

Agriculture

MERGE
188

GENDER FACTORS IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION IN
THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN

Consulting report submitted to:

Regional Development Office/Caribbean (RDO/C)
U.S. Agency for International Development
Barbados

Marianne Schmink
Center for Latin American Studies
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

January, 1989

ITD Library

9.E. 23

Schmink, M.

Table of Contents

I. Background	1
II. Introduction	2
III. AID's Approach to Gender Analysis	3
IV. Gender Analysis of AREP	5
A. Division of Labor; Resources; Income	5
B. Gender-Differentiated Stakes and Incentives	7
C. Problems Related to Gender and AREP	8
1. Farm family vs. gender analysis	8
2. Linkage of WID activities to project goals	9
3. WID monitoring and evaluation	9
4. Staff WID expertise	10
V. Recommendations	10
A. Recommendations for RDO/C	10
B. Recommendations for AREP	11
1. Design document	11
2. Institutional alternatives	12
3. Project adaptation	13
4. Pilot community effort	15
V. Conclusions	15
Appendix: Persons interviewed	16

I. Background

The Agricultural Research and Extension Project (AREP) extends and integrates two previously successful RDO/C projects due to terminate in 1989: support for Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI) and for Caribbean Agricultural Extension Project (CAEP). AREP's purpose is to strengthen the institutional capability of regional research and extension organizations to generate, develop, adapt, and disseminate continuing streams of improved agricultural technologies (varieties/species and management practice) which are responsive to the needs of the participating countries and are widely adopted at the farm level. During review of the AREP (previously called DAREEC) Project Identification Document (PID), the role of women as decision-makers in the agricultural production system was identified as an issue which required additional analysis during project paper preparation.

The consultant was hired to assist RDO/C in the identification of 1) the role which women farmers play in the agricultural technology generation and transfer system in the Eastern Caribbean, and 2) interventions which the AREP project can make to strengthen the capacity of regional agricultural research and extension organizations to support women farmers. Specific tasks were to:

- 1) review existing documentation on women in the technology generation and transfer system in the Eastern Caribbean;
- 2) discuss the issue with a sampling of researchers, extensionists, development specialists, women farmers and women's groups in the Eastern Caribbean, and
- 3) identify specific interventions which the project can make to strengthen the capacity of regional research and extension organizations in supporting women farmers.

The consultant spent eight days (2-9 January, 1989) including travel time, visiting Barbados, St. Lucia and Trinidad. Howard Batson joined her for Barbados and St. Lucia interviews. She spoke with sixteen people in the RDO/C office; CARDI; CAEP/University of the West Indies (UWI) Extension; Women and Development (WAND) Unit of the UWI Extra-Mural Department, Barbados; Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action (CAFRA); and UWI Women and Development (WID) Studies (see list in appendix). She

also drew heavily on a prior analysis of the CAEP carried out in 1985 for a PPC/CDIE study.¹ Before departure from Barbados on 9 January the consultant prepared a report in outline form and presented a verbal briefing, based on those notes. This report follows the outline of that verbal presentation.

II. Introduction

It is generally recognized in the Eastern Caribbean that women are important economic actors, especially in agriculture and marketing. The institutions of the region have the potential to apply this awareness of gender's importance to their agricultural development efforts. There is an existing data base sufficient to indicate many of the specific aspects of gender that are relevant to the work of agricultural research and extension activities in the region. Several regional institutions can provide expertise to these institutions regarding Women-in-Development issues. These conditions provide a favorable environment to implement an exemplary WID effort that will have a positive impact on project success and on development prospects in the region. The AREP project now being prepared by the RDO/C office provides a significant potential opportunity to: 1) serve as a model of a gender-sensitive, mainstream project; 2) have a measureable impact on farmers, including women; and 3) improve the application of A.I.D.'s policies regarding attention to gender as an important development variable.

New congressional actions in 1988 require that project documents show greater attention to gender analysis, and that Missions and Bureaus develop WID strategy statements.² Yet many AID officers have not been exposed sufficiently to WID issues to clearly understand the specific terms of "gender analysis" as defined by AID. Therefore, this report is introduced by a brief discussion of AID's approach to gender analysis. The report also makes several recommendations for implementation of a WID strategy within the RDO/C office.

