IITA
Transforming African Agriculture
CGIAR

Working Paper

A dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

Steven Cole, Devis Mwakanyamale, Lucy Ssendi, Marlène Elias

www.iita.org

Working Paper

December 2021

A dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

Steven Cole
Devis Mwakanyamale
Lucy Ssendi
Marlène Elias

Authors

Steven Cole (s.cole@cgiar.org) is a Senior Scientist at the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Devis Mwakanyamale (d.mwakanyamale@cgiar.org) is a Research Associate at the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Lucy Ssendi (lssendi@yahoo.co.uk) is a Consultant specializing in gender and climate change in Tanzania.

Marlène Elias (marlene.elias@cgiar.org) is a Senior Scientist at the Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT, Rome, Italy.

Published by the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
Ibadan, Nigeria

The International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) is a not-for-profit institution that generates agricultural innovations to meet Africa's most pressing challenges of hunger, malnutrition, poverty, and natural resource degradation. Working with various partners across sub-Saharan Africa, we improve livelihoods, enhance food and nutrition security, increase employment, and preserve natural resource integrity. IITA is a member of CGIAR, a global agriculture research partnership for a food secure future.

International address:
IITA, Grosvenor House,
125 High Street
Croydon CR0 9XP, UK

Headquarters:
PMB 5320, Oyo Road
Ibadan, Oyo State

ISBN

Correct citation: Cole, S., D. Mwakanyamale, L. Ssendi, M. Elias. 2021. A dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making. IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria. 45 pp.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Studies in the agricultural research for development literature that explore women's involvement in decision-making within the household tend to focus their analysis on married or cohabiting couples and often consult only one spouse in a marital dyad during field interviews. These and other studies in the literature explore who makes a particular decision within the household, and more recently, inquire about the extent to which the respondent or another household member was involved in the decision-making process. Few studies investigate why decisions are made by one person or jointly or about the process used to make decisions within the household. Studies on intra-household decision-making frequently use quantitative tools (e.g., survey instruments) to collect data on who decides on a specific production or consumption matter within the household. In contrast, qualitative tools or mixed methods are more appropriate for uncovering how or why intra-household decisions get made. This working paper presents a review of the extant literature on intra-household decision-making, with a specific interest in describing the different methods and tools studies used to assess women's and men's involvement in decision-making within the household. The paper argues for using dyadic interviews as one qualitative method to explore intra-household decision-making. Dyadic interviews bring two participants together to interact and respond to open-ended questions that focus on their relationship as the site for which experiences making decisions takes place. To date, most qualitative or mixed-methods studies use focus group discussions or semi-structured interviews to explore decision-making within the household and separate spouses or organize women and men into sex-segregated groups during the interview or discussion process. The paper reviews the literature on dyadic interviews and presents and discusses the results from a study that developed and piloted a qualitative dyadic interview guide to help understand how and why decisions get made and explore, with some level of precision, the decisions that get made jointly or by only one spouse, and the contributions made by each spouse during a decision-making process. The guide could assist researchers in conducting in-depth interviews for a qualitative study or being part of a mixed-methods study to inform or nuance findings from the quantitative component on intra-household decision-making.

Keywords: Dyadic interviews; Gender; Intra-household decision-making; Women's empowerment

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the following people for helping develop and/or pilot the guide: Miza Khamis (Chief Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Livestock and Fisheries, Zanzibar); Basil Msuha (Senior Agricultural Officer, Division of Sector Coordination, President's Office Regional Administration and Local Government); Prosper Makundi (Acting Head, Environmental Management Unit, Ministry of Agriculture); and Catherine Njuguna (Eastern Africa Regional Communications Officer at the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) and Lead of the climate-smart agriculture project "Building Capacity for Resilient Food Security in Tanzania"). We recognize the efforts by Kona Mosi (District Agriculture Development Officer, North B District), Talib Ramadhani (District Agriculture Development Officer, Unguja South District), Maria Maige (Extension Officer, in Mvomero District), Bakari Abdallah (IITA Field Officer, Zanzibar), Sigsmund Mujuni (IITA Field Officer, mainland Tanzania), and all village extension officers who assisted during the field work. We wish to thank the couples who were interviewed in Zanzibar and mainland Tanzania for their time during the pilot study. This work was undertaken as part of, and funded by, the CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions, and Markets (PIM) led by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). PIM is in turn supported by these donors. This working paper has not gone through IFPRI's standard peer-review procedure. The opinions expressed here belong to the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of PIM, IFPRI, or CGIAR.

1. Introduction

Women's involvement in making important intra-household decisions is a key indicator of their empowerment (Acosta et al., 2019; Seymour and Peterman, 2018). Studies exploring this topic often use survey data to differentiate between decisions that are made individually versus jointly (Alkire et al., 2013), but are unclear, which contributes more to empowerment. Normative, linear thinking suggests that women's sole decision-making is an indication that they are empowered, followed by joint decision-making with a spouse or another household member. Finally, women are not empowered when they are excluded from decision-making processes altogether (Bernard et al., 2020). However, research has shown that this logic may not always hold or is much more complicated. For example, women's equal participation in making joint decisions with their spouses is a strong underlying assumption, prompting efforts to discern to what extent each spouse has a say in making joint decisions (Acosta et al., 2019).

Studies in the research for development (R4D) literature that explored women's involvement in decision-making tended to focus their analysis on married or cohabiting, heterosexual couples. These studies often consulted only one spouse in a marital dyad during field interviews; thus, calling into question whether their response would match that of their spouse's response if they were interviewed separately or together (Anderson et al., 2017; Ambler et al., 2017). Recent studies (e.g., Deere and Twyman, 2012; Anderson et al., 2017) have uncovered intra-household discord in reports on who makes decisions, varying across decision domains and study contexts. According to Acosta et al.'s (2019) review of these studies, women were more likely to indicate they participated jointly in decisions, while men emphasized their roles as sole decision-makers.

Seymour and Peterman (2018) pointed to the need for greater efforts to determine *how* women and men perceive intra-household decision-making, or more specifically, how they explain a decision-making process (Acosta et al., 2019). Ashraf (2009) argued that the specific conditions under which decisions are made within a household might influence household outcomes significantly; thus, also highlighting the need for more information about how decisions were made. Bernard et al. (2020) suggested that more studies into *why* women and men make certain decisions are required, as indicating *who* makes *what* decision does not provide enough information to make claims about empowerment.

Studies on intra-household decision-making mainly used quantitative tools (e.g. survey instruments) to collect data on who makes a particular production or consumption-related decision in the household. Some studies asked if the decision was made with someone else and inquired about the extent to which the respondent or another household member was involved. Fewer studies used qualitative tools or mixed methods (see Meinzen-Dick et al., 2019), which were more apt for uncovering how or why intra-household decisions were made.

One objective of this working paper is to present a review of the extant literature on intra-household decision-making. The review includes a description of the different methodologies and tools studies used in the past to assess women's and men's involvement in decision-making within the household.

Based on learnings from this review, the second objective of this paper is to make a case for using dyadic interviews as one method to explore intra-household decision-making. Dyadic interviews bring two participants together to interact and respond to open-ended questions (Morgan et al., 2013) that focus on their relationship (Morris, 2001) as the site for which experiences making decisions takes place (Forbat and Henderson, 2003). To date, qualitative or mixed-methods studies have resorted to using mostly focus group discussions (FGDs) or semi-structured interviews to explore topics on decision- making within the household. The methods these studies employed separate spouses or organize women and men into sex-segregated groups during the interview or discussion process. This paper reviews the literature on dyadic interviews and presents and discusses the results from a study that developed and piloted a qualitative dyadic interview guide. This guide aimed to understand how and why decisions were made, and explore, with some level of precision, the decisions that were made jointly or by only one spouse, and the contributions made by each spouse during decision-making processes. Regarding the latter, the guide may be especially useful in pinpointing why discrepancies can occur when spouses report on who makes intra-household decisions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Assessing intra-household decision-making using a mix of methods

Anderson et al. (2017) maintained that studies on decision-making powers within the household often only interview one spouse, which ignores that spouses in a marital dyad may not agree with each other on who makes certain decisions or if they make decisions jointly. This issue is especially important given that decisions made can impact household outcomes, with discordance thought to be correlated with fewer positive outcomes (Ambler et al., 2017). Decision-making powers within the household are key determinants of resource allocation in low-income countries as spouses in some country contexts tend not to pool all their income and may not have the same preferences (Duflo, 2003; Duflo and Udry, 2004; Haddad et al., 1997). Studies have established links between women's decision making and ownership and control of assets, for example, with improved well-being outcomes of women and children (see in Ambler et al., 2017; Doss, 2013). Still, male heads of households are more frequently interviewed for information on intra-household decision-making (Anderson et al., 2017); thus, our understanding of women's decision-making powers over household matters is likely limited.

