

# Monitoring changes in intrahousehold decision-making and evaluating its impact: A toolkit

## The manual

**Els Lecoutere** - Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellow, Institute of Development Policy (IOB), University of Antwerp, Prinsstraat 13, 2000 Antwerp, Belgium, els.lecoutere@uantwerpen.be, M+32494835205, Skype – eilecout

Co-developed with the **Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung** with input from **Tobias Voigt, Fortunate Paska, Britta Deutsch, Nora Fedisch, and Blaga Zlateva.**



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 702964.

## The content of the monitoring and evaluation toolkit

The monitoring and evaluation toolkit is compiled in an excel file with different sheets that complement each other. It includes the following sheets:

- A - Theory of change
- B - Key outcome indicators
- C - Instruments
- D - Topics per instrument
- E - Questions per indicator per instrument by topic

In addition, the instructions for conducting the joint problem solving, investment and sharing exercises (Instrument C) are available on [include url.](#)

## 1. The objective of the toolkit

The toolkit for monitoring changes in intrahousehold decision-making in agricultural households and evaluating the impact on the efficiency and equity of household outcomes is meant as a reference guide and as a collection of science-based field-tested tools from which organisations who address inefficiencies and inequities in smallholder household farming can pick to set up a monitoring framework and/or an impact evaluation.

The toolkit is specifically designed to monitor and evaluate changes in the way spouses in dyadic agricultural households in rural developing contexts marked by a patriarchal norm system make decisions and their effect on cooperation between spouses, on the efficiency of their household farm system and on the equitability of the allocation of costs and benefits related to household farming between spouses.

## 2. The context and the program that inspired the toolkit

### 2.1. Agricultural households in a patriarchal context

In developing contexts, especially in patriarchal societies, including in East Africa, in many cases, there is limited cooperation between spouses in dyadic agricultural households which is linked to specific gender norms defining roles, responsibilities and control and linked to imbalanced intrahousehold bargaining power, whereby women typically have a weaker negotiation position (Doss & Meinzen-Dick 2015). By improving cooperation within agricultural households, not only efficiency gains are possible, but at the same time gender equity within households can be improved, which, in turn, can contribute to efficiency by freeing the way for more (risky) household investments (Slootmaker 2013) and by keeping members motivated for collective action at the household level (Ostrom 1990).

Through its long-time engagement with coffee farmers, the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung (HRNS) experienced that women contribute significant labour for the production of cash crops such as coffee. Yet, in spite of their contributions, women have limited access and control over the income earned through coffee, which is regarded as a 'man's crop'. The Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung observed that most of the interventions targeting women in the coffee sector reach out to women in female headed households - widows, divorcees or single mothers - who have some level of control over labour and other resources, including land, and are able to reap the benefits from coffee. Yet, married women, who do not often have that level of control over resources and income, are not specifically targeted by the typical interventions with coffee farmers. Married women also do not regularly participate in coffee related organisations or trainings due to numerous reasons, ranging from cultural restraints to a lack of time to

participate in out-of-household activities. The exclusion of married women not only affects women themselves, but also the development of entire households, as it limits the households' potential to increase the quality and quantity of coffee produced and their income from coffee, as well as their ability to utilise their income in an efficient way.

Mixed methods research in East Africa, Uganda more in particular, gave insights into the typical organisation of household farms and helps to understand why spouses do not always cooperate and why costs and benefits are not always equitably shared between husband and wife (Lecoutere & Jassogne 2017; Lecoutere & Wuyts 2017). Commonly, decisions about the household farm's organisation and about allocating land, labour, and money to invest in agricultural production are taken by men. The allocation of labour for production, post-harvest handling, and transporting crops is crop- and gender-specific. Activities that need physical strength such as land preparation are considered the responsibility of men; these are, however, also activities for which labour is more likely to be hired. Men are said to prioritise the allocation of labour to 'cash' crops such as coffee, matooke bananas, and maize. Repetitive, tedious, prolonged tasks, such as weeding, threshing, winnowing, and so on, are often women's responsibilities; sometimes children's. When it comes to marketing, in most cases, men sell the products, and cash in on the income. Women are not necessarily informed by the amount of cash received for the products; and are dependent on their husband disclosing it to them, or not. Customarily, a crop that fetches an income is considered a men's crop; a crop grown to accommodate the household's food needs is considered a woman's crop.

When it comes to control over income earned through household farming, women normally decide about the expenditures for food and necessities for children, in some cases without full information about the amount available. Spending income on school fees is usually a joint decision. Men normally make the decisions about spending income on investments in agriculture, hiring farm labour, house improvements, or investments in transport means or business. Even if couples 'jointly' control the farm income, men do not need to consult or get consent from their wives for any type of expenditure—except major ones—while women do. Many women feel they cannot access a fair share of the farm income and indicate that they are dependent on the goodwill of their husband to be cooperative or to allocate the financial resources to the benefit of the household. Some women explained their husbands egoistically opt for their own benefits, sometimes neglecting their responsibilities towards the other members of the household, while some husbands are said to manage the household finances in irresponsible ways.

2.2. A program addressing challenges to cooperation and equity within agricultural households

To address the limited cooperation between household members and the gender inequities within its member coffee farming households, the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung devised and implemented the Gender Household Approach. The HRNS Gender Household Approach projects agricultural production as a household farm enterprise where all household members, specifically the spouses, but also youth, can contribute to coffee production and equally benefit from it. The idea behind this approach is that together as a family, household members, when they jointly make decisions and plan the way they will generate income as a household and the way they will utilise the produce and income they generate, they can better achieve their common goals and aspirations.

