



Capturing Women's Voices in Agricultural Research

Lessons Learned from 4 Quantitative Studies

Case Study from Laterite – IGNITE | July 2022

T

tanager
an ADDVOCA affiliate

laterite
DATA | RESEARCH | ADVISORY

60__decibels

The Impacting Gender and Nutrition through Innovative Technical Exchange in Agriculture (IGNITE) mechanism is a five-year investment to strengthen African institutions' ability to integrate nutrition and gender into their way of doing business and their agriculture interventions. IGNITE works with African agricultural institutions in Ethiopia, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, and Tanzania.

Introduction

Including gender approaches and analysis in agricultural research is becoming of more interest to agricultural institutions throughout Africa. Strategically designing research to include both women and men's voices – both adults and youth – is a vital first step to exploring gender in agriculture in any project. This case study outlines lessons learned from four gender-sensitive agricultural research studies led by IGNITE in Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Tanzania, in partnership with four IGNITE clients¹. These lessons are primarily focused on quantitative studies, and a short summary of the four studies can be found on the final page of this case study.

The case study is structured around four guiding questions that researchers and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) professionals should ask themselves when designing a gender-sensitive study. We provide concrete examples of decisions the research team made to ensure women's and female youth's voices were captured in the study and provide recommendations for other researchers studying gender in agriculture.



Photo: Dennis Wegewijs (2016). Available on [Shutterstock](#).

Four Guiding Questions for Gender Researchers

When conducting quantitative gender-sensitive research there are numerous strategic decisions that need to be made during the design, sampling, and field planning phases to ensure representation of women. Researchers and M&E professionals should think carefully about how these decisions can lead to bias in the data, or worse, the exclusion of entire subgroups of the population of interest. Based on experience in Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Tanzania, IGNITE recommends asking four guiding questions when planning your data collection, to ensure that

women’s and female youth’s voices are heard. We summarize them here and provide concrete examples from four IGNITE studies.

Question 1: Who is in the population of interest?

After identifying the research questions, the first step in any research study is identifying who the population of interest is. For example, in IGNITE’s study on decision-making with teff farmers in Ethiopia, the population of interest was adult women and men in teff farming households in Gonji Kollela and Yielmana Densa woredas in the West Gojjam zone of Amhara regional state.

If you are conducting a qualitative study, you will likely be able to purposively sample women and men from this group. However, if you are conducting a quantitative household survey, once the population has been identified, the next step is to compile a complete list of the population to allow the research team to understand the composition of the group, including how many are women and how many are men. For many projects, talking with male and female youth is also critical for the research questions, so it is important to include youth in the listing as well. This information is crucial for sampling decisions to ensure women are accurately represented. Knowing the proportion of men and women in the population of interest allows us to correct for any imbalances in the sample using inverse probability weights, which allow for our estimates to reflect the actual distribution of the population. This way, if the share of women in the sample is lower than their true share in the population, female respondents will receive a higher weight in the data, to improve the representativeness of the sample.

Listing exercises²

The question remains – where does one get such a list? It depends on the population, but oftentimes in quantitative agricultural research a listing exercise is required. These exercises can be time consuming and tedious but are essential for ensuring your study includes perspectives from a representative cross-section of the actual population. For three of the four IGNITE studies outlined in this case study, some form of listing exercise was required. Depending on the study and population of interest, these exercises might be conducted at a group level (e.g., by acquiring lists from a village leader or existing group structure, like a farmer training group), or at a household level (e.g., by visiting each household in a village and conducting a short survey).