¹ The results of the 1985 assessment of incorporation of gender analysis into CAEP will be published as one of ten case studies in Vol. II of Women in Development: A.I.D.'s Experience, 1973-1985. Vol. I, Synthesis Paper by Alice S. Carloni was published as A.I.D. Program Evaluation Report No. 18, April 1987 (Washington: A.I.D., PPC/CDIE).

² Memo of 21 December, 1988 from Michael R. Taylor to Project Officers, USAID, RDO/C.

The primary focus of the report consists of a succinct diagnosis of gender as a significant variable in Eastern Caribbean agriculture, and in the regional research and extension programs. Specific problems in the conceptual and operational dimensions of project activities will be identified. The final section of the report spells out specific recommendations for the AREP project design document, institutional framework, and implementation.

III. AID's Approach to Gender Analysis

WID policies and practices have evolved rapidly within AID over the past fifteen years. In 1973 the Percy Amendment first mandated that AID's development work incorporate attention to women's roles in economic development. The WID office was created to establish and implement that policy. The office developed a training program based on the Harvard Business School case study method, and offered it to AID staff.¹ In 1981, the Agency published a policy paper on Women in Development. At the end of the United Nations Decade for Women (1975-1985) the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) carried out an agency wide, cross-sector assessment of AID's Women in Development experience.² The new 1988 congressional mandate demands greater attention to gender issues in development work, and provides new resources to support expanded WID activities.

The AID approach to gender analysis is not limited to concern with "equity" (e.g., addressing the question, "what is AID, or development, doing for women?"). Since the very beginning, AID's approach has also appreciated the significance of gender as a key variable in determining the "efficiency" of projects and their development successes. The assumption is that improved analysis of gender will benefit the project's overall potential for reaching its objectives and goals.

The major finding of the 1985 CDIE study was that: **"mainstream projects that ensure women's participation in proportion to their roles and responsibilities within the project's baseline situation are more likely to achieve their**

¹ See C. Overholt, M. Anderson, K. Cloud and J. Austin, Gender Roles in Development Projects: A Casebook. W. Hartford, CN: Kumarian Press, 1985.

² See footnote 1, page 2.

immediate purposes and their broader socioeconomic goals than are projects that do not" (emphasis added). There are several important aspects to this statement. 1) Mainstream projects that successfully adapted to gender constraints were found to be more effective in promoting and utilizing women's contribution to socioeconomic development than were women-only projects or separate women's components. 2) Successful gender analysis assessed the relevance of specific gender differences to the baseline situation and adapted project activities to integrate women in proportion to their representation in the pool of eligible participants. Making this direct linkage between gender variables and project objectives and activities required sex-disaggregated data. 3) Projects with high female participation were more likely to achieve their short-term objectives and their broader development goals, whether or not these goals and objectives specifically referred to WID.

The study examined the following set of relationships:

Gender Analysis (Baseline)	Project Adaptation	Women's Particip.	Achieve Project Purposes	Impact on Women	Long-Term Goals
----------------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Adequate gender analysis of the baseline situation (before the project) was found to be essential, but not sufficient to have an impact on project outcomes. The study found that gender analysis must continue throughout the lifetime of projects so that they can adapt to the gender constraints encountered in specific activities. Even when there were no formal barriers to women's participation, projects did not automatically adapt to gender constraints. In some agricultural research and extension projects, it was necessary to target women as a specific audience for project resources or activities because they would be responsible for implementing the project intervention. For mainstream direct-services delivery projects especially, adaptation to gender constraints and differences significantly enhanced women's participation, and also improved the likelihood of achieving project goals and objectives.

The CDIE study found that projects in the agricultural sector that delivered resources directly to women in accordance with their productive and reproductive roles were more successful than those that did not. "Understanding gender factors in agricultural production is crucial to the successful transfer of technology into

agricultural systems" -- because of gender differences in access to and control over productive resources; gender-linked labor constraints; differential control over income; and different stakes and incentives for women and men associated with increased agricultural output. These findings are directly relevant to the AREP.

