livestock practices. Development priorities and needs of the Government of Balochistan (GoB) were met through consultation with government departments and research and policy organizations, and by engaging the Department of Agriculture (DoA) in strategic planning.

The BAP evaluation team asked the Men’s Community Organization (MCO) and Women’s Community Organization (WCO) members about the relevance of project activities in addressing household needs and community problems. Almost 100 percent of the respondents believed that women-specific activities (for example training in food processing and animal rearing, capacity building for marketing, farmer field schools etc.) were relevant to household needs. As a result, communities were more open to these interventions, and subsequently, social norm change was possible.14

**Initiatives to overcome challenges to women’s participation**

A major focus of these projects is to enhance female participation. Women’s lower education, unpaid care burden, and strict norms governing their segregation to the home domain limit women’s involvement in, and benefit from, development. The deep dive evaluations adapted trainings to women’s capacities (literacy and skills); facilitated mobility (provided transport, organized trainings at convenient venues, ensured safety especially in unpredictable security situations, etc.); offered flexible schedules (flexible timing for women who had other responsibilities); and, met women’s gender-role needs (for example, ensured childcare). In

---

14 Balochistan Agriculture Project, Final Evaluation, Page 9
addition, the following strategies were used specifically to address the challenge of women’s restricted mobility and sex segregation:

a. Engaging with men and families
Two of the deep dive evaluations engaged with men and families to overcome barriers to the mobilization of women.

- In GE4DE, counseling family members proved to be an effective way of influencing social norms, or at least of initiating a change in them. In order to overcome difficulties in women’s mobilization, men in the household and other families were made aware of the benefits that the trainings would bring about for the whole community as well as for the women. To create this awareness, partner organizations held meetings with communities, families and male members, and also tried to involve men in training alongside women. This was done to familiarize them with the concept of working women, women in leadership roles and women’s rights. The trainings under GE4DE were designed on the basis of ILO’s TREE (Training for Rural Economic Empowerment) methodology which promotes rural employment using a community-based approach to skills development. It promotes economic/employment opportunities and gender equality throughout the project by using a mixture of tools and strategies.

- BAP started by gaining the trust of men – the decision-makers in households and gatekeepers of communities – and raised their awareness before beginning work with the women. This was effective in opening channels of communication for women.
  “…They engaged with men first because it’s not an easy task to involve women in Balochistan. Women are confined to their homes; they don’t have enough mobility because of the existing systems in place. More so in Pashtun districts which are stricter in this regard. They formed men’s community organizations and built rapport with them, who then allowed the female facilitators to meet up with community women. Then, they gradually formed women’s COs in the villages.”

BAP Final Evaluation, Page 11

While BAP project activities enhanced women’s economic empowerment, they did not have a significant impact on men’s perception about women’s status in the society and therefore the changes may not be sustainable.

There isn’t just one right way to deliver gender-related social norm change. The EGA projects did not engage with men beforehand, but still managed to work with women and deliver social change.

“Social change is much more strongly influenced by program participation, economic opportunity and economic and social empowerment for women than for men.”

---

15 Impact Assessment of Skills Development Programmes of GE4DE, Page 44
b. Working with women in groups
The projects designed specific interventions for women, among other project activities to entice their participation and ensure they were able to benefit along with men. Women were trained in how to form and be a member of community groups (i.e. social mobilization). The groups were then used to create trust and a safe space for teaching the women other skills and giving them greater access to information and networks. For example,
- Exchange visits were conducted whereby female farmers visited other villages/areas in groups and shared knowledge.
- Female farmers (and men) were organized into community- and district-level groups and provided with linkages to provincial- and national-level advocacy networks.
- Groups were involved in participatory planning – a process whereby a group discussion sets the priorities for the project. ILO’s TREE methodology used by GE4DE is another example of participatory planning. Additionally, women were involved in community planning and management processes which exposed them to new forms of decision making by consensus.

c. Interacting with wider governance/social processes
Some projects had targeted interventions to improve the advocacy and lobbying ability of farmers.
- This involved teaching male and female farmers, as a group, how to lobby the government at various levels: community, district, provincial and national. Women were specifically taught about the role of government and the importance of civic engagement to increase government accountability which would then lead to stronger states and societies. This is known as ‘social accountability’.\(^\text{17}\) See also box 2.
- The decision-making process about food security was explained, so that women farmers could better understand how and where they could participate to influence decision-making that affected their food needs.
- Multi-stakeholder discussion forums were held so that the farmers could share their concerns and fears and were able to influence authorities like the Agriculture Department and the Livestock Department.

