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Executive Summary

Two questions are central for agricultural development, a) how to increase agricultural productivity and b) what are the constraints, strategies and policies needed to improve productivity. Gender has an important role in addressing both questions, especially the second one. The commitment of international development organisations to the issue of gender equality in agricultural development highlights several reasons for mainstreaming gender, including increasing agricultural productivity and economic growth, promoting gender equality and addressing gender needs, and promoting stronger, more resilient and sustainable agrarian communities. To mainstream gender in a program, conducting a baseline gender analysis is the initial step, to provide current data and to put gender into the context. The existing most commonly used gender analysis frameworks operate either on micro level which focus mainly on women, or at a more macro structural level looking at the broader influences of institutions and policies. The absence of a more hybrid framework that embodies a mixture of detailed gender-sensitive data collection that is specifically looking at the economic side, including the production and consumption functions of an individual/household/sub-group, and a more macro perspective of gender in a wider structural context is the central focus of this research report. This report aims to develop an alternative comprehensive and hybrid gender analysis framework by integrating Harvard or gender roles framework with social relations approach to capture a balance between micro-focus and detailed hands-on data oriented with a conceptually rich macro analysis. The methodology used in conducting this research included exploratory review and critical analysis of existing scholarly journal articles, books, best practice manuals and handbooks, available from academic databases and an internet search of various international development and research organisations.

Gender roles, resource entitlements, institutional analysis, policy approaches and cause and effect analysis are core elements of the integrated gender analysis. This new development of gender analysis framework has been developed and analysed carefully to satisfy the World Bank’s five major categories for a comprehensive gender analysis: needs assessment, activity profile, resource access and control profile, benefits and incentive analysis, and institutional constraints and opportunities (Pehu et al. 2009; Schaefer 1996). Observations on the day-to-day gendered lived experiences of a community, is an excellent tool to map evidences, daily activities, time use, mobility patterns, and to better understand gender differences, including practical gender needs. Moreover, Gender dimensions in access to, and control over, resources allow for a better understanding of asymmetrical power relations and look closely at the intra-household dynamic. Institutional analysis informs gender and power relations in a wider social structure. Incorporating gender approaches
highlights the significant gender continuum in development projects and provides guidance in determining level of intended impacts. Furthermore, the cause and effect analysis allows for a cause-effect thinking mechanism and the specifying of possible impacts of a development project towards gender. These integrated core elements make up a comprehensive gender analysis framework that is not only useful for baseline study, but also useful to build gender-sensitive indicators for designing, monitoring and evaluating interventions. Lastly, mixed method approach involving qualitative and quantitative methodologies for data collection is essential for a comprehensive gender analysis.

Consider the limitation of a literature-based research, further discussion on appropriate methodology and tools for data collection for this hybrid framework will be one step closer to real life application. Furthermore, it is very important to make a further classification of agricultural development programs. Making a clear distinction regarding agricultural development programs, whether they are agricultural research and development, an innovation system, a development intervention, or an extension service is vital information. Each type of program will have a different project phase and different levels of gender consideration. Hence, such programs have different steps of gender mainstreaming.
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Glossary for Gender Terms and Key Concepts

Feminisation of agriculture
A term referring to the increasing participation of women in the agricultural sphere, including wag workers, unpaid family workers and women as independent producers (Lastarria-Cornhiel 2008).

Gender and Development (GAD)
A popular gender in development discourse or approach that focuses on gender relations between men and women and understands gender inequality as a cross-cutting and multidimensional issue (Razavi & Miller 1995).

Gender analysis
A socioeconomic analysis that explores and highlights the differences in conditions, social positions, needs, resource capacity and entitlements between men and women in their assigned gender roles in a society. The analysis looks at the dynamic relationship between men and women in the public and private spheres, and how power relations at the intra-household level connect with those at the international, state, market, and community levels (March et al 1999).

Gender-aware policies
Policies or actions that acknowledge and take gender into account (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996).

Gender-blind policies
Policies or actions that do not recognise a distinction between sexes and, therefore, do not acknowledge any gender aspects of any conditions (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996).

Gender mainstreaming
A set of strategies to address gender equality, that incorporate and take gender into account in the planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and development programs (European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) 2018).

Gender-neutral policy approach
Approaches that use the understanding of gender and gender relations in a given society for the development of interventions, aiming to ensure target beneficiaries meet their practical gender needs without attempts to challenge gender inequality (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996).

Gender planning
An approach to the development of policies and actions that actively addresses gender and explicitly integrates the gender dimension (EIGE 2018). Gender planning integrates the gender perspective in planning for programs, policies, and any other initiatives.

Gender position/positioning
The position of both men and women, in relation with one another’s social and economic standing in a society.

Gender-redistributive policy approach
An approach that uses the understanding of gender and gender relations in a given society for the development of interventions, aiming to ensure target beneficiaries meet their practical gender needs, as well as their strategic gender needs, and promoting equal position for both sexes (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996).

Gender relations
A culture/society specific set of social relations between men and women as social groups, defining, amongst other things, how power is distributed between men and women, and their access to and control over resources (United Nations Women Training Centre 2017).
Gender roles
Culture/society specific social and behavioural norms for each gender, that are broadly accepted by that society as socially appropriate (EIGE 2018).

Gender-specific policy approach
An approach that adopts the understanding of gender and gender relations in a given society, in the development of interventions specifically for either men or women. This approach aims to ensure target beneficiaries meet their practical gender needs without attempts to challenge gender inequality (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996).

Institutional gender policies
A set of policies or strategies that operate within institutions, which reflect the extent to which such policies recognise and address gender issues (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). This is one of Naila Kabeer’s key terms in her gender framework.

Practical gender needs
Men and women’s needs in their everyday socially accepted roles in a given society (Moser 1993).

Strategic gender needs
Men and women’s needs to improve their gender position in relation to each other. This includes men and women’s capacity for equal entitlement to resources and benefits, political participation, etc.

Women in Development (WID)
A popular gender in development discourse or approach that focuses on women and their role in economic development and shapes the understanding of gender issues merely as women’s disadvantages which put women in the centre of development projects and as target beneficiaries (Razavi & Miller 1995).
Introduction

Although migration and other livelihood diversification have risen in many areas, agriculture remains the cornerstone of rural livelihood, especially in agrarian countries. Agricultural development programs and policies, aimed at increasing agricultural productivity, promoting sustainable agricultural livelihood, and reducing poverty, are central to policy making institutions and international development organisations. Two questions are central to improving agriculture, a) how to increase agricultural productivity and b) what are the constraints and policies needed to improve productivity (Doss 2014). Gender has an important role in addressing both questions, especially the second one. However, the gender dimension of agricultural development has not been acknowledged historically.