የተከታታይ ቁጥር	ጾታ	ዕድሜ	ጾታ	የሰውነት ክብደት	የተከታታይ ቁጥር	ዕድሜ	ጾታ
1	ወ	40	ጾታ	0.25			
2	ወ	40	ጾታ	0.25			
3	ወ	56	ጾታ	0.25			
4	ወ	50	ጾታ	0.25			
5	ወ	41	ጾታ	0.25			
6	ወ	40	ጾታ	0.25			
7	ወ	60	ጾታ	0.25			
8	ወ	50	ጾታ	0.25			
9	ወ	30	ጾታ	0.25			
10	ወ	50	ጾታ	0.25			
11	ወ	40	ጾታ	0.25			
12	ወ	40	ጾታ	0.25			
13	ወ	33	ጾታ	0.25			
14	ወ	55	ጾታ	0.25			
15	ወ	40	ጾታ	0.25			

Photo: Laterite (2021). Hand-written list of farmers in a farmer group in Ethiopia (anonymized)

An example: For IGNITE's two studies in Ethiopia (one with teff farmers; the other with wheat farmers), the research team opted for two different listing strategies. For the teff study, gathering basic information on farmers (e.g., name, sex, contact information) was sufficient for our sampling needs. Therefore, a group level listing was employed at the development agent³ (DA) level, which involved asking DAs for up-to-date lists of each farmer group they manage. For the study with wheat farmers, the research team opted for a two-stage listing exercise, which started with a similar DA listing, but then proceeding to a household-level listing of a randomly sampled sub-group, to gather more detailed household level information on the women living in the households. This additional household-level ensured that comparisons could be made between different sub-groups of women in the study (e.g., women attending women-only extension groups; women attending mixed-sex groups).

Recommendation: When accurate lists of your population are not available, a listing exercise is essential to understand the composition of your population and to ensure that women are appropriately included in the sampling strategy.

Question 2: Within the population of interest, who will you speak with?

Once you have a complete list of your population of interest, including both women and men and youth, the next question involves choosing participants from that list who will help you answer your research questions. Depending on the study objectives there are numerous strategies that can be employed, but from a gender perspective it is important to consider stratification and respondent selection within households.

Stratification⁴

Stratification is a sampling strategy that involves classifying members of the population of interest into distinct groups (e.g., by gender, by age, by location), and then intentionally sampling from each 'strata' in pre-determined proportions. When a particular stratum is of great importance to the research questions (in our case, gender) it is prudent to include stratification of the sample to ensure that adequate numbers of each classification (in our case, women and men) are included in the sample. Using simple random sampling does not guarantee this, especially when there are not equal proportions of the different strata (e.g., women and men) in the population. For example, if the population includes 80% men and 20% women, a random sample will likely yield a similar split. For gender researchers, stratification guarantees that both women and men will be included in the final sample.

An example: For IGNITE's study with wheat farmers in Ethiopia, we stratified the population to capture the views of three groups of women: 1) women who participated in women-only video extension training; 2) women who participated in mixed-sex video extension training; 3) women who were not trained personally but live in a household where a man was trained. The use of stratification in this case ensures we have adequate representation of women in each of these groups in our sample to answer our research questions.

Recommendation: stratification of your sample into relevant subgroups is an invaluable tool for ensuring the voices of different groups of women and female youth are adequately represented in your data.

Selecting one man, one woman, both, or more!

Most agricultural surveys approach the household as a unit, speaking to one person per household and taking those responses as representative of the entire household. These studies often focus on one 'household head', usually male, who is presumed to represent the household. There are clear problems with this approach if the goal is understanding the perspectives of women, or understanding the perspectives of different household members as they relate to each other with respect to gender. Depending on the research objectives it may be beneficial (or necessary) to speak to more than one member of the household. When the primary aim of the

research is to explore gender-specific factors and intra-household decision-making, the best approach is to speak to more than one person per household. This is done to gain multiple perspectives in the household, and to speak to women (who are often not the primary respondent of agricultural household surveys, regardless of the crops explored).

An example: For IGNITE's study with teff farmers in Ethiopia, the primary research question focused on gender-specific drivers of best practice adoption. Understanding this process, including how women and men differently perceived their role and involvement in the decision-making, involves speaking with both women and men in the household. For this study, we decided to conduct two interviews for each sampled household – one with an adult woman and one with an adult man – at each round of data collection.

