



INTERNATIONAL FOOD
POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
sustainable solutions for ending hunger and poverty

DIRECTOR GENERAL'S OFFICE

April 2005

IMPACT ASSESSMENT Discussion Paper 23

STRENGTHENING FOOD POLICY THROUGH
GENDER AND INTRAHOUSEHOLD ANALYSIS:
IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF IFPRI
MULTICOUNTRY RESEARCH

Cecile Jackson

2033 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA • Tel.: +1-202-862-5600 • Fax: +1-202-467-4439 • ifpri@cgiar.org
www.ifpri.org

IFPRI Division Discussion Papers contain preliminary material and research results. They have not been subject to formal external reviews managed by IFPRI's Publications Review Committee, but have been reviewed by at least one internal or external researcher. They are circulated in order to stimulate discussion and critical comment.

Copyright 2005, International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. Sections of this material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without the express written permission of but with acknowledgment to IFPRI. To reproduce the material contained herein for profit or commercial use requires express written permission. To obtain permission, contact the Communications Division at ifpri-copyright@cgiar.org.

CONTENTS

Acronyms	vii
Acknowledgments.....	ix
Abstract	xi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Emergence of the Intrahousehold Program within IFPRI	5
3. Activities and Outputs of the Intrahousehold Program.....	14
4. Impact Measurement.....	19
5. Impact Perceptions.....	29
6. Conclusions and Lessons	40
References	49
Appendix 1: List of Interviews	53
Appendix 2: Key Milestones and Activities of the Intrahousehold Program (1992–2003).....	57
Appendix 3: Key Dissemination Activities of the Intrahousehold Program	67
Appendix 4: Publications Outputs of the Intrahousehold Program (1995–2002).....	79

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 — Some indicators of the products of policy research.....	2
Table 2 — Intrahousehold project publications requested 2002–03	22
Table 3 — Web statistics showing intrahousehold project site visits and downloads	23
Table 4 — Requests for intrahousehold project datasets.....	23

ACRONYMS

AAU	Addis Ababa University
ADB	Asian Development Bank
BIDS	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
CEAPRED	Center for Environmental and Agricultural Policy Research, Extension and Development (Norway)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
DATA	Data Analysis and Technical Assistance (Bangladesh)
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
EPMR	External Program and Management Review (CGIAR)
EPTD	Environment and Production Technology Division (IFPRI)
ERHS	Ethiopia Rural Household Survey
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCND	Food Consumption and Nutrition Division (IFPRI)
FFE	Food for Education
FSR	Farming systems research
GKT	Gono Kallyan Trust
HC	<i>Hogares Comunitarios</i>
HKI	Helen Keller International
HTML	Hypertext markup language
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
ICRW	International Center for Research on Women
ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agroforestry
IFNS	Institute of Nutrition and Food Science, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh
IICA	<i>Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture</i> [Instituto Interamericano de Cooperacion para la Agricultura]
INCAP	<i>Instituto de Nutricion de Centro America y Panama</i> [Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama]
INRA	<i>Institut National de Recherche Agronomique</i> [National Institute of Agricultural Research]
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
KIDS	KwaZulu-Natal Income Dynamics

LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Study
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
PHO	<i>Organizacion Panamericana de la Salud</i> [Panamerican Health Organization]
PDF	Portable document format
PRA	Participatory rural appraisal
Progresa	<i>Programa de Educaci3n, Salud y Alimentaci3n</i> [National Program for Education, Health, and Nutrition]
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy paper
RAE	Research assessment exercise
SCF	Save the Children Fund Australia (Bangladesh)
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SOSEP	<i>Secretar3a de Obras Sociales de la Esposa del Presidente</i> [Office of the First Lady]
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee of the CGIAR
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNRISD	United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Program
WID	Women and International Development

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses deep appreciation to James Ryan for launching this study; to the many people contacted who offered selfless assistance, particularly Agnes Quisumbing; to two anonymous reviewers for their helpful appraisals; to Michael Go, Melanie Allen, and Valerie Rhoe for preparing data for the tables in Chapter 4, and to the impact assessment coordinator and other staff in the Director General's Office at IFPRI for their help in bringing this work to fruition.

ABSTRACT

This assessment focuses on IFPRI's research program, "Strengthening Food Policy through Intrahousehold Analysis," within the Food Consumption and Nutrition Division (FCND). The program was initiated in 1992, formally began in 1994, and was completed in 2003. Research undertaken in the program was complex, involving work in several countries and taking on challenging new research issues of great potential policy relevance, within a rapidly changing environment. The objectives of the program were to document intrahousehold resource allocation patterns; develop economic models and data collection methods necessary to investigate determinants of intrahousehold resource allocations; establish the relevance of these patterns and models for food policy; evaluate the benefits relative to additional costs of data collection at the intrahousehold level, develop guidelines for *a priori* expectations on intrahousehold issues, and manage outreach through training materials and publications geared to the range of research users.

Impact assessment manifests many of the well-known difficulties of assessing policy research; thus, in this paper, what is usually called "impact" is perhaps more properly termed policy response. The approach taken largely follows the methods developed over recent years by IFPRI to allow aggregation and comparison of study findings. For this assessment, however, the standard approach has been adapted, as necessary, to accommodate the characteristics of both the program in question and the nature of the policy environment that gender and intrahousehold research inhabits. The procedure involved study of the program's activities, research outputs, and research dissemination and capacity building through the examination of IFPRI documents and data, and interviews with IFPRI staff and with research users in two of the high-concentration study countries visited for the assessment, Bangladesh and Guatemala.

Most of the program's objectives have been met in full and some in part; there have also been some unintended achievements, or at least some not specified at the outset of the program. Although a more limited degree of direct policy impact was found than was hoped for at the outset of this assessment, the relevance of the research for policy formulation was high. Modeling intrahousehold transfers is obviously central for such policy formulation. Finally, the issue of how independently held assets affect bargaining power in intrahousehold relations is relevant to the emphasis on women's property rights, particularly land, which has become a key policy direction in many countries. The research focus has had undeniably high policy relevance, and therefore high potential impact.

The policy impact through influencing major donors and peer researchers in the United States and other developed countries has been marked, and the outputs and conduct of the program met with enthusiastic approval from respondents in this study. There is no doubt that the quantity and quality of output has been high; dissemination has been varied, strategic, and extensive; methodological advances of the kinds envisaged have materialized as anticipated; and the data collection and dataset availability at the end

of the program leaves behind a resource that will continue to create policy impact for years to come.

While the program had considerable country-level impact in Bangladesh and particularly in Guatemala, overall, the main impact was not at the project or country level but as a body of work that has changed minds and contributed to research as an international public good. Policy impact in developing countries was a focus at the outset of the program, but this has not been as strong as expected, and there was perhaps some unwarranted optimism about the extent to which it would be possible to engage the hearts and minds of policymakers and peer researchers in developing countries, beyond those already familiar with intrahousehold analysis in the paradigm-shifting core of the intrahousehold program. The emphasis on impact through training materials and capacity building in developing countries is not easy to assess because this activity is ongoing. It seems, however, to be rather lower than hoped, and this is likely in part because there has been relatively little demand from developing-country policymakers and researchers.

Within IFPRI, the view that there is now no need for a gender-focused research program because the perspective has been adequately mainstreamed into IFPRI seems ill-judged. The internal impact of the program has been less than one would expect, in relation to external impact. Intrahousehold and gender analysis has not yet become core business of IFPRI or achieved appropriate recognition in profiling by IFPRI. A vigorous new research program in the field, however, alongside the movement of ex-program staff into new programs would both sustain gradual mainstreaming, and consolidate the gains of the program in the best possible way, by demonstrating the value of gender analysis for food policy through high-quality externally recognized research.

Various other issues of method, and good and bad assessment practice, are raised in this paper, which will be of interest and value to all concerned with assessing the consequences and effectiveness of IFPRI policy research.

1. INTRODUCTION

This impact assessment paper focuses on research carried out by members of the Food Consumption and Nutrition Division under the research program, “Strengthening Food Policy through Intrahousehold Analysis” (henceforth, the intrahousehold program), which was initiated in 1992, formally began in 1994, and was completed in 2003. The specific objectives of the intrahousehold program were as follows:

- document intrahousehold resource allocation patterns,
- develop economic models and data collection methods necessary to investigate determinants of intrahousehold resource allocations,
- establish of the relevance of these patterns and models for food policy,
- evaluate the benefits relative to additional costs of data collection at the intrahousehold level,
- develop guidelines for *a priori* expectations on intrahousehold issues, and
- manage outreach through training materials and publications geared to the range of research users.

The research undertaken was complex, involving work in several countries, and taking on challenging new research issues of great potential policy relevance within a rapidly changing environment. A book edited by Agnes Quisumbing was produced in 2003, *Household Decisions, Gender, and Development: A Synthesis of Recent Research*, summarizing the program’s findings.

Impact Assessment

The objectives of impact assessments of this type—to exercise accountability to research funders and assist in internal learning processes so as to improve the effectiveness of IFPRI research—can imply a degree of creative tension. An emphasis on critique is most useful for institutional learning and future planning but is potentially harmful in relation to donor justification and accountability. Perversely, an excellent research program that is commendably honest about shortcomings may be disadvantaged in relation to other research impact assessments that are less so. One would hope, however, that the very presence of honesty and critique is recognized by funders as an indicator of the kind of institution that is mindful of its broad objectives.

The approach taken for this impact assessment largely follows the methods developed over recent years by IFPRI to allow aggregation and comparison of study findings (e.g., Garrett 1999). For this assessment, however, the standard approach has been adapted, as necessary, to accommodate the characteristics of both the program in question and the nature of the policy environment that gender and intrahousehold research inhabits. Clearly, a one-size-fits-all approach to policy assessment is not helpful because policy environments offer diverse and particular challenges that need to be addressed.

In Ryan and Garrett's (2003) framework, they suggest a sequence of research inputs to activities, outputs, outcomes, policy responses, and, finally, impacts. This sequence is illustrated on the cover of the IFPRI (2002a) publication *Impact Evaluation: Assessing the Impact of Policy-Oriented Social Science Research* in the form of an executive desk toy comprising a line of steel balls that, once the first has been raised and dropped, hit each other sequentially with unswerving force and audible impact. The aim of evaluating research impact depends on a view of the policy process as linear, ordered, and stable; but, as Ryan and Garrett note, many would disagree with this depiction. If most policy processes are unstable, interactive, unpredictable, and chaotic, then it is generally unrealistic to aim to assess more than the outputs to policy responses. In this paper, impact is more properly termed policy response (Table 1).

Table 1 — Some indicators of the products of policy research

Outputs^a	Outcomes or Influences^b	Policy Responses^c	Impacts^d
Publications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number and type • refereed/nonrefereed 	Citations, use in curricula, circulation numbers, sales, requests, web hits	Changes in policies attributable to policy research	Reduced poverty
New methodologies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description • value-added 	Use of new methodologies	Reinforcement of existing policies	Improved food and nutrition security
Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number of trainees • extent of training • duration of training • number and type of manuals 	Trainee promotions; number of others trained by IFPRI trainees	Implementation of policy changes	Sustained livelihoods of the poor
Seminars/symposia/conferences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number • type • number of participants 	Number of policymakers present and influence on policy; Invitations to IFPRI staff to present keynote and other papers at other meetings (number, organizations, and whether expenses are paid)		Enhanced natural environment
Press releases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number • type 	Number of press releases published and in what fora; letters to editors spawned as a result		
Press conferences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number • type 	Number of press articles that resulted and in what fora		

Outputs^a	Outcomes or Influences^b	Policy Responses^c	Impacts^d
	Invitations to IFPRI staff and management to be on committees adjudicating policy changes in partner organizations and countries		
	Refereeing assignments of IFPRI staff, requests for additional research in response to earlier outputs		
Assistance to partner institutions to strengthen capacities	Degree of success in acquiring additional resources to partner institutions		

Source: Ryan and Garrett (2003).

^aOutputs are calculations or accounts of activities/efforts that can be expressed quantitatively or qualitatively.

^bOutcomes are measures of the use made of outputs by clients and partners, reflecting the value placed on them as intermediate IFPRI products, which in turn are inputs into policymaking processes. Outcomes can be usefully separated into initial, intermediate, and longer-term.

^cPolicy responses imply a degree of attribution of the effects of the intermediate outputs and outcomes/influences on the formulation or reinforcement of policy.

^dImpacts refer to measurable effects of the outputs and outcomes on the well-being of the ultimate beneficiaries of the research, namely the poor, the food and nutrition insecure, and the environment. It could also include perceptions of peers and policymakers about the impacts.

Further comments on the overall IFPRI impact evaluation approach are offered in the final section of this paper. At the outset, however, it is noted that the evaluation approach suggested (Ryan and Garrett 2003, for example) shows little familiarity with the body of research by gender analysts on policy transformation. This includes Nancy Fraser's influential work on the politics of need, and in particular how needs are legitimated and responded to (Fraser 1989). In this, Fraser theorizes about the way policy discourse forms and how competing need claims are legitimated, domesticated, serviced, enclaved, depoliticized, and repoliticized. She points to the differentiated participants involved in these discursive processes, along with their particular logics and vocabularies. Policies are recognized, legitimated needs, but how do they become so recognized? And what role does research play in this? At a more applied level, the study of organizational change in development institutions and how gender policies are resisted, adopted, adapted, and implemented has had considerable attention over the past couple of decades. These have included studies of what factors explained how particular organizations (the World Bank, Ford Foundation, United Nations Development Programme, and so on) have responded to gender research (Kardam 1991, for example), to institutional analyses of how gender policy has been integrated into the operations of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Goetz (1997, 2001) and others have developed frameworks for analysis of organizational histories, cultures, and practices (such as the

exercise of discretion in policy implementation, the workings of policy leadership, and the understanding of accountability), which contribute to a considerably deeper understanding of policy processes and institutions, and how they can behave in relation to a new body of research and information that establishes—as gender research since the 1970s has—a legitimate claim for development policy and resources. The relevance of this work is not confined to gender issues and could usefully be combined with the approaches of Paarlberg (1999) and others.

Finally, by way of introduction, a word is needed on how this assessment fits in the temporal context of the program being assessed. When the program began in 1994, this assessment was not anticipated, as indeed was the case for IFPRI's other research programs. Thus no explicit paper trail was maintained for the purpose, creating a challenge for the assessor.

Systematic analysis of outputs and their impact requires substantial research to uncover how outputs have been used, by whom, and to what effect. Available resources, however, preclude such depth and detail for this assessment. And since, as already stated, the use of outputs to produce policies, and then effects, is neither direct nor linear, it is in many respects impossible to recover in retrospect. That said, the challenges of such an apparently simple formulation are discussed below.

2. THE EMERGENCE OF THE INTRAHOUSEHOLD PROGRAM WITHIN IFPRI

IFPRI carried out interdisciplinary research on intrahousehold resource allocation in the 1980s, which produced a number of outputs.¹ These were concerned with opening up the black box of “the household” as a unit of analysis, and laid a conceptual foundation for research to follow. But the shift in focus, from households and their internal workings to a gender, came later.

Gender issues arose relatively late, in 1990, at IFPRI. Warren Baum’s history of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) written in 1986 does not mention gender. This is surprising, since CGIAR institutions had been at the forefront of important work on food production and gender through farming systems research from the mid-1970s. This approach to the diagnosis of constraints in farming systems, the analysis of recommendation domains, and the participation of farmers in technology design and assessment was perhaps the most important advance made, outside of academic literature, toward understanding the importance of intrahousehold relations for food security. CGIAR institutions from Peru to Mexico, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe conducted careful empirical work and evolved distinctive methodologies that included intrahousehold research. A great many of these studies collected information from both men and women within survey households and were particularly concerned with women’s preferences in relation to processing and preparation of food crops and labor constraints stemming from gender divisions of labor. For example, the IRRI book *Women and Rice Farming* from 1985, emerging from a 1983 conference, was an influential collection. One wonders why this body of applied and policy-relevant work appears to have been so comprehensively forgotten, and it provokes a certain anxiety that the successes of the intrahousehold program should not be assumed too readily to be institutionalized and secure. It also provokes the very relevant question, in terms of impact assessment, of whether the shelf life of research is inversely related to how applied it is.

While the careful empirical work of CGIAR institutions in developing countries has faded, the one thing that remains in currency from the 1980s is the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations’ (FAO’s) 1985 statement that women do 80 percent of the work in agriculture and own 1 percent of the property. It is interesting that this statement is so enduring, so effective—and so wrong. (It is apparently derived from an estimate attributed to Krishna Patel at the International Labour Organisation in 1978). This is not the place for an analysis of this phenomenon, but it does serve as a cautionary tale against over-enthusiastic popularization of simplified versions of research. High impact should never come at the cost of accuracy.

¹ This section owes a great debt to the work on IFPRI’s institutional history, in preparation by Curtis Farrar. The outputs took the form of series of papers on the household focus that were first published in *Food and Nutrition Bulletin* 5/4 (1983) and Rogers and Schlossman (1989).

A notable feature of Farrar's unfinished draft history of IFPRI is that, from the earliest expression of the need for the CGIAR system to recognize the role of women in agricultural production, there was a simultaneous recognition of the need to increase the participation of women in professional roles within the CGIAR. IFPRI has been more successful in this regard, and the picture has been steadily improving. The CGIAR's External Program and Management Review (EPMR) on IFPRI (CGIAR 1998, 58) comments on the improvements in the gender balance of staffing, and the current position noted positively by the 2005 EPMR (CGIAR 2005) is that some 58 percent of total staff are female and more than one-third of research staff are female. IFPRI has also recently prepared a three-year plan (2005–07) for gender and diversity, addressing policies, practices, and staffing.

There can be few other areas where the identity of researchers and the content and conduct of their work have been implicitly linked in the way that female researchers and gender analysis have been. The internal (gender composition of staff and equal opportunities within IFPRI) is thus tied to the external (conduct of gender-aware research) in an epistemologically novel way, which is commented further on, at various points, below. This connection is a strength in some ways; it usefully demonstrates how personal values and social identities are inherent in scientific research and should not be seen simply as bias. At the practical level, female researchers in the main have been the ones to advance gender analysis; therefore, it follows that having more female researchers will increase gender research capacity. But this link also has a potential weakness. Individuals—mostly women—have been effective gender policy advocates, but to the extent that gender analysis remains on the margin, the careers of such individuals may not flourish. Gender research very likely remains on the margin, in part, because of the failure of many male researchers to engage in the field. IFPRI, however, has been considerably better than other comparable institutions, having had a number of important male researchers of gender issues (for example, Lipton, Haddad, Hoddinott, Maluccio, and others), and this has amplified the impact of the intrahousehold program. The IFPRI experience suggests that it may be best to aim to increase female researcher numbers within institutions overall, but not risk creating a “gender ghetto” by encouraging male researchers into the field. The ultimate goal should be to integrate gender issues into research programs more broadly, for the betterment both of the researchers and the field.

At the 1985 Bellagio seminar, “Women and Agricultural Technology: Relevance for Research,” it was made clear that IFPRI considered its role as addressing “policymakers in developing-country governments and aid agencies as its chief ‘users’,” but the keynote speaker representing the developing world made it clear that the “role of women was none of the business of international agricultural research” (Curtis Farrar, personal communication). This enduring tension is characteristic of gender research, since it is charged with particularly intense political and personal meaning. This needs to be borne in mind when assessing research impact.

Little momentum had been achieved in IFPRI by the external review of 1989, when the panel commented on the patchiness of gender perspectives in IFPRI research, largely confined at that stage to particular individuals—generally women, such as Shubh Kumar and Eileen Kennedy—rather than researchers in general, which was the pattern in many other research institutions as well. Observing the process of change within IFPRI may well tell us about the processes researchers seek to promote within development organizations responding to their findings. As gender analysis of organizations has amply demonstrated, the “Weberian” ideal of value-free bureaucrats is unrealistic, and personal values and identities of researchers can both impede and accelerate responses to research. We should expect that the impact of gender policy change resulting from the intrahousehold program’s research will be deeply affected by the differential presence of “policy entrepreneurs,” or indeed “policy resisters,” within institutions targeted for policy responses.

Farrar makes an interesting observation that when gender did take root at IFPRI it was in association with work on nutrition, which unlike other sectors had a determinedly individual (rather than family/household/community) unit of analysis, to which IFPRI’s director general at the time, Per Pinstrup-Andersen, was firmly committed. By the early to mid-1990s, the research on commercialization included considerable analytical attention to gender, and the book edited by von Braun and Kennedy (1994) reported important research findings on the impact of the adoption of commercial crops on agricultural labor and nutrition. Consequently, when the CGIAR began a donor-supported gender program and asked for information on female researchers and gender analysis within research, IFPRI was able to report a rise in gender disaggregation in research by its consumption division in relation to credit, public works, structural adjustment, women’s time allocation, and micronutrient availability. Thus the intrahousehold program was conceived.

In 1991, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) began to fund IFPRI gender research (specifically on women’s nutrition and health, households headed by women, and the effects of structural adjustment on women). A considerable amount of gender research was also incorporated in areas primarily focusing on other topics, such as deforestation (Kumar and Hotchkiss 1988), hybrid-maize adoption (Kumar 1994), education, and nutrition. But perhaps the distinctive focus on intrahousehold analysis developed most clearly with the 1992 conference on intrahousehold analysis and food policy, which quickly produced a publication incorporating 30 policy briefs derived from the papers presented, and some time later a book (Haddad, Hoddinott, and Alderman 1997). This promised theoretical clarification, measurement and econometric progress, and cross-disciplinary collaboration with anthropology and nutrition essentially set the stage for the intrahousehold program.

By the mid-1990s, a considerable level of interest by economists in the issue of the unitary household (which had preoccupied feminist anthropology for at least a decade) appeared to be building up. Research by Chris Udry et al. (1995) in Burkina Faso was particularly important in this regard and continues to be heavily cited. This was a collaboration of World Bank and IFPRI research (Haddad at IFPRI, Alderman ex-

IFPRI, Hodinott future IFPRI). What were the features that, in addition to timing, created such a high level of impact? The particular success of the Udry et al. work may have been related to some of its features. It offered an empirical study at a time when interest had been primed by debates about models, all the authors were economists (and men!), and the methodology was viewed as rigorous by other economists; yet it also drew on anthropology of the area, the finding was popular among gender researchers—being consistent with their stance on productivity and resource allocation (for example, Agarwal 2003), and it made explicit policy suggestions. Many of these features were also to be ingredients in the impact of the intrahousehold program's publications.

One gets the impression from Farrar's draft account of the emergence of gender research at IFPRI—which fits with other institutions dominated by economics—is that a considerable time lag occurs between the release of findings from one discipline, generally anthropology, and the stimulation of related research in economics. The internally differentiated household was described, analyzed, and widely accepted in mainstream anthropology from the mid-1970s, yet it took at least a decade for mainstream development economists to take notice, although Lyn Squire and others made pioneering contributions to household modeling. A partial explanation of this is that members of a discipline are undoubtedly more persuaded by evidence and arguments of their own discipline, and economists are most convinced by the work of other economists. Having broken through this barrier, it would be regrettable if important momentum was lost through the termination of the intrahousehold program.