A growing number of studies in the literature have interviewed multiple household members asking the same set of subjective questions on decision-making. For instance, Twyman et al. (2015) explored gender differences in perceptions about agricultural decision-making in Ecuador. They interviewed spouses separately when administering a survey questionnaire. Their study found that men reported lower women participation levels than their spouses' reports, showcasing the importance of interviewing both spouses who make up a marital dyad on decision-making processes.

Other studies have revealed similar (but also contrasting) findings when both women and men are interviewed on agricultural and other decision-making in the household. Jejeebhoy (2002) examined data from the early 1990s collected from both spouses in a household on the decision-making powers of wives in two communities in India. She found widespread disagreement between women and their husbands regarding women's autonomy to make financial decisions within the home (e.g., on purchasing food, bigger items, and jewelry), with a greater percentage of husbands indicating they feel their wives have autonomy compared to their wives. Using matched husband and wife reports, Story and Burgard (2012) investigated who makes common household decisions among spouses and whether responses were associated with reproductive health care use in Bangladesh. They found that discordant reports were negatively associated with reproductive health care use and husband-only decision-making was negatively associated with antenatal care use and skilled delivery care. They also found that associations between household decision-making arrangements and health service utilization varied depending on whether the husband's or wife's report was used.

In Ethiopia, a higher percentage of male heads of households reported joint decisions were made with their wives on adopting new wheat varieties than female heads who reported they made this decision alone (Tiruneh et al., 2001). Bomuhangi et al. (2011) found that women and men participated relatively equally in agricultural decision-making in Uganda on what crops to grow, inputs to use, what to sell, and who retains the revenue from crop sales. Some older studies from Latin America showed that a rather significant portion of women in agricultural households

participated in decision-making with their spouses (Deere and León de Leal, 1982; Hamilton, 2000). However, Becker et al. (2006) found discordance on who made household decisions among couples in Guatemala.

Ambler et al. (2017) examined spouse responses on who makes decisions and owns assets and found substantial discord. Women's roles in both were reported more often by women than by their husbands. Using survey data collected from spouses in marital dyads in rural Tanzania, Anderson et al. (2017) found intra-household discord in reports on who made different farm and household decisions. Spouses were interviewed separately using a quantitative survey to ensure they did not influence each other's responses. Their findings suggest that policy and development interventions can be misplaced when studies only interview one spouse in a marital dyad.

Anderson et al. (2016) found that both wives and husbands interviewed separately in Tanzania reported that wives have fewer decision-making powers in polygynous households than monogamous households. Their quantitative study is one of a few studies that looked at decision-making authority in polygynous households. From their understanding of the literature, wives in a polygynous household may have fewer powers when making decisions because of: (1) they have a lower asset base in contrast to a wife's asset base in a monogamous household due to the sharing of resources and responsibilities among wives; and 2) limited exit options and bargaining powers in areas where polygyny is customary as norms heavily restrict women from marrying another husband, while men can marrying another wife.

Acosta et al. (2019) employed mixed methods to better understand intra-household decision-making in agriculture in Uganda. They used a survey-based instrument to explore the differences in men's and women's reporting of intra-household decision-making. Their analysis revealed significant gender differences, with women reporting joint decision-making over the adoption of agricultural practices and consumption expenses more often than men.

In the qualitative part of their study, Acosta et al. (2019) utilized FGDs and a decision-making game to examine gender-differentiated meanings attached to making joint decisions. Spouses were separated during group discussions into all-male and all-female groups to enable each group to express their thoughts freely and allow for a separate dialogue on gender issues. Groups were asked several questions on who makes agriculture-related decisions (e.g., husband only, wife only, jointly) and elaborate on why decisions are individually or jointly made. Spouses participated in the decision-making game together during the first part and individually during the second part. They were asked to make choices between different maize and bean varieties while together, and if they felt they played a role in making the decision later while separated. The study found that joint decision-making can include a range of scenarios, from spouses making decisions with no prior communication (e.g., male spouse informs his wife about the decision before or after the fact) to those decisions made where a man has the final say yet his spouse's ideas were considered or were not considered, but she was informed. The authors suggested that such interpretations of joint decision-making limit its potential for measuring women's empowerment. They advocated for mixed methods to better understand joint decision-making and included questions that studies could ask to explore the process couples adopt when making decisions.[1]

1 Example questions included: Who had the final say? Did you participate in a conversation about this decision? Were you informed before the decision was taken? Were you informed after? Could you influence this decision if you wanted to?

Elias et al. (2018) used vignettes (or short stories/fictional scenarios) in focus groups to better understand and map gendered activities and intra-household decision-making in Vietnam. After presenting a vignette on a typical family in Vietnam, they asked separate female and male focus groups a set of questions on labor contributions and decision-making processes on food production, purchasing, processing, preparation, and child feeding. Participants responded by indicating who does what, who makes the decisions, and how these decisions were made. Overall, their research found that various household members in Vietnam were involved in making decisions on these food-related activities, suggesting that nutrition-related programs and interventions should engage these different members depending on their focus and aims.

Other qualitative tools that have been developed focus more on assessing sole decision-making powers in the household using FGDs or semi-structured interviews when collecting the data. For instance, the 'ladder of power and freedom' tool (Petesch and Bullock, 2018) comprises four questions that ask study participants to rank women's or men's capacities to make important decisions on their own. Mayanja et al. (2018) developed a qualitative tool to assess decision-making powers in domains identified by the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI). In focus groups, respondents were asked about their abilities to decide within each domain, scoring themselves (in private) from none to very high.

Meinzen-Dick et al. (2019) presented qualitative research from several R4D projects that supported the development of the project-level version of the WEAI (pro-WEAI)[2]. Their research also aimed at understanding how rural women and men define and conceptualize empowerment by asking a wide range of empowerment-related questions, including women's and men's involvement in making agriculture-related decisions as an indicator of agency. Several qualitative instruments were designed to carry out the research[3]. One instrument administered to focus groups explored the barriers that prevent women from participating in decisions about agriculture, income, and other matters they wish to participate in, and likewise, the support mechanisms to overcome these barriers. Another instrument was designed for administering via semi-structured interviews and explored: (1) how decisions are usually made in households to better understand the process household members take when making such decisions; (2) the types of decisions women/men make on their own versus jointly; (3) the perceptions of the ways decisions are made; and (4) whether women/men would wish to have more influence on making decisions and why.

When asking spouses (or other household members) how decisions are typically made, respondents may focus on different instances of decision-making from the past when responding (Seymour and Peterman, 2018). For example, differences might arise when spouses reflect on who decided which crop to plant if they think about different plots they cultivate. Importantly, indicating who decides does not provide the necessary information to claim that people have agency or are or are not empowered (Bernard et al., 2020). Few studies have inquired about why people make decisions and the links to individual or household-level production or consumption outcomes or the reasons that explain household decision-making patterns. Thus, it is equally important to think about the rationale behind who makes decisions in the household and whether the reasons explain the variation in household outcomes above and beyond that which is explained by who the decision-

2 The pro-WEAI is a quantitative tool that measures women's empowerment in agricultural development projects. The tool comprises twelve indicators that measure intrinsic agency, instrumental agency, and collective agency. For more information, see https://weai.ifpri.info/versions/pro-weai/

3 See http://weai.ifpri.info/files/2018/04/GAAP2-Qualitative-Protocols-no-comments-.pdf

maker is (Bernard et al., 2020). In their study in Senegal, Bernard et al. (2020) determined who decides and why and related these to certain production and consumption outcomes. They asked the same survey questions to both spouses in a marital dyad, but separately.

