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3 seemingly unrelated events this fall

- **Beijing +20**
  - 1995 World Conference on Women a milestone in terms of UN covenants for women
  - Key ideas in Platform for Action: women’s empowerment and gender equality
  - Women’s rights as human rights

- **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** adopted
  - SDG5: gender equality

- **Angus Deaton wins Nobel Prize in Economics**
Theory, evidence and action

• Theoretical developments on models of household behavior have shaped empirical work

• Empirical findings on intrahousehold allocation (particularly gender-differentiated results) influence programs and policies in developing countries

• Evidence generated from impact evaluations lead us to question models of household decisionmaking
Outline of this talk

1. How empirical tests of theories of household behavior influenced the design of conditional cash transfer programs and other development programs;
2. How recognition of gender gaps in agriculture led to the design of similar programs in agriculture;
3. How we use impact evaluations to learn about gender differences in the use, control, and ownership of assets affect participation in, and distribution of benefits from, agricultural development programs;
4. How findings from these evaluations lead to a rethinking of how households work, and their implications for the design of new programs
Families and households

• Most decisions that affect the well-being of individuals are made within families and households

• These take different forms
  – Nuclear, intergenerationally extended, coresident, non-coresident, etc.

• “Intrahousehold resource allocation”: processes by which resources are allocated among individuals, and outcomes of those processes

• Gender plays a big role in intrahousehold allocation, because rights, resources, and responsibilities of household members may be different
Testing household models

**Unitary model** (Becker)
- Household is a group of individuals who behave as if they agree on how best to combine time and purchased goods to maximize household welfare.
- All members of the household...
  - Share the same preferences OR
  - A (self-interested or altruistic) dictator makes all the decisions.

**Collective model** (Chiappori; McElroy and Horney; etc.)
- Household is a group of individuals who don’t necessarily share the same preferences nor pool resources.
- Households arrive at decisions through bargaining:
  - Cooperative bargaining (Nash)
  - Non-cooperative bargaining
Policy consequences of assuming a unitary model of the household

- Effects of public transfers may differ depending on identity of recipient
- Households may reallocate resources away from transfer recipient to compensate for the transfer receipt
- Policy initiatives information addressed to one member may not be shared with other members
- This assumption disables policy levers that could be used to address development problems
1990s: developments that have contributed to work on intrahousehold issues

- Development of **new models of household behavior**
  - Tests of unitary vs. collective
- Increased awareness that paying attention to **intrahousehold allocation issues** matters in design and implementation of development policy
- Increased **availability of data** from developing and developed countries to test alternative household models
  - Sex-disaggregated data, data on bargaining power determinants
- Use of qualitative methods together with quantitative methods (**q-squared**), to understand non-economic dimensions of human behavior
Empirical tests of the unitary vs. the collective model

What is the underlying model of household behavior?

- **Unitary model:**
  - Households behave as one (common preference, or dictator); households pool resources

- **Collective model:**
  - Different preferences within the household; members do not pool resources

- **Prediction of the collective model:**
  - One’s share of resources depends on *bargaining power* within household

Sources: Quisumbing and Maluccio 2003; Quisumbing, ed. 2003
What determines bargaining power within the household?

- Control over resources
  - Assets
- Factors that can be used to influence bargaining process
  - Legal rights, skills and knowledge, ability to acquire information, bargaining skills, use of violence
- Mobilization of personal networks
- Basic attitudinal attributes
  - Self-esteem, self-confidence, emotional satisfaction
Proxies for bargaining power in empirical work

- Public provision of resources to particular household member
  - Now increasingly tested using randomized assignment
- Shares of income earned by women
- Unearned income
- Inherited assets
- Assets at marriage
- Current assets
Considerations in choosing a proxy indicator

- Exogeneity with respect to labor force participation or savings/accumulation decisions
- Rules regarding assignment of asset ownership (legal, customary)
- Marriage market selection
- Cultural relevance of indicators
Our 4-country paper focuses on assets at marriage

- Assets at marriage important in many cultures; start of the new social and economic unit
- Determined before decisions made within marriage
- Can be affected by personal and family characteristics
Women’s physical and human capital at marriage compared to men’s
Do assets held by husband and wife affect household decisions on expenditures?