Strategy and Objectives for the Program

The important conclusions of the 1992 conference, mentioned above, were that the identity of recipients of a resource transfer affects the use of that resource, that non-recipients' responses to such transfers could offset their value through compensatory resource changes within the household, and that property and assets were critical to intrahousehold relations.

In 1993, the research team for the intrahousehold program was assembled under the leadership of Lawrence Haddad, and the formal program proposal was put to IFPRI. The objectives, issues, and analytical approach were communicated in the title, "Strengthening food policy through intrahousehold analysis," which did not include gender, focused on food policy, and set out to test the assertion that "a better understanding of intrahousehold resource allocation is essential to an accurate prediction of the consequences of policy implementation" (Haddad et al. 1994, 1). Policy impact was anticipated in irrigation management, deforestation, sustainability of tropical hillsides, labor-intensive public works, credit, eradication of micronutrient deficiencies, and agriculture–human fertility linkages.

The vision was of a strongly cross-cutting research program, the strength of which would lie in collaboration with other IFPRI programs, thereby facilitating generalizations across policy instruments and issues. The objectives were fourfold:

1. documenting intrahousehold resource allocation patterns;
2. developing economic models and data collection methods necessary to investigate determinants of intrahousehold resource allocations;
3. establishing the relevance of these patterns and models for food policy through case studies that show links between intrahousehold issues and policy levers, evaluate the benefits of data collection at intrahousehold level relative to additional costs, and develop guidelines for *a priori* expectations on intrahousehold issues; and
4. developing outreach through training materials and publications geared to the range of research users.

The conceptual framework emphasized alternative economic household models and suggested policy relevance in relation to improved targeting, better welfare effects from changes in public transfer methods, and reduced policy failure because of increased precision in directing policy initiatives based on knowledge of intrahousehold resource allocation. Innovations in data methods were anticipated, recognizing inherent problems in the definition of the household as the unit of analysis, the need for more disaggregated data, the broad scope of variables to include extrahousehold data, and the complementary combination of qualitative and quantitative methods.

Six of the nine policy issues outlined were derived from other IFPRI research programs (Haddad et al. 1994, 18), leaving only three identified especially for the intrahousehold program (“development resources are scarce and need to be targeted,” “project resources do not reach women,” and “fertility rates are too high”); of these, only one was explicitly gender focused (the last is a bit of an outlier).

The analytical approach set out involves ethnographic and participatory rural appraisal (PRA) work as the first step in identifying the relevant unit of analysis and to “identify whom we should collect data from and what we should collect” (Haddad et al. 1994, 33). Ethnographic analysis was also to be deployed if the theoretical restrictions of the unitary model were rejected by the data, as the basis for using an appropriate collective model. The question of using a common approach to intrahousehold relations in many different cultural contexts was not seen to preclude generalization if common methods were used.

Policy impact and outreach were to be fostered through interaction with “policymakers and researchers in developing countries” and strengthened capacity for intrahousehold research in developing countries. Indeed, “in order to make policy research more effective, one has to understand policymakers’ needs and their constraints” (Haddad et al. 1994, 41). Impact was expected through making policymakers aware of intrahousehold issues, using country case studies within those countries, drawing synthesis and generalization across countries to provide lessons for other countries, and interacting with policymakers through in-country collaborators.

Policy relationships were anticipated with the then new IFPRI program, “Political Economy of Food and Consumer Subsidies”; through the intrahousehold email network, which was hoped would draw in NARS researchers and national policymakers; and by linkage with the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)–UNDP research program on the incorporation of gender into national development strategies. Feedback on the importance of intrahousehold policy issues was sought in June 1993 from targeted policymakers by contacting individuals in ministries and agencies who had requested IFPRI’s policy brief on intrahousehold issues. The responses (summarized in Haddad et al. [1994, 42]) illustrate the gap between in-country perspectives and the intrahousehold program focus on establishing alternative models of intrahousehold relations. Training materials were to be an important output of the program, starting with materials for the FAO on food policy, and the publications and information dissemination strategy included a new working paper series, presentation at the 1995 Beijing conference, and several workshops. Later, an External Advisory Committee was formed for the program, supported by the Office of Women and International Development (WID) in USAID and academics, which met annually to review progress and advise on and support research developments.

The program identified three necessary elements to enable it to work: models to accommodate individual preferences of household members, innovative methods of data collection, and good dialogue with policymakers.

It is striking on reading the program proposal that it promised a great deal, seemingly aiming to be all things to all people, which no doubt reflects the realities of winning support for the proposal within IFPRI. The impact assessment process, as it becomes anticipated, may well lead to more cautious statements of objectives in project proposals, but it would be a pity if this led to a lowering of aspirations. The intention in this impact study is to assess impact achievements broadly, since some were not anticipated, and to point out those expected that have not yet materialized.

The well-known attribution problem in impact assessment is, in this case, not only a question of which impacts are attributable to which research but also which outputs are attributable to the intrahousehold program, since most team members seem to have worked across multiple IFPRI programs; thus not all of the published output of named members is relevant. Appendix 4 lists those publications that are considered to be intrahousehold program outputs.

In 1994, the program proposal was developed by Haddad and others; in 1995, Agnes Quisumbing was recruited to lead it. From the start, the program appears to have been innovative, particularly in relation to disciplines and dissemination. For example, it set up the e-mail network (Gender-CG) in 1994 with encouragement from the CGIAR Gender Program and membership soon expanded beyond the CG, growing to 280 members in 1996 and reaching a peak of 547 subscribers from 55 countries, at the last count in 2002. The material from the network was published periodically in hardcopy, and a very successful e-conference on gender and property rights was held in 1995.

The United Nations' Fourth World Conference on Women was held in Beijing in the summer of 1995. IFPRI prepared a report on the role of women in food security, citing some IFPRI work but not, however, the World Bank paper on women and food security that preceded it (Price Gittinger et al. 1990), possibly because the paper is flawed by a unitary household model. The focus on intrahousehold analysis was highly significant because it identified an area that was both a conceptual problem in gender and food security research, an interesting economic puzzle, and a highly policy-relevant focus. The intrahousehold program delivered its promise in these three areas.

It is relevant to examine the political perspective of the program based on its outputs: a feminist position is neither disavowed nor declared, no publications have appeared in *Feminist Economics* or similar journals, by default, the economics are rather orthodox, and in general the strategy appears to have been aimed at influencing mainstream economics. Nevertheless, a subtext of conformity to feminist ideas is clear, and few research findings troublesome to such a stance are pursued. For example, Haddad and Hodinott (1994) find that doubling women's incomes raised the status of boys relative to girls (using indicators of boys suffering more morbidity than girls and being perceived by their elders as "insurance" for old age), Thomas (1997) finds that it is not always the case that women spend more on "good" things, and Hallman (2000) finds that dowry empowers women. Hence the research is marked by a certain timidity in relation to both unsettling economists by displaying an overt feminist stance and unsettling feminists by pursuing some of the more complex findings. But this may be just the personal opinion of an admitted contrarian.

Program Methodologies

Economics has dominated IFPRI research since its beginning, but since the mid-1990s suggestions have been made, largely from external sources, that a more multidisciplinary range of research would be appropriate. The 1998 EPMR noted the small proportion of non-economists at IFPRI and encouraged diversification. This diversification of disciplines and methods has probably gone forward most readily in the intrahousehold program, although there is still some way to go.

In the unpublished 1996 concept paper on "Strengthening Food Policy through Intrahousehold Analysis: Issues and Methodology" prepared by the intrahousehold program team, led by Quisumbing and Brown, the approach to the research program was set out in some detail. The overall program design was based on intensive research in four countries—Bangladesh, Guatemala, South Africa, and Ethiopia—and a number of studies in other countries. There would be "specific policy recommendations in each country, with more depth and emphasis in the four high-concentration countries" (1996, 5). For the countries visited for this impact study, it was expected that the research would address the following issues: in Bangladesh, agricultural productivity, credit, safety nets, micronutrients, and health and nutrition; and, in Guatemala, agricultural productivity, fragile lands, safety nets, and health and nutrition. Countries selected as high concentration locations were chosen partly on the basis of existing knowledge of high intrahousehold disparities, partly on the basis of the team assessment that a "window of

policy opportunity” existed whereby policymakers were receptive to implementing policies recommended in the research, and partly in response to donor priorities and the “presence of good in-country collaborators who would benefit from research and training offered by IFPRI” (1996 unpublished concept paper, page 7).

As well as the commendable steps taken toward multidisciplinary learning, the intrahousehold program has also been distinguished by being especially outward looking, and this is clear from the methodology document. A review process was set up under the 12-member External Advisory Committee, mentioned earlier, which would review the relevance and quality of research and outreach annually. Further, to ensure the program stayed up-to-date with developments in model building, data collection techniques, and analytical approaches from a range of disciplines, a number of gender research fellows were appointed over the life of the program: Elizabeth Katz, Bina Agarwal, Julian May, Duncan Thomas, Alok Bhargava, Marcel Fafchamps and Bereket Kebede.

Information on the high concentration studies planned shows that Bangladesh was selected because of its degree of discrimination against women, levels of poverty, and active policy environment (for example, in credit). The micronutrients study was already funded as of 1995 and looking at vegetable and fish technologies for effects on nutrition and employment, and the existing relationships with collaborators were to be tapped for this research, with Data Analysis and Technical Assistance (DATA) being contracted for the data collection and processing. Dr. Sajjad Zohir (Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies [BIDS]) provided enumerator training, Dr. Nazmul Hassan (Institute of Food and Nutrition Studies, University of Dhaka) was to do the same for nutrition, and a local gender specialist would conduct a PRA as an input into later survey rounds and work with Dr. Zohir on the economic analysis. At this stage, Guatemala was not envisaged as part of the program and was taken on in late 1997 as the last high-concentration study country.

In the discussion of the special data needs of intrahousehold analysis, there is no mention of other disciplines, despite the nature of the variables suggesting this might be appropriate. In the data collection methods section of the methodology document, the new demands are seen as the identification of the relevant unit of analysis, greater disaggregation of data, and the inclusion of topics not usually included “in a household survey”; that is, it is simply assumed that household surveys would be the primary method. But the document goes on to refer to anthropological techniques that would be used, such as open-ended interviews with key informants, “systematic and highly structured interviewing techniques for identifying cultural domains ... free listing, pile sorts, paired comparisons, and triad tests.” These would allow the development of culturally appropriate categories of types of decisions, work, income, expenditures, and assets for both women and men. Random spot observations, life histories, and event histories were to be used, and anthropological information was also to be part of the questionnaire design process.

The methodological paper is thoughtful and recognizes some challenging areas, such as the problem of defining male and female incomes; a proposed solution is to

obtain information on wealth accumulated at the time of marriage (1996, 38), but it does reveal a presumption about the primacy of the quantitative methods. The document does not discuss the important basic question of how far some social relations and processes can be captured by the sort of questions that are possible on questionnaires, and, if not, how this would either require other methods or a revised set of research questions. Non-economists at IFPRI do feel that their expertise is not fully recognized or allowed to be fully integrated into research design and analysis at all stages, although in more recent work, such as the South African research, this has been dramatically better.

Interviewees suggested that core of the intrahousehold program was a group of “true believers” who wanted to do high-quality empirical work in order to convince skeptics. Ministries of women and gender specialists all accepted intrahousehold inequality and policy relevance but Ministries of Finance, on the whole, did not. The research aimed not to dazzle but to convince—that is, it was not exceptionally innovative but intended to make a very strongly evidenced case, and it placed itself more on the academic side of IFPRI’s work in order to achieve this. The desire to influence the kind of mainstream economists who are influential in policy debates and circles, and bring these questions in from the margins carried methodological implications. It would necessitate the use of methods that such people would find convincing (as one said, “the donors wanted numbers”), the production of papers in peer-reviewed journals read by economists, and the inclusion of qualitative methods in a rather limited service role. Other programs in IFPRI may exhibit a narrow economic orientation, but for the intrahousehold program this seemed to be a legitimate strategic choice.

3. ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS OF THE INTRAHOUSEHOLD PROGRAM

This section should be read in conjunction with Appendixes 2–4, which gives an account of the intrahousehold program’s work. The following discussion focuses on the two high-concentration study countries visited for this impact assessment, Guatemala and Bangladesh.

Program Membership

The intrahousehold program consisted of around 20 team members, and was led briefly by Lawrence Haddad and then by Agnes Quisumbing until 2005 (2004-05 were spent finalizing products for the completed project). Team members are drawn from a number of other IFPRI programs, providing a cross-cutting effect, which was intended to enable the penetration of gender and intrahousehold analysis into other areas of IFPRI research. A core of team members, however, appears to have played a prominent role in the program (Adato, Haddad, Meinzen-Dick, Otsuka, Peña, Ruel, Maluccio, Smith, and Hallman), with a number of others in more limited roles. While the team has been dominated by economists, non-economists such as Meinzen-Dick, Adato, and Ruel have been influential members. Overall, however, a review of the publications reveals a preponderance of economics.

The degree of cross-cutting membership may offer the possibility of mainstreaming the conceptual and methodological interests of the program into other research at IFPRI, but it also risks a dilution of impact if members drawn from other programs do not see gender analysis and the intrahousehold program’s work as a central interest. When looking at the (non-intrahousehold program) publications of some team members, however, the absence of gender analysis was sometimes apparent where it seemed relevant.

Program Activities

Appendixes 2 and 3 show the sequence of work and the key researchers and donors involved at each stage of the research program, as well as the main dissemination and training activities conducted during 1995–2003. Research programs at IFPRI tend to have three partly overlapping phases: research, outreach, and synthesis. For the intrahousehold program, most of the field studies were complete by 2000 when the outreach phase began, and, as at the writing of this paper in 2005, the third stage is almost complete.

Though difficult to enumerate, since most activities were joint and the roles of team members not quantified, Appendix 2 indicates that a relatively small core of individuals worked very intensively and productively in the program. In particular, the

management and conduct of four major empirical studies by this modest team was an enormous achievement, even allowing for the inputs of local partners.

The intrahousehold program is considered to have been better funded than many research programs, and certainly USAID funding for the four high concentration studies was a big opportunity for a scale of activity that could have a major impact. It is therefore surprising that, when the outreach stage was reached, USAID was not prepared to fund this phase of the work. It was not possible to get a clear explanation of this based on interviews at USAID for the purpose of this assessment. Certainly no dissatisfaction was expressed about the quality or conduct of the research work, and one would have expected that USAID would be eager to drive forward the dissemination of a relatively large research investment. Changing personnel in USAID was one explanation offered by an IFPRI interviewee, while those currently in USAID-WID indicated that a declining budget and a changed relationship between WID and other USAID divisions were factors, such that activities tended to be jointly funded with less scope for WID-only investments. USAID seems to be another example of a mainstreaming logic leading to reduced resources and less strategic capacity. Synthesis work funded by the Norwegian government has proceeded since 2002.

Quite a proportion of the intrahousehold program work was attached to other IFPRI research, for example, the Bangladesh work was done in conjunction with the micronutrients study, in South Africa they explored a collaboration with the Safety Nets program working on public works (both within the FCND) but ended up as a re-survey of households in Kwazulu-Natal, while in Ghana the cooperation was with the Environment and Production Technology Division (EPTD). It is therefore desirable that the synthesis stage now draws together the very diverse outputs of the intrahousehold program, synthesizing the linkages and findings of the program's core research questions. The comprehensive edited collection of papers (Quisumbing, ed. 2003) presenting the program's research and the promised technical guide to come will be two major outputs for this phase.

Background to the Bangladesh and Guatemala Studies

IFPRI has had a research presence in Bangladesh for some years (the reasons for its choice as a high-concentration country have already been discussed above). Research undertaken for the intrahousehold program was done in collaboration with the micronutrients research, since women are particularly disadvantaged in relation to micronutrients such as iron. The study design was based on samples of households involved in vegetable and fish production. The vegetable production was on a commercial scale, since the NGO involved (Gono Kallyan Trust or GKT) offered demonstrations, training, and marketing support to farmers with land interested in commercial production. The survey involved 990 households in three areas. The gender component was initiated by a visit from program staff in 1996, and the module was implemented the following year as the fourth round of the survey. The earlier rounds had had sex-disaggregated data collected, but the fourth round specifically focused on gender and decision making. A second phase of research in 1999–2000 continued with further

work on morbidity. A local researcher (Ruchira Naved) conducted qualitative studies in parallel with the surveys, considering empowerment issues in relation to vegetable producing households.

Guatemala was chosen for a high-concentration study because of the peace accord, local enthusiasm, and the presence of a cooperative female director at the *Secretaría de Obras Sociales de la Esposa del Presidente* (SOSEP [Office of Social Works of the First Lady]). The intrahousehold program's research in Guatemala was essentially an evaluation of a project of daycare centers (*Hogares Comunitarios* [HC]) for poor working women, developed within SOSEP. It was a late addition to the intrahousehold program, representing more applied research, although the papers produced have keyed into the intrahousehold modeling work very well.

HC projects started after a 1991 visit by the then First Lady of Guatemala to Venezuela and Colombia, where she saw similar daycare provision and adopted the idea, initially with 20 centers in periurban slums. Over time, the system grew to 1,650 HCs covering 17,500 children in the 0–7 age range, who receive two meals and two snacks each day, preschool education, and health services and monitoring. At the beginning, the teachers' focus was simply on being a “loving” caregiver, but now they must fit certain criteria and are mostly ex-school teachers. Direct operational costs come from the government (food, water, gas) and each caregiver receives funds for these expenses. There are smaller HCs with up to 10 children per caregiver, larger ones with 20–24 children, and a smaller number of community child centers with up to 60 children, this last venture being funded by Trento in Italy.

The location of the HC projects in SOSEP may be seen as risky, since the agenda of SOSEP is open to change every four years with the accession of a new First Lady. Yet the HC seems to have weathered these changes and endured despite them. It was argued by one interviewee (a longstanding observer of gender policy in Guatemala and not a member of SOSEP) that, in the past, SOSEP has been more progressive than mainstream ministries on gender, that the First Lady has considerable power and can make effective demands of ministries, and that it has independence from official government policy. In addition, since the HC projects are such a significant activity under SOSEP (Q30 of the total SOSEP budget of Q50), it seems likely that they are fairly secure. On the other hand, the extensive change of personnel every four years causes considerable policy discontinuity, staff may not be well qualified, and funds coming into SOSEP from donors seeking influence with the President should really, in the opinion of some, be going to government ministries.

The value of support for poor working women through the HCs was seen as innovative in terms of gender policies in Guatemala. One observer commented that the government is reluctant to acknowledge the extent of employment among women because it implies state responsibility for children (which the government is reluctant to accept), and because the unions don't fight for the causes of its female workers and the women's movement is preoccupied with campaigns on rape, violence, and welfare issues rather than employment support. Given these circumstances, the HC is increasingly

valuable and distinctive, particularly in light of the worsening situation for poor working mothers in Guatemala as a result of the coffee crisis, declining rural incomes, and migration.

Research Outputs

Appendix 4 details the publications produced by the intrahousehold program (they are not repeated here). In addition, four datasets were generated, and to date four have been posted on the IFPRI web site:

1. Bangladesh Commercial Vegetable and Fish Polyculture Production (1996–98), available since 2001.
2. Guatemala: Strengthening and Evaluation of the *Hogares Comunitarios*, available since 2001.
3. South Africa: KwaZulu-Natal Income Dynamics Study (KIDS), available since 2000.
4. The dataset for Ethiopia had only recently been received by IFPRI at the time of this review; 2004, Ethiopia rural household survey dataset (ERHS), 1989–97.

In the following sections, the impact of the program's outputs is discussed. It should be noted that the quantity of publications produced by the intrahousehold program is impressive, the proportion in peer-reviewed outlets substantial, and the range of types of outputs highly diverse. Given that the program was also involved in major data collection activity, the publication level is even more notable. The changing program membership and the mix of degrees of member involvement make it impossible to assess the output per person year, but my sense is that is likely high relative to other IFPRI programs.

Research Dissemination and Capacity Building

IFPRI's 1998 EPMR emphasized the importance of training and capacity strengthening, and clearly this is an important means of research impact. Staff in partner countries who have training in key skills, along with conceptual and methodological understandings, have an enhanced ability to take up and promote new policy directions and conduct further policy-oriented research on food security.

Appendix 3 gives an account of the research dissemination and training activities conducted over the life of the intrahousehold program. An enormous number of research presentations, workshops, seminars, and other outreach activities have been carried out, energetically, by the program team. Beijing's Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 appears to have been a high point of dissemination, as the figures on the women and food security briefing notes indicate. The locations of these activities were mostly in the United States, and of the total of 105 presentations (excluding project workshops and the brown-bag series) 23 were in developing countries. This may seem a somewhat low

proportion in developing countries, but it seems to be consistent with an implicit focus in the program on affecting high-level policy debates in the United States in particular. What we do not know is whether local partners gave presentations in their own countries too. This was probably the case for some partners such as in South Africa, but not for most. The extent of this activity should be documented for a more comprehensive impact assessment.

Conclusion

There is a school of thought that suggests that assessment of outputs and activities is a better way to evaluation method than attempting to measure research impact, which is fraught with difficulty. The complexity of evaluating the role of particular research projects in either policy formulation or the eventual impact of such policies is included in the discussion in the sections that follow. The connections are straightforward in some research, such as that commissioned by a user for a particular purpose (with a measurable impact), but much development research, and certainly the character and objectives of the intrahousehold program, is not of that nature. If assessment of outputs and activities were taken as the best and most reliable indicators of impact, the verdict on this particular program would be very positive.

However, the question of determining reference points for a comparative judgment when deciding what levels of output are expected remains. Without knowledge of how many person months of time, at which levels of seniority, and of which IFPRI staff and partners were actually devoted to this volume of activity and output, one has no objective measure of “productivity.” However, IFPRI does have data: time sheets for staff and estimated total program costs could be isolated, and IFPRI might consider utilizing this information in future impact assessments. And are we seeking comparators within IFPRI (that is, against other programs) as well as external comparators, in which case who might these be? Academic departments with teaching responsibilities would not be similar enough. Even an assessment of outputs rather than impacts is not particularly straightforward.

Clearly, the intrahousehold program has been very productive. But how effective has it been, and has it had the impacts that it set out to achieve?

4. IMPACT MEASUREMENT

Methodology

The procedure adopted in this impact assessment has involved study of IFPRI documents, interviews with IFPRI staff, and a range of interviews with research users in the two high-concentration countries visited, Bangladesh and Guatemala (see Appendix 1 for details). Attempts were made to assess impact both externally and internally in IFPRI, because of the importance of mainstreaming the intrahousehold analysis in other IFPRI research, and because it is potentially revealing to wider debates on policy processes and impact assessment methods to consider the obstacles to achieving impact—even in one’s own backyard. It may also hold relevance for debates about a possible successor program to the intrahousehold program.

In this chapter, an attempt is made to present as much numerical data as possible to give some indication of the extent to which the products of the intrahousehold program—the papers and publications, the workshops and seminars, the datasets, and so on—are used; indicators of esteem are also sought. The relationship between quality and influence is complex, and the means of impact measurement is flawed in a number of ways, but this does not invalidate the insights gained by triangulating the numerical evidence on demand and quality, dealt with in this chapter, with the qualitative evidence on perceptions of research users, which are presented in the next chapter.