The R4D literature on decision-making often only considers one domain or a few related outcomes (e.g., only consumption or production), and rarely both (Bernard et al., 2020). It should not be inferred that people who make decisions in one domain make them in another domain (Bernard et al., 2020). Many of the tools highlighted above seem to ask generally about production or income or consumption-related decisions, rather than zeroing in on a specific decision, which may complicate how respondents interpret their involvement in making decisions. Moreover, past studies that focused on a single decision rather than on multiple decisions that are made within households regularly may have missed variation in spousal decision-making powers across different decisions (Anderson et al., 2017).

The next section describes dyadic interviews in more detail, aiming to showcase how they can help attend to some of the concerns raised in this section, particularly the issues of discordance and jointness in decision-making among spouses in a marital dyad. Likewise, they have their limitations, which are also surfaced below.

2.2. Dyadic interviews

Individuals often make up the basic unit of analysis in most social science research, providing one-sided perspectives on topics that at times involve two or more sides (Eisikovits and Koren, 2010; Mellor et al., 2013). In such cases, study participants are asked to reconstruct events during individual interviews rather than to construct them together as a dyad or larger group during a joint or collective interview (Arksey, 1996). When topics under study are shared experiences between two people, a dyadic analysis can be considered (Eisikovits and Koren, 2010).

A dyadic interview is a form of interactive interviewing with two participants responding to open-ended questions, sometimes referred to as 'relationship-based' (Morgan et al., 2013), 'couple' (Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2018), or 'joint' (Zarhin, 2018) interview. Dyadic interviews are conducted with two people who are well acquainted with each other and who have a pre-existing relationship and emotional attachment, who are knowledgeable about the research topic, and who can work with key aspects of their shared histories (Morgan et al., 2013; Eisikovits and Koren, 2010; Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2018; Morris, 2001). Dyadic interviews enable a comprehensive account and direct observation of interactions between participants in a dyad to indicate how they negotiate decisions (Seale et al., 2008; Bjørnholt and Farstad, 2014). The relationship between the two participants is the focus of the research and informs how the dyad represents themselves during the interview (Morris, 2001; Thompson and Walker, 1982). The interviewer can gain insights about the experiences of both individuals in the relationship during the interview, and especially insights that are sensitive and have some influence on the relationship (Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2018).

According to Zarhin (2018), dyadic interviews have been used since the 1970s. Dyadic interviews generate qualitatively different data from that obtained using individual interviews or FGDs (Morgan et al., 2013; Seale et al., 2008; Arksey, 1996). Morris (2001) proposes that dyadic interviews combine intimacy experienced during individual interviews and public performance experienced during FGDs.

Dyadic interviews can be more appropriate than individual interviews in certain cultural contexts, for example, when it is difficult, intrusive, or threatening to ask a person who is part of a dyad to leave an interview before it begins or to ignore it while waiting nearby (Morris, 2001). During dyadic interviews, participants can help fill in gaps or remind each other when there are lapses in memory (Seale et al., 2008; Taylor and de Vocht, 2011; Rijken and Knijn, 2009), which cannot happen *in situ* when individual interviews are conducted (Morris, 2001). Pairs should be seen as a 'system' consisting of two parts. Through dyadic interviewing, the researcher learns from the pair's collective experiences, thereby gaining insights into the dynamics of the dyad that individual interviews cannot gain (Taylor and de Vocht, 2011). A dyadic interview should not be regarded as the average of two separate views (Taylor and de Vocht, 2011). Individual and dyadic interviews can be combined when studying dyads (Zarhin 2018; Eisikovits and Koren, 2010), as doing both allows for comparisons, cross checking, and triangulation (Morris, 2001).

According to Morgan et al. (2013), dyadic interviews are like FGDs as there is sharing and comparing among participants during the interview, unlike during individual interviews. However, dyadic interviews should not be considered smaller focus groups as conversations between two people can be very different than those that occur in groups. This review found very few studies that juxtapose dyadic interviews with FGDs. Morgan et al. (2013) highlighted some of the advantages of using dyadic interviews instead of FGDs: (1) they comprise two participants who know each other very well, while larger participant groups can get overwhelmed when brought together with new people; (2) they enable discussions on sensitive issues that people in larger groups may not be able to discuss given discomfort; (3) participants can provide in-depth and candid thoughts and discuss complex and challenging topics during dyadic interviews unlike during FGDs; (4) participants feel comfortable agreeing and disagreeing during dyadic interviews, while during FGDs they may not; and (5) there is reduced moderation when carrying out a dyadic interview as there is less clarifying, paraphrasing, and summarizing participant points as is often the case in FGDs.

Studies that have used dyadic interviews tend to portray the method positively, as was mostly demonstrated above. The method's shortcomings have been underemphasized (Zarhin, 2018). Like with any qualitative or quantitative method, there are advantages and disadvantages to consider when determining whether to interview spouses together or separately. Table 1 summarizes these points from the literature reviewed above.

Table 1. Strengths and limitations of using dyadic interviews in comparison to individual interviews

Strengths of using dyadic interviews	Source
Participants discuss topics or share issues they would not have discussed or shared during individual interviews.	Morgan et al. (2013); Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018)
One participant often triggers ideas for discussion or asks direct questions for the dyad to explore.	Morgan et al. (2013)
Participants can provide non-verbal cues that provide insights into the relationship, guide the interviewer to explore topics more deeply or encourage the other participant to add information.	Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018); Arksey (1996)
Help participants reduce their 'blind spots' by adding or correcting information the other participant forgot or was unaware of	Taylor and de Vocht (2011); Seale et al. (2008); Rijken and Knijn (2009)
Dyads may ask each other questions the interviewer may not have thought of.	Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018)
Allow the interviewer to take a less visible role as the dyad interacts	Morgan et al. (2013)
Create a safer space where participants will not be judged, unlike possibly during individual interviews	Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018)
Give voice to participants who would have otherwise been excluded from the research if their partner (the other participant) was interviewed alone and spoke on their behalf	Arksey (1996)
Provide in-depth understanding of the intra-dyad relationship regarding gender issues, intimidation, power inequality, which are all absent when conducting individual interviews	Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018); Morgan et al. (2013); Seale et al. (2008)
Enable a fuller picture about dyad dynamics on a specific issue and richer data than an individual interview could provide	Zarhin (2018); Taylor and de Vocht (2011); Seale et al. (2008); Arksey (1996); Bjørnholt and Farstad (2014); Rijken and Knijn (2009); Mellor et al. (2013)
Participants can challenge each other when their stories differ.	Zarhin (2018); Taylor and de Vocht (2011)
Overcome the issue of participant confidentiality when individuals are interviewed separately. This is especially important when participants indicate different or contradictory views that the interviewer cannot surface given confidentiality protocols that must be followed.	Zarhin (2018); Bjørnholt and Farstad (2014)
Can save time and money as two people are interviewed together	Zarhin (2018); Morris (2001)

Limitations to using dyadic interviews	Source
There is a need to consider the impact of power, gender, sexuality, and ethnicity when inviting two participants to discuss.	Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018); Morgan et al. (2013); Seale et al. (2008)
It is very important to anticipate how participants will feel when asked certain questions and interacting during the interview. Thus, dyadic interviews require major preparation when working with sensitive topics and questions. They may spark negative emotions, friction, or disagreement.	Morgan et al. (2013); Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018); Arksey (1996)
Each participant is unable to tell their own story from their perspective without having to consider the reaction of the other when voicing criticism or bringing up a sensitive topic.	Eisikovits and Koren (2010); Rijken and Knijn (2009)
Dyads may not speak out loud about their truth or reveal certain but not other types of information. Participants may present their 'public' accounts of socially acceptable behavior.	Taylor and de Vocht (2011); Arksey (1996)
Participants may alter their responses to please each other or present the other in a positive light.	Zarhin (2018)
One participant can dominate the discussion, leaving the other without contributing. This may diminish the dyadic interview method's utility, thus becoming a site of 'symbolic violence.'	Zarhin (2018); Morris (2001); Arksey (1996)