With the decision to speak to two people in the household, the natural follow-up question is: 'why not more?' In many households, there are more adults to speak to (20% of households in our study had 3 or more adults). We did not include these primarily because of budget and operational constraints. In order to mitigate this, we included qualitative work exploring the roles of all members of the household and included household members and individuals outside the household as options in household decision making questions.

Recommendation: do not expect a single household member's perspective to be representative of all household members. Speaking to more household members – both women and men – allows all points of view to be captured and will improve the quality of your findings.

Question 3: How will the household's composition impact your research design?

The composition of agricultural households varies widely. Many agricultural households are large, sometimes including several generations of adults, adult children as well as young children. Other households are smaller, perhaps including an adult couple and small children, and some others are led by one single adult. In some contexts (e.g., Northern Nigeria), polygamous households are common, leading to multiple adult wives in the same household. Depending on agricultural season and other migration patterns, some household structures may change significantly throughout the year as different members seek employment far from home. This heterogeneity of household composition means that researchers must make decisions on which household members to include or exclude. These decisions should balance various priorities, including the research objectives, budget, logistics, and ethical considerations.

From a gender perspective, there are some important inclusion and exclusion criteria. These include decisions around the inclusion of dual-adult households, female-headed households (FHHs), polygamous households, and whether or not to include other adults living in the household in the study (e.g., adult children, grandparents, or relatives). Whether to include youth (of ages anywhere between 18 and 35, depending on national policies) is another criteria to consider.

Female-headed households

FHHs include women that are unmarried, widowed, or divorced, and also include those where adult men have migrated (usually for work), yet can still participate in the decision making from afar, and can also contribute income through remittances⁵. These households make up approximately 22% of households in Ethiopia, 18% in Nigeria, and 25% in Tanzania⁶. Depending on the research objectives, researchers must decide whether it makes sense to include these FHHs or not.

An example: For IGNITE's two studies with teff and wheat farmers in Ethiopia, the research team opted for two different strategies with respect to FHHs.

For the teff study, we limited our sample to dual-adult households with at least one adult man and one adult woman and *excluded* FHHs. We decided to exclude FHHs because intra-household decision-making in households with one adult (either women or men) is very different than in households with at least one adult man and one adult woman and we were most interested in understanding decision-making in a dual-adult setting. Like any project, we also had budget constraints and decided it was best to increase the study's power to answer questions about the most common type of household. As a result, our study with teff farmers does not have findings pertaining to FHHs, and there is always the risk that any reporting on this study will be interpreted to represent the local population as a whole (and forget the significant minority of households that were excluded).

For the wheat study, we opted to include *both* dual-adult households as well as FHHs. This is because the primary objective of the study is to compare outcomes for women across three different extension group types, and we expect that women in FHHs will represent a significant fraction of women participating in extension.

It is important to note that both studies exclude male-headed households with no adult women, although we believe this group to represent a small percentage of the population.

Recommendation: consider carefully whether your research questions are relevant or will differ for women in FHHs as compared to women in dual-adult households. Women in these two types of households face different realities in the household, and these differences should be considered when forming a sampling strategy.

Polygamous households

Polygamous households include those with one adult with multiple spouses; in the countries where IGNITE works, the most common structure is one male and multiple female wives. In Nigeria, 31% of women report that their husband has multiple wives. These households need to be surveyed differently. Since it is common to prioritize spouse pairs, it becomes difficult to develop a protocol to select a spouse when there are multiple spouses to choose from. There are three main approaches in the literature: i) randomly select a spouse, ii) interview all spouses, and iii) select the most relevant spouse. If the study design is to only interview two people, we can either select the spouse randomly or purposively. If selecting purposively, one would select the spouse that is most involved in the relevant activity being studied (e.g., cassava farming). If selecting randomly, one would stratify by first wives and non-first wives, as the literature on polygamous marriages suggests different power dynamics between those two groups. In this case, be aware that first wives may or may not be older and have different power in the household than younger or subsequent wives, and spousal order may or may not determine involvement in different agricultural activities or value chains entirely.