Agriculture is closely linked with ‘male dominated’ types of activities and this assumption is further reinforced from time to time, neglecting the fact that women in agrarian communities are not only involved in domestic chores, child bearing and child care, but also engaged in agricultural activities. The absence of taking gender into account in agricultural development has, in many cases, been the key that leads to issues around inclusiveness, social equity and program effectiveness. In this context, the concept of gender is binary – male and female. Gender-based differences that lead to some of the constraints in delivering new knowledge, or tools, are pivotal to ensure that the benefits of programs flow to the intended recipients, as well as achieving program goals. For instance, the Oxfam livelihood program in Nias, Indonesia, reported that in addition to their reproductive role, female farmers play an important role in food production, processing and preparation, within agricultural production (Salkeld 2007). Furthermore, Oxfam recommends mainstreaming gender in livelihood programs and acknowledges the importance of gender, to ensure equitable access to agricultural programs in Nias, for both men and women.

Gender mainstreaming in agricultural development programs has been considered pivotal in many development agencies and policy institutions in recent years. Development organisations, such as the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, the World Bank, the International Food Policy Research Institute, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), have produced best practice manuals to integrate gender in their agricultural programs. Mainstreaming gender in the project planning, design, implementation and evaluation is considered a mandatory step, to promote more meaningful gender integration and create gender responsive actions that are implementable (Njuki 2016). ACIAR also committed to integrate gender in their research projects, to strengthen their projects’ impacts, minimise potential negative impacts to different groups, help
reduce poverty, and to build stronger more resilient communities, in the context of social and economic growth (O’Keefe 2017). Furthermore, USAID has developed a handbook for gender mainstreaming in the agricultural value chain, aiming to equip readers with a clear understanding of how gender issues affect the agricultural value chain, the process of analysing gender issues in the agricultural value chain, and strategies to address these issues (Rubin, Manfre & Barett 2010). The handbook, featuring the Integrating Gender issues into Agricultural Value Chain approach, is essential to further develop strategies designed to enhance the effectiveness of the agricultural value chain and reduce poverty.

The commitment of international development organisations to the issue of gender equality in agricultural development highlights several reasons for mainstreaming gender, including increasing agricultural productivity and economic growth, promoting gender equality and addressing gender needs, and promoting stronger, more resilient and sustainable agrarian communities. To mainstream gender in a program, conducting a baseline gender analysis is the initial step, to provide current data and to put gender into the context. Gender analysis, conducted as an initial baseline study, determines gender-based differences in resource distribution and allows for the prediction of level of participation and the likely impact of planned intervention (Schaefer 1996 cited in Pehu et al. 2009). Furthermore, gender analysis is fundamental in designing “policy reform and supportive program strategies”, as well as developing training tools for staff members (Schaefer 1996 cited in Pehu et al. 2009, p. 682). The need to identify a comprehensive gender analysis that embodies both qualitative and quantitative data, everyday lived experiences, and in-depth social structural analysis, is pivotal in the planning phase of gender mainstreaming. The purpose of this research is to develop an overarching gender analysis framework for agricultural development programs that maps out gender roles and resource distribution, as well as captures the complexities of gender relations in a society. Further, this research aims to provide a comprehensive gender analysis framework that is pragmatic and conceptually rich, by integrating two different gender analysis frameworks: Harvard (Gender Roles) Analytical Framework and the Social Relations Approach.

In the first part of this report, a literature review of a wide range of existing gender analysis frameworks will be provided, followed by a brief discussion on the reasoning for selecting the Harvard Framework and Social Relations Approach, as conceptual tools for analysing gender for an agricultural development program. In the second part of this report, a brief overview of the Harvard Framework and Social Relations Approach will be presented, to provide a more detailed understanding of the core concepts of both frameworks, as well as identify the strengths and limitations of these approaches. The third part of this report will outline technical approaches and methodologies related to collecting data and provide a discussion on the integrated gender analysis
framework in the agricultural development context. An in-depth analysis will also be provided, describing how this integrated framework generates key elements and indicators that are gender-sensitive and comprehensive, encompassing major elements needed to analyse gender, not only at the community and household level, but also gender position and resource relationship in a wider structural and institutional process. The final section of this research report will present the conclusions and recommendations, to encourage further classification of different types of agricultural development programs and different steps essential in the process of gender mainstreaming.

The methodology used in conducting this research included exploratory review and critical analysis of existing scholarly journal articles, books, best practice manuals and handbooks, available from academic databases and an internet search of various international development and research organisations.
Part 1: Overview of the Development of Frameworks for Gender Analysis

A wide range of well-known gender analysis frameworks, dating from the 1980’s, have been commonly used until today. The frameworks include Harvard, or Gender Roles, Framework, Moser Framework, Gender Analysis Matrix (GAM), Women’s Empowerment Framework and Social Relations Approach (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996; Mahama 2001; March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999; Tsikata 2001; Warren 2007). The differences between these major frameworks lie in the different use of gender analysis, the period of time, and the different feminist approaches that influence the frameworks. Warren (2007) argues that these frameworks are not neutral frameworks with the same goal and that gender analysis frameworks have evolved overtime, together with the gender and development discourse that is continuously evolving. Thus, these frameworks reflect different understandings of gender and development, which are highly influenced by previous feminist approaches, such as Women in Development (WID) and Gender in Development (GAD).

The WID approach was developed in the 1970’s, on the basis of modernisation and industrialisation (Razavi & Miller 1995). In this approach, women and women’s subordination are seen as the predominant focus of aid and development programs (Razavi & Miller 1995). In addition, economic efficiency and productivity are central to this approach and, together, these priorities shape the understanding of gender and development (Razavi & Miller 1995). Gender and development discourses evolved over time and this can be seen in the different approach of the GAD, with the acknowledgement of underlying factors relating to women’s subordination (Razavi & Miller 1995). This shift in focus, from women-only target recipients to an understanding of gender relations as a socially constructed concept, embodies not only economic but also social and political aspects. These different notions of gender portrayed in various gender analysis frameworks reflect very different understandings of “the nature of power and inequality” (Kabeer 1994, p. 270 cited in Warren 2007, p. 190). These underlying differences inform users of these frameworks in what needs to be analysed and addressed in a development project. Therefore, these gender analysis frameworks analyse gender relations differently and, until recently, there has not been a single well-known and commonly used gender analysis framework that is all-encompassing.

The Harvard, or Gender Roles Framework, was designed by the WID feminist practitioners in 1984 and was heavily based on the assumption that gender matters, as an economic efficiency issue (Razavi & Miller 1995). This framework was the most commonly used method, until recent times, and essentially provides a guide to gender-sensitive data collection for men and women’s activity, time allocation, and resource and benefit distribution (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999; Okali 2012; Overholt et al. 1984; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 2001). The framework
is most useful for projects that are “agriculturally and rurally based and/or that are adopting a sustainable livelihoods approach to poverty reduction” (UNDP 2001, p. 39). The framework itself operates on the assumption that development projects/interventions “can be planned, implemented, and expected to have reasonably predictable effects so long as the correct units of analysis are used” (Okali et al 2000 cited in Okali 2012, p. 5). In other words, gender analysis in this framework centres around men’s and women’s productivity, and gaps found between the genders will likely form the basis of an intervention.