The elements of the HRNS Gender Household Approach that have inspired the design of this monitoring and evaluation toolkit are the ones targeted towards spouses in married couples, addressing mainly intra-spousal cooperation and sharing of resources and responsibilities. These elements are listed in the toolkit in sheet **‘C - Instruments’** and include: *An introduction to the Gender Household Approach and community development for Depot Committee leaders; b) and for Producer Organisation leaders; c) Couple seminars; d) the Change Agent coaching package; e) Drama shows; f) Community dialogues; and g) Learning tours.* A detailed activity plan of the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung’s Gender Household Approach is included in the annex.<sup>1</sup>

The *introduction to the Gender Household Approach and community development for Depot Committee (a) and Producer Organisation leaders (b)* are meant to sensitise these leaders about gender inequities in coffee farming and to emphasise on the importance of including both men and women in actions and strategies to assist coffee farming households in their development.

In the *Couple Seminars (c)*, conducted at the level of the producer organisations in which the coffee farming households are organised, member couples are guided through a self-assessment of the division of roles and responsibilities and control over resources in their household. Through enhanced awareness of the current gender division and imbalances, couples become motivated to introduce changes. One suggested way for change towards better cooperation as a couple and sharing costs and benefits more equally, is a more participatory way of intrahousehold decision-making, in which spouses consult each other and make decisions jointly.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more detail on the Gender Household Approach of the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, please contact [info@hrnstiftung.org](mailto:info@hrnstiftung.org)

The next stage is the *Change Agent coaching package* (d), a package of activities intensively coaching couples on how to implement participatory intrahousehold decision-making, for a selection of couples who participated in the couple seminars.<sup>2</sup> The activities in the intensive coaching program include a one-day *Change Agent seminar (Activity 1)* for couples focused on putting participatory planning and decision-making into practice by drafting a joint household farm plan and budget. The household farm plan and budget is an important communication tool where spouses together lists their planned investments, expected income and necessary expenditures for both their farm and household. After that, the couples receive a *household visit (Activity 2)* by the gender officer of the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung to support the implementation of their farm plan and budget, to coach and follow up on the way spouses share decision-making. A third activity is a *women leadership training (Activity 3)* to develop women's leadership skills and increase the participation of and representation by women in meetings, trainings and decision-making processes of farmer groups, POs and Depot Committees. The fourth activity is a *follow-up workshop (Activity 4)* in which couples share experiences and self-evaluate the Change Agent coaching program. The couples in the intensive coaching program are stimulated to promote participatory intrahousehold decision-making and gender equity within their communities in order to create a positive spillover and widen the program's reach.

Furthermore, the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung facilitates the organisation of *drama shows* (e) and *community dialogues* (f) by Change Agent couples in their communities to widen the reach of the Gender Household Approach. *Learning tours* (g) for Change Agent couples stimulate learning from shared experiences.

Other activities that are not targeted towards spouses in married couples and are *complementary to the Gender Household Approach* include h) agronomic training and farmer field schools, which are organised as standard activities for all POs connected to the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung; i) climate change adaptation at the household level; j) business training in which farming as a business is introduced as well; k) organisational development training; l) gender mainstreaming with staff of the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung; and m) gender mainstreaming with coffee stakeholders. The Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung seeks partnerships for challenges beyond their scope such as conflict resolution, land rights, health, family planning, and so on. While the monitoring and evaluation toolkit does not focus on these complementary

---

<sup>2</sup> Initially, a selection of couples who participated in the couple seminars volunteered for the Change Agent coaching package out of which the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung field office selected the most promising candidates. With the study of the impact of the Gender Household Approach, the self-selection by couples was abandoned and a random selection of couples who participated in the couple seminars was encouraged to take part in the Change Agent coaching package. The random assignment allowed evaluating the impact. It ensured all couples an equal chance of inclusion in the Change Agent coaching package and promoted the diversity of couples in the Change Agent coaching package.

activities, they will be mentioned in the theory of change, and elements of the monitoring and evaluation toolkit can be applicable to some extent (*cfr. infra*).

### 3. The theory of change of the program

The pathways of change of the different interventions included in the HRNS Gender Household Approach in particular, but could be elements in similar programs program comprising interventions with differential intensity that aims to change intrahousehold decision-making in farming households, are visualised in the chart in sheet '**A - Theory of Change**' in the toolkit. Essentially, what happens in the box of the intensive *Change Agent coaching package* in the chart, and to some extent in the *Couple Seminars*, is introducing couples to a more participatory way of decision-making in their household. A more participatory way of intrahousehold decision-making implies that household members, especially spouses, consult with each other and collaborate on issues related to production, resource allocation and consumption in the household farm. There are theoretical underpinnings why and how more participatory ways of intrahousehold decision-making can contribute to more gender equity, better cooperation, and more efficiency in agricultural households, which we will briefly explain here (see also Lecoutere 2018).

First, participation in rule- and decision-making by members of groups that collectively manage the provision and allocation of the resources in common - as agricultural households do - strengthens those members' incentives to comply with those rules (Bardhan 2000). Besides, in a patriarchal context, the promotion of participation in decision-making implies strengthening the voice of women in intrahousehold rule- and decision-making. The likelihood of inequitable outcomes is reduced, on the one hand, because of women's greater ability to include their claims in the rules, and, on the other hand, through the increased compliance with sharing 'rules' that spouses jointly devised (Agarwal 1997; Agarwal 2001; Doss & Meinzen-Dick 2015). Her participation in intrahousehold decision-making also makes it more likely a woman's interests and priorities are taken into account. There is ample evidence that increased women's bargaining power and more intrahousehold cooperation go hand in hand with a prioritisation of the households' food needs (Quisumbing & Maluccio 2003; Duflo & Udry 2004; Njuki, Kaaria, Chamunorwa, & Chiuri 2011).

Reduced inequities in the household can be beneficial for the efficiency of household farm management because being allocated a fair share of the benefits derived from common resources is motivational for sustained cooperation (Ostrom 1990; Baland & Platteau 1998); and because inequalities are known to constrain choices for the most efficient options from a household perspective, like for instance the investment in sustainable intensification of food production (Slootmaker 2013).