An example: For IGNITE's study on time use with cassava farmers in Nigeria, we first identified polygamous households through a listing exercise. Next, for these households, we decided to collect information on the number of wives and the seniority of the wives, as well as if one woman was more involved in cassava farming than others. If one woman was not clearly more involved in cassava, then we would randomly select a wife, stratified by spouse seniority. We decided to approach the sampling in this way to maximize the women who were most involved in cassava farming, but also reach a variety of women in a consistent manner.

Recommendation: the decision on how to treat polygamous households can lead to the exclusion of some women in the study, so should be carefully considered. If polygamous households are very common in the study area, or are a primary focus of the objectives, a deliberate strategy should be made to account for these cases and ensure these voices are captured in a systematic and consistent way.

Non-spouse pairs and other adults

Many agricultural households include other adults – either adult children or relatives. Studies often exclude these extra members due to logistical challenges and budget constraints, instead opting to speak with a ‘household head’. However, in some contexts these individuals represent a large share of the adult population, so excluding them could lead to bias.

An example: For IGNITE’s study with teff farmers in Ethiopia, the focus was on dual-adult households as the study was exploring decision-making on best practice adoption between women and men. While we prioritized spouse pairs for this study, we did find some households with non-spouse adult pairs of the opposite sex (e.g., a parent and an adult child, or an elderly mother and an adult son). We decided to also include these households when we encountered them to explore decision-making made outside of spouse-pairs as well. However, spouse pairs ended up making up 92% of our sample and were by far the most common household composition.

Recommendation: the decision on how to treat extra adults (e.g., adult children, relatives) in the household can lead to the exclusion of adult women’s and men’s voices in the study. These household members are commonly ignored in household surveys but make up a significant portion of the adult population, so researchers should carefully consider whether excluding these members makes sense for your study.

Question 4: How are you ensuring that you are collecting high quality data from women?

Once you’ve determined your sampling strategy and defined your inclusion / exclusion criteria the next step is to ensure that all important voices are being captured in the collected data. The method of data collection (e.g., in-person; on the phone; qualitative or quantitative), the gender of the enumerator, the time of day when data is collected, the sensitivity of the topic being discussed, and numerous other factors all have gender-specific considerations and contribute to the quality of the data.

Gender of the enumerators

Women and men are not always comfortable sharing their experiences with enumerators, especially when the topic is sensitive. However, women and men are generally more comfortable sharing their experiences with someone of the same sex.^{7 8} This is especially true in certain conservative social contexts which limit the communication between women and men in society. Therefore, employing both female and male enumerators, and pairing them with respondents of the same sex, can be a good way of ensuring respondents are more comfortable.

An example: For IGNITE’s study with teff farmers in Ethiopia, we chose to consider both the adult man and adult woman in the household as primary respondents (as opposed to having a primary and a secondary respondent). We sent a pair of enumerators to each household, and paired each adult female with the female enumerator, and each adult male with the male enumerator. This required some logistical changes during data collection and analysis and was also more expensive to implement. It also involved changing our data monitoring procedures to account for the different risks to data quality that came with paired enumerators (over single enumerators). In analysis, we had two points of data from each household on most questions, even those where disagreement seemed unlikely. This required a different approach for each variable and did not always lead to clear results. However, we believe these extra efforts and costs are worth the effort to ensure respondents are comfortable and that the data quality is high.

Recommendation: when interviewing both women and men in a household, especially when sensitive topics are being discussed, it is strongly encouraged to match respondents to enumerators of the same sex. This leads to additional cost and logistical challenges but is worth it for the improved comfort of respondents and higher quality of data.

Speaking to women and men separately

Related to this above point on comfort of respondents, it can also be the case that women are not comfortable sharing their experiences in front of men in their household or in their community. This is due to cultural norms in many countries (e.g., Ethiopia) where agricultural activities are considered a man's domain, and women's opinions are often less valued. It is also the case that in group settings, people in positions of power – often men or even older women, in some cases – can dominate the conversation and not allow space for women, especially younger women, to speak. Keeping these societal norms and realities in mind when designing your data collection strategy are essential for ensuring women are included in the research.