In addition to the Harvard Framework, the Moser Framework is also commonly used. This approach was also influenced by the WID approach and women are the central focus. Elements of the Harvard and Moser frameworks continue to be adapted in many gender manuals and handbooks (Okali 2006). The Moser Framework offers broad guidelines for gender planning and analysis that highlight the triple roles of women: productive, reproductive and community work (Moser 1993; Okali 2006). However, the idea of women’s triple roles has been highly criticised, due to the lack of a solid concept behind the third role, community work. Naila Kabeer (1994) critiques this framework and argues that it does not strictly, nor logically, distinguish between who does what and how, and what is produced. There is a clear distinction between the idea of women’s productive and reproductive roles, but the idea of community work is vaguely defined – whether this refers to “a production of a third type of resources or to how the labour is organised (i.e. people working collectively rather than individually)” (Kabeer 1994 cited in March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999, p. 65). This criticism highlights the argument of whether the concept of women’s triple roles is effective in terms of gender analysis.

The GAM framework was highly influenced by the idea of participatory planning and was first developed by Rani Parker (Parker 1993). The ideological underpinning behind this framework leans towards local knowledge, “All requisite knowledge for gender analysis exists among the people whose lives are the subject of the analysis, gender analysis does not require the technical expertise of those outside the community, except as facilitators, and gender analysis cannot promote transformation unless it is carried out by the people being analysed” (Parker 1993, p. 2 cited in March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999, pp. 67-68). Although this framework is appealing with its participatory ideology, the type of analysis that is being generated is micro-focused and there is a high possibility of shifting meanings that will generate incorrect data and information (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). Furthermore, this approach neglects the cause-effect relationship, with broader macro units of analysis, such as institutions and economic trends.
The Social Relations Approach differs from other frameworks, in that it aims to provide development practitioners and researchers with a holistic view of gender relations that goes beyond a micro-focus. The approach considers how gender relations are shaped, change, and are reinforced over time by the four key institutions (state, market, community, and kinship) (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). Naila Kabeer, the developer of the concept, believes that gender relations are “multi-stranded: they embody ideas, values, and identities; they allocate labour between different tasks, activities, and domains; they determine the distribution of resources; and they assign authority, agency, and decision-making power” (Kabeer 2005, p. 23). This framework serves as a method of analysing existing gender relations and gender inequalities, in the context of distribution of resources and power at both the household and institutional level of analysis. Further, this framework provides concepts that are intended for gender analysis, but also for designing policies and programmes that have a balance between macro-level more structural types of analysis, such as institutions, and the micro-level, such as intra-household dynamics.

1.1 Comprehensive gender analysis framework – The missing Gap

This overview, of the most commonly used and well-known gender analysis frameworks for development interventions, has highlighted the theoretical underpinnings of these approaches and the way that gender in development is understood by the different people who developed the frameworks. This section highlights three important factors associated with gender analysis frameworks. First, gender in the context of development is centred around women’s subordination and women’s empowerment in economic situations and does not delve in deeper to consider other aspects. Second, gender is understood as a cross-cutting and multidimensional matter that informs developers to take a closer look at social structures and institutional policies. Third, the existing analytical frameworks fall into one or the other category, either approaching the issue as a micro women’s issue, looking at gender in day-to-day activities, or at a more macro/structural level, looking at the broader influences of institutions and policies.

A more hybrid framework, which embodies a mixture of detailed gender-sensitive data collection that is specifically looking at the economic side, including the production and consumption functions of an individual/household/sub-group, and a more macro perspective of gender in a wider structural context, is the missing piece within the gender in agriculture and development literature. Okali (2012), aware of this gap, argues for an alternative approach and suggests a modified Harvard Framework, that would provide the level of detail that this most commonly used framework in natural resources management offers, but enhanced with more insight into the complexity of gender relations within households and the wider social structure. The aim of this research is to
integrate the Harvard Framework and the Social Relations Approach, in an attempt to develop an alternative, more hybrid, all-encompassing gender analysis framework that has a balance between detailed hands-on data, oriented with a conceptually rich macro analysis. The next section of this paper consists of a brief overview of the Harvard Framework and the Social Relations Approach, and critically evaluates the strengths and limitations of each framework, and how both frameworks complement each other and can be integrated to develop a comprehensive gender analysis framework.
Part 2: Harvard Analytical Framework

The Harvard Analytical Framework was one of the first frameworks designed for the purpose of gender analysis to support mainstreaming gender in development initiatives. This framework promotes integration of gender analysis, which is essential for transforming development agenda into practical realities (Overholt et al. 1984). The Harvard Analytical Framework was initially developed in 1984, by researchers at the Harvard Institute for International Development, Harvard University (Overholt et al. 1984). The framework has a long-standing reputation for being the most usable, practical and adaptable framework for gender analysis within the context of research, development initiatives, and policy processes (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). Furthermore, elements, such as gender roles and resource distribution, have been adapted from the framework and have become standard practice for identifying gender-related issues within natural resource governance, including agriculture. The framework focuses on providing a set of tools for acquiring information, to generate gender analysis in the context of economic efficiency. Furthermore, this framework shapes gender and agricultural discourse, by highlighting gender roles, asset mapping, and the fact that women’s interest and needs had been ignored in development (Okali 2012).

2.1 Brief Overview of the Harvard Analytical Framework

The Harvard Analytical Framework’s concept and structure draws on gender differences in day-to-day activities and responsibilities, as well as gender differences in power distribution in agrarian communities. The framework was developed to integrate gender in agricultural development and natural resource management (NRM) in general, through a comprehensive database that “considers what women do and why” (Overholt et al. 1984, p. 4). This framework takes the form of a tool for data collection that maps out men and women’s differences in daily activities, including time allocation, resource use and benefit entitlements. Moreover, socioeconomic and socio demographic characteristics of men and women are included as variables within the database. The original form of the Harvard Analytical Framework for data collection is provided in Appendices 1 and 2.

2.2 Purpose of the Harvard Analytical Framework

The Harvard Framework is used as a gender analysis tool for collecting baseline information to develop interventions and is used as a baseline output, to be taken into consideration when developing initiatives, social programs and policies. Gaps between women’s roles and responsibilities, as well as an asymmetrical power distribution base on assets/resource ownership and control in NRM, are used as key gender disadvantage issues to develop gender equality.
strategies and women’s empowerment programs (Okali 2006). The main elements of the Harvard Framework are often used to develop a toolkit for gender mainstreaming in agricultural and rural settings, and also adopted in gender impact assessment manuals. The Harvard Framework focuses on four main components, based on the key questions of who does what? who owns/controls what? who gets access to what? and what are the influencing factors? These questions mainly focus on the gap and differences in the gender division of labour and resource entitlement.

**Who does what?**

To answer this question, the Harvard Framework provides a matrix to identify all relevant productive and reproductive activities between men and women, within the productive age range of 15-64, their children (boys and girls), and elderly groups (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). In addition to demographic characteristics, time and location are other parameters that are considered, depending on the context of each case (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). This tool provides sex disaggregated data between male and females, to use as a comparison analysis in gender division of labour. Data collected based on men and women’s production and reproduction responsibilities can be used to draw an analysis of what is considered to be “women’s work”. This provides useful data to further investigate feminisation of agriculture in the community.