**Expenditure categories**
- Food budget share
- Health budget share
- Education budget share
- Child clothing budget share
- Cigarettes and alcohol budget

**Determinants**
- total expenditure per capita
- household size
- demographic composition
- men’s assets at marriage
- men’s schooling
- women’s assets at marriage
- women’s schooling

- Controlling for total expenditure, test equality of coefficients of men’s and women’s assets at marriage/schooling
- Control for measurement error in assets using instrumental variables, with family background characteristics as instruments
Summary of expenditure shares regressions
(note: observational)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Sumatra, Indonesia</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food share</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education share</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife assets</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-Husband</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child clothes share</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cigarettes/alcohol share</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from cross-country regressions (also observational): Improving women’s status and resources improves child health and nutrition

Contributions to reductions in child malnutrition, 1970-95

- Women's education: 43%
- Health environment: 19%
- National food availability: 26%
- Women's status: 12%

Source: Smith and Haddad 2000
Late 1990s-2000s: Programs designed to transfer resources to women

- Influenced by findings from intrahousehold literature, programs designed to transfer resources to women (often with specific targeting to girls)
  - Food for education/cash for education programs in Bangladesh
  - Conditional cash transfer programs (PROGRESA in Mexico—now Oportunidades, PRAF in Honduras, etc.)
  - Microfinance programs (Bangladesh)
  - Agriculture-cum-microfinance programs (Bangladesh, India, worldwide)
  - Agricultural development programs (lots)
  - Community day care programs (Peru, Guatemala, etc.)
Percentage change in husbands’ and wives’ exclusively owned assets, Bangladesh, 1996-2006

Does transferring resources to women really reduce gender inequality?
This led us to focus on the impact of agricultural development projects on gender asset disparities in the Gender, Agriculture, and Assets Project (GAAP)
Why assets? Why gender?

• Increasing control/ownership of assets help create pathways out of poverty more than measures that aim to increase incomes or consumption alone;
• Evidence for non-pooling of resources within household exists
• Although we know a lot about how to target women and increase participation with development interventions, methods are still not widely used in development projects and have not addressed the gender-gap in assets;
• We define assets broadly: Natural capital, Physical capital, Financial capital, Human capital, Social capital, Political capital.
## Project intervention approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Assets transferred</th>
<th>Approach to addressing gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Cattle, goats, poultry birds, or land for horticulture</td>
<td>Gender aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Gender transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Plus</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Orange Sweet Potato (OSP) vines</td>
<td>Gender aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Hens, seeds</td>
<td>Gender transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickstart</td>
<td>Kenya and Tanzania</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Gender blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesa</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Land titles, basic inputs (seeds)</td>
<td>Gender aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land O’Lakes</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Improved dairy cows and training inputs</td>
<td>Gender blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR CSISA</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Gender blind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mixed methods approaches to evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Evaluation design</th>
<th>GAAP contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Randomized controlled trial</td>
<td>Qual work; input into gender and assets modules in endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Propensity weighted regression</td>
<td>Qual work; input into gender and assets modules, additional modules for endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Plus</td>
<td>Randomized controlled trial</td>
<td>Qual work, including social network analysis; input into gender and assets modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI</td>
<td>Randomized controlled trial</td>
<td>Qual work; input into gender and assets modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KickStart</td>
<td>Early vs. late pump buyers</td>
<td>Funding for qualitative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesa</td>
<td>Propensity weighted regression</td>
<td>Qual work (FGDs, KIIIs, life histories); input into quant survey module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land O’Lakes</td>
<td>Early vs. late livestock recipients</td>
<td>Qual work (FGDs, KIIIs, life histories); input into quant survey module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR CSISA</td>
<td>Econometric approaches; Experimental auction</td>
<td>Qual and asset module in mid-line quant survey; Funding for analysis time to focus on social networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preview of main findings