Another important contribution of participatory intrahousehold decision-making is the reduction of information asymmetries between household members. It makes sure husband and wife are better informed about how much their spouse has contributed to generating farm income and producing food; and are better informed about how the income and other benefits will be used, how much will be used for household expenditures, how much their spouse will consume. There is ample evidence that reduced information asymmetry decreases the likelihood of opportunistic behaviour and contributes to cooperation in groups collectively managing common resources (Baland & Platteau 1998; Agarwal 2000), which ensures efficient and sustainable management of those common resources. The experience of less opportunistic provision and consumption creates positive feedback loops as it strengthens incentives for cooperative behaviour (Ostrom 1990; Baland & Platteau 1996; Agrawal 2003; Doss & Meinzen-Dick 2015). In agricultural households, the household farm resources can be an efficiently and sustainably managed with investments of labour and capital in the sustainable intensification of crop production, including adaptation strategies to deal with climate change. Because women's interests are more likely to be taken into account, investment in the sustainable and climate smart intensification of food crop production and investment in other household affairs, including reproductive activities and investment in children are likely to be stimulated. A longer term perspective follows from increased cooperation and more equal sharing which makes all users of the common resources value the future benefits they can derive from those resources more.

Lastly, effective monitoring of what each of the members does and effective enforcement of the decisions agreed upon are essential for efficient and sustainable management of common resources like those managed in agricultural households (Ostrom 1990; Baland & Platteau 1998). If power imbalances exist, however, the less powerful have a limited ability to enforce rules (Agarwal 2000; Agrawal 2003; Lecoutere 2011; Lecoutere, D'Exelle, & Van Campenhout 2015). Thus, with greater participation of both spouses, including the wife, in rule-making and monitoring, each of the spouses is expected to be able to more effectively claim his/her share because the other spouse is aware about his/her contributions to investment in the household farm and because the resource allocation was mutually agreed upon.

As a result of both spouses increasing their investments in the sustainable intensification of both cash and food crop production, as well as in general household affairs, including reproductive affairs, income from cash crops like coffee is expected to go up, food to be more certainly available, and farm income to be used responsibly, equitably and to the benefit of sustained development of the household farm; which in the end is expected to translate in greater household wellbeing and food security.

The experience of husband and wife sharing responsibilities and equitably sharing the costs and the benefits derived from their household farm is expected to create a positive feedback loop as it motivates them to continue on the same path. The less intensive awareness raising *Couple Seminars* emphasise this aspect as well as a way to directly stimulate such positive feedback loops.

The *agronomic training, training in climate smart adaptation strategies and business training* organised by Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung ensures the households can acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to also invest in sustainable, climate smart farm and household management. *Gender mainstreaming* and raising awareness about the importance of reaching out to both men and women, among Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung staff but also among other stakeholders in the coffee value chain, like input vendors or coffee traders for instance, should ensure that women can equally access training, services and marketing.

Together with strengthening the leadership capabilities of women, in their households, but in producer groups and the wider community as well, raising gender awareness and mainstreaming contributes to the greater acceptance in the wider community, and within households, that women can be equal partners in decision-making and business.

#### 4. Key outcome indicators

The key outcomes that can be expected from similar programs with interventions of differential intensity that introduce participatory intrahousehold decision-making for more cooperative, efficient and equitable household farming outcomes have been identified based on the objectives of and the experience with the HRNS Gender Household Approach. They are listed in sheet '**B – Key Outcome Indicators**' in the toolkit.

The key outcomes that are expected to follow from interventions that introduce a participatory way of intrahousehold decision-making to stimulate consultation, cooperation and equitable sharing of costs and benefits between spouses in agricultural households are the following (listed in *column A* of sheet '**B – Key Outcome Indicators**')

- a) Spouses share domestic responsibilities
- b) Spouses cooperate when it comes to coffee farming and share responsibilities
- c) Women are seen as equal business partners, inside the household, inside producer organisations, and by society
  - 0. (*Women as equal business partners within the household is captured under b) Spouses cooperate on coffee farming and share responsibilities*)



1. Women can sell coffee and receive payment
  2. Women can buy inputs
- d) Joint planning and decision-making by spouses about the household and about farming
  - e) Spouses have more equal control over household farm income
  - f) Transparency between spouses about household farm income
  - g) Spouses have more equal control over household and household farm resources
  - h) Women are involved in:
    1. leadership and decision-making at level of the Depot Committees and the PO
    2. (training) activities
  - i) More household farm income is available for (re-)investing in the household farm
  - j) The household farming enterprise provides in income and more (certainty about) food
  - k) Improved well-being of the household, and all its members
  - l) (Indirectly and in combination with training in climate smart adaptation strategies: Increased climate change adaptation on the farm and the household level)

The topics listed in *columns B* in sheet '**B – Key Outcome Indicators**' compile the issues at stake and are important to organise the key outcome indicators, listed in *column C*. (The topics will also structure the lists of questions needed to construct the key outcome indicators in each of the data collection tools in sheet '**E - Questions per indicator per instrument by topic**', which will be discussed later in section 6).

The range of topics covered by the key outcome indicators include (listed columns B of the sheet '**B – Key Outcome Indicators**')

- a) Intrahousehold time allocation
- b) Shared decision-making by spouses about coffee production
- c) Adoption of agronomic practices for coffee production
- d) Shared decision-making by spouses about coffee investments (adoption)
- e) Shared decision-making by spouses about strategic household expenditures
- f) Women as equal business partners
- g) Opinions about intrahousehold decision-making
- h) Intrahousehold behaviour: Joint problem solving
- i) Intrahousehold behaviour: Investment
- j) Intrahousehold behaviour: Sharing
- k) Shared control over coffee income

- l) Transparency over household farm income
- m) Shared control over assets, livestock in particular
- n) Personal income and assets
- o) Coffee income
- p) Wellbeing, food security, Poverty Probability Index
- q) Household asset ownership, livestock in particular
- r) (Climate change adaptation)

## 5. The monitoring and evaluation instruments

### 5.1. Instruments for a program with interventions of different intensity

When we propose the instruments for monitoring and evaluating a program addressing cooperation and equitable sharing within agricultural households, we assume a two stage approach like the HRNS Gender Household Approach, in which first an intervention is organised for couples in which awareness is raised about sharing responsibilities and resources within the household; after which a selection of couples gets an intensive coaching to learn how to implement a more participatory way of decision-making, more cooperation and a more equitable distribution of costs and benefits in their farming household. We do so because a first awareness raising stage is essential to identify couples in the community with an interest in a discussion about intrahousehold decision-making; as well as to level the ground to some extent and sensitise at the community level. A second intervention that has a more intensive and engaging approach is necessary because it goes against longstanding, notoriously persistent, institutions such as gender norms, rules and customs that are informed by patriarchy and entails the unlearning of gender roles that have been projected from one's childhood onwards and that form part of one's identity.