Given the problems of tracing the connections between research and particular policy changes, we may do better by focusing on the output level rather than trying to link through to impacts. The evaluation of research output and quality is perhaps simpler, but what is the relationship between research quality and research influence? One might imagine this to be a close and positive relationship, yet it is not difficult to think of examples of seriously flawed but influential work, or conversely examples of excellent research that vanishes without trace. The 1985 FAO “statistic” referred to earlier is an example of the former and illustrates how saying what a particular constituency wants to hear can produce unwarranted influence. Sheer information scarcity can do the same, driving researchers to cite whatever is available, and extensive popular dissemination can transform research findings into assumptions and unquestioned myths.

On the other hand, the reasons for good research failing to produce significant impact can be related to poor dissemination; communication issues, such as technical language, which exclude considerable audiences; policy disconnectedness; research questions that are at a thinly populated frontier; and a multitude of characteristics of particular policy environments. These may include policymakers who actually have limited power to innovate, do not read, are politically constrained, have personal values at odds with those assumed in the research, and so on. Research often needs time to produce answers, and this can leave it adrift from the problems identified in the first place. For example, in Egypt the government wanted a way to shrink the subsidy system

at a time when wheat prices were high, and a three-year study showed how to do this in a poor-friendly way, but by then prices had dropped and it was no longer a government priority.

This suggests three things. First, promoting and popularizing research findings to maximize impact could backfire if research quality is in any way constrained by the diversion of resources into advocacy. Second, accountability should be confined to those elements of the research to policy process that researchers can legitimately be held responsible for, and not for conditions that cannot be anticipated or controlled, which might be seen as covering the majority of factors involved in creating policy impact. The final point is that research takes considerable time to answer policy questions—an observation that inspired the methodological move to rapid rural appraisal and later PRA in the 1980s and 1990s in an effort to deliver more timely information to policymakers. It aimed for “optimal ignorance,” a phrase that implies the tradeoff between research quality and policy impact. One implication may be that a research program such as the program, which aims at conceptual and methodological advances, will set a quality standard that is higher, thereby taking longer than required for immediate policy impact. Yet in the long run, this research is no less policy-relevant, since it changes assumptions and expectations about the nature of individual and household responses and the distribution of well-being.

While high-quality research is no guarantee of impact, it has to be a central element in assessments, because it is generally a necessary if not sufficient condition for impact. One of the most extensive attempts to evaluate research quality, which includes a notion of impact, is the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), which governs the allocation of public funds for research across U.K. universities. Every five years, this exercise assesses research quality and impact on the basis of indicators. These are mainly peer-reviewed publications; volume and quality of competitive research funding won; levels of supervision demand by, and completion rates of, doctoral researchers; and research esteem and impact indicators, such as prestigious invitations, prizes, editorial board membership, research council reviewing, and so on. Citations have not yet been integrated due to the complexity of cross-discipline comparisons, but the bibliographic indicators used are expanding. These indicators are, however, ultimately set alongside the perceptions of the peer-review panel of academics and research-user representatives (for each discipline or field of study), who read and evaluate a sample of submitted publications from every department seeking funding. This may be of interest to IFPRI as a methodology. One consequence of the RAE is that research-active university departments now routinely monitor and collate the required indicators to produce the evidence base needed in RAE submissions, and IFPRI might consider adopting a stable set of indicators, and associated routine data collection for this purpose if research impact assessments are to be conducted for all research programs. It is vital, however, that such processes do not set up perverse effects, lead to indicator-driven research, or alienate researchers through overly intrusive monitoring.

Publications

IFPRI's bibliometric study (Pardey and Christian 2002) found that time lags were greater in social science than in other science, that up-take and subsequent fall-off, in terms of citations, were fastest in developed countries, while up-take was slower in developing countries but longer lasting. IFPRI also emerges as having much more impact in developed countries than in developing countries. The limited citation analysis intended to be done for this assessment unfortunately did not happen, so it is not possible to analyze time lags or duration of impact for the intrahousehold program, but some of the evidence presented below suggests that the program has also had more impact in developed countries.

Book reviews were examined as evidence of independent external recognition of research quality. The book that launched the intrahousehold program (Haddad, Hoddinott, and Alderman 1997) has been reviewed in *Food Policy*; *Economica*; *Development and Change*; the *European Review of Agricultural Economics*; *Culture and Agriculture*; and the *Journal of Development Studies*. The four reviews IFPRI's library was able to locate were all favorable, describing the book as important, interesting, informative, highly recommended reading, making a convincing case for the importance of modeling intrahousehold allocations, and bringing together some excellent studies. The range of journals reviewing the book suggests its multidisciplinary appeal, although two reviewers commented that the most original work was by the non-economists and that economists still treat other disciplines as "simply an input to their own." More reviews were expected than these and certainly more in economics journals. The process for logging and monitoring reviews possibly needs attention.

Data from the IFPRI's publications department on requested intrahousehold program publications show two brief pamphlets on food security to be in heaviest demand by a long way (Table 2). Interpreting these figures as a reflection of impact would be problematic if allowances were not made for date, length and type of publication (briefing notes being much more requested) and the question of the size of the "market" for the products. After all, the very high level of research funding going into biomedical research (compared with social sciences) must mean that the absolute numbers of such researchers interested in nutrition and health topics is much larger. What is commendable in these figures is the strong showing made, despite this, of the publication on trees and gender.

The incidence of use of IFPRI research findings in the policy briefings, in-house circulars, and newsletters of development organizations would also give useful information on the policy penetration of IFPRI research, but such data is not be available. During interviews, two examples came up, however, and International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) staff members volunteered that they often use intrahousehold program material in their newsletters and briefings.

Table 2 — Intrahousehold program publications requested, 2002–03

Rank	Title	Quantity
19	Women: The key to food security	2,284
20	Focus 6: Empowering women to achieve food security	2,198
57	Explaining child malnutrition in developing countries	1,169
69	Overcoming malnutrition in developing countries	1,048
106	Land, trees, and women	727
293	Impact of AIDS on population and economic growth	155
320	The importance of women's status for child nutrition	116

Note: The rank indicated is the rank among all IFPRI publications.

Web Visits and Downloads

The numbers of publications requested in hard copy, however, is diminishing in relation to dissemination via the Internet. Figures for the program publications and site visits are reported in Table 3.² Some overlap exists between hardcopy and electronic requests, as well as some differences with the work on property and on poverty in demand, and the intrahousehold policy statement coming into the list. It would be wrong, however, to imagine that the research on intrahousehold modeling has made less policy impact than the research on food security or nutrition. For a start, these themes are interconnected, but also one would expect the more abstract and less directly applied work to be taken up by a smaller pool of researchers, and possibly ones located in different institutions and at different levels of experience. This does not indicate less policy relevance or impact. It might mean that such research will work its effects in ways that are more extended over time, more indirect, and more enduring, ultimately producing more impact. The problems of comparing different kinds of research by the same measure are quite profound. The closer to the ground the research, the easier it is to demonstrate impact. But, of course, what is most easily measurable is not what is most significant.

Datasets

Other data that signify the impact of intrahousehold program research are the number of requests for the program datasets. There has been an excellent response to these, even though they have been available for relatively little time (Table 4). The value of these outputs and their impact in the longer term is very high. They may be used for teaching purposes for generations of postgraduate students, from both developed and developing countries, and feed into development policy through the career paths of these students. Indeed, the way in which *Programa de Educación, Salud y Alimentación* (Progresá [National Program for Education, Health, and Nutrition]) was established in Mexico was through just such exposure to IFPRI research of a key Mexican policymaker,

² Statistics are derived from IFPRI WebTrends, cumulative from January 1, 2002, to October 28, 2003. Rankings measure visitor sessions, compared with all pages per format types (PDF or HTML) on IFPRI's web site.

while a student at a U.S. university. The datasets will also be used for secondary analyses for years to come and produce further understanding of intrahousehold processes and their policy relevance.

Table 3 — Web statistics showing intrahousehold program site visits and downloads

Total visitor sessions for document-level web pages (HTML and PDF)	98,000
Estimated percentage of total visits to program-related locations	7 percent ^a
Rank of program homepage in HTML visitor sessions	48
Total PDF downloads of full documents	77,257
Total PDF downloads of abstracts or briefs	6,202
<p>The intrahousehold program has 5 files among the top 120 PDF downloads on IFPRI’s web site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue Brief 3 Women—Key to Food Security (rank 52) • Abstract for Research Report 131: Importance of women's status for child nutrition (rank 61) • FCND Discussion Paper 29: Gender, Property Rights, and Natural Resources (rank 79) • FCND Discussion Paper No. 9: Gender and Poverty—New Evidence (rank 101) • Research Report No. 111 (full report): Explaining Child Malnutrition (rank 118) <p>The intrahousehold program publications highest ranked HTML pages are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract of Research Report No. 111: Explaining Child Malnutrition (rank 113) 2. 2020 Brief 64: Overcoming Child Malnutrition in Developing Countries (rank 205) 3. 2020 Focus 6: Empowering Women to Achieve Food Security (rank 274) Food Policy Statement No. 24: Intrahousehold Resource Allocation. (rank 300) 	

^a Total includes IFPRI’s home page, careers pages, and many other locations that are not competing research locations, therefore this figure is a good showing.

Table 4 — Requests for intrahousehold program datasets

Dataset name	Date posted	No. of requests
Bangladesh: Commercial Vegetable and Fish Polyculture	2001	218
Guatemala: Hogares Comunitarios Evaluation	2001	106
South Africa: KwaZulu Natal Income Dynamics Study	2000	268
As a point of comparison, only three other datasets have been in greater demand:		
Egypt: Integrated Household Survey	1997	325
Pakistan: Panel Survey 1986–91	1997	278
Ghana: Urban Food and Nutrition Security	1997	269

The proportion of requests for these datasets coming from developed and developing countries is as follows:

Data set	Developed countries (percent)	Developing countries (percent)
Bangladesh	22	88
Guatemala	40	60
South Africa	37	63

In future impact assessment work, it may be worthwhile to follow up with a sample of dataset users to track the type of usage, determine user views on data quality and usability, and to log publications that emerge from these secondary analyses, surely all part of the overall impact.

E-mail Network

Finally, the gender e-mail network run by the intrahousehold program was a very important means of bringing IFPRI research to the attention of new audiences. Launched initially to service the CG system, it quickly became clear that network served an important need, and certainly was the best managed and most research-oriented network of its kind. The e-conference on gender and property produced an excellent set of papers in a special edition of *World Development*, which is the development journal with the largest circulation list and top RAE ranking for multidisciplinary development research.

Capacity Building

Measurement of impact through capacity-building objectives can be approached by looking for evidence on numbers of trainees and course participants, and on the promotions and career patterns of program researchers (internal to IFPRI as well as partners). There has been very little IFPRI-based training in Washington, D.C., related to the intrahousehold program. But in career patterns of partner researchers, there are a number of examples of successful capacity building. In Guatemala, one of the researchers employed for the HC evaluation went on to take up a post within SOSEP, where she has continued to be involved with monitoring and evaluation, This has both strengthened SOSEP and furthered the career of the researcher. In South Africa, the career of a key research partner has been accelerated on the basis of IFPRI work under the program, and he is now very involved in policy advice.

In Bangladesh, a successful new research services business (DATA, mentioned earlier) was established in 1995 by two local researchers originally involved as research assistants with IFPRI surveys. Although attribution of this start-up to the intrahousehold program is not possible—earlier IFPRI work was the foundation—the program’s research certainly contributed to DATA’s successful establishment as an independent organization. DATA is now conducting surveys for a number of international organizations (the Population Council, World Bank, USAID, World Food Programme

[WFP], and Tufts University), has 18 permanent employees and about 35 casual employees, and trains enumerators for other organizations (Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee [BRAC] and World Vision). Methodological capacity building has also been evident in Ethiopia, where local researchers are now conducting their own surveys.

There have also been a number of Ph.D. researchers involved with the program's research, at least five in Bangladesh. Again, it would be useful to monitor the use of datasets for Ph.D. research as a capacity building impact. The gender research fellow element was also a means of offering both established scholars and partner researchers the opportunity to develop research ideas and to write; and in this way was a contribution to both researcher careers and to the program's output.

Capacity strengthening seems to be a high priority within the CGIAR and Ryan and Garrett (2003) emphasize its importance for enhancing the conduciveness of the policy environment to research findings. Taking the position of devil's advocate, however, one wonders whether this is necessarily as effective as often thought. Certainly, IFPRI should not just assume it to be a good thing and should do follow up studies on samples of trainees and partners to evaluate the impact of the IFPRI inputs to their careers and skills. In particular, the attempt to batten capacity-building objectives onto research projects (rather than simple training programs) has been questioned. In the recent consultation undertaken with universities across the United Kingdom as part of the restructuring of development research funding at the Department for International Development (DFID), it was accepted that linking capacity building to research is not very effective for a number of reasons. Most research projects are too short term, the match between skills needed and those available is always uncertain, the tradeoffs with research objectives are a problem, and ultimately the expectations about what research can achieve are often frustrated. It has been accepted that a separate budget-line for research capacity building will be established for long-term links with developing-country institutions geared exclusively to capacity building.

Finally, it should be noted that the content of IFPRI's training programs is largely devoid of gender material or intrahousehold analysis. There is a small gender component (one-fifteenth) in the governance and food security training materials, but this is exceptional. IFPRI's training office apparently operates in response to partners in developing countries who make requests, and they may not be interested in gender training. But, of course, one of the main arguments for mainstreaming gender is precisely to overcome this obstacle, by the insertion of relevant material into subject specific training—that is, by avoiding a gender-focused training or gender labels. Mainstreaming has often turned into a de facto absence of gender, however. There also appears to be little concern about the low proportion of women in general among those who come to IFPRI for training (only 309 in a total of 13,305 between 1994–2003 [18 percent]).

Networking and Institutional Impacts

External impact is also generated through individual and institutional relationships, and formal and informal networks, which are complex to capture but should, in more comprehensive impact assessments, be traced. The detail of how researchers at different institutions read each others' work (for example, how IFPRI staff connected with the gender initiatives at the World Bank in the 1990s onwards), attended each others' meetings, and influenced each others' work would show the passage of the intrahousehold program ideas igniting research activity elsewhere. Bibliographies are not an adequate testimony to these processes.

One of the limitations of this assessment—and arguably of the intrahousehold program—is the lack of focus on NGOs, which do not seem to have been particularly targeted as research users. Were a more comprehensive impact assessment possible, it would have included more interviews with NGO staff in Bangladesh, Guatemala, and Washington, D.C., to ascertain how the intrahousehold program influenced project and program planning, monitoring, evaluation, implementation, and activities.

Impact within IFPRI

How far has the intrahousehold program had internal impact within IFPRI, and has the research produced a mainstreaming of gender across the institution? The level of cross-citation, the degree of joint research funding, the extent to which non-program research staff have taken up gender and intrahousehold analysis, and what this consists of (simple sex disaggregation of data, the adoption of gender analytical concepts, or the introduction of intrahousehold models developed by the program) are important to assess. Assembling such material was beyond the scope of this assessment, because it would have involved delving into many other IFPRI programs, but IFPRI should consider including some indicators of internal impact in the impact monitoring system it develops. After all, it is not only gender analysis that should be mainstreamed; if IFPRI is a learning institution, it should display a high degree of internal integration of research findings across divisions and programs.

The impression gained from examining program publications and conducting interviews was that cross-citation is frequent, that the template for a module of survey data collection on gender had penetrated other research programs, and that joint research funding was fairly common. However, although other FCND programs have been most responsive to the intrahousehold program, it is not clear that other divisions have been quite so receptive. EPTD had been the best, the former Trade and Macroeconomics Division (TMD) did some gender research, but there has been little uptake in the Markets, Trade, and Institutions Division (MTID, formerly the Markets and Structural Studies Division). The boundaries around divisions seem to be fairly impermeable in several ways, with contained management and financial responsibilities, which are challenging for cross-cutting programs that aim to affect thinking across such divides. The variable uptake of gender and intrahousehold analysis is not easily accounted for by

any “natural” properties of research programs. What is clear, for IFPRI as for other similar institutions, is that particular individuals play a key role as entry points.

Has the significance of the intrahousehold program been recognized within IFPRI, and where does it stand in the implicit hierarchies that distinguish all organizational cultures? A review of IFPRI’s Annual Reports since 1994 revealed that gender and intrahousehold research received only a routine level of reporting in all programs, and has not been the subject of any lead articles. Furthermore, there has never been a media blitz on a gender topic of the sort that IFPRI has launched in some areas. The Beijing paper, right at the start of the program, and a modest recent item on cocoa for Valentine’s Day featuring the Ghana research, seem to be the only special publicity efforts to promote the program’s research. It does not appear that the intrahousehold program is regarded internally as the jewel in the IFPRI crown. This is strange, since the institute-wide logframe in the 2003–05 medium-term plan gives special consideration to food security “particularly for women and children” in many places; increased participation of the poor “especially women” in high-value agricultural markets is sought; and guidelines to strengthen property rights and collective action “particularly for women” are mentioned (IFPRI 2002b, 13–20). At a formal level, IFPRI gives high visibility to the particular importance of women, but the evidence for this having entered the priorities of researchers across the institute is rather weak.

The medium-term plan (IFPRI 2002b) describes modifications to research programs from 2003; hence it is interesting to see how many groups mention gender or intrahousehold analysis. Presumably the impact of the intrahousehold program would leave its mark here. But it appears that no new projects mention gender (that is, the programs on Spatial Patterns, Institutions for Market Development, Diet Quality, Nutrition Policy Process, Pathways from Poverty, or Strategic Alliances). The incorporation of gender issues may be simply assumed by some; for example, it would be reasonable to expect such an assumption from the Pathways from Poverty program, which will include members from the intrahousehold program. But this would perhaps be an optimistic expectation for other new programs. Furthermore, none of the groups that are continuing unchanged, or with minor modifications, mentions gender either.

Finally, how far has the intrahousehold program contributed to capacity building within IFPRI, that is, to expanding competencies within the institution, and to career progression for individuals involved with the program itself? Clearly, without the intrahousehold program some appointments would not have been made, and therefore the capacity for gender analysis of food policy at IFPRI has been a great contribution. The existence of joint research across programs has enabled cross-cutting benefits from the intrahousehold program’s gender expertise. The question of whether the careers of individual researchers have been successfully progressed through the intrahousehold program (though not tackled in this paper) is at one level easily answered by reference to data on promotions relative to progression in other research programs at IFPRI, and IFPRI might consider this as part of the development of its assessment methodology.

A deeper level of impact analysis than was possible for this study should involve the collection of material to indicate how individual researcher career trajectories before, during, and after their tenure at IFPRI show changed direction, new networks, and different emphases in their research as a consequence of exposure to particular research, such as the intrahousehold program. Researchers -- who go on to other institutions where they introduce intrahousehold program perspectives and methods -- are an important element of research impact. This would require a longer time frame for impact assessment studies and resources for tracking careers of staff.

In the case of gender research, it is often said, anecdotally, that being “labeled” a gender researcher is actually disadvantageous in career terms because gender analysis is an interdisciplinary field and, therefore, goes against the powerful disciplinary grain of the gatekeepers of research quality (journals and academic departments), and because there remains a degree of tension around the perception of feminist politics in gender research. As a result, researchers can be anxious about staying with gender research “too long” and ending up in a career cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the experience of “burnout” as a result of the tensions described above is commonly mentioned. These are particular features of gender research that have an impact on individual careers (and thus on institutional capacity). It would be interesting to know how these factors affect male and female researchers differently: the interdisciplinarity disadvantage may affect both equally, but the suspicion of being a feminist (by inference to some, a politically driven, hence biased and less than adequate social scientist) is less likely to afflict men. Certainly, it is hard to imagine a similar expression of burnout outside the intrahousehold program. The intrahousehold program has steered a careful course in this regard. The clear focus on economics has not threatened to deskill its economists and this is the up side of the criticism made elsewhere in this assessment of the research being too “economistic.” The selection of journals and fora for the research has avoided feminist titles, and the good proportion of male researchers in the program has helped to break down the gender division of academic research, which, by feminizing gender analysis, has arguably constrained its impact.

5. IMPACT PERCEPTIONS

This section is based on the interviews with research users and partners in Bangladesh, Guatemala, the United Kingdom, and Washington, D.C., and, which were designed to discover how the intrahousehold program's research was regarded, which findings had had most impact, what kinds of responses followed the research, and what broader lessons could be learned about the ways research users actually use research in policy and practice.

The first question, of course, is “who are the users?” And like many simple questions, this turns out to be rather complex. The distribution list for the program's outputs was used to form a sense of who the researchers think their public is, but, of course, such lists include those who have elected to be on it as well as those who have been nominated by IFPRI. A fevered impact assessor's fantasy would be for some self-consciousness in list management that, for example, might differentiate those who volunteer to be included and those identified by researchers for inclusion. It was clear from interviews conducted with program researchers, however, that they saw their main contribution as producing research of an “international public good” type. Thus, the biggest impact may be felt by those who did not pay for the research, and accountability to the funders needs to be embedded in this wider development mission of reduced poverty and inequality, which includes donor's own research on similar issues.

The terms “peer researchers” and “policymakers” appear frequently in IFPRI documents, but the intrahousehold program does not have an explicit and differentiated view on exactly who its publics are, where they are located, what powers they have or constraints they face, or how they behave in relation to research inputs to their work. Paarlberg (1999) sets out an approach that would help with this need, and one might argue that at the inception of any research program a forward-looking impact analysis should be undertaken to identify key participants at various levels, in order to be clear about exactly who the users for a particular research program in countries and policy environments are.³ This might allow particular research programs to explicitly target their research toward users of international public goods research, while others aim for in-country policy change. How far one can go down a path attempting greater targeting of developing-country policymakers is unclear in a situation where changing policies, personnel, constraints, and needs mean that these are rapidly moving targets, mostly for reasons beyond the control of a research program. But whatever the strategy, it seems to require a more differentiated understanding of research publics, and a conscious and informed choice of targets based on them, rather than a default position of ignorance and assumption.

³ IFPRI has begun ex-ante impact assessment in an attempt to rectify this. Further, a defined communications strategy is expected at the outset (Ryan and Garrett 2003).

One of the problems of impact assessment is that it requires a strong sense of the state of knowledge in 1994 as a basis for judging changes. The state of knowledge about gender and intrahousehold analysis in economic and food policy circles in 1994 was very limited, but almost *because* of the success of the establishment of the new paradigm, those interviewed can take for granted the current state of knowledge and underestimate the change that has occurred.

One of the areas of highest impact has been the intrahousehold program's work with Progresa, the evaluation of the Mexican poverty reduction program, which operates through resource transfers to women within poor households, on the assumption that they will manage these resources more effectively toward family welfare. Progresa is interesting because, as already noted, it was created by an official who had been exposed to pre-intrahousehold program research on gender and food security at IFPRI and shows long-term impacts that often go unrecognized. It also was a study that was not published and promoted early on, but which nevertheless sold itself and has become very widely known. It was probably the work most often spontaneously mentioned in impact assessment interviews undertaken for this assessment, and it has been taken up and popularized by other agency briefs. For example, IFPRI work used for an article in the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) newsletter *Social Development* (November 2001), prepared from the evaluation of Progresa. As one external interviewee remarked, "the fact that Progresa just assumed that resource transfers should go to women is an achievement for [the Program]."