IV. Gender Analysis of AREP

A. Division of Labor; Access to and Control over Resources; Income Patterns

Women play a major role in Eastern Caribbean agriculture, especially in the small farm sector.¹ Data from 1979 cited in the CAEP Phase I Project Paper showed the following proportions of women in the agricultural labor force: Antigua, 50%; Barbados, 40%; Grenada, 20%; Montserrat, over 50%; St. Kitt/Nevis/Anguilla, 45%; St. Lucia, 47%; St. Vincent, 30%. Women predominate in marketing, especially local and inter-island. In some areas, male out-migration leaves women behind as de facto household heads responsible for the farm enterprise, causing the "feminization of farming."²

Research carried out in 1981 on St. Vincent and St. Lucia provided more detailed information about the division of labor in agriculture.³ On St. Lucia, women were the principal farmers in 43 percent of all small farm households. On St. Vincent, they were the sole farmers in 24 percent and the principal farmer along with a male partner in 40 percent. In addition to their role as food producers, women in the Eastern Caribbean had major responsibility

¹ Among the key sources of information on women's role in Eastern Caribbean agriculture not cited elsewhere in this report are recent studies by CAFRA on women and agriculture in Dominica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, as well as many publications by WAND. See especially, Planning for Women in Rural Development: A Sourcebook for the Caribbean (Barbados: Population Council/Women and Development Unit - WAND), 1984.

² Elsa M. Chaney, "Scenarios of Hunger in the Caribbean: Migration, Decline of Smallholder Agriculture and the Feminization of Farming," Michigan State University Working Papers on Women in International Development, #18, March 1983.

³ See Barbara Knudson and Barbara A. Yates, "The Economic Role of Women in Small Scale Agriculture in the Eastern Caribbean - St. Lucia" (Barbados: WAND, 1981) and Barbara Knudson, "The Economic Role of Women in Small-Scale Agriculture in the Eastern Caribbean: St. Lucia and St. Vincent Compared", unpublished report, 1982.

for child support. In St. Lucia, 80 percent of all live births took place out of wedlock. In such cases the mother is the main provider.

Separate income streams were the norm even in households with a male present. While men typically controlled the income earned from bananas and from cattle, for example, women often had an independent income through their vegetable crops. Women were solely responsible for paying for family food in 37 percent of the households surveyed (food represented 40 percent of household expenditures), support of children in 31 percent, transport in 22 percent, medical needs in 29 percent and farm supplies in 22 percent.

A clear gender division of labor in agriculture was noted. Men's contribution to farming was primarily in land preparation, planting, and pest control. Women participated most in weeding, fertilizing, harvesting, storage and marketing. Men were likely to control production of bananas and other export crops. Women worked with vegetables and root crops, and in households with animals they cared for livestock. On St. Lucia, women spent an average of five hours a day in farm work and an additional 8-10 hours a day on housework, child care and marketing trips to town. Women alone did the marketing in 37 percent of the households. They were the sole decision makers on 12 percent of the farms in St. Lucia and 23 percent in St. Vincent; they made decisions jointly with the male partner in 50 percent of the farms on St. Lucia and 80 percent on St. Vincent.

However, women's access to agricultural services was found to be disproportionate to their heavy involvement in agriculture. In St. Lucia, women received only eight percent of the agricultural loans and less than one percent of the total amount dispersed. Only fifteen percent of the women had received information from an extension worker. Women's relatives were cited as their main source of agricultural advice (51 percent). Another independent study of male and female roles in farm planning decisions on three islands (Dominica, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent) also found that family members were highly significant sources of advice and opinions on farm planning and on the adoption of innovation.¹ The study

¹ T.H. Henderson and P.I. Gomes, "Family Structure, Attitudes and Decision-Making among Caribbean Peasant Farmers," Agricultural Administration 9 : 257-265, 1982.

recommended that the whole family be more directly involved in the extension education process. Also, the study suggested that extension workers may neglect female farmers in their contacts.