The activities in the HRNS Gender Household Approach that aim to sensitise the wider community are needed for collective solidarity and support for the changes within households of those who went through an intensive second stage activity and possibly also engender some change with regard to intrahousehold decision-making, cooperation and sharing in the wider community.

### 5.2. Instruments for monitoring and evaluating impact

We propose a set of instruments that permits, not only the monitoring of changes, but most importantly permits an assessment of impact. By that we mean that it needs to be possible to demonstrate that (an element of) the program caused something to change and that the change is only attributable to that (element of the) program. The key ingredient for an assessment of impact is a valid counterfactual, that

is an estimate of what the outcome would have been for a program participant had s/he not been exposed to that program (We refer to Gertler, Martinez, Premand, Rawlings, & Vermeersch (2011) and the Introduction to Evaluations on the Poverty Action Lab website for a more elaborate discussion of impact evaluations). As someone is either a participant or not a participant of a program, we cannot observe that person in the state of a program participant and in the state of not being exposed to the program at the same time. The key challenge of an impact evaluation is finding a group of people who did not participate in the program but closely resemble the program participants if they would not have participated in the program, so that the outcome in this group is a valid counterfactual – valid estimate – of the outcome for program participants had they not been exposed to that program. Ideally, that group of people is on average identical, would react to the program in the same way as the program participants, and is not exposed to other interventions during the evaluation period.

There are different ways to identify a valid counterfactual, with a randomly selected treatment and control group – a randomised control trial – being the ‘gold standard’ as it needs the least assumptions. Other methods, including difference-in-difference, matching or a discontinuity design, are called quasi-experimental and, with some assumptions, allow identifying a valid counterfactual.

In the toolkit, inspired by a two stage approach like the HRNS Gender Household Approach by the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, we propose a phased design in sheet **‘C – Instruments’** in the toolkit. The reason is that a phased design, ideally with a random selection of the areas to sequentially roll out the program, permits constructing control groups in areas selected for later rollout for groups of couples who received the less intensive or intensive treatment in the area where the program is rolled out first. For the less intensive awareness raising seminars, like the Couple Seminars, potentially, an encouragement design could be considered, randomly encouraging member couples of producer organisations to attend couple seminars, in which case random non-encouraged couples can form a control group.

For the identification of the couples who receive the intensive treatment, we suggest an encouragement design. Couples that will be encouraged for the intensive treatment therefore should be randomly selected from the couples participating less intensive awareness raising seminars. The encouragement design implies non-compliance has to be taken into account in the estimation of impact and limits the external validity of the results to compliers (see Gertler et al. (2011) for more detail). In our experience, in practice, sometimes couples who were not up to the task happened to be randomly encouraged. A pragmatic solution could be the blocking of couples in which at least one of the spouses is an elderly person, is physically impaired, is full-time employed in a job or a migratory worker, or couples composed

of a widowed parent and child. Note that the external validity is then limited to couples who are not blocked.

The toolkit suggests a non-exhaustive range of possible methods for impact evaluation, focusing on the impact of a less intensive and intensive treatment in a program, such as the Couple Seminars and the intensive Change Agent Coaching Package in the HRNS Gender Household Approach, which we use as the example here. The following effects can be of interest:

*a) Impact of the Change Agent coaching package versus Couple Seminars*

If the targeting of couples for the Change Agent coaching package was *not random*, a Difference-in-difference (DiD) analysis comparing the outcomes before and after the treatment of couples who received the Change Agent coaching package during the 1<sup>st</sup> project rollout with outcomes before and after the treatment among couples who followed a couple seminar in the 2<sup>nd</sup> project rollout area but are targeted for the Change Agent coaching package in the 2<sup>nd</sup> project rollout can produce a valid estimate of impact Change Agent coaching package versus Couple Seminar. A DiD analysis implies the need for baseline and endline data about key outcomes.

If the targeting of couples for the Change Agent coaching package is based on a *random encouragement*, one can estimate (local) average treatment effects by comparing the outcomes among couples who received the Change Agent coaching package during the 1<sup>st</sup> project rollout with the outcomes among couples targeted for the Change Agent coaching package in the 2<sup>nd</sup> project rollout. In this case, endline data about key outcomes could suffice.

If a *phased design is not feasible*, one can resort to a DiD analysis in which one compares outcomes before and after treatment among couples who received the Change Agent coaching package with outcomes before and after treatment among couples who attended a Couple Seminar but are not exposed to spillovers from Change Agent couples in their producer organisations.

*b) Impact of the Change Agent coaching package after a Couple Seminar versus no exposure to the program*

If the targeting of couples for the Change Agent coaching package was not random, a valid estimate of impact is possible with a DiD analysis combined with a matching procedure in which the outcomes before and after treatment among couples who received the Change Agent coaching package during the 1<sup>st</sup> project rollout is compared with outcomes before and after treatment among a control group not exposed to the program. Such a control group can either constructed from households included in an annual

progress survey, as the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung is conducting; or with households that will be included at a later stage in the phased design ( $t + 2$  and beyond). Matching is required to address the potential selection bias linked to the initial self-selection of couples into Couple Seminars. A DiD analysis combined with matching implies the need for baseline data about spouses' and households' characteristics and key outcomes and endline data about key outcomes.