**Who owns/controls what? and Who gets access to what?**

These questions are used to develop information and analysis on access to, and control over, resources in relation to gender. Access in this context is the ability to use and gain benefits from resources, whereas control means ownership and the ability to make decisions regarding resources, including who can use and gain benefit from them (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). A matrix developed from these questions is used to map out resources and benefits, and identify who (male or female) has access to and/or control over resources, as well as who benefits from the resources and other social and economic infrastructure within the community.

**What are the underlying factors that influence gender division of labour and gender-related control and access over resources?**

This section allows more complex analysis, by listing possible factors that influence the differences in gender division of labour, access, and power distribution. The influencing factors include all factors that construct gender relations and determine different opportunities and constraints for men and women, including social construct, demographic trends and characteristics, general economic conditions, and political events (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). These factors are broad and interrelated, however, the analysis typically does not go beyond the surface
level. Furthermore, the analysis of influencing factors does not provide a cause-effect analysis between the relationship of gender and power structure in the society. A summary of the Harvard Framework is provided in Table 1.

2.3 Strengths of the Harvard Analytical Framework

The Harvard Framework is in the form of a matrix, which serves as a tool for data collection at the household and community level. The framework encourages key variables, such as asset ownership, access to resources and gender division of labour, be considered in an economic relational type of gender analysis. This type of gender analysis may be useful in the process of implementing development projects and/or policy processes (Okali 2006). Since this approach was among the first frameworks for gender analysis and gender integration in a development program, Harvard researchers paved the way for the development of other concepts and tools for women’s empowerment and gender-related strategies. In addition, the Harvard Framework was one of the first concepts that offered a systematic structure to organise sex-disaggregated data for the purpose of gender analysis (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). The Harvard Framework encourages gender-sensitive data collection that allows quantification of variables within the context of gender analysis. In this sense, the framework makes the gender impact assessment and planning phase more practical and hands on, to measure possible gender-sensitive indicators of program interventions and promotes the idea that gender analysis could be structured and simplified.
Table 1: Harvard Analytical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Detailed explanations</th>
<th>Guiding question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles in production and reproduction</td>
<td>List and elaborate typical productive and reproductive activities within the targeted community, between men and women, and in relation to demographic characteristics, such as age, class, etc.</td>
<td>Who does what on a daily basis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-related access to, and control over,</td>
<td>List and elaborate on types of resources, including land, technology, education/training, etc, and identify who can control and/or access them (male and female), in relation to demographic characteristics, such as age, class, etc.</td>
<td>Who owns what and who gets access to what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-related access to, and control over, the</td>
<td>List and elaborate on types of benefits and gains derived from the resources mentioned above, in relation to men and women, and identify who can access and/or control such benefits</td>
<td>Who gains from what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits/gains derived from mobilisation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that influence pattern gap and differences</td>
<td>Analyse some potential underlying factors that shape and determine who does what in any population subgroup, and what access and control individuals (male and female) will have to resources and benefits</td>
<td>What are the underlying factors that influence and shape the differences in men and women’s activities, access and control over resources, and benefits?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Limitations of the Harvard Analytical Framework

The main limitation of the Harvard Framework is that it does not go much beyond the economic side of gender relations in NRM (Okali 2006). Within this framework, gender equity and equality are being understood in terms of productivity, benefits and wealth distribution. Critics of the framework point out the absence of further investigation on gender equity and equality within social relational type of analysis, in terms of mitigating gender issues and identifying the deeper more specific root causes (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999; Okali 2006; Okali 2012; Razavi & Miller 1995). The use of the Harvard Framework may not determine the in-depth cause-effect chain
of gender equity and equality issues in certain contexts. In this sense, the Harvard Framework tends to be oversimplified and generalised, and it overshadows the complex relationships in the broader social and institutional context.

Noting the strengths and limitations of the Harvard Framework as a gender analysis tool, it is clear that the absence of a social and institutional analysis in this framework leads to a static understanding of gender relations. Thus, a gender analysis produced within this framework will merely explore the surface. A more comprehensive approach to the further study of gender relations is needed. In the next section, the Social Relations Approach will be discussed, as a possible concept to complement the Harvard Framework, to generate a more nuanced and comprehensive gender analysis.
Part 3: Social Relations Approach

The Social Relations Approach is a framework proposed by Naila Kabeer aiming to capture the complexity of gender relations that goes beyond gender roles and responsibilities, and move towards the structural process of gender relations and institutional processes that produce and reproduce gender inequalities. In addition, this approach examines the cause-effect of social relationships and specific gender issues, within the development context. The Social Relations Approach emphasises the need to analyse gender and norms at the institutional, state, market, community, and kinship levels, and challenges practitioners to avoid neglecting the complexity of gender and oversimplifying gender analysis in practice and policy processes (Hillenbrand et al. 2014).

3.1 Brief overview of the Social Relations Approach

The Social Relations Approach is based on Kabeer’s concept of development being concentrated around human wellbeing, recognising that gender relations are part of social relations, and acknowledging the intersection of these relationships (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). Institutional analysis, within this framework, is defined by the rules, resources, people, activities and power (Miles 2016). In addition, Kabeer believes that the operations of institutions reflect different policies that determine the extent to which such policies recognise and address gender issues (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). She characterises these policies (or strategies) as gender-blind, gender-aware, gender-neutral, gender-specific, and gender-redistributive (Kabeer and Subrahmanian 2000; March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999; Miles 2016). Furthermore, a cause-effect analysis examining the immediate, intermediate, and structural factors of current identified issues is considered essential. The original matrix of this approach is provided in Appendix 3.

3.2 Purpose of the Social Relations Approach

The Social Relations Approach offers a method of analysing gender relations in resource and power distribution, gender roles and responsibilities, and how the relationships between institutions produce and reproduce gender equality (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). Therefore, it examines cross-cutting inequalities and allows practitioners and/or researchers more space for analysis, as the framework is less prescriptive than other models. This gender analysis framework uses concepts, instead of tools, and offers a more in-depth qualitative analysis, using narrative and analytical data to design projects and interventions. Most importantly, the Social Relations Approach is aimed at providing concepts that are believed to be transformative for gender equity and equality.
3.2.1 Institutional Analysis

In this framework, it is essential to analyse how institutions operate and construct gender relations. The Social Relations Approach is a useful framework to capture the complexity of social dynamics and to identify where gender relations sit within, and how they are produced and reproduced, through institutional analysis. According to Kabeer and Subrahmanian, “gender relations are products of the ways in which institutions are organized and reconstituted over time” (1996, p. 17). In other words, proponents believe that gender relations are evolving overtime, socially constructed by institutions, and inequality is reinforced and influenced by institutions. Kabeer also encourages a way of thinking that challenges the idea that institutions are neutral and relationally independent, with respect to each other (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). Four key institutions in this framework are the state, the market, the community and the kinship/family (World Bank 2016). Table 2 provides more detailed examples of the key institutions. Rules, activities, resources, people, and power are five key interrelated elements that define an institutional analysis within this framework.