Box 2: Enabling environment

The Balochistan Agriculture Project found that the efficacy of women’s groups is less than that of male groups. The project stimulated women’s leadership by setting quotas for women’s representation, encouraging women to become candidates for local elections, and providing women with leadership training and mentoring. As a result of these meetings and discussions, a Charter of Demands was produced that included initiatives such as reducing women’s double burden of work (domestic work and agri-labor), and establishing their entitlement to land. The key learning

\(^{17}\) The World Bank defines social accountability as an approach towards building accountability that relies on civic engagement, i.e. in which it is ordinary citizens and/or civil society organizations who participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability (World Bank, 2004f: 1).
from this is that social accountability tools that are designed to improve participation and equality, result in greater participation of women in project activities.

d. Use of media
Some projects used multiple media tools, including newspapers, television and radio, in order to raise awareness. However, due to poverty and illiteracy, a limited number of farmers benefited from these interventions. For women farmers, the number was even lower because of a lack of access to the various forms of media, the double burden of work and cultural constraints. Nevertheless, these types of approaches were able to reach more women than those who did not engage with wider channels of communication (See example in box 3).

Box 3: Social media example
GE4DE used social media to reach more women with market information. Due to mobility restrictions, accessing markets is challenging for women who often need to seek permission from men to travel and are frequently chaperoned by male kin. GE4DE created an online store Facebook page and an active website, so that women had a virtual presence and exposure to their products. Women could more easily access current prices once they understood how the market worked and how the social media sites could be used.

Duration of project
BAP was in the third phase of a ten-year agricultural development project, and had a significant impact in terms of increasing women’s income and their involvement in decisions about household expenditures and assets. The longer duration of the project and its implementation in phases allows the implementers to develop an understanding of the community and its needs and achieve greater social norm changes.

In terms of the other two evaluations, GE4DE was a six-year program that worked through smaller projects across the country, so based on the author’s experience, it is not comparable here. EGA evaluated 4 projects; their individual interventions and timelines were not clear from the evaluation report, and thus are not suitable. More information of how longer-term projects incorporate social norms and past lessons is required to understand the value of longer projects.

6.1.2 Analysis of learnings from the deep dive
From this overview, some pathways of change are envisioned by these evaluations. These pathways largely involve increasing awareness and the capacity of women via interventions to enhance economic opportunity, and the provision of raw material and resources. Then the focus would be on enhancing the economic and social empowerment of women (which seems to include

---
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developing women’s understanding of governance structures and the value of different communication channels). This eventually results in social norm change.

The following is a list of key success factors for social norm change identified from the deep dive:

1. Multi-intervention designs
2. Participatory planning processes that are relevant to the community’s needs
3. Use of groups
4. Women-focused intervention (including empowering women with new skills and gaining support from men and communities)
5. Interacting with wider governance/social processes
6. Using the media.
7. Longer duration of projects

In addition, the evaluations identified areas for improvement:

i) The deep dive evaluations focused on certain aspects of empowerment (e.g. economic empowerment, understanding governance), all of which are important, but this was not multiplied across levels or done in sequence. Figure 4 shows that empowerment needs to happen at various levels simultaneously. Self-empowerment, or conscientization, was emphasized by the evaluators of GE4D (p 50) as requiring more attention

![Figure 4 Levels for project intervention](image)

ii) Preliminary research needs to be undertaken to gauge women’s capacity and current situation before designing interventions. A gender analysis helps to identify how the
project should intervene (e.g. roles: reproductive and/or productive) and at what level and in what sequence (Fig 4). Strategies can then be developed in advance to deal with the barriers associated with gender norms, instead of taking a reactive approach where gender interventions are retrofitted into the project to ensure women’s participation.

- BAP could have improved the efficacy of results had an appropriate gender analysis been undertaken prior to project design/implementation in phase 1 and then revisited and built upon in subsequent phases.
- The use of the Longwe Framework of Gender Analysis in the GE4DE impact assessment helped to identify significant areas where the project’s gender orientation could be improved. The use of these types of analysis at the design stage would also help to reach more women and address their needs.

iii) Local partners need capacity building to enhance efficacy in projects. GE4DE worked through local partners. Although the model has its own strengths in terms of local and thematic expertise, the evaluation reports show the need to build local partners’ capacity and to supervise them closely during implementation, especially for gender-related activities.

iv) The EGA portfolio impact assessment concluded that USAID program participation has a greater overall impact on women than on men, particularly on economic empowerment and social change. However, the impact was not significant in the area of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) which implies that different strategies would need to be designed and implemented in heavily conservative areas such as KPK.

v) The evaluations acknowledge their failure to build upon previous knowledge learnt. It is not common to share knowledge on gender among project partners or between design phases. This limits learning and the gender-related social norm changes (Box 4 offers an evaluation to refer to for a good example of applying learning.

