



Toolbox on Gender Mainstreaming in Agri-Food Systems Education and Research

Including and measuring intersectionality

Author: Nora Pistor, October 2020



List of Abbreviations

CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIHEAM	International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CIHR	Canadian Institutes of Health Research
EC	European Commission
EIGE	European Institute for Gender Equality
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (UN)
FTC	Farmer Training Center
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GDI	Gender Development Index
GE	Gender Equality
GEAR	Gender Equality in Academia and Research
GEP	Gender Equality Plan
GII	Gender Inequality Index (HDR)
GM	Gender Mainstreaming
GRG	Gender Reference Guide
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
LGBTIQ	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer
M	Man
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDS	Model Disability Survey
MSc	Master of Science
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
R&I	Research and Innovation
RPO	Research Producing Organizations
SALAR	Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions
SDD	Sex-disaggregated data
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIGI	Social Institutions and Gender Index
TOC	Theory of Change
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIBO	University of Bologna, Italy
UNSD	United Nations Statistics Division
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
VAW	Violence Against Women
VC	Value Chain
W	Woman
WEE	Women's Economic Empowerment
WGQ	Washington Group Questions
WHH	Welthungerhilfe
WP	Work Package

TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS FOR INTEGRATING GENDER

In this part of the guide, various tools and instruments are presented that are useful for starting or enhancing the integration of a gender perspective in research producing entities and educational institutions.

The purpose of this toolbox is to offer practical instruments to be applied in various contexts and for various tasks. It should be noted that the tools cannot replace acquiring necessary gender expertise or engaging human resources specialized in gender mainstreaming for each of these specific tasks.

While a large variety of gender related tools exist, this toolbox can only offer a limited snapshot of most relevant instruments. The references provided in each instrument will offer further details and options.

The toolbox includes the following instruments and guidelines:

1. Designing up a Gender Equality Plan (GEP)
2. Gender mainstreaming in project cycles
3. Various levels of gender integration in a program or policy
4. Conducting a gender analysis
5. Including and measuring intersectionality
6. Integrating gender-sensitive approach into education curricula, research and teaching
7. References for gender training resources
8. Checklist(s) for rapid gender audit

Including and measuring intersectionality

Gender is one of the major determining factors of women's and men's lives. Nonetheless, intersecting parameters are increasingly being included in the analysis to create a more inclusive epistemological understanding of how gender interacts with a person's life reality. Hence, the concept of intersectionality goes one step further: It deals with factors, such as race, class, age, disability, status, culture and ethno-religious affiliation, and even world view, of an individual or a group of persons, in addition to the category of 'gender', and intends to analyze how these factors influence - and often reinforce - inequalities. The theory of 'intersectionality' is a significant achievement academic gender studies and their practical application have produced for the cause of gender equality.

When measuring intersectionality in combination with gender analysis, both quantitative and qualitative research methods have been developed. There are a number of research frameworks produced by various organizations with variations for each intersecting topic. Here, the topic of disabilities is selected to provide an example for how to include the assessment of an intersecting parameter.

For this topic, two frequently discussed methods are the Washington Group Questions (WGQ) and the Model Disability Survey (MDS), presented in brief below. It should be noted, though, that the search for the adequate research methodology needs to be assessed for each research project anew, ideally by staff or advisors with gender and research competence. Hence, these models below can be adjusted for specific needs in research projects.

1) The Washington Group Questions

The WGQ are questions targeted at assessing a person's disability status on the individual level in a quick and low-cost way. They contain a short set of six questions (estimated answering time: under two min.) and an extended set of 35 questions (estimated answering time: 10-12 minutes), that are frequently used by non-governmental organizations as well as National Statistical Office worldwide.

The questions focus on whether the respondent has difficulties in seeing, hearing, mobility, communication, cognition and self-care and results in a self-reported assessment of the individual. Responses are all designed with four options, i.e. "No, no difficulty", "Yes, some difficulty", "Yes, a lot of difficulty", and "Cannot do at all". According to this methodology, respondents are classified as disabled if they respond with "Yes, a lot of difficulty" or "Cannot do at all" in at least one of the six questions.

The extended set of questions adds a number of questions, including on the respondent's mental health (specifically on anxiety and depression) that are not covered by the short set.

2) The Model Disability Survey

The MDS has been developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) in collaboration with the World Bank as a stand-alone data collection instrument to provide comprehensive and systematic documentation on all aspects of 'functioning within a population'. It is supposed to be implemented repeatedly, every five to ten years on a country-wide or regional level.

This tool contains nearly 300 questions (estimated answering time: two to two and a half hours) in its full version, and 38 questions in the brief version (estimated answering time: about 12 minutes).

This model looks at the categories of environmental factors, functioning, capacity and health conditions, personal assistance and assistive products.

The analysis is oriented on a 'disability scale' ranging from 0-100, that can be applied as fit for purpose by defining scores associated as disability. Due to the complexity of this model, the analysis and interpretation require specific expertise and resources.

Further references and links:

The research models can be found here:

- Washington Group on Disability Statistics Website: www.washingtongroup-disability.com
- Model Disability Survey: <http://www.who.int/disabilities/data/mds/en/>

Another useful data source is provided by the Disability Data Portal at <https://www.disabilitydataportal.com>. Here, data available from 48 countries can be disaggregated by disability, gender and compared between countries.

Literature Sources and References

Bock, B.B., S. Shortall, S. (2017), Gender and Rural Globalization. An Introduction to International Perspectives on Gender and Rural Development, In: Bock, B.B., S. Shortall, S. (eds.) (2017), Gender and Rural Globalization: International Perspectives on Gender and Rural Development, Boston MA: CABI (2017).