If the targeting of couples for the Change Agent coaching package is based on a random encouragement, it is possible to estimate (local) average treatment effects on outcomes comparing outcomes among couples who received the Change Agent coaching package during the 1<sup>st</sup> project rollout with the outcomes among couples in a control group not exposed to the program. Such a control group can either be composed of households included in an annual progress survey, or of households that will be included at a later stage in the phased design ( $t + 2$  and beyond). The estimation of (local) average treatment effects, however, should be combined with a matching procedure in this case, to address the potential selection bias linked to the initial self-selection of couples into Couple Seminars. In such a case, baseline data about spouses' and households' characteristics and endline data about key outcomes is required.

*c) Impact of Couple Seminars versus no program exposure*

To estimate the impact of Couple Seminars versus no program exposure, a DiD analysis combined with matching is appropriate. It will compare outcomes before and after treatment among couples in the 2<sup>nd</sup> program rollout area who attended a Couple Seminar, and who are therefore not exposed to spillovers from Change Agent couples in their producer organisation in  $t$ , with outcomes before and after treatment among couples in a control group not exposed to the program. Again, that control group can either be derived from the sample of households in an annual progress survey, or include households that will be included at a later stage in the phased design ( $t + 2$  and beyond). Matching is required to address the potential selection bias linked to the initial self-selection of couples into Couple Seminars.

*d) Impact of spillovers from Change Agent couples on couples who participated in Couple Seminars*

The spillovers from couples who received the intensive Change Agent coaching package are intended in the case of the HRNS Gender Household Approach. It may be interesting to measure their effect. To do so, a DiD analysis in which outcomes before and after treatment among couples in the 1<sup>st</sup> program rollout area who attended a Couple Seminar and who are exposed to spillovers from Change Agent couples in their producer organisation are compared with outcomes before and after treatment of couples in the 2<sup>nd</sup> program rollout area who attended a Couple Seminar but are not exposed to spillovers from Change Agent couples can work.

#### *e) Impact of lighter Gender Household Approaches*

Possibly, a full-fledged program with differential intensities like the HRNS Gender Household Approach may not be feasible but lighter versions are achievable.

If the lighter Gender Household Approaches are implemented in a random phased design, we propose to compare outcomes among couples in the randomly selected 1<sup>st</sup> rollout areas exposed to the lighter versions of a Gender Household Approach with outcomes among couples in randomly selected areas for future implementation of the lighter versions of the Gender Household Approach to estimate its impact.

If the lighter Gender Household Approaches are not rolled out in random phased design, a DiD analysis, potentially combined with matching could produce a valid estimate of impact. In that case, one should compare outcomes in a treatment group before and after exposure to the lighter version of the Gender Household Approach with outcomes before and after among couples in a control group constructed from households included in the annual progress survey. Matching can additionally deal with other sources of selection bias not dealt with through DiD analysis.

#### 5.3. Data collection tools

Four data collection tools are suggested in the toolkit: *a) An annual progress household survey; b) a dedicated individual spouse survey; c) joint problem solving, investment and sharing exercises; and d) the standard monitoring of attendance.* They are listed in sheet **‘C – Instruments’**.

In sheet **‘D - Topics per instrument’** is shown what topics are included in each of the data collection tools. In sheet **‘E - Questions per indicator per instrument by topic’**, the questions needed to construct the key outcome indicators are presented per data collection tool, and organised by topic. The colour codes in column B in the sheet **‘B - Key outcome indicators’** refer to the different data collection tools.

An *Annual progress survey (a)*, like the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung is organising, is a cost-effective opportunity to construct control groups from. It covers range of questions and with a minimal addition of questions it is possible to calculate the key outcome indicators for a control group, which, in this example, would be households that are not exposed to (the specific intensive and less intensive treatments of) the HRNS Gender Household Approach, and compare these with key outcomes among households who participated in the intensive or less intensive interventions of the HRNS Gender Household Approach to estimate their impact.

There are some challenges to using an annual progress survey however. First, the addition of questions to a progress survey is an exercise in balancing their added value to the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the progress survey. In some cases, opting for a dedicated survey among a specific control group may prove the most cost-effective. In the specific case of the annual progress survey of the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, a downside is that the progress survey is conducted at the household level (interviewing the registered household member, which is in most cases the male household head) and not at the individual spouse level which is appropriate for research into intrahousehold issues. This implies that some indicators are not measured in exactly the same way, yet, may still allow the estimation of impact if one remains aware of the possible caveats or bias. The fact that often Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung staff conducts the annual progress survey may be an issue with regard to social desirability bias. The choice depends on an evaluation of the costs and benefits of an annual progress survey conducted by staff versus external enumerators.

*A dedicated individual spouse survey (b)* will be required for the collection data needed to monitor and evaluate the impact on key outcomes that are expected from a program with interventions of differential intensity that introduces participatory intrahousehold decision-making for more cooperative, efficient and equitable household farming outcomes. As explained in the previous section 5.2., in some designs endline data may suffice, else baseline and endline data may be necessary. The objective of a dedicated individual spouse survey is to collect the information needed to construct the key outcome indicators of interest using the questions listed in sheet '**E - Questions per indicator per instrument by topic**'. As a program similar to the HRNS Gender Household Approach is meant to make changes at the intrahousehold level and advance women's empowerment, it is essential to interview both the wife and the husband (in private), sometimes to be able to construct a key outcome indicator, sometimes because spouses are not necessarily informed about their spouse's actions or opinions, which can in itself produce information of interest. A dedicated individual spouse survey would be most useful to gather data among spouses in couples who received the less intensive awareness raising and among spouses in intensively treated couples. As mentioned above, interviewing a pure control group using the dedicated individual spouse survey would be an ideal situation but it has a cost implication of reaching out to a control group instead of capitalising on data collected in an annual progress survey. These are cost-benefit considerations organisations have to make.