An example: For IGNITE's study on time use with cassava farmers in Nigeria, we conducted focus group discussions with mechanized cassava farmers to hear of their experiences with mechanization, and how they are spending the time they have saved as a result of the technology. During scoping and piloting, it was observed that during mixed-sex FGDs relating to mechanization, men were overwhelmingly participating the discussion. When moderators specifically encouraged women in the group to participate, it often led to lively discussions between women and men, but the conversation quickly switched back to being dominated by men. Seeing this, we decided to include both women-only and mixed-sex FGD groups in order to ensure women's voices were captured both with and without the influence of men.

Recommendation: women and men may not be comfortable sharing information in front of other household members or community members of the opposite sex. Researchers should be sensitive to these nuances and power dynamics when designing and implementing gender-sensitive research.

Consider your methods – collecting data over the phone has implications

Choosing whether to collect data in-person or over the phone has different implications for women and men. Phone ownership is still heavily skewed towards men, especially in rural areas and in certain countries like Ethiopia, where there is a 26% gap in phone ownership between women and men.⁹ Therefore, choosing to conduct a survey over the phone may systematically exclude women from participating. Relatedly, even if women have access to a phone, they tend to have less income and less control over that income, so they have less chance of having airtime or credit available to take a call. Similarly, choosing to call or visit a household at certain hours of the day can influence the chances of women or men choosing to participate in the study. Across Africa, women have more household responsibilities than men (e.g., childcare, food preparation) and therefore have less time available for an interview. Building trust with respondents is also more difficult over the phone. Consider sending a SMS primer before the call to inform the participant ahead of time. Female enumerators have also been seen to be more trusted over the phone (by both women and men), so consider using more female enumerators.¹⁰ Researchers must take these factors into consideration in order to reach as many of the intended population as possible and reduce bias.

An example: For IGNITE's study with volunteer farmers in Tanzania, we are conducting a phone survey of 5,000 women and men volunteer farmers. In this case phone ownership is less of a concern, as the client confirmed that almost all of the volunteer farmers own a phone and regularly use mobile phones for their role. However, there are some women in the sample who share phones with their husbands. For these cases, we ask the initial

respondent to pass the phone or schedule another time to speak with the second respondent. In terms of time of day, we will monitor the response rate for women and men throughout the data collection process, and attempt call backs at different times of day in an attempt to reach women or men at a convenient time for them. We have also opted to share a small incentive of airtime with each and every participant in the phone study, to ensure that the interview does not have a financial cost to the participants.

Recommendation: not all data collection methods reach women and men equally. If conducting a phone survey, consider factors like phone ownership, time of day, and building trust when collecting data to increase your chances of reaching women.

Conclusion

Through lessons learned in recent studies in Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Tanzania, IGNITE recommends asking four guiding questions when planning your data collection, to ensure that women's voices are heard.

1. Who is in the population of interest?

Identify the groups you want to learn something about (e.g., women teff farmers in Amhara), and if you are conducting a quantitative household survey, consider a listing exercise.

2. Within the population of interest, who will you speak with?

Stratify your sample to ensure representation of relevant subgroups, and do not expect a single household member's perspective to be representative of all household members.

3. How will the household's composition impact your research design?

Consider how your sampling decisions may be excluding important subgroups (e.g., FHHs, other adults in the household) and ensure you are doing this for good reason.

4. How are you ensuring that you are collecting high quality data from women?

Don't forget to take into account factors like enumerator gender, societal norms, time of day, access to phones, and sensitivity of the topic to ensure women can participate.

Summary of the Four IGNITE Studies

Study 1: Intra-household Decision Making & Teff in Ethiopia: How gender factors influence decision-making on the adoption of best practices (BPs) in teff farming households in Ethiopia. The study focused on farming households who have been trained through the national extension program, with a focus on farmers trained by Development Agents (DAs)¹ who were trained by an IGNITE client. The study explored how the decision-making process to adopt BPs is made by the households and worked to identify the key gender-specific factors that influence adoption decisions.