Box 4: Incorporating lessons learnt

The Punjab Rural Support Programme (PRSP), (a disqualified document), has been operational since 1997. There has been social transformation, and continual interaction with the community. Lessons learned have helped guide the program each year.

6.1.3 Deep dive conclusion

Social norms are a deeply entrenched barrier to women’s participation in economic activities. All the projects included in the deep dive carried out targeted interventions for the increased participation of women, ranging from awareness campaigns to training and policy reform. The GE4DE conducted training for men/women and media personnel, and advocacy sessions for employers. The evaluation reported on improved perceptions of gender roles. The EGA Program interventions were focused around policy reform and market and workforce development for women. EGA highlights the need for a heterogenous approach to changing gender norms when
working across the country. Lastly, BAP focused on community and market development by forming women’s and men’s community organizations. The evaluation report emphasizes the relevance of economic as well as social empowerment. More than one strategy or approach is required to deliver gender-related social norm changes in Pakistan.

6.2 Learning from excluded evaluations

It is not imperative that all projects address social norm change. However, considering that 11 out of 14 evaluations that qualified for the second round of screening stated that social norms were a challenge for effective project implementation, so addressing them would logically, have enhanced project impact. Yet information on the topic was scant. This section is based on analysis of the evaluations that did not qualify for the deep dive, and analyzes why and how these evaluations failed to provide learning around gender.

6.2.3 Evaluation approach

Lessons can be learned from the 14 evaluations that passed round one criteria in terms of the evaluation approach used (see summary at table 2). Three evaluations used the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Criteria. Under this approach, programs and projects should be evaluated using the following criteria:20

i. Relevance: The extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

ii. Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which an activity attains its objectives.

iii. Efficiency: Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process was adopted.

iv. Impact: The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

v. Sustainability: Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding is withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

Those evaluations that only used the OECD DAC criteria frequently failed to capture gender results. Within the DAC framework, gender learnings are limited. The Impact Assessment of GE4DE (a deep dive evaluation), used the DAC criteria, and combined this with the Longwe Framework.

The Longwe Framework uses five levels of equality to measure the extent of empowerment and social norm change that is brought about by project interventions: control; participation/mobility; conscientization; access; and welfare; in private (individual and family) and public (community and workplace) domains. It is an effective method of assessing gender empowerment changes. However, it is very detailed and academic. Box 5 illustrates the use of Longwe Framework.

20 DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance. OECD
When evaluators develop reports around questions outlined in a terms of reference (ToR), they are usually limited to responding within the criteria set. Unless a specific question or questions regarding gender or women’s empowerment is asked, gender is not reported on and issues around it are not highlighted. In either case, by limiting gender to one section of a report, the opportunity to learn more with regard to changing or influencing gender norms for sustainable development is restricted. Even when gender is woven throughout an evaluation, the evaluation may not emphasize gender learning if this is not specified in the ToR. Some evaluations did not even answer the gender question set out in the ToR.

However, a ToR can also elucidate well-constructed questions around gender that emphasize learning. Two of the three deep dive evaluations responded to evaluation ToRs. This emphasizes the important role an evaluation ToR can play in capturing gender related learnings and social norm changes. To summarize, for evaluations to capture gender learning there has to be a specific well-crafted gender question in the ToR and/or a gender focused framework such as the Longwe used. OECD DAC in isolation will not capture robust gender learnings about social norm changes.

**Box 5: Longwe Framework**

The Women’s Empowerment (Longwe) Framework was adapted to evaluate and interpret the impact of particular GE4DE interventions. The five levels of equality were used in determining the impact of a particular intervention in terms of promoting equality and female empowerment. Moreover, to support the analysis process, the team further unpacked these by identifying factors under each level at the individual, household and community level. For example, the changes in income and the changes in perceptions of gender roles at the individual, household and community level were compared. The comparison was then based on baseline and endline studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Title</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Evaluation Approach</th>
<th>Software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2 Method, evaluation approach and software used</strong>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Impact Assessment Gender Equality for Decent employment (GE4DE)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Strengthening Participation and Influence of Poor and Vulnerable Farmers and Fisher Folks in Decision Making Processes Related to Food Security (End Term Evaluation Report)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Balochistan Agriculture Project*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Economic Growth and Agriculture Portfolio Impact Assessment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Supporting Sustainable Agriculture &amp; Livelihood Initiatives for Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 United States Assistance to Balochistan Border Areas – Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Building Sustainable Agribusinesses in Pakistan – Final Evaluation of the Agribusiness Project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Satpara Development Project (SDP) Evaluation, irrigated Agriculture in Gilgit – Baltistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Performance Evaluation of Phase I of Dairy Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dairy Project – Performance Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Impact Assessment Study of Four Project Areas in Two IFAD-assisted Projects In NWFP and Punjab</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Agriculture Sector Linkages Program – Phase II Mid-term Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mid Term Evaluation Report – Increased Food Security and Resilience of Vulnerable Communities in District Sanghar- Sindh, Pakistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Impact Assessment GE4DE – Mid-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Evaluations that qualified for the deep dive

