



GENDER MARKER CASE STUDY

Gender transformative agriculture and nutrition work: Win-Win

This case study offers one example of gender transformative programming in livelihoods and value chains work. Read alongside the Gender Marker Vetting Form to see how the project's approaches correspond with each section of the Gender Marker.

ABOUT WIN-WIN

The Win-Win project worked with savings groups in Burundi to engage a combination of agricultural training and support, and CARE's gender transformative EKATA (Empowerment, Knowledge and Transformative Action) model, which engaged participating households in reflection, dialogue and actions toward gender equality. Seeking to test the impact of this approach, the project engaged communities in 3 arms of intervention : the full EKATA model, which is the focus of this summary, alongside a "Gender Light" and "No Gender Component" versions of the intervention.

This EKATA arm of the project explicitly challenges gender roles and relations – go to column B

ANALYSIS

Data from the Baseline Study was segregated by sex, age and married status. The analysis at the baseline suggests that gender inequality and GBV exacerbated existing livelihood problems (food insecurity and poverty, poor yields and limited access to inputs and agriculture advice).

Gender Analysis was conducted using the Project-level Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (Pro-WEAI). Pro-WEAI considers:

1. intrinsic agency, covering indicators on autonomy in income, self-efficacy, attitudes about domestic violence and respect among household members;
2. Collective agency, which includes indicators on group membership, and membership in influential

groups; and

3. Instrumental agency, which includes work balance, access to and decisions on financial services, control over and use of income, ownership and other assets and input in productive decisions.[3]

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS: The analysis suggested that women and girls are the main providers of agricultural labor while men are to make decisions on production and marketing and control the household income. Women were also responsible for domestic chores and were the main care givers for children and elderly relatives. Women were victims of all forms of violence (physical, emotional and sexual) which affected their motivation in agricultural activities and had a negative outcome on production. The analysis also found that violence against women were justified and normalized through social norms even more by women than men. Food and economic insecurity were linked to domestic violence and household conflicts.

Analysis Criteria for Column B:

ACTIVITIES

Activities were designed to work with women to build their skills in negotiation, leadership, conflict management, and work together for change. At the same time men and leaders were involved to talk with women and find ways to change the habits and norms that are leading to inequality. The Win-Win project:

Supported Agency through gender and livelihood trainings, VSLA loans and accessible follow up by community facilitators.

Transformed Structures through solidarity and collective action planning with the EKATA groups. Participants in the EKATA groups had developed action plans by the end of the intervention and were working with their local administration to take forward their ideas.

Advanced more Equitable Relations by creating spaces for women to openly discuss painful experiences of violence and encouraging men to acknowledge harms they committed and begin to take accountability. The ongoing gender training and non-violence communication helped reduce crop theft and strengthened joint economic goals. Men and women participated in gender trainings together which helped men realized and supported women's empowerment and leadership and perceived it as beneficial to their family development.

Activities Criteria for Column B:

PARTICIPATION

Win-Win project team worked closely with two ministries, gender and agriculture, and the local administration were involved in the project. This included service providers, village heads, and relevant line ministry staff. Throughout the project, the Ministry of Gender made 2 staff available to support the project and accompany staff across activities, trainings and measurement.

Women also took part in project planning and reporting workshops, with activities built on participant proposals. Win-Win also organized learning exchanges on good practices, which also enabled a spirit of pride and competition across groups in participating communities.

Beyond the planning and reporting workshops, Win-Win undertook site visits as well as organized visits by service providers, and local government administrators to speak with participants and get feedback and recommendations.

Participation Criteria for Column B:

Information Sharing:

Involvement in Decision-Making:

Responsive Feedback Mechanism:

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

The Win-Win project had a monitoring and evaluation tools that allowed a collection of sex and age desegregated data. In addition, there was a baseline study followed by annual qualitative assessment and a quantitative midterm review on the same participants.

Efforts were also made to capture unintended consequences and the project team tracked changes in gender roles and relations through annual evaluation and collecting change stories. As the project worked across 3 levels of intervention, risks emerged differently across sites. Among control sites, the project studied risks of violence tied to seasonal rice harvest and income. Staff met with the administration to strategize steps to mitigate these risks.

Among sites where gender interventions were only superficially facilitated, project partners in charge of implementation were frustrated by the limits of their engagement with groups. To respond to this, CARE organized meetings with staff and partners to further discuss the project design and importance of maintaining different degrees of engagement across villages in order to avoid 'contamination' for the sake of assessment across different intervention 'treatments' on their farms to discuss opportunities and interventions that could support them.

MEL Criteria for Column B:

Changes in gender roles and relations

Sex and age disaggregated data

Unintended consequences

Changing protection risks and needs

