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Introduction

This annual gender report aims to support gender mainstreaming within Africa RISING. It draws attention to research results on female and male farmers’ needs and experiences. Also, it demands scientists to consider and continuously integrate gender concerns into their studies. Following an action research approach, the report is based on the previous gender action plan. It provides a foundation for evaluation and learning and future research planning.

While the gender action plan 2017 was written with the Africa RISING phase 2 period (2016-2021) in mind, new funding scenarios have emerged in the course of the year and have especially affected and delayed plans for West Africa. The annual gender report indicates where activities had to be postponed. A revised approach will be presented as soon as new planning processes are completed.

Achievements in key results areas

This section follows the structure of the Africa RISING gender action plan for 2017 (http://hdl.handle.net/10568/82853). For each project region it summarizes the state of activities planned for 2017 including results. Wherever possible, links to further reading are given. Activities not captured in the 2017 gender action are also presented. Since capacity development constitutes a cross-regional activity, it is outlined at the end of the report.

East and Southern Africa

The following table shows achievements under outcome 5, output 1 and 3 of the East and Southern Africa research plans for 2017 as well as additional activities (https://africa-rising.wikispaces.com/east_southern_africa#Research%20plans).
Outcome 5, output 1 and 3

Outcome 5: Delivery and uptake of SI innovations through building functional partnerships among research and development institutions enhanced

Output 1: Understanding of the social, economic, and institutional constraints to and opportunities for technology adoption from different farm typologies improved

Activity 1: Conduct cost-benefit and gender analysis coupled with other socio-economic analyses to identify and quantify adoption constraints and opportunities for different farmer contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub activities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Conduct gender analysis of Africa RISING technologies</td>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>Consultancy report on qualitative data with gender perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State: completed

Summary of results:

A team of social scientists investigated the following questions for Africa RISING Malawi:

- How do male and female farmers evaluate new agricultural practices?
- How do they differ in their preferences for adoption?
- How do they perceive various extension approaches?

Results were generated during gender-separate focus group discussions with 148 male and female farmers in Dedza and Ntcheu districts and complemented by key informant interviews. The analysis shows that female farmers tend to evaluate technologies in terms of household food security, while male farmers more often opted for technologies/varieties that are demanded by the market. Both female and male farmers mentioned an interest in adopting the following practices and technologies: intercropping, doubled-up legumes, maize fertilized with NPK and urea using the Sasakawa method (i.e., planting one plant per station spaced 25 cm apart) and the use of *Glicid maria sepium* and *Faidherbia albida* as supplementary feed to livestock. However, men and women differed in their choice of crop combinations for intercropping and doubled-up legumes. For instance, female farmers preferred maize intercropped with cowpea, while male farmers preferred maize with pigeon pea. Variations in doubled-up legume combinations included: groundnut with cowpea, groundnut with pigeon pea, and pigeon pea with soybean. Women were generally less in favour of a groundnut-pigeon pea combination than their male counterparts.

Most study participants, particularly females, appreciated the mother and baby trial extension approach of Africa RISING as opposed to the government
extension demonstrations. The former allows farmers to learn and practice on the mother plot and implement the technology in their own fields within the same season.
Link: http://hdl.handle.net/10568/87892

Kongwa/Kiteto, Tanzania
Conduct gender analysis of selected integrated soil fertility management and crop systems
ARI Hombolo, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ICRISAT
Research report
State: in progress

Kongwa/Kiteto, Tanzania
Conduct gender analysis of poultry enterprises in Kongwa and Kiteto
ARI Hombolo, ICRAF, ICRISAT
Research report
State: in progress

Babati, Tanzania
Determine role of gender in vegetable production/trade
WorldVeg, IITA
Research report
State: completed

Summary of results:
The study investigated gender dynamics in vegetable producers’ households as related to labour, income and expenditure allocation. Originally planned for Babati District only, data collection was included into a broader vegetable production survey and therefore allowed for additional investigation in two districts (Kiteto and Kongwa). Quantitative data was collected from 400 male and female farmers in nine villages. Results were subsequently validated in focus group discussions with sex-separated farmer groups and expert interviews with male and female extension officers.

