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Introduction

The rationale for considering gender in agricultural programs relates to agricultural productivity, food security, nutrition, poverty reduction, and empowerment. In all of these, women play a critical but often under-recognized role and face greater constraints than men. Although gender inequality involves comparisons between women and men, in most (but not all) cases the gender gap penalizes women (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2011).

The World Bank (O’Sullivan et al. 2014) found that productivity on women’s farms in the six African countries studied is significantly lower per hectare compared to men, ranging from 13% in Uganda to 25% in Malawi. This is because women tend to be locked out of land ownership, access to credit and productive farm inputs like fertilizers, pesticides and farming tools, support from extension services, and access to markets and other factors central to improving productivity. In many instances, agricultural service providers are one of the only sources of agricultural information available to small holder farmers, many of whom are women. Increasing women’s education and other resources is a key way to reduce their constraints and increase agricultural production, which can improve food security at the household and higher levels. Orienting agricultural programs to reduce those constraints can make a lasting contribution to this goal (Farnworth and Colverson 2014, forthcoming).

Institutions, programs, and projects must have the skills and resources (both financial and human) to address the differing needs of men and women farmers. To do this, service providers must create equal opportunities for women and men to contribute to and shape the environments in which they live and work. As stressed in The State of Food and Agriculture: Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development (FAO 2011) closing the gender gap in agriculture is essential to increasing agricultural productivity, reducing hunger, and achieving food security. This is a key role of agricultural service providers.

Capacity development of partners in agricultural value chains is a critical piece to achieving gender equity. Many organizations express interest in integrating gender into their programming, but lack the knowledge and understanding of how to do so. Capacity development was highlighted as a priority in the Livestock and Fish Gender Strategy, ‘Increased gender capacity within CGIAR centres, partner organizations and value chain actors to diagnose and overcome gender based constraints within value chains’. As part of this priority, a study was undertaken with partners in targeted livestock and fish value chains in four countries to ascertain their gaps in gender capacity related to integrating gender into agricultural programming. Results from the study will be used to inform the development of gender capacity materials and future trainings for partners. This discussion paper highlights the results of the study.
Methodology

Partners for the study were selected from five value chain countries by gender scientists in the Livestock and Fish gender working group (GWG), based on their involvement in value chain projects. Partners will be essential to identifying and implementing gendered interventions in the target value chains, and therefore are critical stakeholders. The study was conducted over a two month period from May–June 2014 in: Uganda, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Nicaragua. Egypt was initially included, but the response rate was too low to be significant. The partner lists from each country were not exhaustive, as project work with the Livestock and Fish program in most of these countries is just beginning.

The purpose of the study was to:

• assess partners’ current capacities in program and project work related to gender

• determine key constraints to integrating gender in their work

• assess organizational capacity and commitment to integrating gender

• review any gendered monitoring and evaluation in project work

A questionnaire was drafted with members of the GWG (see Annex 1) and circulated to partners electronically. Partners were allocated 3 weeks for responses. Response rates overall were modest, and detailed in the Results section below.
Results

Overall questionnaire response rates per country ranged from 29–42%. For each of the four countries, rates were as follows:

• Uganda: 42 questionnaires sent, 12 returned—29% return rate

• Tanzania: 22 questionnaires sent, 8 returned—36% return rate

• Ethiopia: 40 questionnaires sent, 15 returned—38% return rate

• Nicaragua: 12 questionnaires sent, 5 returned—42% return rate

Of the 40 total respondents, 28 were male (70%) and 12 were female (30%). Levels of job responsibility were classified as junior, mid-level and senior. Of the 40 total respondents, 8 were junior (20%), 22 were mid-level (55%) and 10 were senior level (25%).
Individual country results

Uganda

Respondents in this value chain are working on pigs. There were twice as many males than females (four females, eight males) responding with roughly equal percentages of respondents in the mid-level and senior range, no junior respondents (mid-level seven, senior five). With these job level respondents, there was a remarkable even distribution across response categories (see Figure 1). The primary obstacles to integrating gender include: lack of financial resources, lack of staff training, lack of appropriate gender tools with some other responses that included staff turnover, lack of follow up by existing staff and using partners with gender expertise to achieve gender integration.

Figure 1. Uganda responses.

Tanzania

Respondents in this value chain are working on dairy cattle. There was a small sample size in this country, with more males than females responding (six males, two females). Roughly equal numbers of junior (2), mid-level (4), and senior respondents (2). There were a heavy emphasis on responses in the Not at All and Moderate categories (see Figure 2). Primary obstacles to integrating gender include: lack of financial resources, lack of staff training and lack of appropriate gender tools.
Ethiopia

Respondents in this value chain are working on small ruminants (sheep and goats). There were many more males than females responding (13 males, 2 females), with a high percentage of respondents in the junior and mid-level job ranges: junior (6), mid-level (7) and senior (2). A high percentage of responses fell into the Limited and Moderate categories, with an increasing number of responses marked ‘Limited’ as questions progressed (see Figure 3). The primary obstacles to integrating gender include: lack of financial resources, lack of staff training, lack of appropriate gender tools and lack of support.

