



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



## Opportunities in Gender and Youth Integration: Global Survey Findings

### Questions and Answers

#### **Is it possible that most implementers don't understand what is meant by gender activities or youth activities?**

The IP survey assessed knowledge in multiple ways: (1) self-report by gender and youth technical experts, (2) management assessment of gender and youth technical experts' knowledge, (3) gender and youth experts' assessment of management knowledge, (4) management/gender and youth experts' assessment of implementing staff knowledge, and (5) self-reported knowledge on selected topics by most participant groups. Intersectionality and youth programming concepts are top-rated priorities for increasing conceptual understanding among Gender and Youth Technical staff.

#### **Finding #2 really makes me question how we are collecting the kind of qualitative data we need to understand how and why people participate, not just that they are at the activities.**

This resonates with a recurrent finding from some gender and youth experts. Despite having some quantitative and qualitative indicators, what is actually needed is to have clear qualitative indicators, provided and requested by donor organizations, that can demonstrate the true impact of gender and youth integration in the communities in which they work, and among other staff members within their organizations.

#### **Would [finding #2] change if [Monitoring and Evaluation] M&E would be done more collaboratively with participants?**

Collaborating with participants in M&E can be part of knowledge and awareness activities, while also improving the quality of M&E results.

#### **Does anyone have strategies they have used to successfully get leadership buy-in for prioritizing gender and youth?**

Some strategies that were mentioned during the sessions included: highlighting and reinforcing donor requirements for gender and youth integration; raising the level of the gender and youth staff to management or higher; adequately budgeting for gender and youth analysis, and adaptive management strategies. From the research, one of our qualitative workshop participants from Syria mentioned that leadership buy-in also came from engaging the whole

organization staff in discussions around gender and youth issues they face everyday through their work and life. This helped in generating a lot of discussions within the organization, influencing leadership and their prioritization.

### **Did respondents speak to a link between internal organizational practices and their gender and youth integration in the field?**

Yes. For instance, because staff must first buy-into and believe in the importance of gender and youth integration, some mentioned that their staff try to be role models on gender equality because they cannot expect the community to practice what the staff do not believe in. One way some programs do this is to create staff spaces for dialogue around gender issues – where they bring all the staff together to do a gender training and then create a space for staff to share their perspectives on gender so that they learn from each other. Then they repeat this exercise with the community.

### **One other issue I see is that a technical staff member is designated "Gender and Youth Advisor/Manager," but the gender aspect is more pronounced and takes precedence. Separating the roles might help.**

Yes, this is in line with the finding highlighting that gender integration practices (including program/activity design and implementation informed by data, focal points, tools, specific budget) are more likely to be a part of program implementation than youth integration practices.

### **What strategies do people have for elevating youth integration?**

During the event, strategies mentioned for elevating youth integration were:

- Include youth in the decision making process. Some organizations have Young Professional Programmes that allow young people to be part of the organizational process.
- Advocate for capacity building for youth to strengthen their voice and ability to access decision making platforms.

Some qualitative workshop respondents also had youth champions that participated in the decision making process of the implementing organizations.

### **Are there any institutional behavior change interventions that have proven to work in relation to integrating gender and youth?**

Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC) was highlighted as an area that some programs use, and that capacity building in SBCC could benefit many other IPs working on shifting attitudes and changing social norms in the communities in which they work. Recommendations include enhancing capacity building opportunities on SBCC for those IPs that

request it in order to change attitudes towards gender and youth integration within their organization and in the communities in which they work.

### **What methodology was used to collect data?**

The research first focused on the quantitative component by administering a self-administered online knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) survey. Survey questions were categorized into modules addressing multiple themes within the broad categories of knowledge, attitudes, and practices. A total of 635 respondents answered the survey. To begin to validate survey findings, selected preliminary survey results were integrated into focus group discussion (FGD) and key informant interview (KII) guides, and respondents were asked to react to those results. Qualitative methods were used to both validate and enrich KAP survey findings. Combined, a total of 53 participants were reached through qualitative engagements.

### **Do you have country specific finding?**

In the report, we disaggregated country specific findings when appropriate to highlight trends or differences. Almost three quarters (72%) of respondents from the survey were based in Africa, with a quarter of all responses from Ethiopia (156). Fifteen percent of respondents were based in Asia, 6% in LAC, and 7% in MENAE. Similarly, 70% of participants in the FGDs and KIIs were from staff based in Africa, specifically from Ethiopia, Uganda, and Democratic Republic of the Congo.

### **Did the survey investigate whether programs are collecting data on LGBTQIA+ populations and did that data come out in the findings?**

Although the survey did not extensively examine attitudes and practices around LGBTQIA+ integration or data collection on these populations, some very stark findings emerged from the data nonetheless. When survey respondents were asked “Which groups are a priority to consider when mainstreaming gender?” only 41% selected LGBTQIA+ communities as a priority, whereas men, women, boys, and girls, were all selected at rates above 70%.