The results show that men and women have different perceptions of labour, income and expenditure allocation within the households. Both men and women keep information on their individual income confidential in order to strengthen their position in intra-household negotiations. For instance, male heads indicated to contribute 96% to the household’s income and estimated their wives’ contribution at 4%. On the other hand, female spouses stated to contribute 39% to the household’s income, estimating their husbands’ contribution at 61%. Linked to these perceptions, both men and women complain about their partner’s lack of contribution to the household economy and production activities. Qualitative and quantitative data indicate that men have higher incomes and are in power when it comes to money-related decisions, while women remain economically dependent. Women explain their dependence with men’s control of access to land, financial capital, knowledge and markets. Men on the other hand spoke of ‘women’s physical limitations’ and ‘poor money management skills’ as reasons that prevent them from progressing economically through vegetable farming. Both stated that domestic labour prevents women from getting more involved in farming activities. The analysis shows that distrust and low cooperation within the households constitute obstacles for food security, poverty alleviation and women empowerment. This underlines the necessity of including men in gender-transformative interventions in agricultural research and development.
In 2018, results for producers’ households will be complemented by results for vegetable traders’ households in order to conduct a gendered value chain analysis.

Links:
https://www.slideshare.net/africa-rising/nppsep2017
http://hdl.handle.net/10568/90680

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Babati, Tanzania</th>
<th>Evaluate maize-fertilizer intervention (WTP)</th>
<th>IITA</th>
<th>Report on qualitative results with gender perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State: in progress

Preliminary results: In this study a team of social scientists followed an intervention in Tanzania that promoted the application of improved maize seeds in combination with inorganic fertilizer and row planting. Over 50 semi-structured interviews with participating male and female farmers, implementers, district officers, and representatives of previous development interventions in the district revealed that the conventional focus of adoption studies on financial and knowledge constraints needs to be broadened to include labour requirements as well as historical experiences and social exchange networks of farmers that shape their decisions. The empirical study was supplemented by an extensive literature review.

Link: https://africa-rising.wikispaces.com/file/view/Gundula+Fischer_Social+Exchange+Networks+and+Historical+Experiences.pdf
**Output 3: Gender-sensitive decision support tools for farmers to assess technology-associated risk and opportunity developed tested and launched**

**Activity 1: Identify and communicate gender-sensitive decision support technologies in the context of different farm typologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Subactivities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kongwa/Kiteto, Tanzania</strong></td>
<td>Promote gender-sensitive decision support tools for research and development (R&amp;D) for scientists</td>
<td>ARI Hombolo, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ICRISAT</td>
<td>Progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong> in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kongwa/Kiteto, Tanzania</strong></td>
<td>Promote gender-sensitive decision support tools for farmers to guide adoption</td>
<td>ARI Hombolo, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ICRISAT</td>
<td>Progress report (with indication of farmers trained by sex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong> in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Babati, Tanzania</strong></td>
<td>Identify constraints, opportunities for women integrating improved forages into their cropping mix, livestock diets, and income generation</td>
<td>ILRI, IITA</td>
<td>Research report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong> in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Babati, Tanzania</strong></td>
<td>Workshop to integrate findings of gender in feed processing study</td>
<td>ILRI, IITA</td>
<td>Workshop report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong> completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of results: The workshop revolved around the following agenda items: assessment of available data; structuring the contents of a journal paper in preparation; plans for further research to fill in gaps; events for first presentations of results.

Link: https://africa-rising.wikispaces.com/Babati_foragechoppers_research_review_workshop

**Babati, Tanzania** Assess role of gender and business thinking in the context of soil and water conservation within farming CIAT_NRM Research report
Additional activities

Other activities not mentioned in the East and Southern Africa research plans for 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Subactivities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babati, Kongwa, Kiteto, Tanzania</td>
<td>Exploring farmers willingness to pay for small-scale maize shelling machines (including a gender perspective)</td>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>Research report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babati, Tanzania</td>
<td>Women farmers’ use of agricultural extension services</td>
<td>Caitlin McCormack (graduate student)</td>
<td>Master’s thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary results:
Aim of this thesis was to explore and understand women farmers’ access to and use of agricultural extension services in Babati District, Tanzania. Objectives were:

Objective 1: To explore women farmers’ experiences and perceptions of agricultural extension services and identify factors that determine their interest, willingness and ability to use different types of AES

Objective 2: Investigate perceptions about gender norms and relations amongst agricultural extension service providers and explore to what extent, and
how, these are considered in the design and delivery of agricultural extension services

Objective 3: Explore evidence for agricultural extension services in Babati District being ‘demand driven’ and consider the extent to which women farmers are able to participate in processes to shape extension services and make them responsive to their specific needs

Data collection involved six weeks of fieldwork in Hallu and Mamire villages in Babati District. Qualitative data comprised: 8 group discussions with farmers (4 with men and 4 with women), individual interviews with 20 farmers (16 women and 4 men), individual interviews with 10 extension service providers from both government and non-government organizations, and formal and informal observations.