There is a degree of ambivalence about impact among researchers. This is partly a result of the recognition that impact is maximized and easier to achieve when research partners are involved in policy implementation, as was the case with the Progresa and HC evaluations, or the IFPRI work in Pakistan, which led to the withdrawal of the food distribution scheme because of evidence of leakage. But while the Pakistan research appears to have had high impact, the government had actually committed itself to the policy change already. In this case and other examples of evaluation research of programs already thought to be successful, the impact of the research may appear high on the basis of actions believed to follow as a direct consequence but this measurability should not serve to reduce commitment to other research types that may be more ambitious and less measurable.

The closer the research is to project implementation the easier it is to demonstrate research impact. For example, the HC research can easily be shown to have delivered considerable impact, since it made specific recommendations to SOSEP,⁴ which have almost all been implemented. But many researchers have a preference for research that addresses more fundamental questions in more abstract ways, and which is more difficult to show impact for because the users are an amorphous group, effects are indirect and extended over time, and attribution, as always, is a great problem. This preference is

⁴ Recommendations involved bringing in other ministries (Health and Education) to provide health care and preschool education at the Hogares, improvements to the payment system to the mothers, and their training, and more monitoring and anthropometry and the employment of one of the evaluation researchers to carry out recommendations.

fairly systematic because basic research also enjoys higher academic status than applied research, and although it may be muted in an institution like IFPRI, given that researchers have presumably chosen to work in a policy-oriented environment rather than a university department, it is nevertheless present.

This ambivalence is also expressed in the concern that too much impact is inappropriate because research users need to “own” the research findings and translate them into locally adapted policies themselves. The culture of outreach is regarded as important, in this view, but policy design is thought to be up to policymakers, who need to take ownership and forget that the idea came from IFPRI. It would also be very risky to be solely responsible for a policy that was too readily adopted on the basis of advocacy and pressure, since a hard-sell of a policy that turns out to have been “wrong,” however well-intentioned, creates a certain culpability. By this view, you can lead the horse to water but you should not be too forceful in making it drink. There is real legitimacy in the view that there is an optimal level of research impact, and more is not always better.

One of the most important contributions of the intrahousehold program has been that it is now widely accepted that there are alternative models of households to the unitary household. The evidence for this is seen in the contents of journal papers and research proposals reviewed and in the volume of work on modeling seen in journals. There has been a shift in norms, a mind-changing process that the intrahousehold program has been a significant part of, but for which attribution is impossible. There was, at the inception of the program, a trenchant critique of Becker’s unitary household model and the “New Household Economics” based on it from feminist economists and from anthropologists, but there were few empirical studies to test these alternative ideas in ways that would be convincing to mainstream economics, which dominates development policy. The intrahousehold program was not simply refining household models, it was breaking new ground by investigating intrahousehold relations rather than assuming unitary household interests and behavior, and it was enormously ambitious in aiming at both empirical testing and new theory building.

Other extremely important impacts are the, frequently mentioned, methodological best practice, the integrated quantitative–qualitative research methods developed (for example, a chapter on incorporating intrahousehold analysis in the World Bank’s Living Standard Measurement Study [LSMS] drew heavily from IFPRI’s data collection methodology paper), and the valuable datasets.

If the intrahousehold program had not existed, would it have mattered? A group at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is doing related research, but the scale and scope of the intrahousehold program’s four country studies would be hard to match in a university setting, and the impetus from the critical mass achieved in the program would certainly have been missed. How much it might have slowed down the paradigm shift in relation to household models is impossible to assess.

The users of IFPRI research in universities and in major donor agencies of the North gave uniformly positive assessments of the quality and usefulness of

intra-household program research. The legitimacy of the research is high, and it has been very influential, including the intra-household modeling research that, despite its less direct policy links, was rated as an important contribution to a trend toward fewer basic assumptions about the character of households. Intra-household program research was used in the World Bank's *Engendering Development* book of 2001. In general, World Bank respondents felt that the intra-household program work was important in lowering the degree of skepticism about gender issues at the bank. Another major research organization remarked that the program's "output has shaped a lot of what we know." Methodologically, the program was said to represent "the gold standard," although non-economists spoken to thought the quantitative–qualitative integration was less impressive than economists seemed to think.

Views of IFPRI research in Bangladesh by U.K.–based academics are very positive, as evidenced by one of the best known gender academics: "I think Agnes' work is very good and very thoughtful, and I often make use of the IFPRI gender papers because they are very good examples of this tradition of work." Furthermore, policy impact is judged to be high: "making gender acceptable to mainstream economists in language they understand and cite must be judged as policy impact." Added to this is the widespread dissemination of policy lessons through the more applied work, such as the Food for Education (FFE), HC, and Progresia studies.

Suggestions for further impact generally focused on improved dissemination and further gender and intra-household research on a range of topics: Darwinian economics and their implications for household models, trade liberalization and gender equity, the policy implications of the intra-household program for social protection, and the integration of intra-household analysis with poverty reduction strategies.

Publications were seen as sometimes rather narrowly formulated, and "since they are written for an imagined reader who is a skeptical male economist, it can disappoint the reader who is none of these things." For some, the research has not been engaged enough with feminist economics, or indeed any kind of heterodox economics or political economy, and IFPRI was said, as an institution, to be "rather closed and self-promoting." While the focus of the intra-household program therefore led to some disappointments, some of this is the downside of a rather clear and single-minded strategy.

The gender and nutrition work under the intra-household program was reported to have been very influential in the CGIAR, although this was regarded as a particularly uphill task that may have been inadvertently worsened by the program in that "people in the CG say that there is no need to do gender because IFPRI is doing it." The perceptions of the CGIAR are perhaps revealed in the 1998 EPMP (IFPRI 1998). In the section that highlights 11 issues on which IFPRI could make important contributions to policy research, gender is not mentioned.

It was felt that the impact of the intra-household program had been much more limited in developing countries. An example given was that, in Zambia, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process was conducted largely by good local staff, but

they had no apparent recognition of intrahousehold issues. The cause of this was suggested to be the remoteness of the economics language and the very reduced state of the library at the University of Zambia combined with a high level of “host resistance” to accepting gender equity goals. Interviewees said that one of the difficulties of delivering policy change from research on gender is that this resistance means that, for gender research, the quality criteria and burden of evidence continues to be set higher than in other areas. Male gender researchers (not at IFPRI) were particularly animated about the way in which any topic dealing with gender seemingly has to produce more evidence and stronger arguments to win acceptance than research on other topics. Another disadvantage facing gender research is that it does not readily relate to conventional divisions between sectors; by being “cross-cutting” it can have no home, no authority, and no powerful policy champions. It goes against multiple grains of male resistance, of disciplines, and of sectors.

Impact Perceptions: Guatemala

An important feature of the intrahousehold program’s work on the HC evaluation is that SOSEP was very keen to have IFPRI do the evaluation because of its reputation for high-quality independent work. SOSEP was involved closely and, after the research was completed, and in line with one of the recommendations, it employed one of the IFPRI researchers to see through the adoption of the proposed improvements. Assessing the impact of this research is completely at the other end of the spectrum to assessing the impact of, say, the intrahousehold modeling papers, which have no clients eagerly awaiting a report that would serve a number of purposes in their immediate and obvious interests.

The evaluation of the HC was favorable, and it made some suggestions for improvements to the program. As a result of the evaluation, there has been an increase of involvement of Ministries of Health and Education in improving the quality of care through training of caregivers; provision of education to the children; and vaccinations, worming, and hygiene training. The WFP has continued its support (it provides food to 2,700 of the HC caregivers and 7,500 children) and the level of government commitment has increased. The WFP has now started monitoring the nutritional status of the children every three months, with two rounds completed, in order to further establish the benefits. The IFPRI report has also been used to mobilize funds from the IDB, Spain, Taiwan, and others. Indeed, the current HC director says that “resources are pouring in.” She shows the IFPRI evaluation to potential donors, and describes it as “like gold” when it was proudly produced for display.

SOSEP has also found an increased level of interest from other countries wanting to learn from the experience and adopt similar programs in Chile, Colombia, Israel, Mexico, and Panama. According to SOSEP, however, this has happened not through IFPRI publications but through face-to-face meetings and the policy grapevine. But this would not necessarily be obvious from such enquiries, and it is possible that IFPRI publications on HC stimulated some of this interest. SOSEP followed up the study with

an application for funding from IDB to extend the evaluation into rural areas, which was turned down, but \$150,000 was secured to support ongoing monitoring.

It would hardly be possible to conclude anything other than that the intrahousehold program's evaluation of HC delivered a very high level of impact. A program found to be good has attracted further funds, the evaluation has helped lever greater commitment of resources, and almost all recommendations have been adopted. It would be mistaken, however, to expect this kind of impact for different circumstances though. Impact assessment must be appropriately customized around the particularities of the research and the policy environment. In this case, the evaluation report performed a particular role for the organization, and it was critical that it was authored by IFPRI, since it was its reputation that was vital to producing the effects it did. A local consultancy firm would not have done.

The dissemination of the evaluation report has been in English and Spanish, and every interviewee was familiar with the HC projects and IFPRI's evaluation of them. However, the three research papers produced that analyze the data to answer broader questions about childcare decision making and other issues are only available in English, and these were unknown to everyone interviewed in Guatemala, without exception. Does this matter? Possibly not, since there is clearly a very different public for these analyses; and were it possible to trace the impact of these "international public goods" more easily, there is little doubt that they have influenced debates and thinking about employment, childcare, and the reduction of poverty and inequality. It is a real strength of the intrahousehold program research that even a project as evidently practical and applied as this one was also able to use the data for model testing and more abstract work, and thereby to broaden the impact and reach new publics with it. It shows the fallacy of distinguishing too neatly between different kinds of research.

In discussions of how policymakers use information and research results in their work, virtually no policymakers contacted read research papers or visited libraries, the web is used a little by some, but generally policy was said to be formed through discussion networks and the use of official statistics. Only one interviewee had a book that she had found very useful (a WFP, 2001, manual *Translation of Gender Perspective into Food Projects*). Another interviewee used the Panamerican Health Organization (PHO) web site intensively, where research summaries are posted with links to other institutional sites for full versions of papers. It may be worthwhile for IFPRI to explore linking its web site in this way to key sites, such as the FAO, PHO, and others.

The director of the Institute of Nutrition of Central America and the Panama (INCAP) considers the intrahousehold program to have been very effective at putting gender and nutrition issues into food security work in Guatemala and the region, but felt that uptake has been limited by dissemination, which needs to be strengthened and diversified into more and different styles. Several respondents felt that politicians were an important and neglected audience for research dissemination. Food and nutrition are moving up the political agenda, and politicians in Guatemala have lately been debating a new law on food security. Workshops for electoral candidates and the newly responsible

municipalities, which are to manage the hypothecated 2 percent food security tax, are important targets and would influence an important new set of actors.

A common view on how to improve research impact was that inter-institutional partnerships would overcome the problems of project-based links, which leave no staff behind to follow through and promote the research. This would, therefore, allow better conversion of findings into policy through advocacy of local partners and may indeed deliver more impact. But, is it really IFPRI's role and comparative advantage? And should any policy recommendations require such a hard sell? Going down this route might imply that IFPRI choose a stable set of core countries for such partnership arrangements, rather than establish a new set for each research program. The 1998 EPMR (CGIAR 1998) suggested something similar—that scaling down to fewer core countries would improve relevance and connection to policy. This implies less flexibility but more impact might result. These possibilities are taken up further in the conclusion.

Impact Perceptions: Bangladesh

One of the particular challenges to impact assessment of the intrahousehold program's work in Bangladesh was the difficulty of attribution. Unlike in Guatemala, the program's work was a component of another study on micronutrients, and the smaller study was very much identified in respondent's minds with the longstanding stream of research on food policy undertaken by IFPRI in the country.

According to interviewees, there have been three phases of IFPRI work in Bangladesh. The first was during 1990–94, when the government was looking for help on policy reform. Many possibilities opened up, the food trade and agriculture were being liberalized, and IFPRI participated in researching the food rationing system and targeting research, which was very beneficial and had high visibility and impact. The historical moment was right, and IFPRI moved fast. Phase 2 transpired in the mid-1990s when there was no longer an IFPRI office. The intrahousehold program research occurred in this period. It was excellent for the knowledge base but was not “owned” in the same way by government. This was partly because the micronutrient research was basic research not really aimed at directly influencing policy, partly because the policy environment was less open by that stage and partly because gender aspects that the government was not particularly interested in were being introduced. In the current third phase, a new food policy strategy is developing with IFPRI input, and the intrahousehold program's work is likely to be influential in this.

It was suggested that part of the policy environment consists of gender apathy and resistance, and a view that gender is “business for NGOs.” How responsive have NGOs been? The intrahousehold program has shown that gender can be approached in a rigorous and technical manner, but that it has not been of great interest to the local NGO community.

The policy environment in Bangladesh is one of multiple donors, high levels of corruption (Bangladesh tops the Transparency International corruption league), many

competing and uncoordinated NGOs, and a weak and overloaded state. This is a challenging environment in which to deliver impact. Furthermore, although IFPRI had an office in Dhaka for some time, and still has a sort of de facto office in Dhaka, at DATA, the staff is grounded in the earlier research foci and priorities and not in gender or intrahousehold perspectives. DATA staff members maintain contact with key people in the food security circuits and distribute IFPRI papers to those they wish to sustain relationships with. But the IFPRI intrahousehold work was not really connected to the large and lively gender networks and discourses in Bangladesh established over the past two decades. This was clear in conversations with DATA staff, who were unable to recommend prospective interviewees from the gender policy world, yet knew exactly who was who in nutrition and agriculture.

The design and focus of the intrahousehold program's research was on *commercial* vegetable production and fish polyculture (that is, grown for the market on homestead plots), and it found that the benefits of commercial fish and commercial vegetable production to women's nutrition are limited. One large NGO involved with homestead vegetable gardening projects for women found that IFPRI's research was off-putting to potential donors who did not necessarily realize that IFPRI work was on commercial rather than subsistence-oriented vegetable gardens.

Nutrition policy in Bangladesh is coordinated by a council working across several ministries, which tends to make implementation problematic, and regime changes further disrupt policy continuity. Face-to-face dissemination is vital to policymaking, as one very senior official remarked, "People don't go through books." An example given was the policy to iodize salt. A cross-sectoral group advised the adoption of iodization of all salt to reduce iodine deficiency and goiter, but the president was persuaded against proceeding, with the simple argument that iodine deficiency and goiter were minor problems: after all "*you* have no goiter." When informed of president's changed position by an alarmed insider, the respondent who relayed this story was able to present statistics to the president within hours (47 percent of Bangladeshis are iodine deficient) and turn the argument back in favor of iodizing salt. Having the statistics was important, but such data can be easily overlooked without timely and well-placed policy advocates.

As noted above, interviewees confessed to reading very little, and Babu and Mthindi (1995) note that decision makers often do not use published information in making policy decisions. This is quite significant (and discussed further below). If an identifying feature of a policymaker is one that seeks information as an input to decision making and strategizing, there seem to be very few of them at country level. The explanation may lie in the controlling presence of donor policy or political imperatives obviating the need. The one respondent who did use research papers was in the European Union (EU) office. He reported using IFPRI policy briefs and estimated spending about 10 percent of his time tracking research results. He also used the World Bank distributor several times a year in Dhaka to buy books, and the possibility of IFPRI seeking joint distribution or displays seems worth considering.

It was surprising to find that Helen Keller International (HKI), an NGO supporting vegetable gardens since 1993 (originally with a vitamin A focus, and now covering 875,000 households) made no use of the IFPRI work on micronutrients, and the staff members were not aware of such work. This is due in large part to recent changes in personnel; however, it does underscore the point that local policy networks and discourses are very fluid, and sustaining influence is not possible from Washington, D.C. It was also interesting, however, that HKI was not chosen as a partner for the program's micronutrients study; GKT—a small NGO dealing with commercial gardens—was selected as a partner instead. HKI produces effective, regular policy briefings and research notes, it conducts routine nutrition monitoring on a large scale, and seemed well connected to nutrition policy networks from the frequency with which it was mentioned in interviews. HKI's garden projects were evaluated in 2002 with a survey of 2,160 households, and were shown to produce positive and enduring effects on vegetable consumption (HKI 2003). As a partner, HKI would likely have been able to deliver much more follow-through of research to impact. There may have been good reasons for choosing GKT rather than HKI, but they are not obvious.

Lack of impact from the intrahousehold program's research is indicated by an interview with one of the authors of Bangladesh's Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, who reported that he did not use any material from the intrahousehold program because he was not aware of it, although he would have wanted to, given gender was included in all sections of the report. There was also a special annex on gender, "Women's Advancement and removing gender gaps," (Government of Bangladesh 2003, Interim PRSP Annex 8, 107–113) **which** emphasizes negative sex ratios, elimination of violence, reduction of maternal mortality, promotion of women's employment and economic opportunities, legal equality and quotas, and sex-disaggregation of statistics. One might think the absence of food and nutrition from this list to reflect badly on the intrahousehold program's impact, but all these issues, other than the last two, are absolutely dependent on a better understanding of intrahousehold relations—precisely the program's focus. What is perhaps more striking than the absence of the intrahousehold program (as a relatively recent research program) in the interim PRSP, is the absence of reference to any IFPRI work in the 2001 *Human Development Report* for Bangladesh. (UNDP 2001).

It was also striking to find that the three intrahousehold program papers using Bangladesh data (which were specifically enquired about at all interviews) were dated 2000, and one (Hallman) included what would be seen by many as quite controversial analysis of marriage payments and their effects on intrahousehold influence, yet there seems to have been no debate or critique or response of any kind to this paper. None of these papers was recognized by local interviewees, despite being available for three years on IFPRI's web site.

A degree of criticism was expressed in relation to IFPRI, and the final outcomes of the intrahousehold program, in relation to impact. The examples given often seemed to relate to non-program activities, as these were elided in respondents' minds. In interviews, some respondents expressed critical views that, on probing for examples,

turned out to be more general perceptions rather than simply relating to the intrahousehold program. Since partners often worked with more than one IFPRI research program, the boundaries were rather fuzzy. It was felt that policy engagement at IFPRI was sometimes lacking, such as in the disagreement over the extent of leakage in the FFE program (IFPRI data suggested a lower level than World Bank data and was considered more reliable because it was based on a more appropriate sample frame). IFPRI was thought not to have engaged promptly with this debate, and the government subsequently switched from FFE to Cash for Education (CFE) programs on the basis of the World Bank report. The same order of leakages continues to be reported anecdotally, however, and now further research is to be done to settle the issue. In IFPRI's defense, one might ask why Bangladeshi institutions should not "own" the findings and decide for themselves.

IFPRI was also said to be too slow to produce outputs based on policy needs, and reports were considered to be too technical. The schedule shows that the last round of the Bangladesh data was collected in September 1997, the final project workshop was held in April 2000, and three research papers were produced in 2000. Large datasets do take large amounts of time to process and analyze, but the expectations of local research users are possibly formed by the much more rapid turnaround on less formal and smaller studies, which are more usual.

The character of the relationships with partners appears to have been tense, with criticisms on both sides. Lack of commitment and time input and analytical weaknesses were mentioned by IFPRI researchers, and for their part some local researchers felt that IFPRI had preconceived ideas and did not really listen to them, that excessive shares of the budgets were devoted to "influencing bureaucrats with trips," and that a degree of "capacity mining" took place. Examples given of the last criticism were that the time-use questionnaire was designed locally and then copied by others beyond the project and Bangladesh, and that the gender module was also locally devised and then exported as an IFPRI product. It was felt that local partners were marginalized in the publication stages too. However, the time-allocation questionnaire and the gender modules reflected both the previous field use of such instruments and field experience of IFPRI researchers, and were also locally customized and adapted both in Bangladesh and in subsequent areas where they were used. Marginalization of local collaborators in publications was also a complaint prior to the intrahousehold program, but it would seem that collaborators' expectations of partnership relations were thwarted to a degree.

One explanation given for the lack of impact on the gender side of the research was that Howarth Bouis pursued and promoted the micronutrient side of the research in policy circles, where he was already established, but there was no one to do the same thing for the gender side of the work. The staffing changes in the program (Brown to the World Bank, and one or two other shifts and replacements) came at a time that was difficult and left the Bangladesh work rather exposed. There has been no response to the qualitative paper published on the impact of vegetable gardening on gender relations.

Another particular challenge with gender policy impact is that many of the gender specialists interviewed had become more like “equal opportunities officers” as a result of gender mainstreaming. What this seems to have meant in practice is that a member of staff, outside of sectoral boundaries, is given responsibility to ensure that gender is integrated across the board. In the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the gender person had to cover infrastructure, power, water, urban governance, education, health, agricultural extension, marketing, livelihoods, livestock, social protection, roads and railways, and to mainstream gender into all this with very few staff and inevitably without technical understanding in many of these areas. With 34 ongoing projects, she has no time to read. This is one very effective way to neutralize gender.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS

Objectives and Achievements

To recap, the objectives of the intrahousehold program were to document intrahousehold resource allocation patterns, to develop economic models and data collection methods necessary to investigate determinants of intrahousehold resource allocations, to establish of the relevance of these patterns and models for food policy, to evaluate the benefits relative to additional costs of data collection at the intrahousehold level, to develop guidelines for *a priori* expectations on intrahousehold issues, and to manage outreach through training materials and publications geared to the range of research users. The program anticipated that it would need three elements: models to accommodate individual preferences of household members, innovative methods of data collection, and good dialogue with policymakers. Policy impact and outreach was to be fostered through interaction with policymakers and researchers in developing countries, and by understanding policymakers' needs and their constraints. Country case studies and in-country collaborators would create relevant entry points for policy in those countries, and synthesis and generalization across countries would come from the comparative framework.

Broadly, most of these objectives have been met in full and some in part; there have also been some unintended achievements, or at least some not specified at the outset of the program. These may well have been intentional (but undocumented) strategic adjustments made over the passage of time, and indeed an unswerving adherence to the 1994 objectives (Haddad et al. 1994) would not have been desirable. Although a more limited degree of direct policy impact was found than was hoped for at the outset of this assessment, the relevance of the research for policy formulation was high. For example, microfinance initiatives have been pursued in many developing countries, following models that disburse funds to women borrowers, and for which knowledge of how the identity of the recipient affects the use and impact of credit is critical. Modeling intrahousehold transfers is obviously central for such policy formulation. Another example is in food and nutrition interventions, where household behavior (and possible internal reallocations of food) in response to supplementary feeding of vulnerable groups is important to ultimate well-being outcomes for such groups. Finally, the issue of how independently held assets affect bargaining power in intrahousehold relations is relevant to the emphasis on women's property rights, particularly land, which has become a key policy direction in many countries. The research focus has had undeniably high policy relevance, and therefore high potential impact.

Policy impact in developing countries is the focus of the 1994 document, but this has not been as strong as expected, and there was perhaps some unwarranted optimism about the extent to which it would be possible to engage the hearts and minds of policymakers and peer researchers in developing countries, beyond those already familiar with intrahousehold analysis in the paradigm-shifting core of the intrahousehold program.