---

21 The use and documentation of an analytical software has not been set as a criterion, but it does add rigor to the methodology. Of the 12 evaluations which used qualitative methods, 10 used quantitative methods and only three of these reported the use of software for analysis.
6.2.1 Project design

A logframe is the basic, logical project framework that is used as a tool for improving the planning, implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation of projects. This framework provides a way of structuring the main elements of a project and highlights the logical linkages between them. It involves considering questions like these: If activities are implemented, will outputs be produced? If outputs are produced, will outcomes result? If outcomes result, will the objectives be achieved? This is also related to the concept of the theory of change. This method maps out how a given intervention is expected to lead to the intended change, drawing on a causal analysis based on available evidence. Box 6 presents an example from the GE4DE program that is included in the deep dive.

It is challenging to monitor gender norm change, but relevant and specific indicators and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of data can give valuable insights. A lack of indicators that include gender are a limitation to learning about gender because ‘what gets measured gets done.’ Indicators need to be comprehensive and should cover a range of variables within the areas of economic opportunity and economic and social empowerment, as highlighted in the Economic Growth and Agriculture (EGA) Impact Assessment (Box 7).

Box 6: Integrating gender across the project cycle

The Impact Assessment of GE4DE reports the following project objective: ‘Working women in Pakistan have better incomes, working environment and increased participation in household decisions and specifically expenditures.’

The following project outcome: ‘Government policies and practices are more gender mainstreamed.’

It has a number of indicators to help measure success such as: Approximately how many female trainees possess personal mobile phones?

When gender is in the stated aim of the project and visible at different levels of the logframe, then the evaluation will also focus on gender.

The GE4DE Impact Assessment includes the following objectives:
- Examine empowerment by identifying gender-specific patterns caused by persistent gender specific economic differentials;
- Identify external socio-economic and cultural factors which were enabling and/or constraining women’s economic participation.

Consequently, when gender is integrated across the project cycle, the project and evaluation can learn about gender norms and what works to change them.

Box 7: Gender specific indicator example

EGA includes: ‘What is the current level of economic and social empowerment (e.g. measure of control over their livelihoods and participation in decision making at the household and community level) of the beneficiaries of EGA projects.’

---

Of the 14 evaluation reports that qualified for round two, five (35%) lacked qualitative or quantitative indicators of women’s empowerment. The success of achieving project goals relies heavily on design at conceptualization. When women are invisible in the goals, objectives, indicator(s) and targets, then data regarding women cannot be collected and analyzed. Box 8 provides an indicator example from BAP.

The following two examples illustrate the limitations of project concept and design and how this affects gender results:

1. **Presence of sex-disaggregated goals and targets, but absence of, or poorly defined, gender-sensitive indicators**

In the project Strengthening Participation and Influence of Poor and Vulnerable Farmers and Fisher Folks in Decision Making Processes Related to Food Security (SPFFD), the goal was "to contribute towards creating an enabling environment so that poor women and men farmers can demand pro-poor agriculture and food security policies from the government", yet no gender-sensitive indicators were defined to measure the goal. Although there was a monitoring and evaluation system, it was gender neutral and no sex-disaggregated indicators were present.

The Mid Term Review of Agriculture Linkage Program - Phase II report observed that gender was not incorporated at the design phase, and despite integrating it at a later stage, results did not show any impact in this context. It was noted in the evaluation report that the social team identified ways to involve women in generating additional household income during data collection; however, no economic impacts were seen. This could be attributed to the lack of indicators used for tracking the results.

2. **Presence of a gender-sensitive goal and indicator, but no sex-disaggregated data collection**

The Agribusiness Project (TAP) specifically considered the proportion of female participants in U.S. Government (USG)-assisted programs. The Agribusiness Support Fund’s (ASF) Scope of Work also proposed that at least 30 percent of the project benefits should accrue to women. This was ensured by setting targets such as 30 percent participation by women in Farmers’ Enterprise Groups (FEGs) formed by the Agha Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP).²⁴ Although female

---

²⁴ The Agribusiness Project (TAP) provides grants and technical assistance to small farmers organized into farmers’ enterprise groups (FEGs). Grants help recipients adopt new technologies and practices to enhance competitiveness and ultimately support improved conditions for broad-based economic growth, enhanced profitability, and
participation was set as an indicator as well as a target, the data was not disaggregated by sex in the evaluation report which served as a limitation for measuring any change brought about by TAP with respect to social and gender norms.