Preliminary conclusions of this research are:

▪ Women farmers were found to often have different agricultural knowledge needs compared to men farmers. Women’s needs tend to be neglected in current agricultural extension services in Babati District

▪ Women and men farmers were found to prefer and use different sources of agricultural extension information; specifically, women farmers valued learning with/from fellow farmers and often needed to access extension information at or near home, whilst men were more likely to use formal technical training

▪ Societal gender norms – i.e. perceptions and opinions about accepted roles, responsibilities and behaviour of men and women – were found to be a major factor constraining women farmers’ ability to access and use agricultural extension services:
  o Norms dictate that women farmers are rarely responsible for farm management decision-making, spend much of their time occupied with domestic work, and in some cases are prevented by their husbands from leaving the house and interacting with others (especially other men)
  o There were norms about which parts of production women and men farmers have responsibility for; women were often perceived as being responsible for vegetable and poultry production on home plots, whilst men were responsible for production of cereals on the main farm plot. Extension services were observed to be mainly focused on production associated with men farmers
  o Finally, gender norms shape how agricultural extension services are designed and delivered; actors providing services often had limited awareness and expertise about gender, meaning that it was rarely incorporated or addressed in the design and delivery of the services (although there were some examples of ad hoc efforts and emerging systematic efforts).
**Babati, Tanzania**  
Gender analysis of mechanized forage chopping  
ILRI, IITA  
Research report

**State:** completed

**Summary of results:**
The study followed livestock and poultry keepers in seven villages in Babati (Tanzania) who in 2015 had been introduced to forage chopper machines. In 2016 and 2017, a team of social scientists evaluated the gender implications of the new processing practices through focus group discussions, matrix scoring/ranking exercises, linkage diagrams and a survey. Male and female respondents were selected from among the farmers’ groups that were formed for the management and use of the chopper machines.

Findings show that the technology reduces in particular women’s labour burden in terms of manual chopping. Moreover, machine-ground feed is described as having better quality and as being more filling thereby decreasing the time women need for forage collection. At the same time, additional labour is required for transporting the chopper to the homestead (or forages to the chopper). These transport requirements as well as cost implications of operating the machine impeded actual technology use for some farmers. Access to the forage choppers is influenced by various factors - among others, membership and gender dynamics in farmers’ groups. Men tend to operate machines more frequently, which they in part justify by claiming ‘lower technical skills’ and ‘lower physical strength’ of women. On the other hand, the benefits from improved feeding through the sale of more milk and more eggs have allowed some women to become financially more independent. The sustainability of mechanized forage chopping is evaluated on the basis of the Sustainable Intensification Indicator Framework. A research article has been submitted to a journal in January 2018.

**Link:** [http://www.tropentag.de/2017/abstracts/posters/639.pdf](http://www.tropentag.de/2017/abstracts/posters/639.pdf)
West Africa
The following table shows achievements in 14 sub activities under outcome 1, output 1; outcome 2, output 1 and 2; and outcome 3, output 1 and 2 of the West Africa research plans for 2017 (https://africa-rising.wikispaces.com/west_africa#Research%20plans).
**Outcome 1, output 1**

**Outcome 1**: Farmers and farming communities in the project area are practicing more productive, resilient, and profitable and sustainably intensified crop-livestock systems linked to markets

Output 1: Research products for more productive, intensive, diverse, profitable and resilient crop (cereals, legumes, and vegetables); livestock (sheep, goats, cattle, poultry and pigs) and integrated crop-livestock farming systems are identified and disseminated to farmers through development partners in the intervention communities

**Activity 1**: Test a combination of climate-smart crop varieties and agronomic practices to increase and sustain food and feed production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub activities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bougouni and Koutiala, Mali</td>
<td>Sheep fattening to reduce poverty and food insecurity for women farmers</td>
<td>IER, ICRISAT, ILRI</td>
<td>Field visit, reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong>: in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bougouni and Koutiala, Mali</td>
<td>Profitability and gender analysis of vegetable monocropping and intercropping</td>
<td>ICRISAT, IITA, WorldVeg</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong>: in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West</td>
<td>Variety and planting density effects on grain and fodder yield and quality of groundnut</td>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>Field visit, reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regions, Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong>: in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West</td>
<td>Leaf stripping to maximize food and feed yields from maize-based cropping systems</td>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>Field visit, reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regions, Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong>: in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**State:** in progress

**Northern, Upper East, Upper West regions, Ghana**

Cowpea living mulch effect on weed control, soil properties and maize yield  
IITA  
Field visit, reports

**State:** in progress

---

**Outcome 2, output 1 and 2**

**Outcome 2:** More farmers and farm families in the intervention communities are adopting technologies and practices to improve nutrition, food and feed safety, post-harvest handling and value addition

Output 1: Improved technologies, practices and habits to increase production and consumption of diverse and more nutritious food by farm families, especially by women and children are developed.