B. Gender-Differentiated Stakes and Incentives¹

The existing literature shows clearly that women in the Eastern Caribbean are important in decision-making and/or labor contributions for virtually all farm activities, yet their access to and control over productive resources may be more constrained than men's. This suggests that research and extension programs should be responsive to the constraints faced by women farming without a male partner.

Second, different stakes and incentives will often apply to men and women even within the same household. Extension agents sometimes commented, for example, that men farmers tend to focus their attention and resources on one major export crop, such as bananas, while women deal with multiple aspects of the farm enterprise and were more in tune with the whole system. This characterization would suggest women as an ideal target group for crop diversification programs.

Specific technological or management interventions in agriculture will have to address the realities of gender-differentiated households where there may be different, even competing, constraints and priorities. A good example is the shift of banana packing from packing plant to field -- an extension intervention directly related to RDO/C agricultural goals of improving banana quality control. Apparently there has been no assessment of the impact of that shift on women's labor, even though women usually do the banana packing in both packing plant and field. What happened to the women who lost their jobs in the packing plants? How many are now working in the fields and under what conditions? How has the increased demand for unpaid family labor to pack bananas in the field affected women's other activities? Extension agents commented that women did not like the tedious job of de-flowering the bananas, and resented the new demand on their time

¹ These hypotheses about different stakes and incentives in Eastern Caribbean agriculture were developed during the 1985 evaluation of CAEP carried out by Marianne Schminck and Paula Goddard. They are based on in-depth interviews with about two dozen extension agents and farmers on three islands.

for an activity that generated income not under their direct control. Some were encouraging their husbands to move out of banana production altogether. While these women could be considered "participants" in improved banana production -- by virtue of the labor they contributed -- they were not direct beneficiaries, and therefore lacked the incentive to make the program work.

The banana-packing example shows the direct relevance of applying gender analysis within the family or household unit in order to understand the different stakes and incentives associated with technological change. Gender analysis therefore goes beyond a focus on the whole farm, or household unit. Unless intra-household factors are well understood, the "farm family" approach may assume: 1) that household members share a homogeneous set of goals and incentives (instead of different, sometimes competing priorities); 2) that information is communicated perfectly among household members (e.g. the "trickle across" of extension advice instead of delivery directly to implementers); and 3) that women are primarily involved in consumption and domestic work rather than farm production. Gender analysis within specific household production systems allows project adaptation, to permit more efficient targeting of project resources to appropriate audiences.

The CDIE study found gender sensitivity to be especially important in predicting the success of projects intended to have an impact at the farmer level. The achievement of institution-building objectives was less clearly linked to gender variables than were farm-level socioeconomic goals. Gender sensitivity will therefore be especially important as the RDO/C agricultural sector strategy shifts its emphasis from building institutional strengths in research and extension, to changes in farm-level agricultural systems. The AREP will be more likely to achieve project objectives, and improve the lives of both women and men farmers, if gender sensitivity is built into the overall project design.

C. Problems Related to Gender and AREP¹

1. Farm family vs. gender analysis

¹ Much of the following analysis of problems draws from the 1985 CAEP study by Marianne Schmink and Paula Goddard; see Vol. II of Women and Development: A.I.D.'s Experience, 1973-1985 (Washington: AID, CDIE), forthcoming 1989.

Eastern Caribbean agricultural research (CARDI) and extension institutions (CAEP and UWI Extension) use the farm family as the unit of analysis of the farming system. While this approach is preferable to a focus only on the male farmer, it still may not target resources efficiently, for the reasons discussed above. In CAEP Phase II (1982), the farm family focus replaced specific attention to women and a more extensive gender analysis that had characterized Phase I. Under the extension of Phase II, the project has shifted to a "farm management" focus that does not disaggregate the household by gender. CARDI also deals primarily with the whole (undifferentiated) family, but had begun to refine its farming systems methodology to include an understanding of intra-household dynamics (under the leadership of a staff person who has now left CARDI).¹