Project design summary
Projects could deliver better results for women and gender equality, but they are not captured and reported upon. The general lesson drawn from the above examples is that gender is rarely woven throughout a logframe (goal, indicators, targets), and this results in inconsistent reporting on the project’s impact for women and men at evaluation, and therefore reduces learning. Evaluations that were able to demonstrate social norm changes had gender at the outcome/goal level, in indicators and in targets and collected and reported on sex disaggregated data.

6.2.2 Rigor criteria

Rigor in research methods is vital to ensure that learning is evidence-based. Another reason an evaluation may fail to provide learning on gender is associated with the lack of rigorous methods used (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rigor</th>
<th>Reports fulfilling Rigor Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation report meeting quantitative rigor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation report meeting qualitative rigor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation report meeting evidence rigor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total evaluations in round 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total that met all three categories of rigor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the evaluation reports reviewed lacked a detailed analysis plan.25 The methodology adopted and documented in the EGA Portfolio Impact Assessment, is a good illustration of rigor. Box 9 summarizes the methodology documented in this evaluation report.

Meanwhile, the Dairy Project Performance evaluation report had a poorly-articulated research design. The survey sample was given with a control and treatment group, but was neither detailed nor showed evidence of the male/female distribution. Data was not presented in a systematic employment opportunities, and to contribute to poverty alleviation through product and process transformation. (Building Sustainable Agribusinesses in Pakistan – Final Evaluation of TAP)

25 An analysis plan should be created prior to the data analyses. The analysis plan contains a description of the research question and what the various steps in the analysis are going to be. The analysis plan is intended as a starting point for the analysis - Amsterdam Public Health, Quality Handbook (2017). Available at: http://www.emgo.nl/kc/
manner. Qualitative data was collected but not used in the evaluation as quotes and/or case studies were not used.

The SPFFD evaluation report showed that a clear effort had been made to document numbers of men and women beneficiaries, but lacked details on the methodology used. For example, the sample size rationale for four districts was not provided. The gender ratio of men to women was 61:39%, with no discussion as to why this disparity existed in the respondent sample, nor a discussion of how this may have biased the results. Lastly, the evaluation report mentioned little in terms of addressing social norms aside from the interventions for, and impact on the mobilization of women.26

A good report needs to include related and relevant material in annexures, enabling the reader to objectively review and understand the results. The majority of the evaluation reports did not share details and/or documents, as indicated in Table 4. The identification of 'relevant documents' that should be included in an annexure was based on the authors' observations across the deep dive evaluations.

**Table 4 Reports with relevant documents as annexure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Material in Annexure</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map/Identification of intervention zones</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection tools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical framework analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress/Impact assessment indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Social Mobilization (SM), as defined by UNICEF, is a broad-scale movement to engage people’s participation in achieving a specific development or health goal through self-reliant efforts — those that depend on their own resources and strengths.
The quality of reports carried out by the different stakeholders varied. Donors such as USAID with specific contractors (such as MSI) carried out evaluations with the most rigor\textsuperscript{27}, followed by Oxfam’s in-house publications. However, such was not the case with local, third-party evaluations for NGOs, including for USAID.

The majority of the evaluation reports did not provide evidence to support their claims. In the SPFFD evaluation report gender was represented throughout the report only to the extent of numbers; there was a lack of in-depth analysis justifying those numbers and no discussion of the differences between men and women. Moreover, some evaluations made gender-related claims not backed up by evidence. The SPFFD evaluation report shares a case study on a woman beneficiary, but no numbers have been given on this indicator. In addition, the beneficiary has already been in a leadership role for a decade, which means that project intervention cannot take credit for the quoted result.

“Zareen Gull, a resident and small farmer of UC 172 - TDA is the president of 10 FOs (men and women). She presented CoD to federal minister for food security and research. For the last 1 decade, she has been effectively managing Green Bank that includes atta chacki and wheat storage. She distributed 1.5 mounds to 7 destitute women just last year - 2015. Ms. Zareen Gull is also the president of Producer Organization that highlighted shortage of water supply as main problem of the area to the responsible authorities. She was part of a public hearing where she influenced livestock department Layyah to distribute support package to poor women farmers. As an outcome the department gave 6 Chickens and 1 cock to each woman just in Rs.900. These women are now in a position to sell eggs and chicks and to earn their basic minimum livelihood.”

SPFFD End-Term Evaluation, Page 33

At times, data used as evidence is not representative of the population and beneficiaries. This is more of a challenge in qualitative data. In Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Initiatives for Farmers, evidence of female empowerment has been provided through a case study of a woman in a leadership role.