Policy responses at the country level have been limited in relation to the modeling and more academic work, and a conventional response therefore might be to call for more and better dissemination (reasons as to why this would help overcome, but not necessarily solve, the problem are discussed elsewhere in this paper). It would have been a lot to expect the intrahousehold modeling to feed directly into country policy when the World Bank was only just beginning to accept it. This is because the time lags on developing-country responses are slower (Pardey and Christian 2002), but also because of the power relations between international actors and country-level policy. From the perspective of this review in 2003, with less policy innocence and much more (if still limited) knowledge of policy processes, a more cautious set of local response expectations would be desirable.

The emphasis on impact through training materials and capacity building in developing countries is not easy to assess at this point because this activity is ongoing. It seems, however, to be rather lower than hoped, and this is likely associated with the previous point, that there has been relatively little demand from developing-country policymakers and researchers.

On the other hand, although not given much profile in 1994, the policy impact through influencing major donors and peer researchers in the United States and other developed countries has been marked, and the outputs and conduct of the program met with enthusiastic approval from all such respondents for this assessment. There is no doubt that the quantity and quality of output has been high, dissemination has been varied, strategic and extensive methodological advances of the kinds envisaged have materialized as anticipated, and the data collection and dataset availability at the end of the intrahousehold program leaves behind a resource that will continue to create policy impact for years to come.

There are also features of the program that have been important innovations oriented toward greater policy impact, such as the survey of developing-country policymakers at the start of the program to take into account their priorities (and to reveal their current state of knowledge and attitudes), the use of an External Advisory Committee for guidance, the e-mail network for dissemination and stimulating debate, and importantly the moves toward the use of more qualitative research methods. All of these have been essentially moves to make the program's researchers aware of developing-country policy concerns, to steer the work in relation to research-user perceptions, to draw in users and take dissemination to places not normally reached by conventional research outputs, and to use multi-methodologies to make research accessible to a wider constituency. The impact on U.S.-based policymakers has also been achieved through a sustained commitment to publishing in blue-chip journals, maintaining a high volume of output and a strong presence through seminars and face-to-face presentations, and maintaining contact with key people in major donor organizations. Assessment of impact using the levels of activities as indicators would seemingly result in strongly favorable conclusions on the program.

Attribution Issues

The intrahousehold program has had considerable country-level impact in Bangladesh and particularly in Guatemala, but overall the main impact has been not at the project or country level but as a body of work that has changed minds and contributed to research as an international public good. For example, it has been used in the “engendered development” book by the World Bank (2001), and its researchers have contributed, by invitation, to the United Nations Population Fund’s, *State of World Population Report 2004* (UNFPA 2004). A very substantial volume of journal articles and peer-reviewed work has been produced and appeared in international outlets. Given the character of this contribution, it is particularly difficult to attribute impact, as indeed is recognized in IFPRI’s (2002) “Impact Evaluation: Assessing the Impact of Policy-Oriented Social Science Research.” Fields where impact evidence is harder to produce should, however, not be disadvantaged.

Disciplines and Methods

There is a perception among many users that the research papers are too technical and economics oriented. External observers called for less focus on economics in order to enhance communication with policymakers and thus also policy impact. This observation holds for developing-country users, but senior policy audiences in developed countries are, with justification, thought to be more responsive to the evidence and arguments of economics. There is therefore something of a clash, and a need to produce different outputs for different audiences. The intrahousehold program is seen as considerably more multidisciplinary than other research programs at IFPRI. The program’s External Advisory Committee gave rise to debates between anthropologists and economists, and served to guide the implementation of the research. Sociologists from the intrahousehold program and other IFPRI research programs have also collaborated on a number of studies.

As stated earlier, the focus on economics in the early years in particular was strategically correct, but it has come at a cost. It has been argued (Meinzen-Dick et al. forthcoming, 10) that qualitative methods used in the program were eventually seen as important in their own right, but the predominant sense is that the qualitative methods are still seen as a means to a quantitative end—for example, in helping come up with culturally relevant definitions of variables. Furthermore, the view was expressed that these inputs would be better coming from local partners, which means that methods and disciplines outside economics are on the margin, geographically and intellectually. For example, the absence in the research papers of any conceptual apparatus of social, political, or anthropological theory is very striking.

Sociology and anthropology appear as entirely descriptive fields, providing data for the purposes of economic analysis, and even the notion of social capital, appears largely because economists have become interested in this longstanding idea in social theory (and interestingly it was sociologists in the South African component of the program who were most critical of the value of the focus on social capital). These

conceptual absences impoverish the work. For example, to research and analyze marriage payments with virtually no connection to the enormous body of anthropological work on marriage transactions seems perverse. Key researchers seem to have been aware of some of this, but it is far from evident in either references or analysis. There has been qualitative work done in the intrahousehold program, but this has largely been through parallel rather than integrated analyses, and funding for core researcher posts are usually planned by and for economists (Meinzen-Dick et al. forthcoming), 17 which reproduces this dominance. One also notices a subtle de-skilling in regard to disciplines other than economics. For example, people trained in economics being assigned qualitative research tasks, as if “anyone can do sociology.” The converse thought of a non-economist being expected to turn their hand to some economics would be unthinkable. Hence a further move toward multidisciplinary research would be desirable for policy impact, but this should be done in a way that brings social and political theory to bear and does not collapse the questions of multi-disciplines and multi-methods.

Has this expansion into other disciplines and methods in the intrahousehold program been effective? This question is difficult to answer because the expansion has been more about methods used than a serious multidisciplinary turn, and some of the outputs in this vein are relatively recent and thus hard to compare with economics outputs. Later, impact assessments may wish to test whether multi-disciplines or multi-methodologies indeed have more impact in developing countries, or whether this is simply a plausible account.

Policy Processes and Research Users

Islam and Garrett (1997, 6) suggest the need to understand better *how* IFPRI’s research is used, and Paarlberg (1999, 10) argues for the importance of disaggregating policy audiences. Islam and Garrett also propose an amoebic model of policy processes (1997, 10), which is much less directional than the image of the steel balls neatly hitting each other in sequence—which is actually at odds with the nonlinear understandings reflected in much of the impact assessment work. Islam and Garrett’s expressed uncertainty is well founded and perhaps suggests the need for a properly disaggregated and theorized policy impact analysis as the first step in major research projects, rather than as a puzzle at the tail of a program of research. Impact assessment needs to recognize that change is more difficult in some fields than others, nutrition may be more like the steel ball model, but gender policy can be very fragmented and lacking clear lines of policy influence. It still faces resistance in many quarters so that it would be wise to expect both senior policy people and the “street-level bureaucrats” at the sharp end of policy to seek ways to avoid gender justice responsibilities. At least an explicit recognition of these differences through an early policy impact analysis would enable realistic impact objectives to be formulated.

What evidence there is seems to indicate that IFPRI’s strongest scholarly ties are with the World Bank and U.S. universities (Pardey and Christian 2002, 58), and that its impact is highest in developed countries, as shown by citations and coauthor analysis (Pardey and Christian 2002, 59). One response to this evidence is to attempt to increase

developing-country impact, another might be to pause to consider the possibility that there may be reasons for this that are difficult to change, and indeed that it may be desirable to continue to deliver impact mainly through the established route. Careful research will be needed to analyze, justify, and establish this logic with donors if IFPRI decides that this is where its strength lies and how it can be most effective. But it is conceivable that an explicit (and researched) statement of impact strategy may argue that IFPRI has a comparative advantage in policy impact by influencing major donors through the production of top quality research intended as international public goods, and that country-level impacts are of secondary interest because of the problems of local politics, hitting the moving target of policy shifts, and the other legion of problems of impact delivery so close to the ground. The institutional requirements (for example, for country offices) may be beyond IFPRI's capacity, and the need for local "ownership" may also suggest that too forceful an advocacy of particular policies would be inappropriate. Further, too direct a link to policy in the formative stages of research will always be tied to current concerns, and inevitably not forward looking. Research that takes up existing policy concerns is therefore not agenda setting, it is agenda responsive. The intrahousehold program was, however, indisputably agenda setting in ambition, and although it was clear from the consultation with the 130 users that intrahousehold issues were not a major priority, it is to their credit that the intrahousehold program researchers persisted with this focus.

Such an explicit strategy, argued and evidenced, would serve as a statement of accountability in relation to research funders' demands for impact, which, if understood from the outset, would obviate the problem of both trying to deliver the kinds of impacts that are simply beyond IFPRI's scope and that might divert valuable researcher time away from core business. Donors generally say they subscribe to this notion that the research they fund is not for narrow organizational ends alone, but rather for international public goods. An IFPRI impact strategy document that draws out the implications of this for impact assessment would be useful to IFPRI and perhaps help to manage donor expectations.

As suggested above, there is a need to question the model of country-level policymaking and policymakers that underpins the impact assessment approach. If indeed at the country level there is rather less policymaking and more policy "customizing" to local circumstances in line with donor agendas (explaining why policy people do not read), and if most true policymaking really is located higher up the "food chain," then a strategy to focus on U.S.-based relations is not a bad one. It may be necessary and desirable for a range of other reasons to do everything feasible to maximize local buy-in, but the expectations of direct, immediate local policy impact might be reduced. If realistically the best one can hope for is to cultivate a predisposition to use what discretionary powers local actors possess to direct policy in a particular direction, then this would alter expectations all round. It might suggest that a better understanding of policy discretion (as in Anne Marie Goetz's work in Bangladesh) rather than policymaking is a more modest but also more effective way to approach the aspirations for policy responses. Policymaking is something that, frustratingly, everyone and no one seems to do. This may be an overly dismal view of policy processes, and

certainly the scenario will vary dramatically by country. An interesting project for IFPRI might be to commission a comparative study of two countries, one with a more passive and donor-dependent policy environment and one with the opposite, and then look at both retrospectives on major food policy changes, the role played by research, and identifiable impacts of recent IFPRI research. A gender research and policy impact retrospective might also be interesting to construct when the impact of the commercialization project is addressed.

Finally, the conceptualization of policy impact also needs to address the question of how much impact is enough. The notion of optimal policy impact has been argued elsewhere in this paper, rather than assuming that more is always better.

The Limits of Accountability

IFPRI's approach to impact evaluation (IFPRI 2002a) suggests an extensive involvement in impact analysis and indeed impact management for research institutions. For example, they should know the impacts that donors value, ensure that the impacts of value to donors coincide with those of the people and their governments, create incentive and reward systems consistent with the policy objectives of the agencies that commission or make use of research outputs, and build epistemic communities involving all stakeholders. There is an argument for a division of labor and a specialization, in which research institutes do not take on this level of responsibility. Donors themselves are both in positions of power, which helps promote research uptake, and in close and ongoing relationships with ministries, NGOs, and other users, which gives them a better understanding of policy opportunities, discourses, and entry points. Delivering the impacts donors want and creating incentives for research to meet the policy objectives of donors is essentially to become in-house researchers for donors. Top-quality researchers value their independence, and IFPRI researchers expressed doubt about too close a relationship with donors, a factor that might affect retention.

Garrett and Islam (1998) suggest that outputs, processes, and potential outcomes should be the focus of impact assessment rather than actual policy outcomes, while Ryan and Garrett (2003) argue that impacts must be looked at to enable an institution to sustain funding support. But is it ethical to promise impacts to funders in such concrete ways, or to accept accountability for such impacts when in reality you have very little control over the processes involved? Policy follows resources and, as an institution without significant funding clout, IFPRI can only persuade a position of limited power. The implication of accepting this kind of accountability when you have so little control is that you are pushed to try to extend your area of control through long-term residence of staff, extensive capacity-building activities, advocacy, and other means to deliver what Ryan calls a conducive policy environment. The Malawian experience involved years of intensive support but was ultimately judged to have had little impact, and the argument then made for withdrawal was premature. The question arising is, How much is enough? The (relatively minor) example from this assessment is the Bangladeshi policy on FFE and the criticism that IFPRI had not questioned and debated the World Bank's research. But at what stage is it the responsibility of Bangladeshis to own the research and use it

themselves to argue their position? The lose–lose possibility with increasing in-country commitments is that you end up with both dependence and no impact.

Partners and Policy Impact

The relations with country-level research partners are seen to play a vital role in delivering impact, yet is enough known about exactly how this is supposed to work? Local researchers have their own organizational constraints and personal agendas. They may be oppositional in relation to the government and have particular kinds of networks that shape how useful they are as policy entry points; further, networks may be highly personalized and therefore lost with staff changes. Knowing what makes a good partner is not so difficult; finding them is. And those with desirable qualities will be in high demand and may well be taking on more work than is sensible. Capacity building in partner organizations is the conventional answer to this problem, but, as is argued elsewhere, this is often not really feasible over the lifespan of most research projects. Furthermore, capacity building tends to focus on skills, whereas impact delivery depends in large part on networks and obtaining access and influence. After the end of the research projects, there can be no reasonable expectation for partners to continue to promote IFPRI findings; hence the call for in-country offices and reduced numbers of countries researched. However, if local researchers are involved as coauthors in published journal papers, it is more likely that they will continue to research and disseminate IFPRI (and related) research. A stronger push for real rather than nominal co-authorship with local researchers would be desirable to this end, though it should not consist of simply appending everyone's names to everything produced, as that would not signal real analytical involvement. To assist in this, an IFPRI authorship protocol, setting out author roles and responsibilities and agreed among researchers at the start of projects would be worth considering.

A second point about partners is that they should be included in the impact assessment more comprehensively. The independent outputs, seminars, and publications of local researchers produced in conjunction with IFPRI projects should be listed and acknowledged. Expected partner contributions to impact delivery via publications and presentations, and not only as conduits to government and research users, could be more explicit, and such an expectation might also engender more ownership and greater independent follow through later. These two points suggest an explicit, if informal, “contract” with partners, which makes the expectations of ownership clearer as well as the joint responsibility for policy response and the full involvement in impact assessment.

Doing Impact Assessment

Ryan and Garrett (2003) point out that the returns on economic policy research appear to be largely undocumented, unlike those for agricultural research, which are large and well recognized given the many studies measuring them. The problem for social science research is that measurement of its less tangible products and attribution of impacts to particular pieces of research are more problematic. This emphasizes, in an age of ever-greater accountability to donors, the importance of methodological innovation to

find ways of arriving at evaluations of social science research impact. However, in addition to defining cunning quantitative indicators, setting up systems to monitor them, and seeking unbiased and rigorous qualitative assessments from users, further institutional reflection is needed to reach agreement on an explicit and more detailed impact strategy position. Such a strategy should include limits on accountability, donor obligations for outreach, and expectations of partners. The program of work on impact assessment at IFPRI may indeed now include these factors.

Case studies will continue to be used for impact assessment, but the question of how the assessor is engaged in the process and the connections between the IFPRI's DGO and the research programs being assessed needs further thought. It is important that the assessor takes an independent view, but the assessor lacks the inside information to allow proper engagement with the selection of interviewees. Research program managers and case study country coordinators should be briefed on impact assessment methods, and assessors need lists of defined and identified research users from which to select interviewees. This requires an explicit understanding of who the local "policymakers" and research peers are. Interviews with researchers from universities, NGOs, political parties, and so on, may be more relevant than those with participating partners, which is what tends to be assumed is wanted by local coordinators. Better internal communication about impact assessment would improve the ability of external assessors to do a good job. Furthermore, if surveys are expected to be conducted, then the time requirements (already very constrained) and costs will need to rise substantially.

External impact assessment could be done with a light touch at current levels of time inputs if considerably more data were routinely collected for the purpose, of the kind discussed above. But they should aim to make use of existing forms of reporting modified to accommodate chosen assessment indicators, rather than prompting the adoption of new and onerous data collection systems. One of the more obvious information problems facing the impact assessor is that researchers rarely know, when interviewed, whether their research has had policy impact, because there is no feedback loop to ensure that they do. IFPRI might consider adopting follow-up processes with research partners and key in-country and international users at phased intervals as a means of tracking uptake.

The Future: Daughter of the Program?

The terms of reference for this impact assessment did not include the question of future intrahousehold and gender research at IFPRI. However, the information that the intrahousehold program was winding up came as a nasty surprise to all interviewees, and a number of arguments were made for a second generation of research: the intrahousehold program does research on this topic not done elsewhere, momentum has only just developed, and 10 years is not an adequate lifetime for basic research or for research in a field that faces such particular challenges. For these reasons, it was felt that a second generation of research on intrahousehold questions was desirable.

Within IFPRI, there is clearly a movement of key research staff into other programs, and this is to be welcomed as it will feed the intrahousehold and gender perspective into these new locations. However, the view that there is now no need for a gender-focused research program because the perspective has been adequately mainstreamed into IFPRI seems ill-judged. The internal impact of the program has been less than one would expect in relation to external impact. Intrahousehold and gender analysis has not yet become core IFPRI business or achieved appropriate recognition in IFPRI's profiling. The idea of mainstreaming is sound, but experience indicates a significant risk of gender analysis degrading through mainstreaming to the level of mere data disaggregation by sex, at best, or simply fading away. The nature of the institution matters too. Where line management is strong and priorities set from the top, it may be possible to audit and enforce the adoption of gender analysis, but this is clearly not the case in a research institute like IFPRI where researchers are not and frankly cannot be dealt with in this way. Any attempt to insist on gender issues in research programs would likely backfire and increase resistance. A vigorous new research program in the field, however, alongside the movement of ex-program staff to new programs would both sustain gradual mainstreaming, and consolidate the gains of the intrahousehold program in the best possible way by demonstrating the value of gender analysis for food policy through high-quality externally recognized research.

Any successor program would need to take other social science disciplines much more seriously. Arguments for the donor's desire for economics are not as strong as they were in 1994, as evidenced by the experience with IFPRI's study on agricultural research and poverty, where DFID insisted on changing the balance of methods and disciplines away from economics and toward social analysis.

When asked about research issues thought to be critical for the future, many replies centered on one of two themes (trade or governance), although other suggestions have been mentioned above. Clearly, the process of evolving a new research program will involve recruiting research staff, consulting with potential donors, and soliciting the views of the intrahousehold program staff.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, B. 2003. Gender and land rights revisited: Exploring new prospects via the state, family, and market. *Journal of Agrarian Change* 3 (1 and 2): 184–224.
- Babu, S. C., and G. Mthindi. 1995. Costs and benefits of informed food policy decisions: A case study of food security and nutrition monitoring in Malawi. *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture* 34 (3): 292–308.
- BIDS (Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies). 2001. Fighting human poverty: Bangladesh human development report 2000. A study prepared by BIDS for Bangladesh Ministry of Planning.
- Brown, L., H. Feldstein, L. Haddad, C. Peña, and A. Quisumbing. 1995. *Generating food security in the year 2020: Women as producers, gatekeepers, and shock absorbers*. 2020 Vision Brief No. 17. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Brown, Lynn R., H. Feldstein, L. Haddad, C. Peña, and A. Quisumbing. 2001. Generating food security in the year 2020: Women as producers, gatekeepers, and shock absorbers. In *The unfinished agenda*, eds. Per Pinstrup-Andersen and Rajul Pandya-Lorch. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research 1998. Report of the Third External Programme and Management Review of IFPRI. Rome: FAO, TAC Secretariat.
- _____. 2005 Report of the Fourth External Programme and Management Review of IFPRI. FAO Rome: Science Council Secretariat, February
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 1985. *Women and developing agriculture*. Women in Agriculture Series No 4. Rome.
- Feldstein, H., and S. Poats, eds. 1990. *Working together: Gender analysis in agriculture*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Fraser, N. 1989. *Unruly practices: Power, discourse, and gender in contemporary social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fritschel, H., and U. Mohan. 2001. The fruits of girls' education. In *The unfinished agenda*, eds. Per Pinstrup-Andersen and Rajul Pandya-Lorch. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

- Garrett, J. 1999. *Research that matters: The impact of IFPRI's policy research*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Garrett, J. L., and Y. Islam. 1998. *Policy research and the policy process: Do the twain ever meet?* Gatekeeper Series No. 74. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Gittinger, J. Price, Sidney Chernick, Nadine R. Horenstein, and Katrine Saito. 1990. *Household food security and the role of women*. World Bank Discussion Paper No. 96. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Goetz, A. M., ed. 1997. *Getting institutions right for women and development*. London: Zed Press.
- _____. 2001. *Women development workers: Implementing rural credit programmes in Bangladesh*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. (GOB) 1997. *Bangladesh National Food and Nutrition Policy*. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Dhaka.
- _____. 2003. *Bangladesh: A national strategy for economic growth, poverty reduction, and social development*. Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Dhaka, March, an interim PRSP.
- Haddad, L., and J. Hoddinott. 1994. Women's income and boy-girl anthropometric status in the Côte d'Ivoire. *World Development* 22 (4): 543–553.
- Haddad, L., J. Hoddinott, and H. Alderman. 1997. *Intrahousehold resource allocation in developing countries: Methods, models, and policy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press for IFPRI.
- Haddad, L., R. Kanbur, and H. Bouis. 1994. Intra-household inequality and average household well-being: Evidence on calorie intakes and energy expenditures from the Philippines. In *Agricultural household modeling and family economics*, eds. F.Caillavet, H. Guyomard and R. Lifran. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, 239-257.
- Hallman, K. 2000. *Mother-father resource control, marriage payments, and girl-boy health in rural Bangladesh*. Food Consumption and Nutrition Division Discussion Paper No. 93. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- HKI (Helen Keller International, Bangladesh). 2003. *HKI's homestead food production program sustainably improves livelihoods of households in rural Bangladesh*. Homestead Food Production Bulletin No. 1. Dhaka: HKI.

- IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute). 2002a. *Impact evaluation: Assessing the impact of policy-oriented social science research*. Washington, D.C.: IFPRI.
- _____. 2002b. *Medium-Term Plan 2003–05: Summary of Modifications, Budgets, and Project Portfolio*. Washington, D.C.: IFPRI.
- IRRI (International Rice Research Institute). 1985. *Women in rice farming*. Los Baños, Philippines.
- Islam, Y., and J. L. Garrett. 1997. *IFPRI and the abolition of the wheat flour ration shops in Pakistan: A case study on policymaking and the use and impact of research*. Impact Assessment Discussion Paper No. 1. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Kardam, N. 1991. *Bringing women in: Women's issues in international development programs*. Boulder, Colo., USA: Lynne Rienner.
- Kumar, S. 1994. *Adoption of hybrid maize in Zambia: Effects of gender roles, food consumption, and nutrition*. IFPRI Research Report No. 100. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Kumar, S., and D. Hotchkiss. 1988. *Consequences of deforestation for women's time allocation, agricultural production, and nutrition in hill areas of Nepal*. Research Report No. 69. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Meinzen-Dick, Ruth S., Michelle Adato, Marc J. Cohen, Curtis Farrar, Lawrence Haddad, and Agnes Quisumbing. (forthcoming). *Diversifying social research for food policy development*, In *Researching the Culture in Agri-Culture*. Michael Cernea and Amir Kassam (eds.), Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- Paarlberg, R. L. 1999. *External impact assessment of IFPRI's 2020 Vision for food, agriculture, and the environment initiative*. Impact Assessment Discussion Paper No. 10. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Pardey, P., and J. Christian. 2002. *The production and diffusion of policy knowledge: A bibliometric evaluation of the International Food Policy Research Institute*. Impact Assessment Discussion Paper No. 14. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Quisumbing, Agnes R., Lynn R. Brown, Hilary Sims Feldstein, Lawrence Haddad, and Christine Peña. 1995. *Women: The key to food security*. Food Policy Report. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

- Quisumbing, A., ed. 2003. *Household decisions, gender, and development: A synthesis of recent research*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Rogers, Beatrice, and N. Schlossman, eds. 1989. *Intra-household research allocation*. Tokyo: UNU Press.
- Ryan, James G., and J. L. Garrett. 2003. *The impact of economic policy research: Lessons on attribution and evaluation from IFPRI*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Thomas, D. 1997. The distribution of income within the household and household expenditure patterns. In *Intrahousehold resource allocation in developing countries: Methods models and policy*, eds. L. Haddad, J. Hoddinott, and H. Alderman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press for IFPRI.
- Udry, C., J. Hoddinott, H. Alderman, and L. Haddad. 1995. Gender differentials in farm productivity: implications for household efficiency and agricultural policy. *Food Policy* 20: 402–423.
- UNDP 2001. 2001 *Human Development Report* for Bangladesh., Dhaka.
- UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund). 2004. *The state of world population report 2004. The Cairo Consensus at Ten: Population, reproductive health, and the global effort to end poverty*. New York.
- von Braun Joachim and Eileen Kennedy (eds.) (1994). *Agricultural Commercialization, Economic Development, and Nutrition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press for IFPRI.
- World Bank. 2001. *Engendering development through gender equality in rights, resources, and voice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Washington

IFPRI: Michelle Adato, Howarth Bouis, Marc J. Cohen, Curtis Farrar,
John Maluccio, Lawrence Haddad, Bonnie McClafferty,
Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Agnes Quisumbing, and Marie Ruel.