2. Linkage of WID activities to project goals

During its institution-building phase, CAEP sponsored a variety of special WID activities, including training workshops sponsored by WAND that helped to increase sensitivity to the realities of women's lives and rural communities. There was also some attention to women's representation in the extension service process. However, the increased awareness of women's roles was not sufficiently linked to the project's overall goals in agricultural production. As a result, for example, the farm management data collection instruments now being used do not disaggregate farm systems (labor, income, access and control over resources) by gender. In CARDI, economist Vasantha Chase carried out some special studies of women's agricultural roles and worked informally with her staff colleagues to increase their understanding of gender issues. However, her expertise was not sufficiently institutionalized at CARDI and her departure about a year ago has left a vacuum. Economist Charles Douglas (based in Antigua) is working on development of quantitative methods for selecting priority farming systems, and participating farmers. He has incorporated a number of variables measuring gender differences into his models. This is an example of a "WID" activity directly related to CARDI project goals.

3. WID monitoring and evaluation

¹ See Vasantha Chase, "Farming Systems Research in the Eastern Caribbean: An Attempt at Analyzing Intra-Household Dynamics," pp. 171-182 in S. Poats, M. Schmink and A. Spring (eds.), Gender Issues in Farming Systems Research and Extension (Boulder: Westview), 1988.

The 1985 CAEP study found the agricultural extension project to be gender sensitive in many ways that were not reflected in project reports and evaluations. On the other hand, there was little data on project participation by gender. The monitoring and evaluation system was not designed to provide good information about the gender-differentiated impact of the project. Evaluations did not analyze gender as a specific variable in project outcomes. The first major evaluation (in 1984) found little progress in increasing women's representation in the extension staff. In assessing farmer-level impact, the evaluators apparently assumed women were primarily involved with nutrition and backyard gardening within the farm system. CARDI, likewise, lacks any specific reporting on WID activities or sex-disaggregated data on project activities. Research and extension staff must probably be convinced of the relevance of gender to their work before they will systematically collect such information.

4. Staff WID expertise

Most of the CAEP/UWI Extension staff have a high level of awareness and understanding of gender issues and their relevance to agricultural research and extension activities. They also have good linkages with local WID groups and regularly collaborate with WAND, CAFRA, and UWI/WID. The CARDI staff, on the other hand, has lost its WID expert with the departure of Vasantha Chase. The social science input into CARDI's programs is very weak. Nor does CARDI have strong ties to local WID groups. In general, staff at UWI, CARDI and at the RDO/C office could benefit from more exposure to the concepts and applications of gender analysis, in order to move beyond sensitivity to adaptation of projects and programs.

V. Recommendations

A. Recommendations for RDO/C

1. Mission staff should participate in the UNDP WID training workshop on gender analysis, using the Harvard case study method (scheduled for 30-31 January, 1989, Barbados)
2. Form a cross-sectoral WID committee to develop the RDO/C WID strategy

3. Consult with the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) on RDO/C WID strategy during requested visit in February

4. Develop stronger linkages with local WID experts: WAND, CAFRA, and UWI/WID. All three are regional institutions with direct experience in development work in agriculture. WAND's strengths are in facilitation of community participation and in training. CAFRA is involved in participatory research and community development. UWI/WID would like to develop a program of research on women in Caribbean agriculture that could provide important information for the AREP and other RDO/C projects.

5. Identify and document more systematically the existing gender-sensitive programs and projects in RDO/C's portfolio. This will provide a point of departure for the office's WID strategy, and improve the prospects for seeking matching WID funds from AID/Washington and other sources.

6. Develop an expanded WID strategy funded in part through specific project funds targeted to women participants and in part through special RDO/C allocations, to be matched by WID funds from AID/Washington and other outside sources.

7. Develop a set of key WID resource materials. This should include the sources of information on women in Caribbean agriculture cited in this report, and key sources on the AID approach to gender analysis.¹

B. Recommendations for AREP

1. Design document

a. Expand the gender analysis in the project paper (e.g., to include more than the one-paragraph "boilerplate" on p. 20 of the PID). Summarize more of the specific aspects of the division of labor, access and control over resources, and income patterns within the household, as outlined above and reported in more detail in other sources of information.² The analysis should focus on women's role

¹ For example, the A.I.D. Policy Paper on Women in Development; C. Overholt, M. Anderson, K. Cloud and J. Austin, Gender Roles in Development Projects: A Casebook. W. Hartford, CN: Kumarian Press, 1985; the CDIE study; ICRW's collection of working papers; S. Poats, M. Schmink and A. Spring (eds.), Gender Issues in Farming Systems Research and Extension (Boulder: Westview), 1988.