Activity 1: Develop a nutrition strategy to harmonize the nutrition activities with the national nutrition approaches and link them to the crop and livestock activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub activities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West regions, Ghana</td>
<td>Evaluation of nutrition-sensitive-agriculture options in West Africa</td>
<td>ILRI, UDS, WorldVeg, ARI, MOFA, GHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State:** in progress (with new focus)

New focus: The study originally had three objectives. These were

**Objective 1:** To develop a nutrition strategy for the project

**Objective 2:** (i) To characterize nutrition practices of the households in the study areas and quantify gender-differentiated roles in household nutrition practices; (ii) To assess the effect of livestock productivity enhancing interventions and vegetable production in home-gardens with or without nutrition education on household nutrition, particularly children under two years and women of reproductive age

**Objective 3:** To determine the operational feasibility and effectiveness of women’s empowerment in agriculture to increase production diversity and improve maternal and child nutritional outcomes without compromising child care practices.

The implementation of the activity was to involve three graduate students. Due to funding challenges, the students were not engaged. The focus of research is now on monitoring children’s growth and nutrition education for women.
### Koutiala, Mali

**Evaluation of nutrition-sensitive-agriculture options in Mali**

ILRI, WorldVeg, IER, AMEDD

**Report**

**State:** postponed

**Output 2:** Post-harvest technologies and practices to provide options for the food, and feed sectors are tested and disseminated to farmers, through researchers, extension staff, and development partners

**Activity 1:** Introduce, evaluate, adapt and disseminate existing postharvest technologies and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Subactivities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West regions, Ghana</td>
<td>Exploring farmers willingness to pay for small-scale maize shelling machines</td>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State:** postponed

---

**Outcome 3, output 1 and 2**

**Outcome 3:** Farmers and other value chain actors have greater and equitable access to production assets and markets (input and output) through enabling institutions and policies

Output 1: Enabling policies and institutional arrangements to increase participation of farm families, especially women and youth in the output and input markets and decision-making are advocated for implementation by national governments, policy makers and development partners.

**Activity 1:** Review existing policies and institutional arrangements affecting equitable access to production assets and markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Subactivities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West regions, Ghana</td>
<td>Enhancing farmers access to credit and markets</td>
<td>IITA, FOSTERING</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State:** in progress

---

**Koutiala and Bougouni, Mali**

**Literature review of existing policies and institutional arrangements affecting access to production assets**

Odile Traoré (graduate student)

**Master’s Thesis**

**Journal article**
and markets

**State:** in progress

**Activity 2: Assess the level of inclusiveness of women and the youth along crop and livestock value chains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub activities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West regions, Ghana</td>
<td>Explore value chain options engaged in by men, women and the youth</td>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State:** postponed

**Output 2: Options to increase access to production assets and increase participation in decision-making by women, youth and other vulnerable groups**

**Activity 1: Identify constraints to, and opportunities for improving access to the output and input markets by women and youth in the target area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub activities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koutiala, Mali</td>
<td>Assess value chain constraints and opportunities for male, female and young farmers in the Koutiala area</td>
<td>Arouna Dissa (PhD student)</td>
<td>PhD proposal. Inventory of actors and institutions. Report on value chain assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State:** in progress

**Link:**

**Bougouni and Koutiala, Mali**

Identify constraints and opportunities for improving access to markets for women and youth

Moussa Sanogo (graduate student)

Master’s thesis

**State:** in progress

**Activity 3: Identify constraints to and opportunities for increasing women and youth access to production assets/decision making in the target area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub activities</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Means of verification (with sex-disaggregated data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Upper East, Upper West regions, Ghana</td>
<td>Analyze intra-household differences and decision-making to better understand adoption</td>
<td>WUR, IITA</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State: in progress

Preliminary results:
The aim of this study is to understand intra-household differences and decision-making in technology adoption in Duko (Northern region), Nyangua (Upper East region) and Zanko (Upper West region). The objectives are:

Objective 1: Identify individual curves of satisfaction (per household member) associated to different farm configurations, mainly land allocation to different crops. Show intra-household trade-offs

Objective 2: Quantify and explain differences among different household members concerning their ‘curves of satisfaction’

Objective 3: Make use of typologies e.g. by comparing the technical and social performance of different traction methods per farm type in Duko (Northern Region) and Nyangua (Upper East Region)

For Objective 1, work is ongoing on a report on intra-household trade-offs.