The *joint problem solving, investment and sharing exercises (c)* are described and explained at length in the document '**Instrument C - Joint problem solving, investment and sharing exercises**' that is available

online [include url](#). These exercises can be used to assess behavioural change within agricultural households with regard to investments, sharing and joint problem solving. The key outcome indicators that can be derived from the data collected through these exercises are listed in sheet '**B - Key outcome indicators**' and explained in the online document. In addition, these exercises can serve as a learning tool.

Most organisations do a *standard monitoring of attendance* (d) in trainings and other activities, in most cases differentiated by gender. These data collection tools are regularly available and provide the necessary information to monitor and evaluate the impact on the participation of women in activities and in leadership.

## 6. How to use the toolkit

### 6.1. The steps

The toolkit for monitoring changes in intrahousehold decision-making in agricultural households and evaluating the impact on the efficiency and equity of household outcomes is meant as a reference guide and as a collection of science-based field-tested tools from which organisations who address inefficiencies and inequities in smallholder household farming can pick to set up a monitoring framework and/or an impact evaluation. What elements of the toolkit are finally included in a monitoring framework or an impact evaluation design will depend on various organisational, programmatic, budgetary, and contextual factors but the toolkit can provide a solid, scientifically sound, and flexible basis.

We will describe the steps to take to make use of the toolkit to set up a monitoring framework or an impact evaluation here. A first step is defining what the program that addresses intrahousehold decision-making in agricultural households and needs to be monitored or evaluated does and is able to achieve, whereby a *theory of change*, informed by the one presented in sheet '**A – Theory of change**' in the toolkit is a key feature.



Secondly, theoretical and programmatic pathways of change of the interventions in the program make you can reasonably expect key outcomes will change, or at least that is the aim. It is possible that a program, because it is slightly differently designed, targeted or implemented in another setting is not be



expected to result in all key outcomes that have been listed in the toolkit as possible and desirable outcomes of the HRNS Gender Household Approach that informed this toolkit. Once it is clear what your program can and cannot achieve given its set up, target groups, scope and the context in which it is implemented, and a theory of change is drafted, the toolkit will guide in identifying the *key outcomes* to monitor or evaluate.

For the key outcomes that can be reasonably assumed to follow from the designed program, a set of *key outcome indicators* should be identified that will be monitored during the course of the program cycle and evaluated at the end of the program. In the sheet '**B - Key outcome indicators**', a set of indicators is suggested per key outcome, and these indicators are listed under a specific topic.

Thirdly, the toolkit proposes a number of *methods, instruments and data collection tools* that may be needed to monitor or evaluate in sheet '**C – Instruments**'. In the toolkit, a few options are proposed but the selection of the methods, instruments and data collection tools will depend on the scope and budget of the program and its context.

Fourthly, once the methods, data collection tools, and key outcome indicators are decided upon, the sheet '**E - Questions per indicator per instrument by topic**' in the toolkit can be consulted to find the *appropriate science-based field-tested questions* that should be incorporated in the data collection tools to be able to measure the key outcome indicators. In this sheet, per data collection instrument and per topic (*column C*), the questions (*column D*) necessary for each of the key outcome indicators (*column F*), can be found. All the questions have been pre-tested and used in the evaluation of the impact of the HRNS Gender Household Approach or in other monitoring tools from the Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung. In the seventh *column G* of this sheet, if necessary, the *instructions for calculating the key outcome indicators* on the basis of the data obtained through the question are provided as well.

## 6.2. Some practical examples

How can the toolkit work for you in practice? Just an example: Imagine your organisation will start the implementation of a program comprising interventions with differential intensity that aims to change intrahousehold decision-making in farming households, quite similar to the HRNS Gender Household Approach, and, as the Monitoring & Evaluation person, you are responsible to set up an appropriate system for a mid- and end-term impact evaluation. Together with the program team, you will think the program through, go back to its theoretical basis and, if it has not been drafted yet, you will draft the pathways of change of the program inspired by *theory of change* included in the toolkit in sheet '**A –**

**Theory of change**. A chart that visualises the logical pathways following from the different features incorporated in the program will enable to determine what *key outcomes* can be expected from the program; an exercise the program team possibly already went through at the design stage of the program (sheet '**B - Key outcome indicators**' will provide guidance). Let say you and the program team agree that one of the key outcomes is *shared decision-making by spouses about strategic household expenditures*.

From the toolkit you can get inspiration for the *design of your impact evaluation* from sheet '**C – Instruments**'. Your design of choice will need to fit within the possibilities of your organisation, the program and the available budget. You might decide to use a difference-in-difference method to evaluate the impact of an awareness raising activity incorporated in the program as compared to not having been exposed to the program as a randomly phased design is infeasible. As the targeted couples self-select into the awareness raising activity you will need to *combine difference-in-difference with a matching procedure* to address the possible selection bias linked to the self-selection. Your method of choice, difference-in-difference with matching, implies the need for baseline data on couples' and individual spouses' characteristics for matching. It also implies you need data to construct the key outcome indicators at base-, mid-, and endline among couples who participated in the awareness raising activity and among couples without program exposure for the difference-in-difference analysis. You could decide that the more intensive treatment of the program, that follows for a selection of couples who went through the less intensive awareness raising activity, can be randomly encouraged among the latter, enabling the assessment of impact of the intensive treatment as compared to awareness raising activity based on a *randomised encouraged design*. For the impact of the intensive treatment as compared to no program exposure the randomised encouraged design will need to be *complemented with matching* to address the possible selection bias linked to the couples' self-selection into the initial awareness raising activity. Because of the matching, baseline data on couples' and individual spouses' characteristics is needed, also in the group receiving the intensive treatment; as well as mid- and endline data to construct the key outcome indicators.

In the sheet '**E - Questions per indicator per instrument by topic**' the toolkit provides the list of science-based, field-tested survey questions that can be included in the base-, mid-, and endline data collection tools to enable the measurement and comparison of the key outcomes across the intensive treated group, the group who has received the less intensive awareness raising treatment, and the control group who was not exposed to the program. In your case, for the key outcome used as an example, you could have opted to focus on the *percentage of households making decisions about major expenditures for the*

*household jointly* as the key outcome indicator. In the survey conducted among individual spouses, you will thus include the question, if a decision about major expenditures for the household – like, for instance, for repairing the house, buying a motorcycle, bicycle, television, or cattle - was made in the course of last three months, *who took that decision. If husband and wife agree they jointly made that decision* they count as a household taking decisions about major household expenditures jointly.