“Community members in her village elected Yasmeen as Village Development Committee Treasurer in 2013. Yasmeen reported that the Village Development Committee increased gender equality and female empowerment at the household and village levels in her community. “Now men and women sit side by side, and discuss community issues

\textsuperscript{27} The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) awarded a five-year contract to Management Systems International (MSI) to provide performance management support to USAID-sponsored development programs throughout Pakistan in May 2015. The Performance Management Support Contract (PERFORM) serves as a centralized management support mechanism supporting USAID/Pakistan’s mission to increase stability, democracy, and prosperity for the men and women of Pakistan through the implementation of the Mission Strategic Framework (MSF). PERFORM aims to provide data and information to help improve project results through better implementation and design, as well as services that support the Mission’s learning and adaptive process, enabling it to better target its programming and achieve its goals and objectives. The performance components include (1) Monitoring Services; (2) Evaluation Services; (3) Assessment Services; and (4) Learning Support Services.
“together,” Yasmeen stated. She reported widespread community acceptance of her leadership role in the Village Development Committee as well as improved decision-making power in her home.”

Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Initiatives for Farmers, Page 17

The presence of one female does not reflect the relative proportion of women in similar positions nor does it prove that it is due to project facilitation. There is no other data, quantitative or qualitative, to support the statement that women’s empowerment increased.

The statistical method used in the majority of the evaluation reports is difference in difference, whereby comparisons have been made either between groups of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of a project, or between the baseline and current data for the same group. Hence, the availability of baseline data is critical for comparison with endline data in order to gauge attribution and change. However, 12 of the 14 evaluations did not report on the baselines (out of the deep dive, the EGA did not report on baseline). In the case of increased food security and resilience of vulnerable communities in Sanghar, Sindh, comparative statistics were quoted repeatedly against baseline figures, but no data of the baseline was shared to validate it. The evaluation conducted significance testing during sampling; however, for data analysis, the evaluation report only mentioned the use of "data analysis software (Statistical Package of Social Sciences-SPSS)" and no further details. Two of the deep dive evaluations – BAP and EGA Impact Assessment – reported on conducting statistical analysis.

Mixed methods compensate for the limitations of one method with the strengths of the other; of the 14 evaluations that reached the second round, 10 used mixed methods (one of them used secondary quantitative data collected via an endline survey undertaken before the impact assessment by a third party). The three deep dive evaluations all used mixed methods.

6.2.3 Summary of learnings from excluded documents

Learnings about the evaluation process identified these valuable tools and methods: use a gender framework and have well-constructed ToRs that include gender, use statistical analysis, report on baselines, document the analysis and methodology, and use mixed methods to gain gender learning and evidence of social norm changes. See also Annex 1 for more good practice examples.

Best practices for improving gender programming include: in-depth preparatory work and planning at the start of project via background studies and gender analysis ensuring gender is in the theory of change at different levels and especially at the goal level, and have indicators to measure gender changes. There is a need to ensure that the project and project partners have the necessary gender capability; if not, gender-responsiveness in organizational capacity should be strengthened, for example by hiring gender consultants and experts. Continuity of these gender experts would enhance the gender learning between project phases and among partners and stakeholders. Key to implementing interventions in a gender-sensitive manner is to ensure that all project benefits are equally accessible by male and female beneficiaries.
7. **Meta-analysis conclusion**

This meta-analysis of evaluations aims to identify factors that do or do not lead to social norm change in respect of gender. Social norms are a deeply entrenched barrier to women’s participation in economic activities. Programming must proactively design initiatives that aim to address social norm challenges and barriers to the project’s equitable results, and this may require an iterative design that is adjusted according to the changes observed. All the projects included in the deep dive carried out targeted interventions for the increased participation of women, ranging from awareness campaigns to training and policy reform.

The meta-analysis highlights a number of factors that can contribute positively to changing gender norms. These include:

- **Planning for the inclusion of men and families**: One feature of successful interventions was the involvement of men and families: counseling family members, especially males, and communicating the importance and benefits of women’s participation in project activities.

- **Provision of an enabling environment for women**: Providing an enabling environment for women was effective in initiating social change. Additional activities such as social empowerment, capacity building with market linkages, and governance awareness proved to be successful for the empowerment of women, at least to the extent where women could be more economically independent and access more information.

- **Multi-intervention design**: Social norm change is a complex process where pathways can be multi-dimensional. The interventions that followed a multi-pronged approach, for example provision of resources such as seeds and plants along with skill development training, have proven to be more effective for social norm change.

- **Consideration of existing gender roles**: Considering existing gender roles and cultural norms while implementing activities helped to increase women’s participation. Culturally-tailored and gender responsive interventions such as adapting content to women’s literacy and skill levels; facilitating mobility by providing transport; organizing training at convenient venues and times for women; ensuring safety; and ensuring childcare; were key strategies to enhance women’s participation.