For Objective 2, an article has been published on ‘Model results versus farmer realities. Operationalizing diversity within and among smallholder farm systems for a nuanced impact assessment of technology packages’. The study used a farm typology by Michalscheck et al. (2017) that categorizes households into three resource endowments, namely high resource endowment (HRE), medium resource endowment (MRE) and low resource endowment (LRE). Participants were consulted on local inter- and intra-household differences. The study analyzed the differences in perceived suitability and modelled technical impact by different technology packages promoted by Africa RISING in the three communities across the three regions namely maize with fertilizer application (P1), improved cowpea variety (P2), integrated soil fertility management on soybean (P3), maize-legume rotation (P4) and maize-legume strip cropping (P5). The results of the study include large differences among and within farms per type and per region with low resource endowed farms being projected to benefit most in relative and least in absolute terms from adoption of technology packages. Within households, the study finds women to be more positive about technology packages than men. The study concludes that operationalizing inter- and intra-household diversity is a fundamental step in identifying sensible solutions for the challenges smallholder farm systems face in Northern Ghana.

Link: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308521X17306303

For Objective 3, using the same farm typology (HRE, MRE and LRE), a master’s thesis with results focusing on household resource endowment in Duko (Northern Region) and Nyangua (Upper East Region) has been completed.

Link: http://hdl.handle.net/10568/89064
Capacity development

Africa RISING’s gender experts continuously support individual scientists and teams to include gender perspectives in their research. Apart from that, the gender team developed a training manual and piloted it in four training sessions in Mali, Ghana, Tanzania and Malawi in 2017. The manual provides Africa RISING with a training concept that resonates with its farming systems and action research approach and puts a focus on gender analysis and gender transformation. The final version of the manual will be available on CGSpace in 2018.

The following table provides an overview over the four training sessions conducted in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Where, when</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender analysis in agriculture</td>
<td>Arusha, Tanzania 08 to 09/06/2017, SG Resort</td>
<td>14 participants (13 male, 1 female)</td>
<td>WorldVeg, IITA, CIMMYT, CIAT and other Africa RISING partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lilongwe, Malawi 12 to 13/06/2017, Crossroads Hotel</td>
<td>16 participants (8 male, 8 female)</td>
<td>Michigan State University, IITA, LUANAR, CIAT and other Africa RISING partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamale, Ghana 07 to 08/09/2017, Modern City Hotel</td>
<td>15 participants (12 male, 3 female)</td>
<td>IWMI, STEPRI, FOSTERING, UDS and other Africa RISING partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bamako, Mali 11 to 12/09/2017, ICRISAT</td>
<td>15 participants (13 male, 2 female)</td>
<td>ICRISAT, WORLDVEG and other Africa RISING partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all countries, participants self-assessed their knowledge and skills at the beginning and after completion of the training. The following two tables provide an overview of their perceived learning outcomes. While the first aggregates results for all four countries as well as sub-questions, the second presents detailed and disaggregated information. The second table also includes results to the question if participants have identified entry points for an inclusion of gender analysis in their research together with social scientists.
Aggregated results of participants’ self-assessment before and after the Africa RISING ‘Gender analysis in agriculture’ training in 2017.
Detailed and disaggregated results of participants’ self-assessment before and after the Africa RISING ‘Gender analysis in agriculture’ training in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s perceived ability to</th>
<th>Tanzania Before</th>
<th>Tanzania After</th>
<th>Malawi Before</th>
<th>Malawi After</th>
<th>Ghana Before</th>
<th>Ghana After</th>
<th>Mali Before</th>
<th>Mali After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe Africa RISING research approaches and their gender link</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish main features of gender roles and relations</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define the concept of intersectionality for their work</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply basic gender concepts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Gender roles</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gender relations</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Intersectionality</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain basic principles of gender analysis in agriculture</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply participatory gender analysis tools together with social scientists</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outline the following principles in survey research:

- a. Data sex-disaggregation
- b. Gender analysis questions
- c. Gender sensitive sampling
- d. Gender sensitive research setup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.82</th>
<th>4.50</th>
<th>3.50</th>
<th>4.64</th>
<th>3.50</th>
<th>4.33</th>
<th>3.27</th>
<th>4.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employ the following principles in survey research:

- a. Data sex-disaggregation
- b. Gender analysis questions
- c. Gender sensitive sampling
- d. Gender sensitive research setup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.50</th>
<th>4.54</th>
<th>3.38</th>
<th>4.50</th>
<th>3.36</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>3.60</th>
<th>4.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have identified entry points for an inclusion of gender analysis in my research together with social scientists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>92.90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in the table represent averages of the actual responses provided by the participants. Missing answers were not considered. Ranking scale: 1= very low, 2= low, 3 = medium, 4 = high, 5 = very high.