Or else, imagine your organisation supporting coffee farming households did not manage procure funds for a full-fledged program yet, but decided to keep mainstreaming the importance of reaching out to men and women in its activities by raising the awareness about this among its staff, field partners and farmer leaders. Your organisation obviously wants to keep track of what those efforts produce as results, more particularly on key outcomes such as *joint planning and decision-making on farming* and specifically *intrahousehold investment behaviour* (sheet '**B - Key outcome indicators**'). As your organisation is awaiting funds, budgets might be tight, which could create the opportunity for you as the Monitoring & Evaluation person to suggest to *implement or roll out the mainstreaming randomly across areas*, which essentially comes down to a randomised control trial (sheet '**C – Instruments**'). In that case, collecting endline data is necessary to construct the key outcome indicators, like for instance the *extent to which the couple, the husband, respectively wife, invests in the common household farm by allocating their available resources to agricultural labour and inputs* as the indicator for joint planning and decision-making on farming (sheet '**B - Key outcome indicators**'). Based on the key outcomes identified for the mainstreaming, you can consult the toolkit to develop your data collection tool, in which case the *intrahousehold investment* exercise (instructions for which are provided in **Instrument C - Joint problem solving, investment and sharing exercises**, available online [include url](#)) can be played among treated and non-treated groups of couples; from which the key outcome indicators of interest can be derived as instructed. By playing the intrahousehold investment exercise the *extent to which couples, husbands, and wives invest in the common household farm by allocating their available resources to agricultural labour and inputs* as a result of the mainstreaming program can be assessed.

**Suggested citations for the IOB Policy Brief, Toolkit, Manual, and the Joint problem solving, investment and sharing exercises:** [include suggested citations](#)

## 7. References

- Agarwal, B. (1997). "Bargaining" and gender relations: Within and beyond the household. *Feminist economics*, 3(1), 1-51.
- Agarwal, B. (2000). Conceptualising environmental collective action: why gender matters. *Cambridge journal of economics*, 24(3), 283-310.
- Agarwal, B. (2001). Participatory exclusions, community forestry, and gender: An analysis for South Asia and a conceptual framework. *World development*, 29(10), 1623-1648.
- Agrawal, A. (2003). Sustainable governance of common-pool resources: context, methods, and politics. *Annual review of anthropology*, 32(1), 243-262.
- Baland, J. M., & Platteau, J. P. (1996). *Halting degradation of natural resources: Is there a role for rural communities?*. New York, USA, Oxford, UK: Food and Agricultural Organization and Clarendon Press.
- Baland, J. M., & Platteau, J. P. (1998). Wealth inequality and efficiency in the Commons, part II: the regulated case. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 50(1), 1-22.
- Bardhan, P. (2000). Irrigation and cooperation: An empirical analysis of 48 irrigation communities in South India. *Economic Development and cultural change*, 48(4), 847-865.
- Doss, C. R., & Meinzen-Dick, R. (2015). Collective action within the household: Insights from natural resource management. *World Development*, 74, 171-183.
- Duflo, E., & Udry, C. (2004). Intrahousehold resource allocation in Cote d'Ivoire: Social norms, separate accounts and consumption choices (No. w10498). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B., & Vermeersch, C. M. (2011). *Impact evaluation in practice*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank. Retrieved from the World Bank: [https://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTHDOFFICE/Resources/5485726-1295455628620/Impact\\_Evaluation\\_in\\_Practice.pdf](https://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTHDOFFICE/Resources/5485726-1295455628620/Impact_Evaluation_in_Practice.pdf)
- Lecoutere, E. (2011). Institutions under construction: resolving resource conflicts in Tanzanian irrigation schemes. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 5(2), 252-273.

Lecoutere, E. (2018). Improving intrahousehold cooperation for efficient smallholder farming. A field experiment in central Uganda. (*IOB Working paper 2018.07*). Antwerp: The Institute of Development Policy (IOB), University of Antwerp. Retrieved from the Institute of Development Policy: [include url](#)

Lecoutere, E., & Jassogne, L. (2017). Fairness and Efficiency in Smallholder Farming: The Relation with Intrahousehold Decision-Making. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 1-26.

Lecoutere, E., & Wuyts, E. (2017). *Confronting the wall of patriarchy: does participatory intrahousehold decision-making empower women in agricultural households?* (*IOB Working paper 2017.13*). Antwerp: The Institute of Development Policy (IOB), University of Antwerp. Retrieved from the Institute of Development Policy: <https://www.uantwerpen.be/en/research-groups/iob/publications/working-papers/wp-2017/wp-201713/>

Lecoutere, E., d'Exelle, B., & Van Campenhout, B. (2015). Sharing common resources in patriarchal and status-based societies: evidence from Tanzania. *Feminist Economics*, 21(3), 142-167.

Njuki, J., Kaaria, S., Chamunorwa, A., & Chiuri, W. (2011). Linking smallholder farmers to markets, gender and intra-household dynamics: Does the choice of commodity matter?. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 23(3), 426-443.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Quisumbing, A. R., & Maluccio, J. A. (2003). Resources at marriage and intrahousehold allocation: Evidence from Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Indonesia, and South Africa. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 65(3), 283-327.