• Gendered use, control, and ownership of assets affect the take-up of agricultural interventions
  – Gilligan et al. (2014); HarvestPlus Orange Sweet Potato, Uganda

• Agricultural interventions affect the gendered use, control, and ownership of assets; some of these effects may be subtle and not captured in standard (quantitative) impact evaluations
  – Van den Bold et al. (2014); HKI Enhanced Homestead Food Production, Burkina Faso
  – Das et al. (2013); BRAC-TUP, Bangladesh

• Gendered use, control and ownership of assets is more nuanced than simple male or female individual ownership: jointness is also important
“If you build it, they will come”

• “If you have a good intervention, people will participate”...not necessarily
• For example, dairy value chain projects require having a cow!
• Different approaches to this:
  – Target households that already have cows: CARE-Bangladesh
  – Transfer cows: BRAC-Targeting Ultra Poor
  – Transfer cows and provide training: LandOLakes Mozambique
• Other projects (e.g. Kickstart treadle pumps) have market driven approaches—no subsidy on pump buying
• Dissemination of seeds, new varieties, assume use or control rights over land (even if not ownership)
An Evaluation of Biofortification in Uganda

- HarvestPlus Orange-Fleshed Sweet Potato (OSP) Project
  - disseminate provitamin-A-rich OSP as a strategy to increase vitamin A intakes and reduce vitamin A deficiency
  - In 2007, 10,000 households in Uganda were given OSP vines plus agriculture, nutrition and marketing trainings in two models:
    - Model 1: 2 years of trainings (intensive)
    - Model 2: 1 year of trainings (less intensive)

- The IFPRI/HarvestPlus/CIP evaluation
  - randomized, controlled trial
  - 2007-2009: baseline & endline surveys
  - n=1,472 households
  - outcomes: OSP adoption, dietary intakes of vitamin A, serum retinol
  - 2011: qual study; follow-up survey
1. How do gender dimensions of control over land and intrahousehold decisionmaking affect OSP adoption and vitamin A intakes?

2. What is the role of gender in the effect of social networks on OSP diffusion and sustainability of OSP adoption?
1. Control over assets and OSP adoption

- The share of assets exclusively owned by women or by men does not affect the household decision to grow OSP in a given season.

- In female-headed households, the share of exclusively owned...
  - ...land assets: weakly increases OSP adoption
  - ...nonland assets: decreases OSP adoption

### Table 2: HH OSP adoption, controlling for women’s baseline asset ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep. Var.: Pr(Adopt OFSP)</th>
<th>All project households</th>
<th>Female headed households</th>
<th>Male headed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of land exclusively owned by women, 2007</td>
<td>0.038 (0.070)</td>
<td>0.365* (0.217)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of nonland assets exclusively owned by women, 2007</td>
<td>-0.029 (0.069)</td>
<td>-0.540** (0.232)</td>
<td>0.032 (0.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: RE model with controls. * significant at the 10% level; **significant at the 5% level.
2. Gender, control over land and crop choice

Household crop choice decisions are complex and are usually joint decisions by men and women, but with men taking the lead. OSP adoption is most likely on plots where decisions are joint, but women play a leading role.

• Plots exclusively controlled by women are not more likely to have OSP

• Conditional on household adoption, male controlled plots are least likely to have OSP
Lessons about gender and OSP adoption

3. Women’s assets, control over land and OSP adoption

• Households in which women have lower asset ownership are more likely to grow OSP on joint plots with women in primary control

• Where female share of assets is higher, decision-making on joint plots appears more egalitarian, but OSP adoption is lower on male-controlled plots

Table 6: OSP adoption by female ownership of nonland assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep Var: Grow OSP on this parcel</th>
<th>Low share of female ownership of nonland assets (1)</th>
<th>High share of female ownership of nonland assets (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel control: female only</td>
<td>0.032 (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.036 (0.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel control: male only</td>
<td>-0.085 (0.065)</td>
<td>-0.198 (0.082)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel control: joint, female 1st</td>
<td>0.097 (0.029)**</td>
<td>0.021 (0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Other control variables not reported.
4. Role of gender in diffusion of OSP to other households

- Women do not play a unique role in OSP diffusion, but their participation in nutrition trainings (women only) increased diffusion.