Bock, B.B. (2006), Gender and migration: An overview. In: Bock, B.B. , Shortall, S. (eds.) Rural Gender Relations: Issues and Case Studies., Wallingford, UK: CABI, 155–164.

Bonierbale, M.W., Amoros, W.R., Salas, E., et al. (2020), Potato Breeding, In: Campos, H., Oscar O. (eds.) (2020), The Potato Crop. Its Agricultural, Nutritional and Social Contribution to Humankind, E-Book).

CGIAR (2019), Gender Equality in Food Systems Research Platform. Proposal Resubmission.

Council of Europe (2020), What is gender mainstreaming?, Online Portal, online available: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/genderequality/what-is-gender-mainstreaming> (accessed July 2020).

Council of Europe (2016), Gender Equality Glossary, online available: <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016805e55eb> (accessed July 2020).

Devaux, A., Velasco, C., Ordinola, M. et al. (2020), Enhancing Value Chain Innovation Through Collective Action: Lessons from the Andes, Africa, and Asia, In: Campos, H., Oscar O. (eds.) (2020), The Potato Crop. Its Agricultural, Nutritional and Social Contribution to Humankind, E-Book).

European Commission (2018), Trans and intersex equality rights in Europe – a comparative analysis, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2018, online available: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/trans_and_intersex_equality_rights.pdf (accessed October 2020).

European Commission (2016), Intersectional discrimination in EU gender equality and non-discrimination law, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2016, online available: <https://op.europa.eu/it/publication-detail/-/publication/d73a9221-b7c3-40f6-8414-8a48a2157a2f> (accessed October 2020).

European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) (2016), Gender Equality Training. Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) (2016), Gender Equality in Academia and Research. GEAR tool, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Esterik, P.V. (1999), Right to food; right to feed; right to be fed. The intersection of women's rights and the right to food. Agriculture and Human Values 16 (2), 225–232 (1999).

FAO (2016), Did You Know? Men and women in agriculture, Rome: FAO, online available: <http://www.fao.org/3/i2050e/i2050e.pdf> (accessed August 2020).

FAO (2011), State of food and Agriculture. Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development, FAO, Rome.

German, L., Taye, H. (2008), A framework for evaluating effectiveness and inclusiveness of collective action in watershed management, Journal of International Development 20(1):99–116.

Hall, J., & Myanmar Survey Research. (2017). Women's Empowerment Study of Selected LIFT Microfinance Partners. Yangon.

Hardell, L. (2003), Environmental organochlorine exposure and the risk of breast cancer, In: Jacobs, M., Dinham, B. (eds.), *Silent Invaders: Pesticides, Livelihoods and Women's Health*. London: Zed Books.

International Potato Center (2017), *Farmer Business Schools in a changing world: a gender responsive and climate smart manual for strengthening farmer entrepreneurship*, International Potato Center, Lima. 2 Volumes.

Kabeer, N., Subrahmanian, R. (1996), *Institutions, relations and outcomes. Framework and tools for gender aware planning*. IDS: Brighton, available online: <https://www.ids.ac.uk/files/Dp357.pdf> (accessed July 2020).

Keller, J.C. (2015), Rural queer theory. In: Pini, B., Brandth, B. and Little, J. (eds.), *Feminisms and Ruralities*, Lexington Books: London, pp. 107–118.

Krumbiegel, K., Maertens, M., Wollni, M. (2017), *Modern agri-food systems, horticultural employment and women's empowerment*, Global Food Discussion Papers 96, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Research Training Group (RTG) 1666 – Global Food, Göttingen.

Marin, A.B., Kuriakose, A.T. (2017), *Gender and sustainable forest management: Entry points for design and implementation*, Climate Investment Funds.

Mayanja, S., Barone, S., McEwan, M., et al. (2016), *Prototype guide for integrating gender into participatory market chain approach*. International Potato Center, Lima.

Meinzen-Dick, R., Quisumbing, A., Behrman, J., et al. (2010) *Engendering Agricultural Research*, IFPRI discussion paper 00973, available online: <https://ebrary.ifpri.org/digital/collection/p15738coll2/id/1581> (accessed July 2020).

Mudege, N.N., Escobar, S.S., Polar, V. (2020), *Gender Topics on Potato Research and Development*, In: Campos, H., Oscar O. (eds.) (2020), *The Potato Crop. Its Agricultural, Nutritional and Social Contribution to Humankind*, E-Book), available online: <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-030-28683-5.pdf> (accessed July 2020).

Smith, D. E. (2003), *Making Sense of What People Do: A Sociological Perspective*, In: *Journal of Occupational Science*, 10:1, 61-64, available online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2003.9686512> (accessed November 2020).

Staal, S., MacMillan, S., Escarcha, J. et al. (2014), *Livestock farming boosts local economies in developing countries*, In: Griffiths, J. (ed.), *Deep Roots*. FAO, Rome, available online: <http://digital.tudor-rose.co.uk/deep-roots/files/assets/common/downloads/publication.pdf> (accessed August 2020).

UNEP (2016), *Global Gender and Environment Outlook. The Critical Issues*, United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, available online: <https://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/176246/176246.pdf> (accessed August 2020).

UN Women (2018), *Gender Equality Glossary*.

Watts, M.A. (2007), *Pesticides and Breast Cancer: A Wake Up Call*, Pesticide Action Network, Asia and the Pacific, Penang.