Figure 3. Ethiopia responses.
Nicaragua

Respondents in this value chain are working on dairy or beef cattle. There was a small sample size, and some difficulty with transcribing responses from Spanish as they did not always follow the prescribed format. There were a high percentage of female respondents (four females, one male). Most organizations are using participatory methods and responded either Not at All or Moderate to the questions asked (see Figure 4). The primary obstacles to integrating gender include: lack of financial resources, lack of staff training and lack of appropriate gender tools.

Figure 4. Nicaragua responses.
Conclusions

Overall, interesting preliminary data emerged from the four countries sampled. The percentage of males responding to the questionnaire was high (70%) but in line with research findings on the preponderance of male agricultural service providers (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2011). More than half the respondents were mid-level professionals which could be in alignment with their duties as agricultural officers and program coordinators. In Uganda, it would be interesting to determine why there were no junior level responses. In the three African countries, respondents were overwhelmingly male (27 out of 35 respondents) whereas in Nicaragua the respondents were primarily female (4 out of 5 respondents). Whether there are more female agricultural service providers in Latin America as compared to Africa would an interesting research question, as this could have implications for increasing the number of overall female agricultural service providers.

In all four countries, the primary obstacles to integrating gender included lack of financial resources, lack of staff training and lack of appropriate gender tools. Further research is needed on the specific types of training and tools that would be most appropriate to partner needs, as the results will have implications for development of future gender materials and capacity development in the Livestock and Fish program. For more detailed information on this study, please visit the Livestock and Fish website here.
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Annex I  International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)—Gender capacity questionnaire

Objectives: to identify and analyse the factors that hinder efforts to integrate gender into organization programs/projects and to identify approaches to strengthen staff capacity to integrate gender in planning, implementation and evaluation of programs/projects.

Please mark the responses that most accurately reflect your answers to the following questions and statements about your organization.

Programming

1. Are gender equality goals and objectives included in project or program activity designs?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

2. Does the implementation plan for your project or program include activities that strengthen skills and provide women/girls with equal access to services and training?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

3. Does the implementation plan for your project include activities that strengthen skills and provide men/boys with equal access to services and training?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

4. Have there been any gender analyses in your organization to determine gendered constraints and opportunities along the agricultural value chains you work in?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know
Types of value chains your organization works with:

5. Does your organization have any projects or programs that focus exclusively on gender equality?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

Can you give a brief description of the project or program?

6. Do you use participatory methods to incorporate the views and preferences of both male and female community
   members in planning, implementation and evaluation projects/programs?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

7. Is sex disaggregated data collected and used systematically in planning and reporting?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

8. Do you monitor and evaluate gender impacts of projects and programs?
   [ ] not at all
   [ ] to a limited extent
   [ ] to a moderate extent
   [ ] to the fullest extent
   [ ] do not know

9. What are some of the obstacles to integrating gender in project planning, implementation and evaluation in your
   organization? Please check all that apply.
   [ ] lack of financial resources for gender programming
   [ ] lack of staff training or understanding of how to integrate gender into project or programs
   [ ] lack of tools on integrating gender
   [ ] lack of support from senior management
   [ ] low organizational priority for gender issues
   [ ] negative gender stereotypes
   [ ] other, please specify below:

Organizational operations

10. Is there a person or department responsible for gender in your organization?
    [ ] not at all
    [ ] to a limited extent
    [ ] to a moderate extent
    [ ] to the fullest extent
    [ ] do not know
11. Is there assigned staff responsibility for gender integration in different field offices?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

How many staff is assigned exclusively to integrating gender into your organization’s work?
Location(s)?

12. Does your organization/department/project frequently draw upon the person(s) responsible for integrating gender?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

13. Do project staff have the necessary knowledge, skills and attitude to carry out their work with gender awareness?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

14. Has project staff been trained in gender awareness and sensitization?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

15. Does your organization provide training and tools on gender planning, analysis and evaluation to their own staff, partner or local NGO affiliate staff?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

16. Does your project office have a written gender policy that affirms a commitment to gender equality?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

17. If your organization has a gender policy, how well is it implemented?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know
18. Has your organization budgeted adequate financial resources to support its gender integration work?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

19. Is gender awareness included as a criteria in all job descriptions?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

20. Is gender awareness included in job performance criteria?
[ ] not at all
[ ] to a limited extent
[ ] to a moderate extent
[ ] to the fullest extent
[ ] do not know

What else is needed to increase gender integration in organizational project or program work?

Demographics

This section focuses on the basic demographic information of the respondents.

21. Are you male or female?
[ ] male [ ] female

22. What is your position in your organization?
[ ] Senior management
[ ] Mid-level personnel
[ ] Junior-level personnel
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