### Table 8: Gender-based differences in diffusion of OSP, 2007-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep Var: Shared OSP vines with other households</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Kamuli</th>
<th>Bukedea</th>
<th>Mukono</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household has a female FG member</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.145**</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household has a female FG member</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended at least one nutrition training</td>
<td>0.228***</td>
<td>0.347*</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Models control for land area under the household’s control in 2007 and an indicator for Model 2. Models of the full sample include district dummy variables. * significant at the 10% level, ** significant at the 5% level, *** significant at the 1% level.
Implications for Programming

• In the Uganda study
  • Women do play an important role in decisions about adopting OSP and about vitamin A consumption by children, but intrahousehold dynamics on the adoption decisions are complex
    • suggests continuing to target women for nutrition trainings, but there may be some benefits to bringing men in as well
  • New diffusion experiments being conducted with HarvestPlus give a unique role to opinion leaders in health, who are almost always women. This may shed new light on the role of female leaders in promoting adoption

• In other biofortification studies, context really matters
Can agricultural interventions affect the gendered use, control, and ownership of assets?

Papers: Van den Bold et al. (2015); Olney et al. (2015)
Enhanced-Homestead Food Production (E-HFP) program in Burkina Faso

- Targeted to women with children 3-12 months of age at baseline
  - Eastern region, Gourma Province, Fada district
  - Water shortages inhibit having a second cultivation season
  - High prevalence of malnutrition (stunting 30%, underweight 30%, wasting 14%, anemia 92%)
    - Food insecurity
    - Suboptimal maternal and child health and nutrition practices
    - Limited availability, access and use of health services
- Overall goal to improve women’s and children’s nutritional status
Comprehensive Evaluation Design

- **Impact evaluation**
  - Cluster-randomized controlled trial
    - 15 “older women leader” villages (OWL villages)
    - 15 “health committee” villages (HC villages)
    - 25 control villages (Control villages)
  - Longitudinal design (2010, 2012)
  - Quantitative household survey along with children’s growth and hemoglobin measures

- **Two rounds of process evaluation including specific qualitative research on gender related topics including ownership and control over agricultural assets**
  - Random sample of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
  - Purposive sample of key informants
  - Longitudinal design
    - First round May-June 2011
    - Second round May-June 2012
  - Qualitative semi-structured interviews
## Difference-in-difference estimates of impact of E-HFP on men’s and women’s assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men’s assets</th>
<th>Women’s assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household durables</td>
<td>-0.565</td>
<td>1,867.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural assets</td>
<td>-1.330***</td>
<td>-4,085.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small animals</td>
<td>4.315**</td>
<td>29,102.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Comparison is to a control group that did not receive any program services. All estimates controlled for baseline age, sex, clustering, and attrition. ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01*
Perceived obstacles to women’s ability to own and use land

- Land for agricultural production is primarily obtained through inheritance and gifts.
  - In general, men obtain land through inheritance
  - Women generally obtain land through marriage/widowhood or through gifts.
- Respondents in both beneficiary villages and non-beneficiary villages reported **obstacles to women’s ability to own land**, mainly due to traditional / social barriers
- Respondents in both beneficiary villages and non-beneficiary villages reported **obstacles to women’s ability to use land**, mainly due to lack of inputs such as seeds, fertilizers or tools and lack of rainfall as well as traditional practices.
Summary of results from qualitative work