### **Did the team do any deep dives on specific projects to better understand the challenges getting disaggregated and qualitative data?**

The survey was not designed to dive deeply into specific projects. The focus was on implementing partner staff knowledge, attitudes and practices. The qualitative FGDs and KIIs validated the self-reported survey data and provided contextual examples to some of the reported challenges from across the BHA IP community. The survey, however, was designed to distinguish capacities at some level between RFSA and emergency staff, while recognizing that many survey respondents will work in other programs.

As highlighted during this event, GAYA has planned a number of work streams that will build on the learning of IPs. It is through these work streams that GAYA will seek out specific programmatic examples to share with the broader IP community.

**What kind of staff indicators could be set up in programmes to ensure the responsibility doesn't just fall on 'gender and youth' experts?**

Some respondents highlighted that quantitative indicators do not demonstrate the results that the project needs, as you cannot measure cultural changes by value or figure. Therefore, as mentioned above, clear qualitative indicators that can demonstrate the true impact of G&Y integration in the communities in which they work, and among other staff members within their organizations are needed.

**Were there any interesting differences in findings between different gender groups who responded to the survey or FGDs?**

We did have non-binary respondents. Three respondents reported their gender as non-binary. To protect their identity in countries where sexual and gender minorities are at risk, these respondents have been excluded from any disaggregation analysis that might create a risk of them being identified.

More female respondents strongly agreed that using a gender lens makes work more effective (71% for women compared to 63% for men) and that conducting gender analysis improves program outcomes (63% for women compared to 56% for men).

**From the assessment findings, are there projects that are doing well in either gender or youth programming, which we can learn from?**

Targeting critical community structures, such as traditional leaders and faith leaders, was identified as a strong pathway to success. For an organization in Uganda, coaching of community members, particularly couples, was an important aspect for their success. During the coaching sessions, they tackled topics such as GBV, and sharing of household responsibilities. At first, the men complained that they were not being involved, but after the first cohort was coached, they conducted a second cohort which included the men. They began to get stories about how the men are now supporting women with their activities because they understand how overworked the women are, and that the men are now watching the small children and cooking if the wife must come home late because of her economic or leadership activities.

**At what age can we say that a person is a youth or a child in order to avoid certain clumsiness?**

58% of respondents defined the youth category as 18-29 years, and 22% defined it as 10-29 years of age, with the latter being the USAID definition of youth. While USAID defines youth as 10-29, it recognizes that those under age 18 are universally considered children and subject to numerous national and international norms and legal protections. USAID defines different periods of youth as follows: ● Early adolescence (10-14); ● Adolescence (15-19); ● Emerging adulthood (20-24); and ● Transition to adulthood (25-29).

When engaging youth, GAYA recommends a nuanced approach that addresses the specific needs and opportunities of youth at the different stages of youth development.

### **What is the difference between youth integration and youth inclusion?**

The difference here is youth coming to and engaging in activities vs activities being adapted to better serve youth and meet their needs as well. It could be helpful here to further consider [Roger Hart's Ladder of Participation](#). It presents eight levels of youth participation that start from manipulation and tokenism at the lower rungs, to full participation at the top. It is important to note that the ladder metaphor of the model should not be assumed to mean that higher levels of participation are always better in all contexts and for all interventions. Instead, as the research correctly points out, there are real-life situations where different circumstances could call for different levels of participation. In certain contexts, a lower level of participation may be necessary for preparing both youth and adults before moving further up the ladder. The real strength of the model is that it constructs participation as a process of negotiation rather than a deliverable product, where numerous psychosocial and contextual factors play a key role. It could be seen as a form of “Pathways to Participation” model that focuses on the behavior of adults. That is, *what do adults have to do so that youth can have space and opportunity to participate?* Essentially, those with power and authority need to exhibit listening skills and respond in ways that create openings for youth participation in decision-making.

### **We find tools but struggle to know how to adapt them for our context. What can GAYA do to support this issue?**

One of GAYA’s work streams – amplifying approaches and resources to the implementing partner community – looks specifically at this issue. GAYA is looking at potentially offering a library of resources, including any contextual adaptations to those resources, so that others can learn how resources were previously adapted to other contexts. Additionally, GAYA may offer targeted support to contextualize a tool or resource, depending on bandwidth and applicability to the broader community.

### **How will GAYA address these findings?**

As part of the November 8 event, GAYA shared three potential work streams that were designed to address some of these challenges that implementing partners are facing. Those workstreams include: a resilience, gender, and youth fellowship; convening implementing partners in online conversations on key issues; and amplifying tested approaches and resources to the implementing partner community. GAYA will share more about its plans for the next year on its [Food Security and Nutrition \(FSN\) network page](#). [Subscribe here for more updates from GAYA](#).

**These findings are not new. What will GAYA do differently to ensure that actions follow?**

See above response to “How will GAYA address these findings?”

**DISCLAIMER:**

This brief is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of the Gender and Youth Activity (GAYA) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.