- **Innovation in participatory methods**: Alternative ways of influencing gender norms could be employed, such as using technology, rather than limiting oneself to using a few conventional strategies like separate training for men and women. Involving women in planning processes and co-creating project approaches with the community (men and women) helps ensure community ownership and keeps the project relevant to community needs.

The meta-analysis also reveals why some evaluations are unsuccessful in providing learning around gender. A limitation of most project evaluation reports is that while they discuss economic participation and empowerment, they do not report clearly on social norm change. The following list highlights ways to counter common mistakes:

- **Frame questions around gender**: If the ToR for the evaluation does not ask questions around social norms these will not being captured in evaluations. In terms of improving learning
around gender, it is important that evaluations ask the right questions, to ensure that gender is an integral part of the data collected.

- **Ensure rigor in evaluation design:** The research design, from the rigor of methods to the representativeness of the data, determines the quality of learning that an evaluation provides. Poor quality leads to the evaluation not providing information of value regarding gender norm change. Most evaluations do report the use of software but do not run the relevant tests.

- **Use gender-friendly evaluation frameworks:** Not all evaluation frameworks are effective in capturing learning around gender. For this purpose, the use of gender analysis frameworks, especially those focusing on social change, such as the Longwe Framework are more effective at capturing gender norm change.

- **Build on learning:** Evaluation reports should document how the project built upon previous learning. Evaluators should build on past learning while developing their research design, analysis and recommendations. In addition, the authors of evaluations did not effectively document their learning.

- **Share learning:** Knowledge sharing is an important part of disseminating learning from practice and ensuring that lessons learned are built upon. Many evaluations are not shared, and therefore important lessons evaporate.

This meta-analysis contributes to building a body of knowledge about effective programming and evaluation to stimulate gender-related social norm changes. Research for development projects are meant to collect evidence that will help shape more sustainable interventions. Perhaps the evidence in this meta-analysis suggests the need to pair research for development project implementers with pure development implementers to enhance the overall evidence base on gender norm changes in the agriculture sector of Pakistan.
8. **Recommendations**

The meta-analysis has identified approaches that work to change gender norms. These include mainstreaming gender at the program design stage and frontloading gender interventions in the inception stage, and then ensuring consistent efforts, to guarantee enough time is allowed for behavior change to occur. The following are some recommendations:

- **Adopt a gender focus**: Effecting gender norm changes may be different to core project activities and these should be programmed. In particular for Pakistan, gaining women’s participation is key but not always straightforward. Gender norm changes should be included in the project/program’s theory of change.

- **Train project teams**: The readiness of the team is vital for the effective execution of a project which is sensitive to gender norm change. The skills of the project staff should be sufficiently developed to deliver on gender equality, and all staff should be held accountable for gender results (which are not just the responsibility of the gender adviser).

- **Track gender-related indicators of change**: A monitoring system should be in place that tracks gender-related indicators of change. All research and evaluations need to be undertaken with rigor and should aim to document gender norm changes. Evaluation ToR are crucial to how much is learnt about gender norms.

- **Strengthen in-country qualitative data collection and quantitative data analysis and reporting**: the majority of evaluations collected lacked rigor. The evidence presented to form the evaluation’s argument was weak. The significance and representativeness of findings was rarely discussed and analyzed.

- **Create an environment that enables women to change**: Think more widely than project activities to ensure norms can change. An enabling environment should be ensured in which procedures, services, training, materials and outreach are designed and delivered in a gender-sensitive manner. This means considering issues specifically related to men and to women, and then addressing them so that individuals are not disadvantaged based on their gendered position in society. Teaching women about the functioning of governments and markets will also be necessary.

- **Document learning**: Program implementers and evaluators need to document their own learning (strengths and weaknesses) regarding the methods employed as part of the project, and how effective they were in changing social norms.

- **Knowledge management and dissemination**: Dissemination should be an objective of the evaluation reports from the beginning, because this will ensure better research design and rigorous analysis. All learning and research needs to be shared on platforms to reach as wide an audience as possible. This will allow people to learn about and build upon methods that affected social norm changes, rather than repeat mistakes.