World Bank:

Harold Alderman, *Human Development Economist, Africa Region*
Karen Mason, *Director of Gender and Development*
Mark Blackden
Andy Mason

International Center for Research on Women (ICRW):

Charlotte Johnson-Welch, *Public Health Specialist*
Caren Grown

Lynnda Kiess, *Director, Health and Nutrition*, Helen Keller International

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB):

Mayra Buvinic
Gabriela Vega
Claudia Piraz

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID):

Shirley Toth
Mary Knox

Hilary Feldstein

Guatemala

Organizacion Panamericana de la Salud [Panamerican Health Organization]:
Elsy Camey, *Consultora, Genero y Salud, Unidad Technica Salud
Familiar y Comunitaria*

World Food Programme (WFP):

Guillermina Segura de Usera, *Representative*
Debora Natareno

Secretaria de Obras Sociales de la Esposa del Presidente (SOSEP):

Marta Lidia de Montenegro, *Directora, Programa Hogares Comunitarios*
Nora Coj, *Programa Hogares Comunitarios*

Irma Palma, *Programa Mundial de Alimentos (PMA)*

Magali Quintana, IICA

Maggie Fischer, *Area Tecnica Salud Ambiental y Desarrollo Sostenible, Organizacion Panamericana de la Salud (PAHO)*

PHO/INCAP (*Organizacion Panamericana de la Salud/Instituto de Nutricion de Centro America y Panama*):

Clara Luz de Pereda

Ana Victoria Román, *Gerente de Sistemas Alimentarios*

Leonardo F. de Leon

Raul Rosenberg, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

Ernan Delgado, *Director, INCAP*

Bangladesh

Zahidul Hassan Zihad, *Director of Data Analysis and Technical Assistance Ltd. (DATA)*

Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council (BARC):

M. Anwar Iqbal, *National Project Director*

Anwar Iqbal, *Director of Nutrition*

Gono Kallyan Trust (GKT):

Syed Ansarul Hoque, *Chief Program Officer*

Md. Shafiuddin, *Coordinator*

International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research (ICDDR,B):

[on the web as “ICDDR,B: Centre for Health and Population Research”]

Md. Adbus Salam, *Associate Director, Head of Clinical Sciences Division*

Ruchira Tabassum Naved

Vianney Labé, *Food Security Advisor, Delegation of the European Commission to Bangladesh*

Begum Nurun Naher, *Programme Officer, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)*

Helen Keller International:

Md. Abu Taher, *Project Manager of the Homestead Food Production*,
Helen Keller International
Gudrun Stallkamp, *Nutrition Program Advisor*
Nasima Akter, *Senior Analysis and Reporting Officer, Health and
Nutrition*

Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS):

Omar Haider Chowdhury, *Research Director*, Bangladesh Institute of
Development Studies (BIDS)
Binayak Sen, *Senior Research Fellow*
Sajjad Zohir, *Senior Research Fellow*

Md. Nazmul Hassan, Institute of Nutrition and Food Science, University of
Dhaka

Md. Abdul Mannan, *Secretary*, Bangladesh National Nutrition Council

Ferdousi Sultana, *Gender and Development*, Asian Development Bank

Amita Dey, *Rural Livelihoods*, Department for International Development
(DFID), United Kingdom

Naser Farid, *Additional Director and Policy Advisor*, Food Planning and
Monitoring Unit, Ministry of Food, Bangladesh

Appendix 2: Key Milestones and Activities of the Intrahousehold Program (1992–2003)

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
1992–94				
February 1992	Conference on intrahousehold resource allocation	USAID's WID office, World Bank WID division, Rockefeller, Ford (Fundraising done in 1991)	Haddad	Roger Slade (World Bank) Betsy Cambell (Ford)
1993	Research team assembled. Presentations at various U.S. Fora (ICRW, UNICEF, Population Association of America meetings, 1993) Formal program proposal presented to IFPRI		Haddad	
1994	Start of CGIAR Gender-CG network (newsletter and listserve)	CGIAR Gender Program	Haddad	Hilary Feldstein (CGIAR gender program)
1995				
1995	Funding received from USAID's Office of Women in Development	USAID GWID	Haddad, Quisumbing, Brown	Margaret Lycette (USAID)
1995	Gender-Prop email conference on gender and property rights	CGIAR gender program, USAID GWID	Meinzen-Dick, Brown, Quisumbing	Feldstein
September 1995	Beijing World Conference on Women; production of food policy report; IFPRI presentation at a panel on food security	IFPRI core	Quisumbing	
September 1995	Field visit to Ghana to visit sites of gender and property rights study	Government of Japan	Quisumbing, Otsuka	Aidoo (University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana)
1996				
February 1996	Program methodology review		Program team, Hans Loftgren (internal reviewer)	Emmanuel Jimenez (World Bank)
January 1996	Call for proposals for supplemental	USAID	Brown	

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
	studies circulated (closing date for last phase: July 15, 1996)			
March 1996	Field visit to South Africa and Zimbabwe: (1) South Africa: to investigate the possibility of doing work with Michelle Adato on public works in the Western Cape (this was eventually dropped in favor of a panel survey of the Kwazulu Natal households); (2) Zimbabwe trip: visit to field sites of one of the supplemental studies (Hoddinott and Kinsey)	USAID	Quisumbing, Brown	Michelle Adato (Cornell); Bill Kinsey (University of Zimbabwe)
March 1996	First meeting of External Advisory Committee	USAID	Quisumbing, Brown	
April 1996	Field visit to Bangladesh to set up the study on intrahousehold and micronutrient impact of new agricultural technology, one of the high-concentration case studies. Survey was conducted from June 1996 to September 1997 in four rounds, with a qualitative study in between the 2nd and 3rd rounds, and a module based on a qualitative study fielded between the 3rd and 4th rounds	USAID, Danida	Bouis, Quisumbing, Brown	Shakuntala Thilsted (Denmark); DATA; Nazmul Hassan (IFNS); Sajjad Zohir (BIDS); Ruchira Tabassum Naved (SCF)
May 1996	First field visit to Indonesia for gender and property rights study	ODA	Quisumbing, Otsuka	Suyanto (ICRAF)
June 1996	Bina Agarwal visits IFPRI as visiting gender research fellow	IFPRI		Bina Agarwal
July–September 1996	Marcel Fafchamps visits IFPRI as visiting gender research fellow	USAID	Quisumbing	Marcel Fafchamps (Stanford University)

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
August 1996	2nd field visit to Ghana to design inheritance module	ODA	Quisumbing, Payongayong	J. B. Aidoo
September 1996	Field visit to Ethiopia to set up administrative arrangements for high concentration case study	USAID	Quisumbing, Brown	Bereket Kebede and Mekonnen Tadesse (AAU); Stefan Dercon (Oxford University)
October 1996	Field visit to Indonesia to pretest inheritance module for gender and property rights study	ODA	Quisumbing, Payongayong	Suyanto (ICRAF)
October 1996	Visit to Philippines to set up resurvey for gender and property rights study		Quisumbing	Jonna Estudillo (IRRI)
December 1996–January 1997	Intensive survey for gender and property rights project in Ghana	ODA, Government of Japan	Payongayong	Aidoo
December 1996–March 1997	Intensive survey in Indonesia for gender and property rights study	ODA, Government of Japan		Suyanto
1997				
January–April 1997	Four team members made three visits to Bangladesh to analyze preliminary results from the first round of data collection, and to design modules on intrahousehold and gender issues, women’s empowerment, and group participation prior to the fourth round of the survey. The program team members worked with collaborator who undertook the qualitative study, using the results of this study to inform the design of questionnaire modules in the 4th round.		Bouis, de la Briere, Quisumbing	
February 1997	Visit to Ethiopia to pretest questionnaire modules on gender issues	USAID	Quisumbing, Payongayong	Marcel Fafchamps, Bereket Kebede
March 1997	External Advisory Committee Meeting	USAID	Hoffman	

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
April–May 1997	Intensive survey in Ghana for gender and property rights project	ODA, Government of Japan	Otsuka, Payongayong	Aidoo
May–December 1997	Fourth round of Ethiopia Rural Household Survey	USAID		Bereket Kebede
June 1997	Marie Ruel and Lynn Brown participated in a workshop on nutritional approaches and methodologies, and met representatives from various governmental, NGO, and academic institutions involved in nutrition activities in Peru to discuss research topics and opportunities for collaboration.	USAID	Ruel, Brown	
August 1997	Ruel and Brown returned to follow up possibilities in Peru	USAID	Ruel, Brown	
September 1997	Last round of Bangladesh survey completed	USAID, Danida		
July–October 1997	Last round of gender and property rights survey in Indonesia	ODA, Government of Japan		Suyanto
April–December 1997	Intensive household survey on gender and property rights in Ghana	DFID (formerly ODA)	Quisumbing, Payongayong, Otsuka	Aidoo
August–September 1997	Two team members traveled to South Africa to examine the possibility of conducting an evaluation of NGO programs using randomized assignment. The trial, planned with MVULA Trust, aimed to examine, among other things, the impact of the gender composition of groups on the repayment rates for domestic water usage under	USAID	Haddad	Hanan Jacoby (Rochester University)

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
	randomization of the water pump technology. This did not eventurate as it was politically infeasible.			
Sept–October 1997	Two team members worked with South African collaborators on the 1998 resurvey of the 1,200 Kwazulu Natal households first surveyed in 1993 under the Project for Statistics on Living Standards and Development by the University of Cape Town and the World Bank. Lawrence Haddad and John Maluccio networked with the poverty research community, developed and pretested the household questionnaire, developed the community questionnaire, and undertook logistical preparations for field work with the Southern Africa Labor Development and Research Unit, and Data Research Africa.	USAID	Haddad, Maluccio	Julian May
October 1997	Training of AAU staff on panel data analysis using Stata; pretest of community questionnaire	USAID	Maluccio, Payongayong	
August–December 1997	Two visits were made to Peru and one to Guatemala to discuss research interests, to identify programs directed at improving the conditions of women in urban areas, such as income-generation programs, credit programs, community day care centers to name a few, and to identify potential collaborators from government institutions, NGOs,	USAID	Ruel	

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
	academic or research institutions. Sufficient information was collected to make the final selection of country by the end of the year.			
October–December 1997	First round of gender and inheritance survey in Philippines	Government of Japan		Estudillo (IRRI)
October–November 1997	Qualitative study on shocks in South Africa	USAID	Haddad, Maluccio	Cross et al.
November–December 1997	John Maluccio went to South Africa to pretest the household questionnaire and attend a workshop on the qualitative study examining social capital and shocks experienced by households.	USAID	Maluccio	May
November 1997	Ruel, Brown, and Kelly Hallman went to Guatemala from November 9–15 to attend the quadrennial meeting of the Latin American Nutrition Society and to talk with representatives of government and nongovernmental institutions regarding the possibility of evaluating nutrition intervention programs in Guatemala. (Guatemala site eventually chosen as 4th site).	USAID	Ruel, Brown, Hallman	
December 1997	Team from Progres (Mexico) visits IFPRI to request it to evaluate its program		Haddad, Hoddinott, Quisumbing	
1998				
January–February 1998	Resurvey of Philippine households for gender and inheritance study	Government of Japan		Estudillo (IRRI)
February–	Quantitative survey in South Africa	USAID	Haddad, Maluccio	May, Carter

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
April 1998	(Kwazulu-Natal Income Dynamics Study)			
February–May 1998	Preparations for evaluation of <i>Hogares Comunitarios</i> Program in Guatemala City	USAID	Ruel, de la Briere, Hallman	INCAP, Katz (visiting gender research fellow)
March 1998	External Advisory Committee Meeting	USAID	Quisumbing, Hoffman	
March–July 1998	Operations evaluation of Guatemala HCP	USAID	Ruel, de la Briere	
June 1998	Elizabeth Katz visits IFPRI as visiting gender research fellow	USAID	Ruel	Katz
September 1998	Supplemental Studies Workshop	USAID	Quisumbing, Brown	Supplemental studies grantees; External advisory committee members
October 1998	Submission of final report “Gender and Forest Resource Management in Selected Areas of Asia and Africa”	DFID	Quisumbing, Otsuka	
October–November 1998	Visiting gender research fellows Julian May and Duncan Thomas visit IFPRI	USAID		May, Thomas
December 1998–August 1999	Quantitative survey for <i>Hogares Comunitarios</i> Study	USAID	Ruel, de le Briere, Hallman, Quisumbing	Coj de Salazar
1999				
February 1999	Visit to Bangladesh for next phase of intrahousehold–micronutrients study	USAID, Danida, Neys-Van Hoogstraten Foundation	Bouis, Hallman	
February 1999	Start of gender and development brown bag seminar series	USAID	Quisumbing, Hoffman	
March–August 1999	Alok Bhargava works with team as visiting gender research fellow	USAID	Bouis, Hallman	Bhargava
March–April 1999	Bereket Kebede visits IFPRI as visiting gender research fellow	USAID	Quisumbing, Maluccio	Kebede, Fafchamps (on sabbatical at World Bank)
March–May	IFPRI team members work with	Government of Mexico	Adato, Quisumbing, de la	

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
1999	Progresa team to design intrahousehold modules for the Progresa evaluation; intrahousehold modules fielded in May–June 1999 round		Briere	
May 1999	External Advisory Committee Meeting	USAID	Quisumbing, Hoffman	
June 1999	Presentation of background paper for World Bank’s Policy Research Report on Gender and Development	World Bank	Quisumbing, Maluccio	Elizabeth King, Andy Mason
2000				
March 2000	Outreach presentations to USAID; negotiations on outreach project within USAID begin. Outreach project was not funded.	USAID	Quisumbing, McClafferty	Kathy Blakeslee (USAID)
March 2000	Presentation of intra-household results in Mexico	Government of Mexico	Adato, Quisumbing, de la Briere	
April 2000	End of project workshop in Bangladesh	USAID	Bouis, Hallman	
October 2000	End of project workshop in South Africa	USAID	Haddad, Maluccio	May
December 2000	End of project workshop in Ethiopia	USAID	Maluccio	Fafchamps
2001				
January 2001	End of project workshop in Guatemala	USAID	Ruel	
February 2001	End of project workshop for USAID project	USAID	Quisumbing, Hoffman	
January–August 2001	Work on women’s status and child nutrition on 36 countries using DHS data	Sida	Smith, Haddad	
January–December 2001	Field work for follow-up study on social capital in South Africa	MacArthur Foundation	Haddad, Maluccio, Adato	
September 2001	2020 Conference in Bonn; panel on Empowering Women; briefs produced	IFPRI 2020	Quisumbing, Meinzen-Dick	

Date	Activity	Donor	Key people involved	
			IFPRI	External
January–December 2002	Legacy of Inequality (social capital) study in South Africa: analysis and policy conferences	MacArthur	Haddad, Maluccio, Adato	
2002				
January 2002	Funding received from Norway for production of gender technical guide and synthesis volume	Norway	Quisumbing	
March 2002	Completion of first draft of gender synthesis volume	Norway	Quisumbing	
May 2002	First technical guide workshop in Nepal	Norway	Quisumbing, McClafferty	Hari Upadhyay (CEAPRED)
July 2002	2nd technical guide workshop in Nairobi	Norway	Quisumbing, McClafferty	Vicki Wilde (CG Gender and Diversity Program)
August 2002	3rd technical guide workshop in Guatemala City	Norway	Quisumbing, Maluccio	Maggie Fischer (INCAP)
2003				
February 2003	Policymakers' technical guide workshop in Washington, D.C.	Norway	Quisumbing, McClafferty	
June 2003	Submission of technical guide to Norway	Norway	Quisumbing, McClafferty	

APPENDIX 3: KEY DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES OF THE INTRAHOUSEHOLD PROGRAM

1995

Beijing — United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women

Indianapolis, IN — Symposium at the American Agricultural Economics Association meetings in Indianapolis, August 1995, which featured intra-household analysis

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia — Presentation on “Gender and Agriculture,” at a UNICEF Eastern/Southern Africa Regional Conference in Addis, September 1995

Cambridge, MA — Paper entitled “The Extended Family and Intrahousehold Allocation: Inheritance and Education in the Rural Philippines” was presented at the Northeast Universities Development Economics Conference, Harvard University, November 1995

Washington, DC — Paper on “Women, Food Security, and Economic Reform” was presented at the American Anthropological Association Meetings, November 1995

1996

San Francisco, CA — Paper on “Intrahousehold Consumption Smoothing in Bukidnon, Philippines” was presented at the 1996 Econometrics Society/Allied Social Sciences Association Meetings in San Francisco.

Madison, WI — Presentation on “Intrahousehold Modeling in Developing Countries,” at the 10th Annual Kenneth Parsons Institutional Economics Lecture Series, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

San Antonio, TX — Discussant at the Principal Paper Session, “Modeling Household Behavior in Developing Countries: New Empirical Analyses,” AAEA meetings in San Antonio.

1997

Washington, DC — USAID meeting on “Incorporating Gender into Strategic Objectives,” at USAID, January 1997.

Paris, France — DELTA/INRA (*Département et Laboratoire d'Economie Théorique et Appliquée/Institut National de Recherche Agronomique*) Development Economics Seminar in Paris on January 1997.

Dhaka, Bangladesh — Presentation of the household survey and the preliminary results from the first round at the Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies, February 12, 1997.

Washington, DC — Presentations were given on “Does Parental Gender Preference Pay Off? Child-Parent Transfers and Asset Accumulation in the Rural Philippines” and “The Demand for Curative Healthcare for Children,” at the Population Association of America meeting, March 1997.

Providence, RI — Watson Institute for International Studies, Seminar Series on Gender and Development. Brown University, March 1997.

Providence, RI — Applied Microeconomics Seminar Series, Department of Economics, Brown University, March 1997.

Washington, DC — The George Washington University Women’s Studies Graduate Seminar on “Women, Health, and Development.”

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Two papers were presented on “Urban Food and Nutrition Security: Concepts and Issues,” and chaired a session on “Micronutrients and Growth” and “Gender and Household Food Security in Latin America,” at the *Sociedad Latino Americana de Nutricion*.

Washington, DC — Seminar Series of the Department of Economics of George Washington University on “Does Parental Gender Preference Pay Off? Migration and Child-Parent Transfers in the Rural Philippines,” April 1997.

Washington, DC — Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID) at the Smithsonian Castle, workshop on Multicountry Work in Asia.

Lima, Peru — Paper presented on “Examples of Successful Nutrition Policies in the World,” at the workshop on Nutritional Approaches and Methodologies, A Challenge for Peru: Lessons and Opportunities.

Helsinki, Finland — Paper presented on “Women’s Land Rights in the Transition to Individual Ownership: Case Studies from Ghana and Indonesia,” at the United Nations University/World Institute for Development Economics Research Conference on Land Reform: Access to Land, Rural Poverty, and Public Action, May 30–31, 1997.

Sacramento, CA — Papers presented on “The Incomes Earned by Women: Impacts on Welfare Outcomes” and “Gender Differences in Agricultural Technology Adoption: A review of empirical evidence,” at a mini-symposium on Sustainable Nutritional Security for Sub-Saharan Women Subsistence Farmers, held at the 23rd International Conference of Agricultural Economists, August 10–16, 1997.

Colombo, Sri Lanka — Presentation made on “Gendered Participation in Water Management: Issues and Illustrations from Water Users’ Associations in South Asia,” at the Women and Water Workshop at the International Irrigation Management Institute, September 15–19, 1997.

Williamstown, MA — Presentation on “Adoption and Maintenance of Soil Conservation Practices in the Dominican Republic Highlands,” at the Northeast Universities Development Economics Conference at Williams College.

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Presentation on “Gender and Household Food Security in Latin America,” at the 11th Congress of the Latin American Nutrition Society, November 13, 1997.

Advisory/Technical Assistance/Training

Washington, DC — Membership on the Technical Advisory Group for the ICRW/CEPDA’s program, Promoting Women in Development (PROWID).

Kumasi, Ghana — Training in data management for collaborators at the University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana.

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia — Training on the use of Stata to analyze panel data at Addis Ababa University.

Washington, DC — Training on intrahousehold and gender issues in an in-house training program for our collaborators from the Department of Population and Social Development, Ministry of Planning and Finance (in Mozambique), held at IFPRI.

Assisted DEVTECH and USAID G/WID in preparation of a paper on “Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction in an Era of Decreasing Resources: The Need for a Strategic Focus on Gender Based Constraints.” This paper was prepared for a USAID meeting to discuss changing the Agency’s strategic objective on economic growth to explicitly acknowledge gender.

Assisted USAID G/WID with preparation of a bulletin on gender and property rights, which will be circulated to all USAID Mission offices.

1998

Chicago, IL — Presentation of “Does Parental Gender Preference Pay Off? Migration and Child-Parent Transfers in the Rural Philippines,” at the Allied Social Science Associations Annual Meeting, January 1998.

Baltimore, MD — Paper presented on “Does Parental Gender Preference Pay Off? Migration and Child-Parent Transfers in the Rural Philippines,” at the Johns Hopkins University’s Department of Population Dynamics, School of Hygiene and Public Health, March 24, 1998.

Chicago, IL — Presentation made on “Grandparent Wealth, Coresidence, and Investments in Children: Evidence from the Rural Philippines,” at the Population Association of America meeting, April 2–4, 1998.

Baltimore, MD — Lecture titled “Household Resource Allocation and Nutrition Outcomes,” at the Johns Hopkins University’s Department of Population Dynamics, School of Hygiene and Public Health, April 8, 1998.

Dhaka, Bangladesh — Presentation on “Linkages Between Agriculture and Nutrition: A Conceptual Framework,” at the National Workshop on Food-Based Interventions for Nutrition in Dhaka, Bangladesh, April 26–27, 1998.

Pretoria, South Africa — Brown Bag presentation to the USAID Mission on “Kwazulu Natal Income Dynamics Study,” April 28, 1998.