During dyadic interviews, participants can add to, correct, or challenge parts of the discussion resulting in more and richer information (Taylor and de Vocht, 2011). When an additional person is part of an interview, their presence will impact the behavior of the other interviewee. Responding in a socially desirable way during dyadic interviews can occur when one participant responds in a manner perceived as acceptable by their partner or consistent with their perceived or known viewpoint (Taylor and de Vocht, 2011). When interviewing pairs individually as opposed to jointly, they can disclose thoughts and feelings that are not the same as those expressed when together. When interviewed together, pairs may not speak their truth or reveal some but not others (Taylor and de Vocht, 2011). Importantly, people's experiences are not the same as those of their partners; thus, conducting individual interviews to capture these differences might be more appropriate depending on the topic and aim of the research.

Decades ago, family researchers questioned the validity and reliability of collecting relationship data from one person in a dyad given their perspective alone. Such one-sided data collection denies how complex relationships are and could be very different from the other person in the pair (Thompson and Walker, 1982). Bokemeier and Monroe (1983) examined several studies on decision-making from the 1950s to the 1980s. Their analysis revealed widespread discrepancies between responses provided by spouses, particularly between husbands and wives. concerning responses on decision-making. Thus, calling into question measurements that rely on only one family member for data on intra-household decision-making. At times, accounts differ between pairs, which is of interest

to the interviewer in dyadic interviews. How one person reacts or responds when accounts differ is valuable data in examining the relationship and the topic under study (Morris, 2001).

Dyadic and individual interviews both have the scope to cause harm, conflict, or distress (Taylor and de Vocht, 2011). Both types of interviews can improve or restrict the depth and quality of an interview. Male partners may be overbearing during dyadic interviews, intending to speak on behalf of the pair; thus, inhibiting women from contributing to the joint account (Arksey, 1996). Men tend to talk more and longer in mixed-sex settings and modify their performances of masculinity (Seale et al., 2008). Dyadic interviews can be a catalyst for pairs to discuss issues further outside the interview, in both positive and negative ways. Given these and other concerns, it is paramount that the research team comprises an interviewer who has prior experience in carrying out interviews and adequate training to deal with the different types of challenges that may arise during an individual or dyadic interview. Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2018) highlighted the skills and training researchers require to administer dyadic interviews effectively. She emphasizes the need for researchers to have advanced interviewing expertise, a critical and probing stance, and counseling skills when conducting dyadic interviews, especially when the topic under discussion is quite sensitive (e.g., understanding the lived experiences of HIV-serodiscordant couples).

2.3. Using dyadic interviews to explore intra-household decision-making

This review presents a few studies that utilized dyadic interviews when conducting their research on decision-making. Rijken and Knijn (2009) used dyadic interviews to explore decision-making on having a first child in the Netherlands. Specifically, they examined the nature of decision-making processes for couples who had their first child early on versus at a later age and to what extent and in which ways processes differed between the two groups. They noted that one advantage of interviewing spouses together was that they helped remind each other of things the other forgot to mention or clarify certain issues, which resulted in a fuller account of the topic. One disadvantage highlighted was that couples are less likely to reveal their individual points of view during dyadic interviews. To address this latter issue, they asked each spouse to respond to an individual questionnaire before the joint interview.

Wood et al. (2012) studied couples to explore and better understand how they make general and more specific financial decisions (e.g. on retirement) in the United Kingdom. They were also interested in determining whether couples do financial planning individually or jointly, and to what extent they rely on each other for help or guidance if performed together. Through the research, they identified typologies to describe the characteristics of the couple groups concerning their financing decision- making and their broader attitudes to finances. They interviewed couples in their home – first separately and then together – to understand individual as well as collective perspectives.

Challiol and Mignonac (2005) used dyadic interviews to identify the dynamics associated when dual-earner couples make decisions on relocating when one spouse is offered a transfer proposition.

According to Challiol and Mignonac (2005: 259), "family decision-making occurs within an intimate, private social group, hard to observe and in which the researcher may find strong reticence to self-disclosure." They interviewed couples in their homes. They used dyadic interviews to: (1) "mitigate potential vanity or modesty biases" that they claimed a researcher encounters

when interviewing spouses individually; (2) enrich the narratives of each spouse; and (3) challenge each other's viewpoints. They contended this could lead to a better understanding of the decisions couples make, noting that spouses may exaggerate to appease the interviewer.

Hung (2018) used dyadic interviews to explore how intra-household dynamics influence hurricane preparedness in the southern United States. In so doing, a dyadic picture and shared discourse around hurricane preparedness emerged. He observed couples interacting in 'real time.' His study found that while hurricane preparedness is a joint process between spouses in a marital dyad, spouses disagree about preparing for a hurricane.

Mbweza et al. (2008) focused on dyads but interviewed spouses separately to explore decision-making processes in the areas of money, food, pregnancy, contraception, and sexual relations in Malawi. From their data, they developed categories of approaches couples used to make decisions, including husband-dominated, wife-dominated, and shared. The rationale couples employed to make decisions were explained using gender- and non-gender based cultural scripts. In their study, they found that couples used four steps when making decisions: (1) either spouse initiates communication about a problem or issue; (2) the couple explores ways of solving the problem or issue; (3) the couple finds a solution; and (4) the couple makes a final decision on the solution to the problem or issue. Couples recognized that either spouse can influence each other's actions, with gendered power relations having a significant impact on who dominates certain decision-making processes.

3. Designing a dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

Our review of studies on intra-household decision making revealed that: (1) studies found it difficult to differentiate between individual versus joint decisions made by spouses. Recent progress using quantitative methods and tools has been made in determining to what extent women participate in making joint decisions with their spouses; (2) studies mainly consulted one spouse in a marital dyad during field interviews. When both spouses were interviewed (often separately), many studies found discrepancies between the reports;[4] (3) studies on intra-household decision-making frequently used quantitative tools to collect data. Fewer qualitative studies exist that explored decision- making within the household. These studies used mostly FGDs or semi-structured interviews to collect data. Qualitative methods and tools are better for uncovering how or why intra-household decisions get made, underexplored topics in the literature; and (4) studies on intra-household decision-making often only considered one decision-making domain and are vague (e.g., decision-making on agricultural production), which complicates how respondents interpret their involvement in making such decisions. Studies should focus on a range of specific decisions to capture the variation in spousal decision-making powers across different types of decisions.

Our review on dyadic interviews was conducted to help understand how this method was used by previous studies, specifically to explore decision-making processes between spouses. As noted above, the review surfaced important benefits and drawbacks to using dyadic interviews, although many of the studies that were reviewed painted a rather positive picture from their use. From our review, we learned that dyadic interviews: (1) can help create a space for participants to fill in gaps or remind each other when there are lapses in memory or add to, correct, or challenge parts of the discussion, but may also inhibit spouses from speaking the truth out loud or enable one spouse to be overbearing during interviews; (2) can be a catalyst for dyads to discuss issues outside the interview; (3) can be more appropriate than individual interviews in certain cultural contexts; 4) have been used to study a range of topics on intra-household decision making, and mostly in higher-income country contexts; and 5) can be combined with individual interviews when studying dyads.