• Close or equal to 90% of all respondents report no changes in men’s ability to own land over the past 2 years
• Over 90% of men and women in control villages report no changes in women’s ability to own land.
• In beneficiary villages however, some change is reported due to land grants by HKI or husbands, and establishment of (community) gardens for women.
• Changes in women’s ability to own land primarily had to do with women in intervention villages being granted land by their husbands or HKI, that they now have community gardens
Impacts on maternal knowledge of optimal infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices and on dietary diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OWL (DID)</th>
<th>HC (DID)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about IYCF practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive breastfeeding until 6 mo of age</td>
<td>31%***</td>
<td>29%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of liquids at 6 mo of age</td>
<td>28%***</td>
<td>27%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of semi-solid foods at 6 mo of age</td>
<td>17%***</td>
<td>15%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household (1-12 food groups in past 7 days) (N)</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s (4 out of 7 food groups in past 24 hours) (N)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.9%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comparison is to a control group that did not receive any program services. All estimates controlled for baseline age, sex, clustering, and attrition. ** p < 0.05, *** p <0.01
Conclusions from E-HFP Burkina Faso study

• Women’s participation in the E-HFP program increases their ownership and control over agriculture assets, has a positive influence on changing perceptions related to women’s ability to own and use land for agriculture purposes and improves their health and nutrition-related knowledge.

• These positive changes were likely related to the positive changes we found on household, women’s and children’s dietary diversity and on children’s anemia and wasting and women’s thinness although these were limited to HC villages.
But impacts on gendered use, control, and ownership of assets are subtle

- Projects that unambiguously benefit households may have mixed effects on individuals within those household, especially women
- Women may have a hard time maintaining control of income from assets
- Intangible benefits, especially related to norms, are important for women and may signal longer term changes
BRAC-Targeting the Ultra Poor Program, Bangladesh

Beneficiary woman with livestock

Photo credit: BRAC
Motivation

• “TUP Phase 2” – running from 2007-2011, allocated using a randomized controlled trial design

• Existing quantitative research (e.g., Bandiera et al 2013) shows large positive impacts of the program at the household level

• However, little evidence on the *intrahousehold* impacts of TUP – or of any other targeted asset transfer program

• We use mixed quantitative and qualitative methods to explore TUP’s impacts on the targeted women themselves:
Methodology

• Quantitative analysis:
  – Draw on randomized controlled trial design of TUP
  – Add new survey round in 2012, focusing on gender-disaggregated asset ownership, control, mobility, and decision making
  – Estimate TUP’s causal impacts by comparing outcomes of 6,066 “treatment” and “control” households, adjusting for attrition

• Qualitative analysis:
  – Conduct focus group discussions & key informant interviews in 2011
  – Use local concepts of gendered asset ownership & control to inform design of quantitative survey modules in 2012 follow-up
  – Explore “intangible” benefits and perceptions that allow interpreting quantitative impacts in light of local context
Key findings

- Analysis confirms previous findings that CFPR-TUP significantly improved household-level well-being

- But shows new evidence of mixed effects on targeted women
Women’s ownership of livestock increased more than men’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock Type</th>
<th>Owned total in HH</th>
<th>Owned solely by female</th>
<th>Owned in any part by female</th>
<th>Owned solely by male</th>
<th>Owned jointly by male and female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cows/buffalo</td>
<td>1.036*** (0.031)</td>
<td>0.817*** (0.031)</td>
<td>0.958*** (0.032)</td>
<td>0.076*** (0.013)</td>
<td>0.129*** (0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats/sheep</td>
<td>0.220*** (0.037)</td>
<td>0.159*** (0.033)</td>
<td>0.192*** (0.036)</td>
<td>0.026*** (0.010)</td>
<td>0.026** (0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens/ducks</td>
<td>0.883*** (0.123)</td>
<td>0.779*** (0.116)</td>
<td>0.803*** (0.121)</td>
<td>0.079*** (0.023)</td>
<td>0.027 (0.029)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women experienced corresponding increases in control rights over livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Rent out</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Decide how to spend money generated from</th>
<th>Decide about inheriting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cows/buffalo</td>
<td>0.401***</td>
<td>0.371***</td>
<td>0.385***</td>
<td>0.374***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats/sheep</td>
<td>0.083***</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
<td>0.066***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens/ducks</td>
<td>0.093***</td>
<td>0.074***</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transferred assets: Livestock