1. **Rules:** institutions are rule-governed, and consist of formal, informal, explicit and implicit rules expressed through norms, values, laws, traditions and customs (World Bank 2016). The institutional rules have the capacity to control what is done, how it is done, by whom and who will benefit and who will lose (World Bank 2016). Unpacking the institutional rules within organisations informs how gender relations are ruled and governed.

2. **Activities:** institutional activities are identified by determining who does what? who gets what? and who can claim what? (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). The activities can be productive, distributive, or regulative (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). Institutions produce routinised common practices and thus produce inequality over time. For instance, child care and domestic chores are valued, rewarded and understood differently than income generating activities.

3. **Resources:** institutional resources or inputs consist of human (such as labour, education, and skills), material (food, assets, land, money), and intangible (such as information, network) resources (World Bank 2016).

4. **People:** institutions embody specific people and determine inclusion and exclusion. In addition, institutions establish hierarchy and determine rights and entitlements (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). To further analyse gender and gender relations,
examining how an institution excludes and includes people, men and women, their race, class, gender, and ethnicity, will lead to the question of how an institution produces, and reinforces inequalities.

5. **Power**: power is considered as an integral feature of how institutions operate, through their norms, rules, customs, and practices (Kabeer 1994). Further examination of how institutions work and identifying actors who have more capacity to control and mobilise resources will further determine how gender relations are constructed.

This framework provides useful concepts to breakdown and unpack institutions, enabling a gender analysis to be conducted through the lens of Naila Kabeer’s Social Relations Approach. Each of these five key aspects within institutions is interrelated with the other factors.

Table 2: Key institutions and its organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Institutions</th>
<th>Structural form – examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Larger domain, such as military, legal, administrative organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Enterprises, firms, multinationals and corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Village tribunals, community associations, non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>Family, household members, lineage groupings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999

### 3.2.2 Cause and Effect analysis

A cause-effect analysis is at the heart of the framework. Cause and effect analysis explores the long-term, intermediate, and immediate effects, as well as the immediate, intermediate and structural causes of a problem (World Bank 2016). The use of cause and effect analysis allows people to look more thoroughly at the root causes, systems and structures that hinder equality at different institutions. The cause and effect analysis can be presented in a table form, as a way of collecting qualitative data and analysis, or presented in a narrative format. The cause and effect format is depicted in Appendix 3.

### 3.3 Strengths of the Social Relations Approach

The Social Relations Approach is designed to provide a deeper analysis of gender and examine gender dynamics, beyond assessing gender roles and gaps in relation to resources and wealth distribution. Kabeer suggests the framework is a way to challenge the simplistic formulation of gender analysis (Mukhopadhyay & Wong 2007). The Social Relations Approach is not only able to capture the complexity of cross-cutting gender issues and the dynamic of gender relations, but also
takes a closer look at structural, systematic, and institutional factors that shape gender relations in a particular society. In addition to taking into account intersectionality, the approach conceptualises gender as the centre of development thinking, rather than an add-on component (International Labour Organization 1998). It can be said that the framework provides adequate concepts that equip people with in-depth and sufficient understanding of mainstreaming gender in development programs and policy discussion. Furthermore, the Social Relations Approach encourages structural analysis and a cause-effect analysis of certain issues, which allow for deeper discussion and projections of immediate and long-term factors, as well as looking through layers of causes.

3.4 Limitations of the Social Relations Approach

This approach is among the less frequently used frameworks for gender analysis, due to the fact that it requires extensive and skilful probing to capture complexities and translate these into the analyses (Hillenbrand et al. 2014). Therefore, the Social Relations Approach is seen as complex and demanding, as well as time consuming, for the purpose of conducting gender analysis. Furthermore, this framework does not operate in a detailed individual level and tends to downplay individual units of analysis (World Bank 2016).
Table 3: Strengths and Limitations of Harvard Framework and Social Relations Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender analysis framework</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harvard/Gender Roles      | • Micro oriented: Economic relational type of gender analysis at household and community level  
• Detailed and gender-sensitive data oriented  
• Hands-on and practical | • Does not go far beyond economic side of gender relations  
• Lack of in-depth understanding of root causes of some gender disadvantages found in the analysis  
• Oversimplified and produces a static understanding of gender in the development context |
| Social Relations Approach | • Macro-oriented: In-depth analysis on gender relations, not only in intra-household but looks further into structural system in a society  
• Transformative concepts for gender analysis  
• Cause-effect chain analysis | • Time and resource consuming  
• Downplays individual level within an analysis |
Part 4: Integration of Harvard Framework and Social Relations Approach as a gender planning tool in agricultural research

The essence of integrating the Harvard Framework and the Social Relations Approach is to generate a comprehensive gender analytical tool that is pragmatic and conceptually rich. Integrating the Harvard and Social Relations frameworks allows users to zoom into the everyday gender dimension in a specific community, but at the same time zoom out and examine the construction of gender relations in the broader structural social system that is influencing and shaping the everyday lived experiences of men and women in an agricultural community. Adopting hands-on data collection at the household and individual level, with an analytical approach on gender within the wider structural and institutional processes, generates an overarching set of gender-sensitive indicators that can be useful for consideration in project planning. By integrating these frameworks, this research project aims to have both a micro analysis of gender dimension in a community, household, and individual level, and a macro analysis of gender power relations in the structural system of a society.

For the purpose of developing this analytical framework, it is essential to incorporate the World Bank’s five major categories of information for a comprehensive gender analysis: needs assessment, activity profile, resource access and control profile, benefits and incentive analysis, and institutional constraints and opportunities (Pehu et al. 2009; Schaefer 1996). This section presents the integration of the two frameworks, as a gender analysis framework that embodies these major categories.

4.1 Framework for Gender analysis: Integrating Harvard and Social Relations Approach

The Harvard Framework provides a clear focus on gender roles and gender division of labour that shape gender differences, and gender-based constraints in implementing development projects and disseminating knowledge. Although the Harvard Framework provides an analysis of underlying socioeconomic factors, the framework does not encourage a more in-depth analysis of gender positioning in the society. The core elements of the Harvard Framework are twofold: gender roles and time expenditure, and gender differentiated access to, and control over, resources and benefits. In addition, underlying factors that construct gender relations are taken into account. On the other hand, the Social Relations Approach is intended to structurally analyse existing gender inequalities in the context of resource distribution, roles and responsibilities, as well as power and gender positioning. Kabeer and Subrahmanian (1996) incorporate concepts that enable analyses for designing gender-sensitive policies and programmes and gender equitable strategies. The
framework uses concepts, rather than tools, to focus on the relationships between men and women and their relationship to resources and pattern of activities, and how these are re-worked through institutions, such as the state or the market (Hillenbrand et al. 2014).