- **Donors should mandate greater rigor**: and audit evaluations and firms for evaluation quality and increase accountability for results by publicly sharing evaluation findings.
Annex 1: Learning from excluded documents that were not evaluations

This annex tabulates the learning derived from the 27 excluded documents that were not evaluations. These documents included gender assessments, learning documents, end of project reports, and internal reviews. Best practice and lessons learned revolve around the project’s life cycle, formulation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Best practices from excluded documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exemplary Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gender analysis</td>
<td>Do a gender analysis before the theory of change is developed.</td>
<td>USAID’s Women’s Economic Empowerment Assessment report p 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gender Strategy</td>
<td>Develop a gender strategy to outline specifically how you will overcome challenges associated with gender norms and women’s needs.</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming in the Pakistan Domestic Biogas Programme (PDBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Involve Women</td>
<td>Involving women in all aspects of the project from inception, need assessment, design, implementation and M&amp;E enhances the impact and sustainability of a project.</td>
<td>United States Assistance to Balochistan Border Areas Evaluation, p 36-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Focus on Empowerment and Decision Making</td>
<td>Project interventions should not only focus on delivering activities, but also plan for longer-term processes such as community empowerment (as a means for creating space to empower women and enhancing the participation and decision-making of women). This will ensure that the project’s stakeholders continue to benefit after the project has finished.</td>
<td>Evaluation of Punjab Rural Support Programme – The case of Lahore Region, p 61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Reduce Women’s Drudgery</td>
<td>Due to their dual roles, women are more interested in projects that would lower their workload. Consequently, this also enhances the impact of projects for women.</td>
<td>Market Development Facility’s (MDF) report: What Can be Achieved in Women’s Economic Empowerment, p 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employ Women</td>
<td>Employ women for increased outreach to women.</td>
<td>Evaluation of Punjab Rural Support Programme – The case of Lahore Region, p 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Involve Key Partners</td>
<td>Involve key partners in the gender analysis or in monitoring the project with a gender</td>
<td>MDF’s report: What Can be Achieved in Women’s Economic Empowerment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Track Impacts for Women</td>
<td>Track impacts for women and look for opportunities to take successful ones to scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: Sources of documents used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Deep Dive</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Impact Assessment Study of Four Project Areas in Two IFAD-assisted in NWFP and Punjab Projects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic Growth and Agriculture Portfolio Impact Assessment, Assessing the Theory of Change and Impact of USAID/Pakistan's Economic Growth and Agriculture Program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Balochistan Agriculture Project (BAP): Final Evaluation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance Evaluation Of Phase I of Dairy Project, Draft Report</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance Evaluation Report - Dairy Project, Phase II</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation of Punjab Rural Support Programme-The Case of Lahore Region</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Satpara Development Project (SDP) Evaluation, Irrigated Agriculture in Gilgit-Baltistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strengthening Participation and Influence of Poor and Vulnerable Farmers and Fisher Folks in Decision Making Processes Related to Food Security (End Term Evaluation Report)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Building Sustainable Agribusinesses in Pakistan, Final Evaluation of the Agribusiness Project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. United States Assistance to Balochistan Border Areas, Evaluation Report</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Women's Empowerment in Pakistan, Impact evaluation of empowering small-scale producers in the dairy sector</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resilience in Pakistan, Evaluation of enhancing food security and resilience of small-scale farmers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Evaluation in rural development definitions discourses and lessons from evaluations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Audit of USAID/Pakistan’s Smallholder Dairy Project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pakistan House and Garden Plot Field Study</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. WELD Impact Assessment Draft Report</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Women in Pakistan’s Urban Informal Economy - Vulnerabilities, Opportunities and Policy Solutions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Wheat and Value Chain Governance, Sindh and Punjab</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>A gender impact assessment study of CABI interventions in Muzaffargarh, Punjab, Sakardu, Gilgit-Baltistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>CELDAC- End of Project Report</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Engro Foundation, Rural Women Empowerment Work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Household-level analysis of poverty, gender and exclusion in selected areas of Pakistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>What Can Be Achieved in Women' Economic Empowerment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Management Framework</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Agriculture Sector Linkages Program – Phase II</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Human Resource Development (HRD) for Improvement of Agriculture Extension System in Punjab</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation: Increased Food Security and Resilience of Vulnerable Communities in District Sanghar-Sindh, Pakistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Evaluation - Promoting Gender Equality for Decent Employment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Impact Assessment - Promoting Gender Equality for Decent Employment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Supporting Sustainable Agriculture &amp; Livelihood Initiatives for Farmers: 2015 Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Impact Assessment Study: Livelihood Improvement through Agriculture and Livestock Innovations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>NRSP/FAO EU Food Facility Project: Combating rising food prices in Pakistan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Gender Impact Assessment : Sindh Coastal Community Development Project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming in The Pakistan Domestic Biogas Programme</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Pakistan: Country Gender Assessment; Part 1 of 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Pakistan: Country Gender Assessment; Part 2 of 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Midterm Review: Community Empowerment through Livestock Development and Credit</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Nutrition Mainstreaming in Flood Response Programming</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Emerging opportunities for women in KP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Gender Outcome Evaluation, UNDP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internet (#), Phone (^) and Email (*)