² Potential sources of information for this expanded analysis include: CAEP Phase I Project Paper, pp. 90-96 and annex; Schmink/Goddard reports on CAEP; WAND/MUCIA study on St. Vincent and St. Lucia (see footnote 3, p. 5; V. Chase

not only in farm decision-making but also in farming. Where possible, the project paper should differentiate the likely pools of eligible participants according to their gender, indicating the need to target project resources to specific audiences. (For example, the discussion of priority agricultural opportunities on p. 6 of the PID should specify the predominance of women hucksters as traders and mention women's importance in vegetable production).

b. Describe the ways CAEP and CARDI have already adapted to gender considerations.¹ This includes reporting on WID activities peripheral to mainstream project activities as well as the ways gender analysis has changed the implementation of research and extension activities, especially in the more recent farming systems work. For example, did CARDI include women farmers among their on-farm trial participants? If so, did gender turn out to be a significant variable in defining their research priorities?

c. Describe mechanisms for incorporating gender analysis into project implementation to allow for new gender-sensitive project adaptations under AREP. Specific examples from the PID include: 1) p. 10: specify gender as a key variable in farming systems research and extension, that will be addressed in the sondeo and in work plans. State that WID/social science expertise will be incorporated into the project for this purpose. 2) p. 10: specify the need for attention to gender differences within the farm enterprise, as part of the farm/home management approach. The data-keeping instruments used by researchers and extension agents should disaggregate labor demands, decision-making, income streams, and resource use by gender. 3) Pp. 11-12: among linkages with the private sector, specify local WID experts, especially for the Technology Adaptation and Transfer Program. 4) p. 15: Specify training in gender analysis. 5) p. 16: specify WID consultancies.

2. Institutional alternatives

1988 (see footnote 1, p.9) and other studies by V. Chase; papers from CARDI seminar on women in agriculture in the Caribbean held in July of 1987; papers by C. Douglas of CARDI; studies being completed by CAFRA on women and agriculture in St. Vincent and Dominica.

¹ Potential sources of information include: CAEP Phase I Project Paper; Schmink and Goddard reports on CAEP; papers from CARDI seminar on women in agriculture; Vasantha Chase papers and case study; Charles Douglas papers; study of CARDI and CAEP carried out by Rhoda Reddock (UWI/WID) for UNIFEM.

- a. Hire (or designate from existing staff) an AREP WID coordinator to work with UWI, CARDI and WID groups. One good candidate would be Anne Rajak of the UWI Extension staff in Trinidad and the UWI/WID group.
- b. Strengthen CARDI's WID/social science staff expertise to fill the vacuum left by Vasantha Chase's departure. Consider allocating a staff position to rural sociology or anthropology, with a specific WID focus.
- c. Form a WID advisory committee for AREP with representatives of CARDI; UWI Extension; UWI/WID; WAND; CAFRA; RDO/C.
- d. Strengthen linkages with regional and U.S.-based WID experts. Take advantage of planned activities like the February CAFRA seminar (to be attended by AREP staff) and UWI/WID seminars (on social science in April; on agriculture in September, 1989). Develop joint training, monitoring, and research activities with WID groups (see below).

3. Project adaptation

- a. Sponsor a training session for CARDI, UWI Extension and WID groups to undertake jointly, using the case studies method applied to gender analysis of farming systems. The training course could be delivered by Tropical Resources and Development (TR&D), Gainesville, Florida; by the Harvard-based group; by the University of Florida; by others recommended by the ICRW. TR&D has the most experience with the use of gender-sensitive farming systems case studies, one of which was developed by Vasantha Chase based on CARDI's work in St. Lucia. Local trainers could include V. Chase and Peggy Antrobus, or others from WAND with training experience. WID experts involved in the course would learn about the farming systems approach to agriculture, and agricultural experts would learn about gender analysis.