Study 2: Time Savings from Mechanization for Cassava Farmers in Nigeria: How the time saved from the use of farm mechanization technologies (e.g., tractors, harvesters, boom sprayers) is being reallocated to other activities among smallholder cassava farming household members in Nigeria. The study explored: 1) who is enjoying the benefits of that extra time, and 2) how that time is being used. The study focused on smallholder cassava farming households who were accessing mechanization services and comparing them to households who were farming entirely manually.

Study 3: Women's Inclusion in Wheat Extension Training in Ethiopia: How video-mediated extension training delivered to women wheat farmers via women-only farmer groups compares to the same extension delivered to women farmers via mixed-sex groups. The study also compares knowledge and adoption outcomes for women farmers who receive video-mediated extension (in either type of farmer group), and women farmers who reside in households where only a male household member received video-mediated extension. Women farmers include those in both FHHs and MHHs.

Study 4: Volunteer Farmers & Entrepreneurship in Tanzania: How lead volunteer farmers earn income from their work, and how these paths to income differ for women, men, and youth. Volunteer farmers offer last mile delivery of extension services including training and inputs such as seeds and fertilizers. They are self-employed – providing training to other farmers usually at no cost, and without receiving a direct wage for their work. The study focuses on entrepreneurial volunteer farmers who have started an income-generating business that is tied to their work, with a particular focus on how gender plays a role in these income-generating activities.

¹ IGNITE uses the term 'clients' for the institutions it works with – including African NGOs, private sectors organizations, and governments.

² For detailed information on listing exercises, please refer to the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) Program's Sampling and Household Listing Manual: <https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-dhsm4-dhs-questionnaires-and-manuals.cfm>

³ A development agent (DA) is a government extension worker in the Ethiopian agricultural system. DAs form farmer groups consisting of all farmers in each location and provide training on good agricultural practices for crops grown in the area.

⁴ For detailed information on stratification, please refer to the World Bank DIME Wiki: https://dimewiki.worldbank.org/Stratified_Random_Sample

⁵ Note that this categorization excludes male-headed households (MHH) without adult women, although this is a much less common household group across Africa.

⁶ World Bank. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.HOU.FEMA.ZS?locations=ET-NG-TZ>

⁷ Ayhan, H. (2001). Statistics by Gender: Measures to Reduce Gender Bias in Agricultural Surveys. International Statistical Review, 69(3), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1403456>

⁸ Elias, M. 2013. Practical Tips for Conducting Gender-responsive Data Collection. Bioversity International, Rome. https://www.bioversityinternational.org/fileadmin/_migrated/uploads/tx_news/Practical_tips_for_gender_responsive_data_collection_1658_02.pdf

⁹ LeFevre, Shah, Bashingwa, et al. (2020) Does women's mobile phone ownership matter for health? Evidence from 15 countries. <https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/5/e002524>

¹⁰ Hersh, S., Nair, D., Komaragiri, P. B., & Adlakha, R. K. (2021). Patchy signals: capturing women's voices in mobile phone surveys of rural India. BMJ global health, 6(Suppl 5), e005411. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-005411>

This case study was written by Tessa Ahner-McHaffie and John DiGiacomo at Laterite.

IGNITE Partners

Tanager, an ACDI/VOCA affiliate, is an international non-profit that brings people together at the table, on the ground, and across supply chains to co-create economic and social opportunities that change lives. Working closely with our partners, we align interests to expand market access and unlock the full potential of shared market opportunities that result in reliable supply chains, stable incomes, healthy families, and resilient communities.

Laterite is a data, research, and advisory firm dedicated to providing high-quality research services for social impact in East Africa. We provide technical advice on the design and implementation of research projects, development interventions, and socio-economic policies. We strive to deliver impactful research that helps decision-makers find solutions to complex development problems.

60 Decibels is a tech-enabled social impact measurement and customer intelligence company, spun out of Acumen. We make it easy for companies and organizations to listen to the people who matter most. Using our Lean Data approach, we collect social impact and customer feedback data through phone surveys and other methods.