For the purpose of this research, the core elements of the Social Relations Approach were adopted, not to challenge how existing institutions operate, but merely to further examine the enabling environments and the likelihood of gender positive implications, in the context of agricultural development programs. Acknowledging Kabeer’s position on gender relations and institutions, it can be said that gender positioning, including gender power relations and gender roles, are constructed and reinforced through various institutional mechanisms. To be specific, this research will look into the four key institutions: state, market, community and kinship. Table 3 presents a summary of the integration of the core focus of each gender analysis framework and the essential components to be taken into account for gender analysis.

4.1.1 Gender Roles and Time Expenditure

The idea of gender relations as differences in men and women’s roles and responsibilities is largely understood by many researchers, development practitioners and institutions. The different lived experiences of men and women in agricultural communities shape gender-differentiated preferences, priorities, and needs. Women’s productive and reproductive roles and time allocation combined form the analysis of women’s burden, in comparison to men. Women in conservative communities also have demanding household responsibilities on top of supporting agricultural production for their families (Rubin, Manfre & Barett 2010). Time allocation and mobility patterns are also aspects to look at in a baseline study, to understand how men and women operate and work together in the community. For instance, women in rural Kenya, on average, work three hours per day more than men (Marston & Barret 2006). Despite some restrictions on women’s mobility, women often travel long distances for house chores and food production at home (Rubin, Manfre & Barett 2010). Furthermore, Lilja and Ashby (2001) point out the extent to which gender analysis is integrated and should take into account all stages of agricultural and NRM innovation and research processes (design, testing, and diffusion). The use of gender analysis could inform and identify gender differences, which might affect different research outcomes and impacts for men and women (Lilja & Ashby 2001). Mapping gender-differentiated activities, mobility patterns and time allocations are at the heart of gender analysis, which aims to identify different preferences, traits, priorities, and constraints faced by both men and women. This baseline information is used to assist understanding of how such differences would be affected with the planned research intervention.
and the different ways of disseminating knowledge and technologies to user groups, including how extension services work with both men and women.

Gender differentiated traits, preferences, priorities and knowledge use

Given the distinct gender roles in agriculture, men and women have differentiated preferences, knowledge use, priorities and interests. Men and women have different preferences for new technologies, or practices, for potential agricultural knowledge adoption (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2011). These preferences are driven by day-to-day gender-differentiated activities, gender-differentiated responsibilities, and their differentiated biological traits. Gender roles also influence gender-differentiated knowledge systems, which are often overlooked (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2011).

The different styles of knowledge application, by men and women, will likely determine research dissemination processes, as well as project implementation. Bellon et al. (2007) found that gender-differentiated preferences for agricultural innovation are highly influenced by their agricultural activities and responsibilities. For instance, men and women farmers have different preferences for grain characteristics and that traits related to vulnerability are significantly more important to female farmers than their male counterparts (Bellon et al. 2007).

Findings from participatory gender-sensitive research, in Afghanistan and Pakistan, indicate that female farmers play a major role in maintenance-related tasks in various cropping activities, particularly in Punjab province, Pakistan (Tibbo et al. 2009). This study highlights the need to focus on the end-users of agricultural research and development projects and, hence, baseline study on gender roles, including daily activities and time expenditure, is essential to gain a better understanding of the main stakeholders in a project (Tibbo et al. 2009). These examples indicate that gender differences in agricultural development are conditioned by the differences in the everyday lived experiences of men and women, shaped by gender roles. Thus, analysing gender roles and responsibilities on a daily basis informs people about major gender characteristics that are essential to consider when designing gender-sensitive indicators for agricultural development programs.

4.1.2 Access to and Control over Resources

Resources are critical components of human development and wellbeing. The term resources in this context is used interchangeably with capital and assets. Resources include both tangible and intangible assets, such as human capital (education, labour and employment, agricultural techniques, skills, and knowledge), physical capital (private land, farms, livestock, and equipment), common pool and community managed natural resources (community forests, lake, etc.), social capital (access to social networks, organisations, associations) and public services (healthcare, roads, water, and sanitation). Access to, and control over, resources in the context of
gender and intra-household reflects bargaining power between men and women within households (Behrman et al. 2014). Gender relations shape gender capacity to access and control resources that are necessary to be an active and productive participant in society (Rubin, Manfre & Barett 2010).

A significant gap in men and women’s capability to access and control resources has been found in many different countries. For example, there are asymmetrical gender differences in access to, and control over, agriculture-derived incomes in Punjab province, Pakistan (Tibbo et al. 2009). Beside dairy products and female income categories, men have a higher tendency to manage and control all other income sources in the household (Tibbo et al. 2009). Further discussion of the degree of access and control over resources in gender analysis will generate more nuanced and useful information, to reveal a wide-range spectrum of intra-household decision-making processes.

Besides mapping out tangible and intangible capital, it is essential to understand individual’s capability to gain access, control, and benefit from it (Behrman et al. 2014). Hagmann, Chuma & Gundani (2001) highlight the importance of analysing social, communication, gender, and participation issues, as the major issues of knowledge transfer in the dissemination process of an agricultural innovation in Zimbabwe. This study found that access to knowledge was asymmetrical, between male and female farmers. Through analysing the information flow in the community, the researchers found that female farmers were more likely to pass information from extension workers to their husbands or male headed households, in comparison to male farmers (Hagmann, Chuma & Gundani 2001). This information flow reflects the hierarchal structural norms, where male head of households are not obligated to inform wives or other members, whereas female farmers are accountable to pass any information given in training or visits provided by the extension services.

Understanding gender relations in the context of access to, and control over, a wide range of tangible and intangible resources is a significant part of a baseline study. This information will support analysis and assessment of the extent to which an agricultural project is designed to have outcomes that put women in a better, and more equal, position in terms of decision-making and their ability to use and gain benefits from resources, as well as to what extent projects could manage to have an effective flow of benefits/impacts that are inclusive and empowering for the community as a whole.

4.1.3 Institutional Analysis

An institutional analysis in the Social Relations Approach reveals relationships between power, rules, resources, activities, and people, in four key institutions with gender relations, and how changes in other institutions intersect with the intra-household dynamic. This analysis informs gender positioning in a wider structure of the society and connects with a household level of
analysis. Naila Kabeer (1994) offers an in-depth approach, unravelling complexities through institutional analysis. Gender relations embody aspects of social relations, which "create and reproduce systematic differences in the positioning of women and men in relation to institutional process and outcomes" (Kabeer 1994, p. 280). The framework is universally used not only for intra-household analysis, but also for community, and social groups. This dynamic, in-depth and structured approach will be integrated in the development of the more comprehensive framework for gender analysis, to highlight institutional analysis and how institutions are interrelated with each other. Besides giving a snapshot of gender roles and resource distribution charts and analysis, institutional analysis is also critical to examine the institutional processes that have, in many aspects, strong correlations with gender differences. The following description of the incorporation of an institutional analysis examines gender positioning in the four key institutions that make up some of the major influencing factors of gender relations in societies. As Lilja and Dixon state, “the implications of social and institutional complexity are that any strategy for research and development intervention always need to investigate the context in which it can work effectively” (2008, p. 9). In other words, institutional analysis is significant to identify the enabling environments and project the long-term process of any developmental project planning.