• CFPR-TUP significantly increased household ownership of livestock
• *Largest increases were in livestock owned by women* (including cattle, typically thought to be “men’s assets”)
• Corresponding increases in women’s control over livestock
• Reflect that *high-value livestock transferred to women remained in their control* – one dimension of transformation in gender roles
Other assets

- Men’s ownership of assets generally increased more than women’s
  - Agricultural productive assets
  - Nonagricultural productive assets (except cash)
  - Land
Women’s workload and mobility

• CFPR-TUP did not increase the proportion of women working but did *shift work from outside the home to inside the home*
  – Consistent with transferred assets requiring maintenance at home
• Women reported increased workloads – which combined to *reduce mobility outside the home*
• However, women also reported *preferring reduced mobility to facing the stigma of working outside the home.* Women are harassed when they work outside the home, and working in the homestead is easier to combine with childcare.
Women’s decision-making power

- CFPR-TUP decreased women’s voice in a range of decisions
  - Women’s decision-making over their own income, purchases for themselves, and household budgeting was significantly reduced
  - Men’s voice in household decisions was significantly increased
  - Consistent with women’s reduced mobility, leading to reduced access to markets
Findings from qualitative work

• However, taking into account “intangibles” and context, effects on targeted women appear *more favorable* (if still mixed):

  – Women’s social capital increased (having better clothing meant they were no longer ashamed to be seen by others)
  
  – Given sociocultural stigma of working outside home, women *preferred* working at home even with reduced mobility
  
  – Women themselves framed project impacts *more* in terms of intangibles (self-esteem, satisfaction in contributing to household and children’s well-being, status in the household and community, etc) than individual rights or material gains
Conclusions and implications

Take-aways:

• Asset transfers targeted to women *can* increase women’s ownership/control over the transferred asset
• May *not* necessarily increase women’s overall control over resources or bargaining position in the household
• If the transferred assets require maintenance at home, targeting them to women may shift women’s work inside the home
• Desirability of working inside the home may depend on local context – but may reduce decision making power over use of resources
Conclusions and implications

• *Nuance required* in assessing whether interventions improve “women’s empowerment”
  
  – Even if a program’s “household-level” impacts are unambiguously positive, effects for individuals within the household may be mixed
  
  – Some outcomes valued by individuals may be “intangible,” and some that seem negative from an external viewpoint may be favorable in the local context
  
  – However, *if* increasing women’s asset ownership and decision-making power are explicit goals, a targeted asset transfer may not be sufficient; local sociocultural norms may themselves need to be changed
A recap from GAAP

• Gendered use, control, and ownership of assets affect the take-up of agricultural interventions
• Agricultural interventions affect the gendered use, control, and ownership of assets; some of these effects may be subtle and not captured in standard (quantitative) impact evaluations
• Gendered use, control and ownership of assets is more nuanced than simple male or female individual ownership: jointness is also important (but messy to know about unless you do qualitative work)
Looking back to household models

- Unitary model assumed that households operated “as one”; bargaining models relied on individual indicators of bargaining power, and individual outcomes
- But families and households are more complex
- Jointness is important; women often increase asset ownership not through individual assets but through joint ownership
- Future work on household modeling will do well to investigate what jointness means in different cultures and contexts
Resources

Early work on intrahousehold allocation

Tests of the unitary vs. collective model:

IFPRI work on gender and intrahousehold issues:

This is a blog with links to papers written by IFPRI authors, on various topics related to gender (agriculture, health and nutrition, shocks, climate change, governance)
Resources

- **Gender, Agriculture, and Assets Project (GAAP):** [gaap.ifpri.info](http://gaap.ifpri.info)
- **Policy oriented summary of all GAAP studies:** Quisumbing, Agnes R., Meinzen-Dick, Ruth Suseela,; Njuki, Jemimah; Johnson, Nancy, eds.;. 2013. *Learning from eight agricultural development interventions in Africa and South Asia* GAAP Policy Notes, IFPRI.