Santiago, Chile — Presentation entitled “Land Rights and Natural Resource Management in the Transition to Individual Ownership: Case Studies from Ghana and Indonesia,” at the workshop sponsored by the World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) and FAO on Land Reform: Access to Land, Rural Poverty, and Public Action, April 27–29, 1998.

Columbia, MO — Presentation entitled “Water and Land: Gender and Property Rights,” for the panel on gender, groups and control of resources, at the Seventh International Symposium on Society and Resource Management: Culture Environment and Society, May 27–31, 1998.

Washington, DC — Brown Bag presentation to the USAID G/WID Office on “Kwazulu-Natal Income Dynamics Study,” May 28, 1998.

Tokyo, Japan — Paper presented on “Causes and Consequences of Changing Land Tenure Institutions in Western Ghana,” at the International Workshop on Land Tenure and the Management of Land and Trees: Community and Household Case Studies from Asia and Africa, July 1–3, 1998.

Salt Lake City, UT — Presentation of “Women’s Assets and Women's Empowerment in Bangladesh,” and participation in a panel on “Mentoring and the Sylvia Lane Fellowship,” at the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings, August 2–5, 1998.

New York, NY — Presentation entitled “Gender Issues in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management,” at the training for field and headquarters staff of the United Nations Capital Development Fund, September 10–11, 1998.

Chicago, IL — Presentation entitled “Who in the Household is Poor and Why Does It Matter?,” at the Latin American Studies Association, September 25–26, 1998.

Little Rock, AR — Luncheon Speech on “Women, Livestock, and Family Food Security,” at the Heifer Project International Symposium on Human Nutrition and Livestock in the Developing World, October 14, 1998.

New Haven, CT — Papers presented were “Social Roles, Human Capital, and the Intrahousehold Division of Labor: Evidence from Pakistan,” and “Women’s Assets and Intrahousehold Allocation in Bangladesh: Testing Measures of Bargaining Power,” at the Northeast Universities Development Consortium Conference, Yale University, October 1998.

Washington, DC — Seminar presented to the World Bank’s Gender and Agriculture Thematic Group on “Women's Land Rights in the Transition to Individual Ownership: Implications for Tree Resource Management in Western Ghana,” October 27, 1998.

New York, NY — Presentation on “Gender and Natural Resource Management, Land Tenure and Property Rights,” United Nations Capital Development Fund Panel on Gender, November 12, 1998.

1999

Syracuse, NY — Presentation of “Individualization of Land Rights and Gender Differentiated Inheritance in Matrilineal Sumatra: Efficiency and Equity Implications,” at a seminar at Syracuse University’s Maxwell School of Public Policy, February 4, 1999.

Dhaka, Bangladesh — Seminars in Dhaka, Bangladesh, on the Bangladesh micronutrients and gender projects at the International Center for Diarrheal Disease Research, the Bangladesh Rice Research Institute, the USAID Mission, and IFPRI’s Food Management and Research Support office, February 12–26, 1999.

Washington, DC — Presentation to a delegation visiting IFPRI from the Institute du Sahel (INSAH — Bamako, Mali,) on “Gender and Intrahousehold Aspects of Food Policy,” at the request of USAID, March 4, 1999.

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Presentation of “Evaluation and Strengthening of the *Hogares Comunitarios*: Methods and Goals,” a report on IFPRI’s work in Guatemala, at the INCAP (*Instituto de Nutricion de Centro-America y Panama*) scientific meetings in Guatemala, February 26, 1999.

Washington, DC — Presentation of “Urbanization and Women’s Employment: Constraints and Opportunities for Child Feeding and Care,” at a meeting at the Pan-American Health Organization on Processed Complementary Foods in Latin America: Why, Where, and How?, March 18–19, 1999.

New York, NY — Presentation of “The Mobility of Adults in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Levels, Determinants, and Consequences,” at the Population Association of America Annual Meetings, for a session on Resource Allocation Within the Household, New York, March 25–27, 1999.

New York, NY — Presentation of “Women’s Assets and Intrahousehold Allocation in Rural Bangladesh: Testing Measure of Bargaining Power,” at the Population Association of America Annual Meetings, for a session on Intrahousehold Decision Making, New York, March 25–27, 1999.

Washington, DC — Brown bag seminar titled “Data Collection Plans for Phase II of the Bangladesh the Program Micronutrients/Gender Project,” March 29, 1999.

Washington, DC — Brown bag seminar titled “Poverty Dynamics and Social Capital in South Africa,” March 30, 1999.

Sussex, UK — Presentation of “Social Capital and Income Generation in South Africa, 1993–1998,” at the workshop on Economic Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Developing Countries at the Institute of Developmental Studies (IDS), University of Sussex, April 5, 1999.

Madison, WI — Presentation of “The Mobility of Adults in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Levels, Determinants, and Consequences” and “Social Capital and Income

Generation in South Africa, 1993–98” to the Economics Department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, May 6–10, 1999.

Princeton, NJ — Seminar presented on “Gender, Land Rights, and Management of Land and Trees in Customary Areas of Western Ghana,” at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, April 21, 1999.

Baltimore, MD — Paper presented on “Intrahousehold Resource Allocation in Rural Bangladesh,” at the Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health as part of a course on health economics in developing countries on April 23, 1999.

Toronto, Canada — Paper presented on “Child Growth in the Time of Drought,” at the annual meetings of the Canadian Economics Association in Toronto, May 28, 1999.

Oslo, Norway — Paper presented on “Intrahousehold Allocation and Gender Relations: New Empirical Evidence,” and discussed at the Authors’ Workshop for the World Bank’s Policy Research Report on Gender and Development, held on June 23–25, 1999.

Cancún, Mexico — Paper presented on “The Role of Gender, Age, and Family Composition in Explaining Remittances: An Analysis for the Dominican Sierra,” at the Latin American Econometrics Society meetings, July 23, 1999.

Dhaka, Bangladesh — Paper presented on “Mother–Father Resource Control and Boy–Girl Health in Rural Bangladesh,” at the International Centre for Diarrheal Disease Research, Social and Behavioural Sciences Programme Seminar, Public Health Division in Dhaka, September 29, 1999.

Los Baños, Philippines — Presentation on “Commercial Vegetable and Polyculture Fish Production in Bangladesh: Their Impacts on Income, Household Resource Allocation, and Nutrition,” at the IFPRI/CG-Wide Workshop on Improving Human Nutrition Through Agriculture: The Role of International Agricultural Research, October 1999.

Washington, DC — Presentation on “Commercial Vegetable and Polyculture Fish Production in Bangladesh: Their Impacts on Income, Household Resource Allocation, and Nutrition,” at USAID, July 1999.

College Park, MD — Presentation on the Bangladesh micronutrients and gender project to a class in the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Maryland, College Park, November 4, 1999.

Rome, Italy — Presentation on “The Generation and Use of Information on Women’s Land Rights in the Design of Sustainable Agriculture Project,” at a technical panel at the High-Level Consultation on rural Women and Information, at the Food and Agriculture Organization, October 3–6, 1999.

Copenhagen, Denmark — Presentation on “Commercial Vegetable and Polyculture Fish Production in Bangladesh: Their Impacts on Income, Household Resource Allocation and Nutrition,” at the Research Department of Human Nutrition of the Royal Veterinary and Agriculture College, October 1999.

Santa Monica, CA — Presentation on the types of health and nutrition data being collected in Phase II of the Bangladesh Micronutrients/Gender Project and workshop on “Health Status Measurement in Social Surveys,” sponsored by RAND/UCLA/WHO, October 16, 1999.

Williamsburg, VA — Presentation on “Social Capital and Income Generation in South Africa, 1993–1998,” at the College of William and Mary, November 5, 1999.

Medford, MA — Presentation on “Women’s Assets and Intra-household Allocation: Testing Measures of Bargaining Power,” at the Tufts University School of Nutrition Social Science Seminar Series, November 1, 1999.

Cambridge, MA — Presentation on “Child Schooling and the Distribution of Parental Resources at Marriage: New Empirical Evidence from Four Developing Countries,” at the Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies, November 2, 1999.

Washington, DC — Table presentation of IFPRI gender materials at USAID Officers’ Gender and Results Workshop reception, October 14, 1999.

Cambridge, MA — Presentations of “Land Tenure and the Management of Land and Trees,” “Social Capital and Income Generation in South Africa, 1993–98,” “Mother–Father Resource Control and Boy-Girl Health in Rural Bangladesh,” and “Child Growth in the Time of Drought,” at the Northeast Universities Development Consortium Conference, Harvard University, October 8, 1999.

College Park, MD — Presentation of “Intra-household Allocation and Gender Relations: New Empirical Evidence,” at the World Bank’s Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) week at the University of Maryland, July 14, 1999.

Alexandria, VA — Participation in a panel on “Women in Agriculture” at the Association for Women in Development (AWID) 8th International Forum for Leading Solutions for Equality and Justice, and display table on Gender and Intra-household Research and Results, November 11–14, 1999.

2000

Boston, MA — Presentation of “Women’s Assets and Intra-household Allocation in Rural Bangladesh: Testing Measures of Bargaining Power,” at the Allied Social Sciences Association meetings, January 3–6, 2000.

Boston, MA — Presentation of “Are Women the Fairer Sex? Looking for Gender Differences in Gender Bias in Uganda,” at the Allied Social Sciences Association meetings, January 3–6, 2000.

Washington, DC — Seminar at the Inter-American Development Bank on the evaluation of the Guatemalan community day-care program, including presentation of the framework for the USAID-funded project “Strengthening Development Policy through Gender Analysis,” and the initial results of the operations evaluation of the community daycare program in Guatemala City, January 2000.

Washington, DC — Seminar presented on “Strengthening Development Policy Through Gender Analysis: Research Results from an Integrated Multicountry Research Program” to USAID’s Economic Growth, Gender, and Development team as part of USAID’s series on exploring joint concerns of economic growth and gender issues, March 2000.

Washington, DC — Presentation of “Modeling the Proximate Determinants of Haemoglobin Concentration of Bangladeshi Women: Is Iron Fortification of Rice a Viable Strategy for Reducing Iron Deficiencies?” made to the Nutrition Thematic Group as part of the World Bank’s Seminar Series on Poverty, Household Economics, and Rural Development by Alok Bhargava (University of Houston), a Visiting Gender Research Fellow, April 2000.

Oxford, UK — Two papers presented on “Social Capital and Household Welfare in South Africa: Pathways of Influence” and “Intrahousehold Allocation and Gender Relations: New Empirical Evidence from Four Developing Countries” at a conference on Opportunities in Africa: Micro-evidence from Firms and Households which was held at the Centre for the Study of African Economies at the University of Oxford, England, April 9–10, 2000.

San Diego, CA — A Poster Session on “Parental resource control and girl-boy morbidity” was presented at the session on International Nutrition: Child Feeding, Growth and Development of the FASEB meeting in San Diego, California, April 2000.

Durban, South Africa — In-country planning workshop on “Confronting the Legacy of Inequality: Local Communities, Social Capital and the Dynamics of Income Distribution and Poverty,” June 12–15, 2000.

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Presentation and discussion of the findings of the operational evaluation of the Community Day-Care Program in Guatemala during a one-day workshop held at INCAP with staff from the program, September 2000.

Ithaca, NY — Presentation of “Nuptials and Nutrition: Mother–Father Resources, Wedding Payments, and Girl–Boy Anthropometry in Bangladesh,” at the Northeastern Universities Development Consortium (NEUDC) Conference held in Cornell University, October 6–7, 2000.

Washington, DC — Presentation on social capital in the course “The Microeconomics of Development,” held at the School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS) at the Johns Hopkins University, October 26, 2000.

Washington, DC — Brown bag lunch on “Bangladesh: Gender Dimensions of New Agricultural Technologies,” at the World Bank’s Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) Week, November 16, 2000.

2001

New Orleans, LA — Presentation of “Household Structure and Child Well-Being: Evidence from KwaZulu-Natal,” at the Allied Social Sciences Associations Meetings, January 5–7, 2001.

Washington, DC — Presentation of “Women’s Employment and Child Care and Nutrition in Urban Areas: Examples from Guatemala and Ghana,” at a Brown Bag Series of the Poverty Unit of the World Bank, January 11, 2001.

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Presentation of “*Evaluacion y Fortalecimiento del Programa de Hogares Comunitarios de Guatemala*” (Evaluation and Strengthening of the *Hogares Comunitarios* Program) at the *Final Workshop of Guatemala case study* held at INCAP, January 29–30, 2001.

Washington, DC — Presentation of “Strengthening Development Policy Through Intrahousehold Analysis,” the Program End-of-Project Workshop held at IFPRI, February 1, 2001.

Washington, DC — Presentations of “Gender Differences in Land Inheritance, Schooling, and Lifetime Income: Evidence from the Rural Philippines” and “Land Inheritance and Schooling in Matrilineal Societies: Evidence from Sumatra,” at the Population Association of America Annual Meetings, March 28–30, 2001

Washington, DC — Presentation of “Day Care for Preschoolers in the Urban Slums of Guatemala City,” at the Population Association of America Annual Meetings, March 28–30, 2001.

Philadelphia, PA — Presentation of “Intergenerational Transfers in the Philippines and Sumatra,” at a seminar held at the Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, April 19, 2001.

Washington, DC — Presentation of “The Impact of Progresa on Women’s Status and Household Decisionmaking,” at a workshop on Assessing the Impact of Progresa, sponsored by the Poverty and Inequality Unit of the Sustainable Development Department (SDS/POV) at the Inter-American Development Bank, June 5, 2001.

Bogor, Indonesia — Presentation of “Technology and Tasks: Improved Vegetable Varieties and Time Allocation of Men and Women in Rural Bangladesh,” at Neys-van Hoogstraten Foundation International Workshop on Socioeconomic Research as a Tool for Improving Household Food Security and Nutrition, held in Bogor, Indonesia, July 2001.

Vienna, Austria — Presentation of “Explaining the Gender Differences in Child Nutritional Status Outcomes as a Function of Male-Female Resource Control: Evidence from Bangladesh,” at the 17th International Congress of Nutrition 2001, held in Vienna, Austria, August 27–31, 2001.

Bonn, Germany — Presentation of “Empowering Low-Income Women,” at the 2020 Conference on Sustainable Food Security for All, held in Bonn, Germany, September 6, 2001.

Boston, MA — Presentation of “Control and Ownership of Assets in Rural Ethiopian Households” and “Technology and Tasks: Improved Vegetable Varieties and Time Allocation of Men and Women in Rural Bangladesh,” at the Northeast Universities

Development Consortium Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, September 28–30, 2001.

Washington, DC — Presentation of “Food Aid and Child Nutrition in Rural Ethiopia,” at the Workshop on Crises and Disasters: Measurement and Mitigation of their Human Costs, sponsored by the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C., November 13–14, 2001.

2002

Manchester, NH — Lecture presented on “Inheritance, Education, and Gender Differences in Income in the Philippines and Sumatra,” at St. Anselm’s College, Manchester, New Hampshire, February 11, 2002.

Kathmandu, Nepal — Presentation of “Food Security in Practice: Using Gender Research in Development, Focus on Agriculture and Natural Resources,” at the workshop on Addressing Gender Issues in Development Projects: A Focus on Agriculture, jointly organized by the Center for Environmental and Agricultural Policy Research, Extension and Development (CEAPRED) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Kathmandu, Nepal, May 23, 2002.

Nairobi, Kenya — Presentation of “Food Security in Practice: Using Gender Research in Development, Focus on Social and Legal Institutions,” at the workshop on Addressing Gender Issues in Development Projects: A Focus on Social and Legal Institutions, jointly organized by the International Center for Research on Agroforestry (ICRAF), the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program, and the International Food Policy Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya, July 9, 2002.

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Presentation of “*Seguridad Alimentaria en Práctica: Aplicación de la Investigación de Género en Proyectos de Desarrollo; El Trabajo de la Mujer y los Proyectos de Inversión en Capital Humano*,” at the workshop on *Consideraciones sobre Género en Proyectos de Desarrollo*, jointly organized by the *Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá* (INCAP) and the International Food Policy Research Institute, Guatemala City, Guatemala, August 13, 2002.

Williamstown, MA — Presentation of “Food Aid and Child Nutrition in Rural Ethiopia,” at the Northeast Universities Development Consortium Conference, Williamstown, Massachusetts, October 25–27, 2002.

Gender and Development Policy Brown-Bag Seminar Series

- “Gender, Land Rights, and the Management of Land and Trees in Customary Areas of Western Ghana,” by Agnes Quisumbing, IFPRI, February 16, 1999.
- “Who Supports Widows in Rural India — Household Structure and Maintenance,” by Martha Chen, Harvard Institute for International Development, March 16, 1999.

- “Intrahousehold Distribution of Food and Micronutrient Status in Bangladesh,” by Howarth Bouis, IFPRI, April 20, 1999.
- “Gender, Participation, and Rights to Common Property Resources: The Case of Water Users’ Organizations in South Asia,” by Ruth Meinzen-Dick, IFPRI, May 18, 1999.
- “Whose Work and Whose Leisure? Time Use and Overlapping Activities of Men and Women,” by Maria Sagrario Floro, American University, June 15, 1999.
- “Women’s Status, Women’s Education, and Child Nutrition in Developing Countries,” by Lisa Smith and Lawrence Haddad, IFPRI, July 20, 1999.
- “Gender Differences in Schooling and Land Inheritance in Rural Philippines,” by Jonna Estudillo and Keijiro Otsuka, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Japan, August 17, 1999.
- “Intrahousehold Allocation and Gender Relations: New Empirical Evidence,” by Agnes Quisumbing and John Maluccio, IFPRI, September 21, 1999.
- “Social Capital and Gender in South Africa,” by John Maluccio and Lawrence Haddad, IFPRI, November 16, 1999.
- “Family Planning, Gender Differences, and Infant Mortality: Evidence from Uttar Pradesh, India,” by Alok Bhargava, University of Houston, Texas, November 18, 1999.
- “Control and Ownership of Assets Within Rural Ethiopian Households,” by Agnes Quisumbing, IFPRI, March 21, 2000.
- “Mother-Father Resource Control, Marriage Payments, and Girl-Boy Health in Rural Bangladesh,” by Kelly Hallman, IFPRI, April 18, 2000.
- “Survival Strategies for the Urban Poor,” by Irene Tinker, Professor Emerita, University of California, Berkeley, October 17, 2000.

Project Workshops

Washington, DC — Supplemental Studies Workshop, USAID/WID project on “Strengthening Development Policy through Gender Analysis,” September 17–18, 1998.

Dhaka, Bangladesh — A workshop entitled “Strengthening Development Policy by Looking within the Household: Linking Agriculture, Nutrition and Health in Bangladesh” was held as part of the USAID-funded project on Strengthening Development Policy through Gender Analysis. It was co-hosted by IFPRI, the Institute of Food and Nutrition Science of Dhaka University, and the Bangladesh National Nutrition Council (BNNC) and was a key feature of the BNNC’s National Nutrition Week. Presentations by IFPRI included: “Modeling the Proximate

Determinants of Hemoglobin Concentration of Bangladeshi Women: Is Iron Fortification of Rice a Viable Strategy for Reducing Iron Deficiencies?,” “Mother-Father Resource Control, Marriage Payments, and Girl-Boy Health in Rural Bangladesh,” and “Women’s Assets, Expenditure Outcomes, and Education of Children.” Two IFPRI researchers were also interviewed on Bangladeshi national television while attending a workshop in Dhaka as part of Bangladesh’s National Nutrition Week in Dhaka, Bangladesh, April 25–26, 2000.

Pretoria, South Africa — In-country workshop on “Strengthening Development Policy by Looking within the Household: Linking Household Resources to the Dynamics of Poverty in South Africa: A Case Study of KwaZulu-Natal,” October 13, 2000.

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia — In-country workshop on “Strengthening Development Policy by Looking within the Household: New Evidence on Assets and Outcomes in Rural Ethiopian Households,” December 14, 2000.

Guatemala City, Guatemala — Presentation of the results of the “Evaluation of the Hogares Comunitarios Program,” January 30, 2001.

Washington, DC — End-of-project workshop on “Strengthening Development Policy Through Intrahousehold Analysis,” February 1, 2001.

External Advisory Committee Meetings

1996 — First meeting of External Advisory Committee, March 18–19, 1996.

1997 — Second meeting of External Advisory Committee, March 17, 1997.

1998 — Third meeting of External Advisory Committee, March 9-10, 1998.

1999 — Fourth meeting of External Advisory Committee, May 20–21, 1999.

APPENDIX 4: PUBLICATIONS OUTPUTS OF THE INTRAHOUSEHOLD PROGRAM (1995–2002)

Books and Monographs

- Haddad, L., J. Hoddinott, and H. Alderman, eds. 1997. *Intrahousehold resource allocation in developing countries: Methods, models, and policy*. Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.: Johns Hopkins University Press for IFPRI.
- Quisumbing, A. R., ed. 2003. *Household decisions, gender, and development: A synthesis of recent research*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Brown, L. R. and J. Kerr, eds. 1998. *The Gender dimensions of economic reforms in Ghana, Mali, and Zambia*. Ottawa, Canada: North–South Institute.
- Quisumbing, A. R., and K. Otsuka. 2001. *Land, trees, and women: Evolution of customary land tenure institutions in western Ghana and Sumatra*. Research Report 121. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Quisumbing, A. R., J. P. Estudillo, and K. Otsuka. 2004. *Land and schooling: Transferring wealth across generations*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press for IFPRI.
- Smith, L., and L. Haddad. 2000. *Explaining child malnutrition in developing countries: A cross-country analysis*. Research Report No. 111. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Smith, L. C., U. Ramakrishnan, A. Ndiaye, L. Haddad, and R. Martorell. 2003. *The importance of women's status for child nutrition in developing countries*. Research Report 131. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Research Papers

Journal Articles

- Alderman, H., J. R. Behrman, H.-P. Kohler, J. A. Maluccio, and S. Cotts Watkins. 2001. Attrition in longitudinal household survey data: Some tests for three developing country samples. *Demographic Research* 5 (4): 77–124.
- Bhargava, A., H. Bouis, and N. S. Scrimshaw. 2001. Dietary intakes and socioeconomic factors are associated with the hemoglobin concentration of Bangladeshi women. *Journal of Nutrition* 131: 758–764.