Institutions, intra-household dynamics, and empowerment: Case Studies

Institutional analysis offers a way of understanding how various institutions interrelate and connect with how people behave, and what shapes gender differences. It gives more insight into the roots of powerlessness, poverty, and women’s subordination (March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay 1999). Hillenbrand et al. (2014) discuss the use of the Social Relations Approach to explore baseline gender analysis in their Fish on Farms project, a livelihood and food security intervention. In the paper, Hillenbrand et al. (2014) highlight the application of an institutional analysis and examine the dynamic characteristics of gender relations within the state, market, kinship, and community. They found that the rise of trans-national migration for men and factory work opportunities for women opened the possibility of renegotiating intra-household power relations. Although both work opportunities were shaped by gender norms, these new livelihoods rapidly transformed gender positions and shifted gender roles over time. The new livelihood strategies changed caregiving practices, with more households depending on grandparents for day-to-day child care (Hillenbrand et al. 2014). The notion that ‘men are the bread winners and women deal with the domestic sphere’ was gradually overshadowed by the fact that ‘men and women have equal rights’, with the latter being promoted by many civil organisations, state policies, and community-level authorities (Hillenbrand et al. 2014). This case study demonstrates that changes in an institution will likely
change other dimensions of the institution itself, such as the rules, resources, people, activity and power, and more importantly, intra house-hold power relations between men and women.

Effective and gender-sensitive projects have the possibility to shift institutional rules and renegotiate gender norms in the society. Research has found that gender-sensitive strategies in agricultural innovation development contribute positively to strengthening women’s position, as well as boosting women’s confidence (Hagmann, Chuma & Gundani 2001). During the adaptive on-farm trials in Masvingo province, Zimbabwe, Hagmann, Chuma and Gundani (2001) identified major social issues that hindered the flow of knowledge transfer and proved research to have little impact on farmers. The authors developed a new inclusive training program, for both male and female farmers, and considered gender-sensitive methods in their approach, with the knowledge transfer. During the impact measurement, women were found to have more confidence and leadership qualities within themselves and, together, they formed a new notion that women should be equally presenting and interacting in the training activities (Hagmann, Chuma & Gundani 2001). Furthermore, men who used to be the inhibitors of women’s participation in training programs slowly became supporters and accepted the new social norms of gender equality in access to knowledge (Hagmann, Chuma & Gundani 2001). Although the varying contextual cultural factors and beliefs that constructed the relationships between men and women seem to be a continuous generational mechanism, gender relations do change over time, along with institutional and cultural shifts.

4.1.4 Gender Approaches and Classifications: Institutional Gender Policies

Policies are defined as a set of actions or strategies that work to influence rights, entitlement and equity, as well as prices of goods and services (World Bank 2005). Institutional gender policies in this context aim to provide more understanding of different classifications of approaches used for project cycles and policy processes. The concept of institutional gender policies offers guidance into which approaches will be used to formulate strategy in projects that address gender dimensions.

Kabeer and Subrahmanian (1996) identify two main policies: gender blind and gender sensitive policies. The Social Relations Approach offers three classifications of gender sensitive policies and strategies, depending on the degree to which they recognise and address gender-specific issues. The *gender-neutral policy approach* aims to ensure projects equally benefit both genders effectively, to meet their practical gender needs and work with the existing gender roles and resource distribution (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996). The *gender-specific policy approach* is aimed at a specific gender and/or specific gender needs, while the *gender-redistributive policy approach* is categorised as actions or strategies that are intended to be more transformative,
creating impacts that put a gender in a more equal relationship, and intend to meet both practical and strategic gender needs of both sexes (Kabeer & Subrahmanian 1996).

Gender-responsive agricultural strategies are a significant way to overcome gender-based constraints in productivity, efficiency and well-being in the community, where livelihood is heavily dependent on farms and other agricultural activities (Kristjanson et al. 2017; Pehu et al. 2009; Rubin, Manfre & Barett 2010). Asymmetrical power relations are the major challenge that put women at a disadvantage in comparison to men. Actions and strategies that put both genders in a more equal bargaining position and improving women’s access to productive assets, including knowledge, information, training, land, and technology, are the focus of agricultural sustainability; improving food security, climate change and disaster risk resilience, and market productivity (Kristjanson et al. 2017; Pehu et al. 2009; Rubin, Manfre & Barett 2010).

4.1.5 Cause and Effect analysis

The proposed analysis allows a cause-effect hypothesis and the specifying of possible impacts. In addition, this concept encourages a further examination of the immediate and long-term underlying and structural factors of an issue, and the effect of different people involved, in relation to the four key institutions (World Bank 2016). This concept relates more to impact analysis. Impacts of an intervention are realised through a relational chain of cause-effect relationships. A cause-effect analysis provides clarity in an impact analysis and makes it easier to trace causes of success and failure of a research or innovation project (Lilja & Ashby 2001). To draw a simple analogy, participatory or gender analysis, applied during research processes, that draws baseline information can be understood as the cause, while the hypothesis about the expected impact or the “research priorities change” can be considered the effect (Lilja & Ashby 2001). In other words, gender analysis that generates a more nuanced understanding of gender differences and gender-based constraints, leads to identifying new priorities that draw hypotheses about the expected impact. Similar to the cause-effect analysis in this framework, this is used to identify cause and effect relationships of an issue in the immediate, intermediate and long term, and a structural level of analysis.
Table 4: Core Elements of the Integrated framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Elements</th>
<th>Key Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles and time expenditure</td>
<td>• Gender differentiated traits, preferences, priorities, and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobility pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to and control over resources</td>
<td>• Men’s and women’s capacity over resources – the degree of access and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intra-household bargaining power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asymmetrical power distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional analysis</td>
<td>• Institutional analysis informs gender position in the wider structure in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Structural changes overtime will shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the enabling environments and project the long-term process of any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>developmental project planning (i.e. what works effectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender approaches and classifications</td>
<td>• Give nuanced understanding of different classifications of approaches used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender-neutral policy approach</td>
<td>for project cycles and policy processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender-specific policy approach</td>
<td>• Highlight the practical and strategic gender needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender-redistributive policy approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause and effect analysis</td>
<td>• Identify cause and effect relationships of an issue in the immediate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intermediate and long term, and a structural level of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specifying possible impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Methodological Approach and Some Important Notes for Gender Analysis

As mentioned, to conduct a gender analysis the collection of sex-disaggregated data is a mandatory step. Moreover, gender-disaggregated data collection for planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation, should ideally be context specific (Hunt 2004; Doss & Kieran 2014). A mixed-method approach has been shown to be the best option for data triangulation, as it captures complexities that are rarely shown in quantitative data collection. For example, greater methodological pluralism for gender analysis in forestry research was found to be beneficial, to understand the drivers of gender differentiated outcomes, particularly when those outcomes inform policy and practice (Mai, Mwangi & Wan 2011 cited in Manfre & Rubin 2012). According to Manfre
and Rubin (2012), a mixed approach has advantages for gender analysis, not only to quantify and identify inequalities, but also to describe and interpret factors that contribute to the disparities. In other words, mixed and diverse methods of qualitative and quantitative data collection, as well as participatory techniques, should be used to effectively measure factors of gender gap and differences, and interpret the revealed data in the most effective, non-biased and appropriate way. Furthermore, identifying an appropriate unit of analysis, depending on the context, is crucial in gender analysis. Doss and Kieran (2014) list a wide variety of units of analysis needed for gender analysis in agricultural research, ranging from individual, household and community units of analysis to regional/national, resource unit and value chain. This section will not consider specific tools and methods in detail but will briefly highlight some important issues relating to analysing the dynamic gendered relationship. Three factors will be briefly discussed, intra-household analysis, gender-resource analysis, and community level of analysis.