The format of the course might be a two-day class session with 30-40 participants (and 3-4 trainers), followed by a two-day training-of-trainers session with 10-15 participants. This would allow the training experience to filter through the project. Participants could use existing project data to analyze in the course. The output of the course would be a refined AREP gender strategy.

The course should be planned by a committee including representatives of the project institutions, WID groups, and U.S.-based trainers. Such a course would cost roughly \$35-50,000, including support for a prior planning meeting in the region. The training activity would provide a point of departure for a much broader AREP gender strategy. If it could be financed by RDO/C funds, it could serve to justify a request for matching WID funds from AID/Washington to support an expanded set of activities. Ideally, the training course would be scheduled prior to the UWI Extension Field Workshop planned for August 6-19, 1989 in Trinidad.

b. Experiment with gender-sensitive delivery mechanisms for agricultural technology (e.g., gender-specific information channels; women's organizations; changes in timing, duration or location of extension meetings; training for frontline agents in gender analysis). (See CAEP Phase I Project Paper for more discussion of these suggestions).

c. Monitor and evaluate the gender aspects of project activities.

- 1) Collect disaggregated data on participants, beneficiaries and pools of "eligibles." This information -- now required by AID/Washington and by Congress -- is necessary but not sufficient to assess gender aspects of the project.
- 2) Specify target audiences by gender in project work plans, when appropriate
- 3) Design an evaluation strategy to measure both the impact of gender on project outcomes, and the impact of the project on women. It will be impossible to show project success in relation to gender without explicit monitoring and evaluation activities.

d. Consolidate and expand research on gender variables in relation to AREP.

- 1) Expand the gender analysis of existing project data bases: disaggregate by gender, and test relationships of gender variables to key project objectives. There is a wealth of valuable information that has yet to be digested and fed into research and extension institutions' work.
- 2) Encourage or commission WID experts to carry out supplementary studies: e.g., analysis of gender in different farming systems. The UWI/WID group would seem to be particularly well-suited to a collaborative, and mutually-beneficial, research program. The WID group coordinator for the Trinidad campus is a plant scientist and there are several other women from the WID group on the UWI agricultural staff.

4. Pilot Community Effort

As a side effort, it would be ideal to select one or more community sites in which to carry out an integrated community development effort involving multidisciplinary teams from CARDI, CARDATS, UWI Extension, WAND and CAFRA. This activity could be coordinated by the newly-created Caribbean Network for Integrated Rural Development (CNIRD). AREP could provide the agricultural technical assistance component. A pilot project with a gender focus would permit the testing of collaborative, multidisciplinary research and extension approaches.

V. Conclusions

The report presents specific recommendations for AREP project design, institutional framework, and implementation. The framework of gender analysis as developed by AID provides the rationale for implementing these recommendations, in order to improve women's participation in the project and to enhance the likelihood that the AREP will achieve its development goals and its immediate purpose (to strengthen institutional capability to deliver farm level agricultural technology).

Recommended actions in staffing, training, meetings, monitoring, research, and pilot community efforts all cost money. A coherent WID strategy could be developed within AREP using some combination of 1) earmarked project funds (e.g. for a staff position, training course, consultant, or workshop); 2) RDO/C funds (e.g. for consultants, a training course, or commissioned research); 3) outside funding sources (e.g., foundation support for UWI/WID research or for pilot projects); 4) matching WID funds from AID/Washington. If attention to gender improves the likelihood of success in development efforts, then additional resources will be well spent. They will help RDO/C to more systematically integrate WID concerns into the regional portfolio.

Appendix: Persons interviewedRDO/C

Timothy Miller
Howard Batson
Ralph Cummings
Michael Lofstrom

CARDI

Calixte George
John Hammerton
Charles Douglass

CAEP/UWI Extension

P.I. Gomes
Dunston Campbell
Anne Rajak

WAND

Peggy Antrobus
Patricia Rodney

UWI/WID

Grace Sirju-Charran
Rhoda Reddock

CAFRA

Rawwida Baksh-Soodeen
Tina Johnson