- Carter, M. R., and J. A. Maluccio. 2003. Social capital and coping with economic shocks: An analysis of stunting of South African children. *World Development* 31 (7): 1147–1163.
- Estudillo, J., A. R. Quisumbing, and K. Otsuka. 2001. Gender differences in wealth transfers and expenditure allocation: Evidence from the rural Philippines. *Developing Economies* 39 (4): 366–394.
- Estudillo, Jonna, Agnes R. Quisumbing, and Keijiro Otsuka. 2001. Income distribution in rice-growing villages during the post-green revolution periods: The Philippine case, 1985 and 1998. *Agricultural Economics* 25 (1): 71–84.
- Estudillo, Jonna, Agnes R. Quisumbing, and Keijiro Otsuka. 2001. Gender differences in land inheritance, schooling, and lifetime income: Evidence from the rural Philippines. *Journal of Development Studies* 37 (4): 23–48.
- Estudillo, Jonna, Agnes R. Quisumbing, and Keijiro Otsuka. 2001. Gender differences in schooling and land inheritance in the rural Philippines. *Land Economics* 77 (1): 130–143.
- Fafchamps, Marcel, and Agnes R. Quisumbing. 1999. Human capital, productivity, and labor allocation in rural Pakistan. *Journal of Human Resources* 34 (2): 369–406.
- Fafchamps, M., and A. R. Quisumbing. 2002. Control and ownership of assets within rural Ethiopian households. *Journal of Development Studies* 38 (2): 47–82.
- Fafchamps, M., and A. R. Quisumbing. 2003. Social roles, human capital, and the intra-household division of labor: Evidence from Pakistan. *Oxford Economic Papers* 55 (1): 36–80.
- Haddad, L. 1999. The income earned by women: Impacts on welfare outcomes. *Agricultural Economics* 20 (2): 135–141.
- Haddad, L. 2000. Women's status: Levels, consequences for child nutrition, and implications for policies and programs. *Asian Development Review* (forthcoming).
- Haddad, L., and J. A. Maluccio. 2003. Trust, membership in groups, and household welfare: Evidence from KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 51 (3): 573–601.
- Kadam, Nuket. 1991. *Bringing women in: Women's issues in international development programmes*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.
- Lastarria-Cornhiel, S. 1997. Impact of privatization on gender and property rights in Africa. *World Development* 25 (8): 1317–1333.
- Maluccio, J. 2004. Using quality of interview information to assess nonrandom attrition bias in developing-country panel data. *Review of Development Economics* 8 (1): 91–109.

- Maluccio, J., L. Haddad, and J. May. 2000. Social capital and income generation South Africa, 1993–98. *Journal of Development Studies* 36 (6): 54–81.
- May, J., M. R. Carter, L. Haddad, and J. Maluccio. 2000. Kwazulu-Natal income dynamics study (KIDS) 1993–1998: A longitudinal household data set for South African policy analysis. *Development Southern Africa* 17 (4): 567–581.
- Meinzen-Dick, Ruth S., and Margreet Zwarteveen. 1998. Gendered participation in water management: Issues and illustrations from water users associations in South Asia. *Agriculture and Human Values* 15 (4): 337–345.
- Meinzen-Dick, R., L. R. Brown, H. Sims Feldstein, and A. R. Quisumbing. 1997. Gender and property rights: Overview. *World Development* 25 (8): 1299–1302.
- Meinzen-Dick, R., L. R. Brown, H. Sims Feldstein, and A. R. Quisumbing. 1997. Gender, property rights, and natural resources. *World Development* 25 (8): 1303–1316.
- Otsuka, K., A. R. Quisumbing, E. Payongayong, and J. B. Aidoo. 2003. Land tenure and the management of land and trees: The case of customary land areas of Ghana. *Environment and Development Economics* 8 (1): 77–104.
- Paolisso, M., K. Hallman, L. Haddad, and S. Regmi. 2002. Does cash crop adoption detract from child care provision? Evidence from rural Nepal. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 50: 313–338.
- Quisumbing, Agnes R. 1996. Male-female differences in agricultural productivity: Methodological issues and empirical evidence. *World Development* 24 (10): 1579–1595.
- Quisumbing, Agnes R. 1996. Modeling household behavior: Discussion. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 78 (5): 1346–1348.
- Quisumbing, A. R., L. R. Brown, L. Haddad, and R. Meinzen-Dick. 1998. Gender issues for food security in developing countries: Implications for project design and implementation. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 19 (Special Issue: The Quest for Food Security in the 21st Century): 185–208.
- Quisumbing, A. R. 2003. Food aid and child nutrition in rural Ethiopia. *World Development* 31 (7): 1309–1324.
- Quisumbing, Agnes R., Lawrence Haddad, and Christine Peña. 2001. Are women over-represented among the poor? An analysis of poverty in ten developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics* 66 (1): 225–269.
- Quisumbing, A. R., E. Payongayong, J. B. Aidoo, and K. Otsuka. 2001. Women’s land rights in the transition to individualized ownership: Implications for the management of tree resources in western Ghana. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 50 (1): 157–182.

- Quisumbing, A. R., and K. Otsuka. 2001. Land inheritance and schooling in matrilineal societies: Evidence from Sumatra. *World Development* 29 (12, December): 2093–2110.
- Quisumbing, A. R., and J. A. Maluccio. 2003. Resources at marriage and intra-household allocation: Evidence from Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Indonesia, and South Africa. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 65 (3): 283–328.
- Ruel, M. T. 2001. Do subsidized childcare programs work? An operational evaluation in Guatemala City. *FAO Journal* 29: 44-52.
- Smith, L., and L. Haddad. 2001. How important is improving food availability for reducing child malnutrition in developing countries? *Agricultural Economics* 26: 191-204.
- Stoltzfus, R. J., J. Chakraborty, A. Rice, B. de la Brière, and A. de Francisco. 1998. Plausible evidence of effectiveness of an iron supplementation program for pregnant and post-partum women in rural Bangladesh. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin* 19 (3): 197–205.
- Rocheleau, D., and D. Edmunds. 1997. Women, men, and trees: Gender, power, and property in forest and agrarian landscapes. *World Development* 25 (8): 1351–1371.
- Zwarteveen, M. 1997. Water, from basic need to commodity: A discussion of gender and water rights in the context of irrigation. *World Development* 25 (8): 1335–1349.

Published Abstracts

- Ruel, M. T., B. de la Brière, K. Hallman, A. Quisumbing, and M. Morfin. 2001. Nutritional impact of a government-sponsored community day care program in Guatemala. *Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism* 45 (suppl.1): 534 (abstract 7.A4.014).

Chapters in Books

- Haddad, L., L. R. Brown, A. Richter, and L. Smith. 2000. The gender dimensions of economic adjustment policies: Potential interactions and evidence to date. In *Gender and development: Theoretical, empirical, and practical approaches*, eds. L. Beneria and S. Bisnath. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Haddad, L., R. Kanbur, and H. Bouis. 1994.. Intra-household inequality and average household well-being: Evidence on calorie intakes and energy expenditures from the Philippines. In *Agricultural household modeling and family economics*, eds. F.Caillavet, H. Guyomard and R. Lifran. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, 239-257.
- Haddad, L., and J. Hoddinott. 1998. Incorporating work intensity into household models: A primer for non-economists. In *Gender differentials in work*

intensity, sustainability, and development, ed. R. Palmer-Jones. England: University of East Anglia (forthcoming).

Kennedy, E., and L. Haddad. 2000. Gender and nutrition. In *The Cambridge world history of food and nutrition*, ed. K. Kiple and C. Ornelas-Kiple. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Otsuka, K., and A. R. Quisumbing. 2001. Land rights and natural resource management in the transition to individual ownership. In *Access to land, rural poverty, and public action*, eds. A. de Janvry, G. Gordillo, J.-P. Platteau, and E. Sadoulet. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quisumbing, A. 1998. Women in agricultural systems. In *Women in the Third World: An encyclopedia of contemporary issues*, ed. N. P. Stromquist. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Quisumbing, A., L. R. Brown, L. Haddad, and R. Meinzen-Dick. 1998. The importance of gender issues for environmentally and socially sustainable rural development. In *Agriculture and the environment: Perspectives on sustainable rural development*, ed. Ernst Lutz (with the assistance of H. Binswanger, P. Hazell, and A. McCalla). Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Quisumbing, A., J. B. Aidoo, E. Payongayong, and K. Otsuka. 2001. Agroforestry management in Ghana. In *Land tenure and natural resource management: A comparative study of agrarian communities in Asia and Africa*, eds. K. Otsuka and F. Place. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Food Consumption and Nutrition Division Discussion Papers and Briefs

- 9 "Gender and poverty: New evidence from 10 developing countries," by Agnes R. Quisumbing, Lawrence Haddad, and Christine Peña, December 1995.
- 10 "Women's economic advancement through agricultural change: A review of donor experience," by Christine Peña, Patrick Webb, and Lawrence Haddad, February 1996.
- 19 "Food security and nutrition implications of intra-household bias: A review of literature," by Lawrence Haddad, Christine Peña, Chizuru Nishida, Agnes Quisumbing, and Alison Slack, September 1996.
- 23 "Better rich, or better there? Grandparent wealth, coresidence, and intra-household allocation," by Agnes R. Quisumbing, January 1997.
- 27 "'Bargaining' and gender relations: Within and beyond the household," by Bina Agarwal, March 1997.
- 29 "Gender, property rights, and natural resources," by Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Lynn R. Brown, Hilary Sims Feldstein, and Agnes R. Quisumbing, May 1997.

- 31 “Is there an intra-household ‘Flypaper Effect’? Evidence from a school feeding program,” by Hanan Jacoby, August 1997.
- 34 “The impact of changes in common property resource management on intra-household allocation,” by Philip Maggs and John Hoddinott, September 1997.
- 37 “Why do migrants remit? An analysis for the Dominican Sierra,” by Bénédicte de la Brière, Alain de Janvry, Sylvie Lambert, and Elisabeth Sadoulet, October 1997.
- 48 “Human capital, productivity, and labor allocation in rural Pakistan,” by Marcel Fafchamps and Agnes R. Quisumbing, July 1998.
- 52 “Testing nash bargaining household models with time-series data,” by John Hoddinott and Christopher Adam, November 1998.
- 54 “Endogeneity of schooling in the wage function: Evidence from the rural Philippines,” by John Maluccio, November 1998.
- 55 “Efficiency in intra-household resource allocation,” by Marcel Fafchamps, December 1998.
- 58 “Women’s land rights in the transition to individualized ownership: Implications for the management of tree resources in western Ghana,” by Agnes Quisumbing, Ellen Payongayong, J. B. Aidoo, and Keijiro Otsuka, February 1999.
- 60 “Explaining child malnutrition in developing countries: A cross-country analysis,” by Lisa C. Smith and Lawrence Haddad, April 1999.
- 68 “Early childhood nutrition and academic achievement: A longitudinal analysis,” by Paul Glewwe, Hanan Jacoby, and Elizabeth King, May 1999.
- 69 “Supply response of West African agricultural households: Implications of intra-household preference heterogeneity,” by Lisa C. Smith and Jean-Paul Chavas, July 1999.
- 70 “Child health care demand in a developing country: Unconditional estimates from the Philippines,” by Kelly Hallman, August 1999.
- 71 “Social capital and income generation in South Africa, 1993–98,” by John Maluccio, Lawrence Haddad, and Julian May, September 1999.
- 73 “Social roles, human capital, and the intra-household division of labor: Evidence from Pakistan,” by Marcel Fafchamps and Agnes R. Quisumbing, October 1999.
- 79 “Adult health in the time of drought,” by John Hoddinott and Bill Kinsey, January 2000.

- 84 “Intrahousehold allocation and gender relations: New empirical evidence from four developing countries,” by Agnes R. Quisumbing and John A. Maluccio, April 2000.
- 85 “Intrahousehold impact of transfer of modern agricultural technology: A gender perspective,” by Ruchira Tabassum Naved, April 2000.
- 86 “Women’s assets and intra-household allocation in rural Bangladesh: Testing measures of bargaining power,” by Agnes R. Quisumbing and Bénédicte de la Brière, April 2000.
- 87 “Changes in intra-household labor allocation to environmental goods collection: A case study from rural Nepal,” by Priscilla A. Cooke, May 2000.
- 93 “Mother-father resource control, marriage payments, and girl-boy health in rural Bangladesh,” by Kelly Hallman, September 2000.
- 95 “Attrition in the Kwazulu Natal income dynamics study, 1993–1998,” by John Maluccio, October 2000.
- 96 “Attrition in longitudinal household survey data: Some tests for three developing-country samples,” by Harold Alderman, Jere R. Behrman, Hans-Peter Kohler, John A. Maluccio, and Susan Cotts Watkins, October 2000.
- 109 “Does cash crop adoption detract from childcare provision? Evidence from rural Nepal,” by Michael J. Paolisso, Kelly Hallman, Lawrence Haddad, and Shibesh Regmi, April 2001.
- 113 “Measuring power,” by Elizabeth Frankenberg and Duncan Thomas, June 2001.
- 114 “Distribution, growth, and performance of microfinance institutions in Africa, Asia, and Latin America,” by Cécile Lapenu and Manfred Zeller, June 2001.
- 115 “Are women overrepresented among the poor? An analysis of poverty in ten developing countries,” by Agnes R. Quisumbing, Lawrence Haddad, and Christine Peña, June 2001.
- 120 “Control and ownership of assets within rural Ethiopian households,” by Marcel Fafchamps and Agnes R. Quisumbing, August 2001.
- 131 “Does subsidized childcare help poor working women in urban areas? Evaluation of a government-sponsored program in Guatemala City,” by Marie T. Ruel, Bénédicte de la Brière, Kelly Hallman, Agnes Quisumbing, and Nora Coj, April 2002.
- 135 “Trust, membership in groups, and household welfare: Evidence from KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa,” by Lawrence Haddad and John A. Maluccio, May 2002.

- 142 “Social capital and coping with economic shocks: An analysis of stunting of South African children,” by Michael R. Carter and John A. Maluccio, December 2002.
- 151 “Childcare and work: Joint decisions among women in poor neighborhoods of Guatemala City,” by Kelly Hallman, Agnes R. Quisumbing, Marie T. Ruel, and Bénédicte de la Brière, June 2003.
- 153 “Maquiladoras and market mamas: Women’s work and childcare in Guatemala City and Accra,” by Agnes R. Quisumbing, Kelly Hallman, and Marie T. Ruel, June 2003.

Other IFPRI Publications

Smith, L., and L. Haddad. 2000. *Overcoming child malnutrition in developing countries: Past achievements and future choices*. 2020 Vision for Food, Agriculture and Environment Discussion Paper 30. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Unpublished Papers

- Brown, L. R. 1995. Women, food security, and structural adjustment in Ghana. Paper prepared for and presented at the American Anthropological Association Meetings, November 17, 1995.
- Cross, C. R., T. M. Mngadi, and W. T. Mbhele. 1998. Poverty at ground zero: Social capital and economic shocks in rural Kwazulu Natal. Report submitted to International Food Policy Research Institute, May.
- de la Brière, B., and A. R. Quisumbing. 1998. Women’s empowerment and women’s assets in rural Bangladesh. Paper presented at an organized symposium, American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 2–5.
- Haddad, L. 1997. The incomes earned by women: Impacts on welfare outcomes. Paper prepared for the mini-symposium on Sustainable Nutritional Security for Sub-Saharan Women Subsistence Farmers, XXIII International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Sacramento, California, August 10–16.
- Quisumbing, A. R. 1997. Does parental gender preference pay off? Migration and child-parent transfers in the rural Philippines. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Quisumbing, A. R. 1997. Gender differences in agricultural technology adoption: A review of empirical evidence. Paper prepared for the mini-symposium on Sustainable Nutritional Security for Sub-Saharan Women Subsistence Farmers, XXIII International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Sacramento, California, August 10–16.

Quisumbing, A. R., and B. McClafferty. 2003. Food security in practice: Using gender research in development. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.

Unpublished Reports and Mimeographs

Michelle Adato, Francie Lund, and Phakama Mhlongo. 2002. The reconstitution of work in KwaZulu Natal, South Africa. Paper prepared for the Infocus Programme for Socio-Economic Security, International Labour Organisation, December.

Bouis, Howarth, Bénédicte de la Brière, Leah Guitierrez, Kelly Hallman, Nazmul Hassan, Ole Hels, Wahid Quabili, Agnes Quisumbing, Shakuntala Thilsted, Zahidul Hassan Zihad, and Sajjad Zohir. 1998. Commercial vegetable and polyculture fish production in Bangladesh: Their impacts on income, household resource allocation, and nutrition. International Food Policy Research Institute, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, and Institute of Nutrition and Food Science.

Campbell, Constance, A. Chicchón, M. Schmink, and R. Piland. 1999. Gender and intra-household impacts of community-based conservation and development initiatives in Peru and Brazil. Final report submitted to the International Food Policy Research Institute.

Fafchamps, M., and A. Quisumbing. 2000. Assets at marriage in rural Ethiopia. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.

SOSEP. 2000. *Fortalecimiento de la nutrición y alimentación en Hogares Comunitarios*. Guatemala: Secretaría de Obras Sociales de la Esposa del Presidente.

Gutierrez, L. 1999. Time allocation of female heads and wives in rural Bangladesh: The roles of the adoption of new fish and vegetable varieties and household attributes. Final report for Bangladesh High Concentration Country Study under Gender and Intra-household Research Project No. 2492-000, October 15.

Katz, E. G. 1999. Individual, household, and community-level determinants of migration in Ecuador: Are there gender differences? Final report submitted to the International Food Policy Research Institute.

Katz, E. 2000. Female-headed households in urban Guatemala: Household composition, labor force participation, and childcare strategies. Report submitted in September.

Maluccio, J., D. Thomas, and L. Haddad. 1999. The mobility of adults in post-Apartheid South Africa: Levels, determinants, and consequences. Paper prepared for the PAA Meetings, March 25–27.

- Otsuka, K., and A. R. Quisumbing. 1998. Gender and forest resource management: A comparative study of selected areas of Asia and Africa. Report submitted to the United Kingdom Department for International Development.
- Quisumbing, A. R., and J. Maluccio. 1999. *Intrahousehold allocation and gender relations: New empirical evidence*. Policy Research Report on Gender and Development, Working Paper Series No. 2. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Ruel, M. T. 2000. Evaluación operacional del programa de Hogares Comunitarios de Guatemala (Operational evaluation of the *Hogares Comunitarios* Program in Guatemala). Final Report, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Ruel, M. T., B. de la Brière, and K. Hallman. 2000. *Evaluación operativa de programa de Hogares Comunitarios de Guatemala* (Operational Evaluation of the Community Day Care Program of Guatemala). International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Subramanian, J. 1998. Rural women's rights to property in Bangladesh: A literature review. Report prepared for the International Food Policy Research Institute under the USAID/WID grant by the Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- Udry, C., and M. Goldstein. 1999. Agricultural innovation and resource management in Ghana. Final report submitted to the International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Vásquez Vargas, S. L., and S. Lastarria-Cornhiel. 1999. A legal analysis of urban women's rights in Guatemala. Final report submitted to the International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Woldegiorgis, O. 1999. Gender and land access in Ethiopia. Final report submitted to the International Food Policy Research Institute.

Newsletters

Gender-CG Newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 3, October 1995.

Gender-CG Newsletter, Vol. 2, No. 1, October 1996.

Gender-CG Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 1, June 1996.

Gender-CG Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 1, April 1998.

Gendev News, Volume 5, No. 1, July 1999.

Gendev News, Volume 5, No. 2, October 1999

Project Briefs

Women: The key to food security. Looking into the household. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute, June 2000

Women: The key to food security. Looking into the household. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute, revised October 2000.

Brown, L. R. 1997. The potential impact of AIDS on population and economic growth rates. 2020 Brief 43. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Quisumbing, A. R., and R. S. Meinzen-Dick, eds. 2001. Empowering women to achieve food security. 2020 Focus 6. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Resource allocation and empowerment of women in rural Bangladesh. Gender and Intra-household Aspects of Food Policy Project Brief No. 1, IFPRI, April 2000.

Commercial vegetable and polyculture fish production in Bangladesh: Their impacts on income, food consumption, and nutrition. Gender and Intra-household Aspects of Food Policy Project Brief No. 2, IFPRI, April 2000.

Mother-father resources and girl-boy health in rural Bangladesh. Gender and Intra-household Aspects of Food Policy Project Brief No. 3, IFPRI, April 2000.

Effects of diet in improving iron status of women: What role for food-based interventions? Gender and Intra-household Aspects of Food Policy Project Brief No. 4, IFPRI, April 2000.

Cecile Jackson is a professor at the School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION PAPERS

23. **Strengthening Food Policy Through Gender and Intrahousehold Analysis: Impact Assessment of IFPRI Multicountry Research**, *by Cecile Jackson (April 2005)*
22. **The Impact of the Food-for-Education Program in Bangladesh on Schooling Outcomes and Earnings and the Contribution of IFPRI Research**, *by James G. Ryan and Xin Meng (November 2004)*
21. **Impact Assessment of IFPRI's Research and Related Activities Based on Economywide Modeling**, *by Kym Anderson (December 2003)*
20. **The Impact of Economic Policy Research: Lessons on Attribution and Evaluation from IFPRI**, *by James G. Ryan and James L. Garrett (October 2003)*
19. **Impacts of IFPRI/ICARDA Policy and Property Rights Research on the Mashreq and Maghreb Project**, *by John H. Sanders and Hassan Serghini (October 2003)*
18. **Institutional Learning and Change in the CGIAR: Summary Record of the Workshop Held at IFPRI, Washington, DC, February 4-6, 2003**, *by Ronald Mackay and Douglas Horton (October 2003)*
17. **Evaluating the Impact of Agricultural Projection Modeling Using the IMPACT Framework**, *by James G. Ryan (February 2003)*
16. **The Impact of the International Food Policy Research Institute's Research Program on Rural Finance Policies for Food Security for the Poor**, *by Jeffrey Alwang and V. Puhazhendhi (December 2002)*
15. **Synthesis Report of Workshop on Assessing the Impact of Policy-oriented Social Science Research in Scheveningen, The Netherlands November 12-13, 2001**, *by James G. Ryan (March 2002)*
14. **The Production and Diffusion of Policy Knowledge: A Bibliometric Evaluation of the International Food Policy Research Institute**, *by Philip G. Pardey and Jason E. Christian (January 2002)*
13. **Impact of IFPRI's Policy Research on Resource Allocation and Food Security in Bangladesh**, *by Suresh Babu (February 2000)*
12. **A Review of Food Subsidy Research at IFPRI**, *by Curtis Farrar (January 2000)*

IMPACT ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION PAPERS

11. **Assessing the Impact of Policy Research and Capacity Building by IFPRI in Malawi**, *by James G. Ryan (December 1999)*
10. **External Impact Assessment of IFPRI's 2020 Vision for Food, Agriculture, and the Environment Initiative**, *by Robert Paarlberg (June 1999)*
9. **Returns to Policy-Related Social Science Research in Agriculture**, *by Bruce L. Gardner (May 1999)*
8. **Assessing the Impact of Rice Policy Changes in Viet Nam and the Contribution of Policy Research**, *by James G. Ryan (January 1999)*
7. **The Value of Economic Research**, *by David Zilberman and Amir Heiman (January 1999)*
6. **Policy for Plenty: Measuring the Benefits of Policy-Oriented Social Science Research**, *by George W. Norton and Jeffrey Alwang (December 1998)*
5. **Some Useful Methods for Measuring the Benefits of Social Science Research**, *by Henry E. Kilpatrick, Jr. (October 1998)*
4. **Adding Value through Policy-Oriented Research: Reflections of a Scholar-Practitioner**, *by C. Peter Timmer (October 1998)*
3. **A Proposal for Measuring the Benefits of Policy-Oriented Social Science Research**, *by Donghyun Park (August 1998)*
2. **Measuring the Benefits of Social Science Research**, *by Vincent H. Smith (July 1998)*
1. **IFPRI and the Abolition of the Wheat Flour Ration Shops in Pakistan: A Case-Study on Policymaking and the Use and Impact of Research**, *by Yassir Islam and James L. **Garrett** (December 1997)*