4.2.1 Intra-household Analysis

The definition of household should be carefully defined, to obtain the appropriate data for gender analysis. Typically, surveys use household definition as “people who sleep under the same roof, eat out of the same pot, and share in production and consumption activities” (Doss 2013, p. 5). Households in rural agrarian communities often have extended family members living in the same house and, therefore intra-household analysis is likely to deal with family interactions. Furthermore, the idea of using gender to define the head of households has been criticised and considered biased, when conducting gender analysis. This approach will underrepresent women’s access to extension services and ownership of assets, in the data obtained (Doss 2013). Thus, survey questions and key variables should be sex-disaggregated and, more importantly, capture the interactions of all members of the household.

4.2.2 Gender-resource Analysis

Analysing control over and access to resources, from the perspective of gender, is complex and multilayered. Besides gender dynamics in resource entitlement, property rights are also an element to be considered. This “bundle of rights” further explains the degree of use of land and other natural resources and to what extent people could use, benefit from and manage the resources (Berhman et al 2014). Therefore, these complex rights in the community and gender dynamics within households add layers of analysis in the context of gender and resource entitlement.
4.2.3 Community Analysis

This level of analysis relates to the institutional analysis previously discussed. It requires a higher level of probing skills, to connect analyze and identify effects of shifting institutional rules towards intra-household dynamics and gender roles in the community. Information collected from existing research, local documents, newspapers, and ethnographic writing can provide useful understanding and information of the current and historic context of the social and gender dynamics of a particular area (Manfre & Rubin 2012). Further qualitative approaches, such as in-depth interviews and participant observations, are an important addition to data collection for this level of analysis.
Part 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Integrating the Harvard or Gender Roles, Framework and Social Relations Approach has created a more holistic basic framework for gender analysis in the agricultural setting. The combination of detailed observation of day-to-day lived experiences with a broader and structural cause-effect relational analysis on gender positioning in the society, assembles a comprehensive analytical framework used as a gender planning tool in agriculture. As mentioned section 4, a comprehensive gender analysis should embody the five components of needs assessment, activity profile, resource access and control profile, benefits, and institutional analysis (Schaefer 1996). The integrated gender analysis framework has been developed with these major characteristics incorporated in it, therefore providing a comprehensive gender analysis, in particular, by adding the cause-effect component and policy analysis. Observation, including qualitative and quantitative data collection on the day-to-day lived experiences of a community, is an excellent tool to map evidence, daily activities, time use, mobility patterns, and to better understand gender differences, including practical gender needs.

Gender dimensions in access to, and control over, resources allow for a better understanding of asymmetrical power relations and look closely at the intra-household dynamic. This is a significant part of a baseline study, to support decisions in designing agricultural programs that have an impact on bringing women into a better and more equal position, as well as equitable access to resources. Further, access and control profile over resources and benefit is essential knowledge for policy makers and development practitioners, to ensure services and benefits of programs are delivered to target beneficiaries and inclusively making a bigger positive impact on the community. Gender roles and resource distribution analysis are consistently featured in gender and agriculture literature. These two points adapted from the Harvard Framework are an essential part of gender analysis in agriculture. Moreover, this satisfies some of the major characteristics of a comprehensive gender analysis according to the World Bank (Schaefer 1996).

Institutional analysis informs gender and power relations in a wider social structure. Naila Kabeer (1994) believes that gender relations are a cross-cutting and multidimensional matters that are shaped by social institutions, and this institutional analysis is a way to look at gender from Naila Kabeer’s perspective. The five elements of rules, power, activities, resources and people are the essential keys of an analysis at an institutional level. The four key institutions (state, market, community, and kinship) form a set of analytical concepts that form a broader analysis, which tells of the underlying institutional and structural factors of gender inequalities. The institutional analysis connects with all levels of analysis. The shifts in institutional rules, formal and informal, changes the
intra-household gender dynamic. Hence, Naila Kabeer has successfully demonstrated her idea that gender is cross-cut and interrelated with major aspects of social life. This concept is important in the integrated analytical framework, to satisfy what is considered to be a comprehensive gender analysis. Furthermore, institutional analysis is needed in planning a gender-sensitive development program, to identify the enabling environments and project the long-term implications for possible implementation.

Incorporating gender approaches highlights the significant gender continuum in development projects and provides guidance in determining level of intended impacts. The classifications of gender approaches help identify the direction of a policy or program and emphasise the need to understand what the practical and strategic gender needs are, and whether such a project will address one or more of the needs. This element is significantly important when designing policy reform and program strategies. Lastly, the cause and effect analysis allows for a cause-effect thinking mechanism and the specifying of possible impacts. This detailed analysis of immediate, intermediate and structural causes follows the immediate, intermediate and long-term effects of an issue support planning phase when designing a program/policy. Therefore, these integrated core elements make up a comprehensive gender analysis framework that is not only useful for baseline study, but also useful to build gender-sensitive indicators for designing, monitoring and evaluating interventions. Furthermore, mixed-method approach involving qualitative and quantitative methodologies for data collection and gender-disaggregated data are essential for a comprehensive gender analysis. Defining key variables and survey questions is also an important initial step for data collection to capture gender dynamic within household interactions. The need to understand local property rights is obvious, especially when analysing gender and resource entitlements.

The development of this integrated gender analysis framework should continue beyond this research report. Further discussion on appropriate methodology and tools for data collection for this hybrid framework will be one step closer to real life application. Furthermore, it is very important to make a further classification of agricultural development programs. Making a clear distinction regarding agricultural development programs, whether they are agricultural research and development, an innovation system, a development intervention, or an extension service is vital information. Each type of program will have a different project phase and different levels of gender consideration. Hence, such programs have different steps of gender mainstreaming.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1

Harvard Analytical Framework – Activity profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Women/girls</th>
<th>Men/boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Generating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reproductive Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water related:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel related:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health related:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and repair:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market related:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP 2001
### Appendix 2

Harvard Analytical Framework – Access and control profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/training, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic needs (food, clothing, shelter etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political power/prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP 2001
Appendix 3

Cause and Effect Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE AND EFFECT ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate causes at level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate causes at level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural causes at level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank 2006