After reviewing this literature, a dyadic interview guide was first drafted by the lead author. The aim was to design the tool for administering with couples in a rural, agricultural setting but linked to an existing project under which it could be piloted. A climate-smart agriculture (CSA) project in Tanzania was selected to pilot the tool. The first draft of the guide was completed in September 2020. The draft tool was shared with a handful of project partners and gender researchers within and outside Tanzania for review and feedback. A workshop was held in Stone Town, Zanzibar in October 2020 with different partners on the CSA project to refine the tool and ensure it was fit-for-purpose before administering it with project participants. Those invited to the workshop provided feedback line by line and discussed the implications of asking certain questions to couples in the Tanzanian context. Many revisions were made, including to the *Kiswahili* version of the tool. These efforts continued when workshop participants began to practice administering the guide on each other. After four days, the workshop ended when the participants felt the tool was ready for pre-testing. The tool was then pre-tested with two couples who were not selected for the piloting phase, and final changes were made before the pilot study commenced.

4 According to Acosta et al. (2019), reasons for the discrepancies could include: 1) spouses being present during the time of the interview; 2) ambiguous decision-making questions with no reference to a defined timeline; or 3) spouses attaching different meanings to questions and decision-making processes.

3.1. Brief description of the dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

The dyadic interview guide that was piloted can be found in Annex A. The tool enables research teams to explore intra-household decision-making by interviewing married or cohabiting couples.

The dyadic interview guide contains six sets of mostly open-ended questions, summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Sets of questions included in the dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

Question type	Description
The process couples used to make important decisions	The first set of questions asks couples: how they planned to carry out the decision, who initiated the discussion and what prompted them to initiate the discussion; how each spouse talked about the plans to make the decision; whose ideas were considered the most and why; how the final decision was made and who made it and why; whether any people from in or outside the household were consulted during the decision-making process; and whether they were satisfied with the final decision made.
The process each spouse used to make specific decisions on their own	The second set of questions are similar to the first set, but asks about the process each spouse used to make specific decisions on their own, including: why the decision was made by only one spouse; how they planned to carry out the decision and whether they considered different options; whether they consulted or informed their spouse about the ideas they were considering before making a final decision and at what stage of the decision-making process (e.g. early on versus just before the decision was made); and how significant the decision was to the welfare of the family and the spouse making the decision. This set of questions also asks the other spouse who was not directly involved whether they had an opportunity to influence the decision and whether they would have liked to have been involved in making the decision with their spouse and why.
Couple's perceptions about general decision making in their relationship	The third set of questions asks about the perceptions of couples concerning general decision-making in their relationship. Specific questions were asked, including: (1) how they feel about how decisions are made in their relationship; (2) if either spouse would prefer to have more/less input on decisions in their marriage; and (3) what keeps them from having more/less input on certain decisions.
Agreeing and disagreeing on decisions	The fourth set of questions asks about the decisions that couples tend to agree or disagree on the most and whether these decisions are important for the family and in what manner.
CSA-specific decision-making questions	The fifth set of questions combines elements of the first four sets of questions but focuses specifically on the decisions couples made together, and those that spouses made alone regarding their use of CSA practices and technologies.*
Changes in decision-making over time	The sixth set of questions simply asks couples to reflect on how they made decisions in the past compared to how they make decisions now in their relationship, and whether things have changed and why.

*In the draft version of the guide, these domain-specific questions also focused on decisions on agricultural production, income expenditure, and food-related decisions.

Before asking the open-ended questions, the guide asks questions on the role spouses play in carrying out agricultural and other types of tasks in the household, demographic information on couples, the assets they own, and other types of information that questionnaires on decision-making or empowerment often collect.

Post-interview, couples are asked whether they had given much thought to the issues discussed during the interview and how they felt after having the discussion, if any topics discussed surprised them and why, and whether they prefer to make decisions together or alone and the reasons for their preferences.

4. Piloting the dyadic interview guide

The dyadic interview guide was piloted in Zanzibar and the Morogoro Region of mainland Tanzania. The Internal Review Board (IRB) at the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) approved the research before piloting the tool. Extension officers, who supported the implementation of the CSA Project, identified 15 couples from a wide range of backgrounds for interviews. Before identifying these couples, officers were asked to choose couples who did not have a history of violence in the household given the somewhat sensitive nature of the interview questions and being a new tool that the research team was testing for the first time. Seven couples were identified in Zanzibar and eight in the Morogoro Region. All 30 spouses (wife and husband) consented to the interviews. For all couples, informed consent for one spouse was obtained in the presence of the other spouse.

Each couple was interviewed at their home residence or while taking a break from gardening or working in their field, or at the government extension office located nearby their home. Interviews with couples comprised the couple and research team members, and in some cases, the extension officer. During many interviews, children sat listening to the discussion or played nearby where the interview was being conducted. All interviews were recorded, and photos were taken during interviews with consent from each spouse. Interviews took 1 hour and 25 minutes on average to complete.

A total of 12 couples identified themselves as being in a monogamous marriage or cohabiting at the time of the interview. The other three couples identified themselves as being in a polygynous marriage. In all three cases, the husband indicated he was married to two women. The average number of years that the spouses of the 15 couples were married was around 17 years, ranging from one couple indicating they recently married (six months before the interview) to another couple indicating they married 39 years ago. The average household size was around six members. Only the newlywed couple indicated they did not have children, while all other couples had at least one child, and one couple had nine children. The couples who were interviewed came from 13 different ethnic groups. Nine couples indicated they are Muslim, three indicated they are Christian, and another three indicated either the husband or wife is Muslim or Christian. Most study participants indicated they completed primary (63 percent) or secondary (30 percent) school, with only 7 percent (two women) indicating they did not attend any formal schooling. All spouses indicated farming as their main occupation. Some spouses indicated they engage in other types of work, such as fishing, seaweed farming, masonry, mechanics, weaving mats, performing casual labor, or other types of off-farm or salaried work.

In the sub-sections that follow, results from piloting the dyadic interview guide are presented and discussed. The focus in these sub-sections is to indicate how the guide performed in generating the data of interest and present the evidence to support our conclusions about how the guide performed.

4.1. The process couples used to make important decisions

In the first set of questions, the guide instructs the interviewer to ask the couple to think of an important decision they made over the past year. The decision they choose together becomes the focus of this first part of the interview as couples describe the process that unfolded when making the decision and who had the final say.

As an illustrative example, a couple in Zanzibar focused their discussion on a decision they made to send their daughter for post-secondary school training instead of encouraging her to marry. The husband explained,

> "My wife asked, is it a must that our daughter be married just because she is a girl and has completed her secondary education? I said, yes, since we do not have money for further education. My wife then said, no, I want her to continue with her education since she is my only daughter…We then summoned all our older sons…I told them that their mother wants her daughter to continue with further education."

The wife responded,

> "Just like he said, I put it straight that I didn't want my daughter to get married. I want her to get training on any skill than to get married at this time because she would end up being unemployed. If she attends training on specific skills, she may even employ herself."

The husband provided more details on how the couple reached a final decision,

> "In the beginning…I, as the father, had two or three challenges. I said, my daughter has already completed her studies…[so], the next thing is to get married. Why should we spend more money again on her education when we have already spent a lot?...Our sons said they completely disagreed with my ideas…, that their sister will become a burden to them…The [eldest] son said we should do this, and that to raise funds for her training, he would contribute half of the cost so that we implement the idea of his mother."

From this conversation, we can conclude that the wife initiated the discussion and contributed ideas that were mostly considered. Therefore, she played a major role in deciding to send her daughter for additional skills training. The couple, however, believed they made a 'joint' decision, given they eventually reached an agreement.

Couples mostly selected decisions that required finances to implement when describing the process they use to make important decisions. Examples included decisions to build or refurbish a house, invest in a new business, purchase new land for farming, buy inputs (seed), and install plumbing in the house. Other decisions discussed were on what crops to grow during the cultivation season, whether to save money through a village savings and loan group, or expand the area of crop production.

In one interview, where a couple from Morogoro Region discussed an agricultural production-related decision they made, the wife explained how her involvement in training influenced their decision to grow an improved cassava variety on their farm. She explained,

> "You know, I attended training about agriculture. We also had cassava in one of our fields, but the variety we had was not drought-tolerant. After the training, I told my husband that there are varieties that are drought-tolerant…my husband supported... [and then] we planted our plot with the improved variety."