Slootmaker, C. (2013). Technology adoption, risk, and intrahousehold bargaining in subsistence agriculture. In *2014 American Economic Association Annual Meeting Allied Social Science Associations, January 3-5, 2014, Philadelphia, PA*. Retrieved May 4, 2018 from the American Economic Association website: <https://www.aeaweb.org/aea/2014conference/program/retrieve.php?pdfid=68>

The Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL). *Introduction to Evaluations*. Retrieved from <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/research-resources/introduction-evaluations>

## 8. Annex – The Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Gender Household Approach activity plan

Activity	Target group	Objectives	Duration and Timing	Scope	Person(s) responsible
Introduction to the Gender Household Approach and community development for Depot Committee leaders	<b>Depot Committee (DC)</b>  Organised at the level of the DC	a) To develop an understanding among Depot Committee (DC) leaders on the importance of including both men and women b) To develop actions and strategies to be undertaken to ensure that both men and women participate in farmer activities c) To agree on implementing these actions and strategies to include both men and women in farmer group activities	1 day	Max. 40 - 50 participants	<b>Gender officer</b>  Assisted by Producer Organisation Trainer (POT), and Assistant POT
Introduction to the Gender Household Approach and community development for Producer Organisation leaders	Lead Contact Farmers, Lead Farmer Promoters, Farmer Promoters, Contact Farmers, and Lead Farmers from all <b>Producer Organisations (POs)</b>  Organised at the level of the DC	a) To develop an understanding among DC leaders on the importance of including both men and women b) To develop actions and strategies to be undertaken to ensure that both men and women participate in farmer activities c) To agree on implementing these actions and strategies to include both men and women in farmer group activities d) To make farmer promoters aware of the need to mobilise couples of the respective POs for the couple seminar	1 day	Max. 40 - 50 participants	<b>Gender officer</b>  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
Mobilisation of couples for couple seminar	<b>Couples who are member of the PO</b>	a) Mobilise couples for the couple seminar	Immediately after the Introduction to gender and community development training  (There should be approximately 1 week in between the Introduction to gender and community development training and the couple seminar)	-	<b>Farmer promoters</b>

Couple seminar	<b>Couples who are member of the PO</b>  Organised at the level of the PO (if appropriate some PO are targeted together)	a) To raise awareness about the unequal division of resources and responsibilities b) To improve joint planning and decision-making on the utilisation of resources in the household. c) To improve the participation of women, men and youth in meetings, trainings and leadership roles	Half day  (Takes place approximately 1 week after the Introduction to gender and community development training)	Max. 20-25 couples	<b>Gender officer</b>  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
Mobilisation of encouraged couples for Change Agent coaching package	<b>Couples who participated in the couple seminar and who have been selected to be encouraged for the Change Agent coaching package</b>	a) Mobilise couples who participated in the couple seminar and who have been selected to be encouraged for the Change Agent coaching package		Invitation of the couples who have been selected to be encouraged for the Change Agent coaching package  by a phone call by the gender officer, and a letter.	<b>Gender officer</b>
Change Agent coaching package  <b>Activity 1: Change Agent seminar</b>	<b>Couples who participated in the couple seminar and who have been selected to be encouraged for the Change Agent coaching package</b>  Organised at the level of the DC	a) To formally register couples as Change Agents b) To coach couples towards improving their household situation, to draft a household vision c) To coach couples in the development of a household plan and budget d) To coach couples on how to implement joint decision-making, equal sharing of workloads and joint planning in their household e) To provide couples with the skills to promote gender equality within their communities f) To enhance the couples' skills on monitoring and documenting their own household situation and that of other households within their communities	1 day  (Takes place between 1 to 6 months after the Couple seminar)	Max. 1-2 couples per PO who participated in the couple seminar are selected to be encouraged for the Change Agent coaching package	<b>Gender officer</b>  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT

Planning and organising the household visits	Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar		Immediately after the Change Agents seminar	-	Farmer promoters
Change Agent coaching package Activity 2: Household Visit	Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar Organised at the level of the household	a) To support the couples on implementing their household vision b) To follow up and support the couples on implementing their household plan and budget c) To coach couples on how to implement joint decision-making, equal sharing of workloads and joint planning in their household	Up to 3 household visits per day (Takes place as soon as possible after the Change Agent seminar)		Gender officer  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT, Farmer promoter
Change Agent coaching package Activity 3: Women leadership training	Women in couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar (Women leaders of PO and DC) Organised at the level of the DC	a) To develop women's leadership skills b) To develop women's business skills c) To increase the participation of women in meetings, trainings and decision-making processes of farmer groups d) To increase the representation of women in PO and DC leadership	1 day (Takes place after the household visits)	Max. 20 participants	Gender officer  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
Change Agent coaching package Activity 4: Follow up and self-assessment workshop	Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar Organised at the level of the DC	a) to follow up on households' progress towards a household vision, the development of a household plan and budget, and the implementation of joint decision-making b) to share experiences c) women and men in couples self-assess their progress	Half day		Gender officer  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
Drama shows	Community Organised at the level of the DC	a) To raise awareness about the importance of gender equality (in terms of economic benefits, human rights etc.) b) To promote gender equality principles within communities	1 afternoon		Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar conduct the drama shows, potentially with other PO members



					Gender Officer supports the planning and organisation of drama shows, assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
Community dialogues	Community Organised at the level of the DC	a) To raise awareness about the importance of gender equality (in terms of economic benefits, human rights etc.) b) To promote gender equality principles within communities	1 afternoon		<b>Initiated by couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar</b>  With support from the Gender Officer, assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
Learning tours	<b>Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar</b>  Organised at the level of the DC	a) To exchange experiences on implementing gender equality principles within the household and to learn from each other b) To find out about challenges and lessons learnt from Change Agent couples	1 day per learning tour		<b>Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar</b>  With support from the Gender Officer, assisted by POT, and Assistant POT
<b>Change Agent coaching package</b>  <b>Activity 5: 2<sup>nd</sup> household visit (if applicable and feasible)</b>	<b>Couples who participated in the Change Agent seminar</b>  Organised at the level of the household	a) To discuss any remaining issues and come up with action points	Up to 3 household visits per day  (Takes place approximately 6 months after the Change Agent seminar)		<b>Gender Officer</b>  Assisted by POT, and Assistant POT, Farmer promoter

**Source:** Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung (2016). *Guide to Increase Gender Equity in Coffee Farming Households in Tanzania*. Hamburg: Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung (mimeo).