And while the wife indicated that she felt she contributed more to the discussion, she mentioned that the husband had the final say when deciding to plant the improved cassava variety because,

> "He was the one who said let us go and do it, and we did. Although it was me who initiated the idea, it was him who had the final say because I do not have the capacity to implement an idea such as that on my own."

Most couples indicated that husbands played the key role in initiating discussions on decisions, contributing ideas, and making final decisions, mainly citing their position as heads of household or overseers of household finances. Reasons provided on why wives made the final decision were because they originally came up with the idea or oversaw the handling of the finances in their household. In a few cases, couples indicated that they made the final decision together. When the outcome was a joint decision, couples explained that this was the case because they reached a consensus or agreed on how to proceed. Thus, the guide enables an understanding of not only who made the final decision but also the rationale used by couples to justify individual or joint decision-making.

In another example of an older couple from Morogoro Region who discussed the relatively lengthy process they used when deciding to build a new house, they started by explaining how they were living in a rented house in an urban setting and heard about farmland for sale. After viewing the property, they jointly decided to purchase the land. They erected a makeshift home out of wood and thatch at first, and then eventually sat down and planned how they could build a more permanent structure. According to the couple, the wife started the conversation about why it was important to construct a permanent house. She explained,

> "Because, as a woman, you look at the environment you are living in, and also, you visit your friends and look at their environment and you find that they are different from yours. So, I started the conversation by telling my husband that we needed to build a house; a house that even when visitors come, would give a good impression…because…as a woman, you need to live in a decent house."

With the husband adding,

> "Not just a house." [With all present at the interview breaking out in laughter.]

The husband agreed with the wife's idea to build a permanent structure, which made her feel good about bringing up the matter. The couple then had to decide on the design of the house, and specifically, how many rooms to include as this decision had cost implications. The husband believed there should be fewer rooms than what the wife had in mind. In his opinion, he wanted to build a good-quality house that had a small number of rooms. The wife agreed with the husband's idea to include fewer rooms because of their small family size and budget.

To begin purchasing the materials to build the house, the couple decided to use the money they would generate from selling the sunflower they produced. The husband explained,

> "…[Y]ou know we do our things collaboratively. It is a must that every one of us brings their idea and defends it, and if that is okay, we go by this idea and we are not going to get stuck…[and] that is why we decided that…when we sell our sunflowers, we would [buy the building materials]…[W]e made our calculations that if we cultivate four acres of sunflower, we get our initial money."

Clearly, in this case, the wife was highly involved in the decision-making process from start to finish, sharing lots of ideas that were considered or further strengthened by the husband. In the end, both spouses indicated that they were happy with their decision to build a house with fewer rooms on their newly acquired farmland. The husband noted that he made the final decision on purchasing the materials to build the new house using the cash generated from selling their sunflower. The main reason he had the final say was because he had prior experience doing construction work, so was more knowledgeable on this topic. The couple indicated that they informed but did not consult their children and did not consult anyone else outside their household during the decision-making process.

A larger number of couples indicated that they did not consult family members about the important decisions they made. In these cases, the reason provided was because their children were too young or too old and had since moved away. In one case, a polygynous couple did not inform the second wife of their decision to build a new house because she has no say in making such decisions, according to the husband. For those couples who did consult their children, they explained that they did so because they are part of the family and need to be consulted when certain decisions get made or to teach them that consulting family members is good practice. Similarly, very few couples indicated they consulted people outside their household when making the decisions. Those who did, consulted their in-laws or parents. One couple consulted the husband's employer (a clove farmer) because he was helping with financing their decision to upgrade their housing structure. Those who did not consult or inform people outside their household mainly believed it was a family matter that did not involve consultation with others outside their households before making the decision.

All but one couple expressed satisfaction with their decisions, but the reasons they were satisfied differed depending on the type of decision. In some cases, decision-making brought about stability, peace, or happiness as the decision implemented solved an immediate problem or tackled a source of conflict within the household (e.g., decisions that led to installing plumbing in the house, sending a girl child to school, or putting a new roof on the house to keep out the rainwater). Concerning the latter decision that was made to put a new roof on their house in Zanzibar, the husband explained:

> "We considered it as important because whenever it started raining, she was thinking as if I was not serious about addressing the problem, while in actual fact I did not have financial capacity [to put a new roof on the house]. We were arguing, but finally, we are finished and are now settled…"

In other cases, making the decision led to enhanced productivity on the farm when an improved cassava variety was planted or increased income or savings due to a decision to invest in a new business (e.g., retail shop or transportation) or get involved in a village savings and loan group.

4.2. The process each spouse used to make specific decisions on their own

Three different couples revealed that they only make decisions together, never alone. A couple in Morogoro Region explained that making decisions together allows either spouse to continue implementing the decision if the other would fall sick or pass away. When probing further about their stance on decision-making within their household, the interviewer asked whether the wife

consults the husband when deciding to purchase a *kitenge* (a cloth wrap for women), for example. The wife's response generated quite a bit of laughter. She said,

> "How can you buy a kitenge without the knowledge of your husband? That is stirring up the quarrel [raising questions from the husband on where the kitenge came from]."

When the couple was asked whether they make even minor decisions alone, such as slaughtering a chicken to make soup, the husband responded,

> "We must consult each other on that. Today, this particular chicken should be slaughtered or this guinea fowl."

In a case from Morogoro Region, one husband developed a relatively unique strategy for ensuring he makes decisions with his wife. He explained,

> "When I do certain business and earn money, I give the money to my wife because she is good at budgeting and saving."

In about half the cases, wives indicated they never make decisions on their own and instead must inform or ask permission first from their husbands. In these cases, it is clear these women lack the abilities to make both practical and strategic decisions on their own regardless of the circumstances. Whether this is simply the case of women emphasizing more often than men their participation in joint decision-making, as Acosta et al. (2019) found through their review, is difficult to conclude. From the above section, it is clear these women do contribute to or inform decisions made jointly with or by their husbands. Nonetheless, it appears they are restricted from making their own decisions on whatever the matter.

In the other cases, wives mentioned they made decisions alone to purchase clothing for their children or themselves or to rear small livestock or cultivate crops on their own. Arguably, these decisions require relatively smaller amounts of money to implement compared to those mentioned above that couples made or discussed together. Wives justified making these types of decisions on their own primarily because they believed their husbands would have tried to convince them not to proceed with their decisions if they were informed or consulted. Several other reasons were mentioned that suggest these women have agency to make decisions of this nature alone, (e.g., the wife was using her own money; thus, it was not the husband's decision to make). One woman in Morogoro Region explained:

> "I don't see the importance of consulting or informing my husband because the money is mine. I have control over it without seeking anybody's advice. Buying clothes for my children and me helps us look smart. My husband gets respected in the village when my children and I are well dressed."

Husbands reported they made decisions on their own to purchase different kinds of assets (e.g. solar panel and water pump, gas cooker, agricultural inputs) or to expand their business or area of crop production. Two husbands indicated that they made decisions on their own to sell farm produce when there was a shortage of cash or to join a local savings and loans group. In one case, a husband

decided to marry a second wife on his own and did not inform his first wife until they were married. In most cases, husbands explained that they made the decisions on their own because they knew their wives would disagree or believed this was their responsibility as heads of household. In two cases, husbands decided on their own because the wife was not around to consult.

By asking questions during the dyadic interview about decisions each spouse made alone, the interviewer can observe the other spouse's reaction and pick up on verbal and non-verbal cues that provide additional insights into the spouse's sensitivities concerning their lack of involvement in helping their husband or wife decide. These questions also help us to better understand the circumstances under which women (or men) become disempowered from a decision-making process and/or (dis)interested in getting involved. For example, a woman in Zanzibar reported that she would have liked to be involved when her husband decided to purchase a solar panel to power a water pump for irrigating their garden. She explained:

> "You know that decision was big compared to his ability…I felt he was not capable of implementing such a big decision…I have no problem with the decision [to buy a] solar panel. But I would like to have been involved…I want to be aware so that I can contribute if I have an idea. I can probably have a second eye on the decision, to point out a negative outcome, if any."

In this case, the husband did not involve his wife because he feared she would discourage him from making the decision to purchase the solar panel. He explained,

> "I didn't consider involving her [when making the decision] because it would make her worried. She could ask about where all that money would come from. This would discourage me. So, I decided to make it alone as a man. Because ideas involving a lot of money make her worry as she might think it is impossible to accomplish something like that. Even if we had cash, she would probably even propose that we buy a new big cupboard. Thoughts such as those would disturb me. That's the reason I decided to do it silently and let her see the outcome."

In another case where the husband had to remind the wife of a decision she made alone to invest her own money to buy chickens for rearing, the husband was disappointed for not being included in helping the wife make the decision. Instead, when he got home one day, he found two chickens in the yard. When asked if he had an opportunity to get involved, he said,

> "If she involved me, I would have advised her…that instead of buying two grown hens for TZS10,000 [around USD5.00], she should buy four chicks for the same amount."

In this case, the husband felt his involvement in helping decide with the wife could have increased the number of chickens for rearing. He also mentioned that he could have contributed his money to increase the amount available, and instead of buying chickens, they could have purchased a goat or cow. However, the wife's original intentions behind purchasing the chickens were to rear them for eggs and meat or to sell them when cash is needed (e.g., when their child gets sick and must travel to the hospital).

4.3. Couple's perceptions about general decision-making in their relationship

The views provided by wives and husbands about general decision-making in their relationships signal that couples are satisfied with most decisions they make, especially concerning bigger decisions. However, it also indicates that there is still room for improvement, particularly in making more joint decisions. From Zanzibar, a woman in one couple who was interviewed detailed how she felt about decision-making within the couple's relationship. She said,

> "I feel we have no problem with the way we make our decisions. We feel good because we make decisions together…we are always in agreement. When something happens, we address it together. So, we feel good to do things together instead of doing [it] individually. We will not get anywhere. For example, if we go our separate ways, we cannot succeed. But if we make decisions together, it becomes good."

And the husband confirmed,

> "There is no problem because we make family decisions, and we are heading towards our target. So, I feel we are doing good."

A couple from Morogoro Region indicated they were generally satisfied with how they make joint decisions within their household. The husband explained why. He said,

> "Making joint decisions increases unity...Joint decisions are better than individual decisions. Joint decisions reduce complaints as anything bad that will happen later is the product of your [collective] decision and this is rather different [when making] individual decisions."

Both wives and husbands indicated they would like to provide more inputs into decisions ranging from those that require money to implement all matters that impact the family's welfare. Very few couples mentioned the factors that prohibit them from providing more inputs into decisions, except for being excluded from the process at the start.

Wives indicated they would rather not be consulted on certain agricultural decisions husbands make or their decisions to leave home to engage in work or extra-curricular activities (i.e., going out for entertainment or attending meetings). In one case from Zanzibar, the wife from a middle-aged couple explained that she would like to make fewer inputs into decisions about livestock because she feels she cannot contribute to this work even if she was involved in making decisions about the animals as tending to livestock is demanding. When asked about which decisions a woman from Morogoro Region would prefer to be less involved in, she said,

> "For me, the decisions I hate [to get involved in are when] he goes out to have fun."

And when asked if there were other decisions, she indicated,

> "[Decisions about] going to meetings far from here…he should just go."

With the husband responding,

> "I shouldn't [even] say bye to you?"

Perhaps these matter within their household where the husband leaves home to engage in extra-curricular or leisure activities that do not involve the wife. The wife feels she is being left behind or something else is more important or capturing her husband's attention; thus, the wife prefers he leaves home without letting her know or asking for her consent. In this particular case, the research team felt that the wife was somewhat suspicious of the husband's overall behavior and spoke out of bitterness and used the interview to send a message to her husband.

There were no reported cases of husbands having less preference to get involved when their wives wish to leave home to engage in leisure or other activities that do not involve the husband or other family members. Instead, husbands indicated they would rather not get involved in making decisions that they considered as minor, including those that involve carrying out household chores or preparing food. These tasks are mainly carried out by women in Tanzania; thus, it is of little surprise that husbands feel less inclined to get involved in deciding, for example, what vegetables to eat for supper or when to collect water or to bathe smaller children. When asked about which decision the husband of one younger couple in Morogoro Region would not like to get involved in, he explained,

> "Kitchen stuff, she can just do them. Those things are specialties [specific tasks for the wife]. Maybe when she is sick, I can get involved."

And when the interviewer commented that he could get involved even when his wife is well, he responded,

> "No, I can't. Kitchen stuff? No."

In another case of a younger couple from Morogoro Region, the husband indicated he would prefer not to get involved when his wife makes decisions to engage in small business activities such as selling tomatoes because,

> "She is also helping me financially."

With this justification, it appears that the husband feels he is the main breadwinner. When the wife can contribute to support his main efforts of generating income for the household, he is appreciative, although he does not need to be part of the process when deciding to pursue the business activity.

The guide enables couples to reflect on their general decision-making within their relationship, especially on whether they would like to strengthen (or change) their decision-making processes by becoming either more or less involved when deciding on certain matters. Interestingly, the interviews showed that both women and men wish to be less involved in making decisions on matters that their spouse is most often responsible for carrying out or has little control over. Men wish to be less involved in making decisions on what foods to prepare as this type of work is not customarily undertaken by men in Tanzanian society; thus, calling into question their involvement

in making decisions within this domain. On the other hand, women prefer to be less involved when their husbands decide to leave the home alone to engage broadly in leisure activities, reflecting their inabilities to influence such decisions. Thus, their preference may not be consulted or informed when their husbands have already decided.

4.4. Agreeing and disagreeing on decisions

When asked about the decisions that couples agree and disagree on, there was consistency in responses among the 15 couples. Most couples indicated they agree on food and agriculture-related decisions, on decisions about health care and educating their children, and making investments in land and building houses. The decisions mentioned that couples tend not to agree on were those decisions that benefit the one or the other spouse individually, but that could positively or negatively influence the welfare of the family overall. For example, the decision made by husbands to marry a second wife, or purchase and sell assets, or to move outside the home to visit relatives or attend celebrations or ceremonies. One wife in Morogoro Region indicated that she and her husband disagree about him quitting drinking alcohol.

4.5. Climate-Smart Agriculture-specific decision-making questions

Spouses indicated that they make a range of decisions together as a couple on the use of CSA practices and technologies, including: (1) use of weather information to inform production decisions; (2) use of crop varieties tolerant to climatic stresses (e.g., drought); (3) timely land preparation; (4) use of tied ridges or soil bunds to prevent erosion and harvest rainwater, respectively; (5) use of spaces when planting; (6) timely planting; (7) whether to intercrop; (8) use of fertilizer and/or manure; (9) whether to retain crop residues and to mulch; (10) de-suckering (bananas); and (11) timely harvesting. The decisions most mentioned by couples were on the use of varieties tolerant to climatic stresses, fertilizer and/or manure, tied ridges or soil bunds, and timely land preparation.

In many cases, spouses explained that they contribute equal amount of input when making decisions as a couple to use CSA practices and technologies. In one case, a couple indicated that the wife contributes more input when making these decisions, while four couples indicated the husband contributes more.

When it comes to who has the final say in making decisions to use CSA practices and technologies, the vast majority of couples indicated that the husband makes these decisions primarily because this is his responsibility as head of the household, because he contributes money to implement CSA practices and technologies, has more knowledge and/or experience in this area of farming, or because he initiated the discussion in the first place on the use of CSA practices and technologies. In three cases, couples indicated that the wife has the final say because this is her area of expertise. One couple explained that neither spouse has the final say because they discuss and make decisions together.

Only three couples indicated that they do not agree when making decisions on matters regarding the use of CSA practices and technologies. For example, one older couple from Morogoro Region indicated that they disagreed when deciding on the types of seed to use and on whether to hire casual labor to help them cultivate using CSA practices. Similarly, a younger couple from Morogoro Region explained that they disagree on decisions requiring money to implement CSA practices (i.e., hiring of casual labor). In this case, the wife explained that she would rather diversify their production by using the money to buy more chickens for rearing. Most couples indicated that, on the whole, they agree when making decisions on matters regarding the use of CSA practices and technologies. The husband of a couple from Zanzibar explained why he and his spouse agree when making decisions on the use of CSA practices,

> "There is none [no disagreement] because we have already learned about climate-smart agriculture. If it is about making bunds, we make bunds. If it is planting on rows, we plant on rows. If it is about fertilizer application, likewise. If you do not follow good practices such as using bunds, or proper spacing and fertilizers, you will not get good rice yield. So we agree on all those [decisions to use such practices]."

And the wife explained further,

> "We usually agree because we go to training together, so when we come back, we think of what we have learned and ask ourselves if we apply that knowledge, will we make it? And when we apply the knowledge, we get good results."

In this case, it appears that the couple benefits from attending CSA training together as it builds the capacities of both spouses. Therefore, there are few gaps in one spouse's understanding to question the other spouse when deciding to use a particular CSA practice or technology.

Around half of the spouses interviewed indicated that they do not make decisions alone on the use of CSA practices and technologies. On the other hand, the other half indicated that husbands make such decisions alone when applying fertilizers, pesticides, and other agrochemicals. In one case, spouses indicated that the wife makes decisions alone on applying fertilizers and pesticides. In another case, both the husband and wife make these same decisions on their own when needed.

The reasons provided by spouses for deciding alone to use CSA practices and technologies versus making the decisions together were diverse and some were circumstantial. In two cases, decisions were made alone because the husband has more knowledge and experience or strength to do the work. One husband from Morogoro Region explained,

> "Pesticide application is a man's job and I know it is my responsibility, so I do not see why I should involve my wife in such decisions."

Other reasons were because the nature of the work requires the decision to be made by the husband or the husband decided because he was away from home. In the one case where a couple indicated that both the wife and husband make decisions on their own, it mainly happens when the other spouse is absent and the spouse who is at home must decide on their own to get the work done. The wife of this couple explained,

> "Maize plants were heavily infested by pests, and I did not wait to discuss this with my husband. I just went to the hamlet chairperson and asked for the pesticide."

She indicated that she showed the pesticide to her husband when he returned home.

In cases where spouses made decisions on the use of CSA practices and technologies on their own, the couple confirmed that the decision made led to a positive outcome (e.g., increased yields) or that the decision, if made jointly, would have resulted in the same outcome as a sole decision by either spouse to use a CSA practice or technology. In one case from Morogoro Region, the husband confirmed that the decision he made alone led to a positive result but was not the concern of his spouse, explaining,

> "Yes [it had a positive impact on the family], but also, this is not a new thing; it is a common thing in our society. Even my spouse won't question me why I did it by myself [decided to apply pesticides]. Even if my wife went to the farm and found that the maize needed pesticides, she wouldn't tell me to do it. It is something very open that she can't complain about."

4.6. Changes in decision-making over time

Regardless of the age bracket, all but a few couples explained that they agree much more now on the decisions they make than in the past when they first got married. Some couples spoke about quarreling early on in their relationships due to not having spent much time together to better understand each other's needs or because of financial limitations. These quarrels complicated decision-making processes. For example, one husband in Zanzibar explained,

> "When we first got married, we were using a lot of energy, but got less yield. Now we are old. We use less energy, but the yield is good…During that time, we were arguing because I was the one doing all the work because she would either be pregnant or taking care of our young child. So, we would argue about who should go to the farm, take the sick to the hospital, or do this and that."

Two couples commented that they make bigger and more sensible decisions (e.g., purchasing land, building a house) now compared to in the past because they consult each other and discuss more. While a few others indicated that they now make more joint decisions than in the past. Only two couples indicated no changes in how they make decisions since they were first married, while one wife indicated that when she and the husband first married, he involved her in all decisions, but not anymore.

4.7. Post-interview questions

Post-interview, couples were asked a brief set of questions on whether they had given much thought to the issues discussed during the interview, whether any parts of the discussion surprised them, whether they preferred to make decisions together or alone, and how they felt after the interview. Overall, couples responded quite positively to the interview and the questions asked. Some indicated that they learned a lot during the discussion about how they make decisions. In a few cases, spouses were surprised to hear about the details of how their spouses decided on

their own, especially husbands. Many couples confirmed their desires to make more joint decisions moving forward to better the family.

The feedback suggests that using the tool in an interview with couples creates an opportunity for them to talk about and reconsider their decision-making patterns. As such, the tool and method used to administer the tool can be seen as part of a gender transformative research process. Broadly, gender transformative approaches aim to surface the underlying causes of gender inequalities (e.g. harmful norms that restrict women from making strategic life choices) and spark critical reflection and action by women and men at household, community, and other levels that address said norms (Cole et al., 2014). While this study did not follow up on couples to determine whether aspects of their decision-making patterns shifted towards making more joint decisions, it is hypothesized that these interviews had some positive impact on intra-household decision-making afterward. Future studies that use dyadic interviews to conduct research on women's agency, or intra-household decision-making more specifically, could consider integrating a follow-up phase in their protocols to test this hypothesis.

4.8. General observations

In all 15 cases, there were no incidences of couples arguing openly during interviews. During some interviews, the body language of one spouse showed disagreement with another spouse's response. While in other cases, certain responses from one spouse elicited an explicit a surprised reaction by the other spouse, including when wives were quite candid about disagreeing with their husbands about marrying a second wife. In two interviews, husbands dominated the discussions, encouraging their wives to respond when asked a specific question by the interviewer. Otherwise, they were in control of the conversation. In one of these two interviews, it was very difficult to communicate with the wife during the entire interview. In such instances, this type of research tool does not yield quality data per se but does capture the power dynamics that limit or restrict some women from contributing to decision-making processes within their homes. The responses from the husband, in this case, suggest he makes most of the decisions and is confident about making them given his status as head of the household and his belief that the decisions he makes on his own result in good outcomes for his family.

Managing dyadic interviews with participants who dominate the overall discussion can be quite challenging and requires patience and practice. Before pre-testing and piloting the guide, the interviewer and notetaker practiced multiple times with other workshop participants acting as spouses from various backgrounds and who were both collaborative and dominating when responding to questions. Such practice is important to prepare for any interview, but especially to prepare an interviewer during dyadic interviews that can create conflicts between spouses depending on their relationship. Per feedback from the IITA IRB, we made sure not to interview couples who were known in the community to have marital problems or instances of gender-based violence in the home; thus, given the nature of the questions we asked, no conflicts arose during interviews. It should also be noted that a senior woman researcher interviewed all 15 couples and had extensive training in qualitative interviewing. It was evident from reading through and analyzing the transcripts that she was acutely aware when certain questions were generating some tension or being responded to with brief answers. Thus, this required moving to the next question or set of questions to ensure the discussion was amicable between spouses, and between the interviewer and couple.

With regards to the overall quality of the data, the guide generated very rich and detailed responses by couples/spouses in most sections, especially earlier on in the interview when spouses were discussing decisions made jointly and on their own. The guide is clearly capable of eliciting information on women's involvement in making intra-household decisions and determining how certain decisions get made within the household. The guide can help researchers understand when joint or sole decisions get made and why. And while the guide can also assist researchers in better understanding and interpreting conflicting responses between spouses, this is only possible when the guide is used together with a quantitative instrument administered to spouses separately before (or after) the dyadic interview is conducted. The other parts of the guide create an opportunity for couples to provide some background information about decision-making in their relationship and how things have changed (or remained the same) throughout their marriage. While not presented in detail in this paper, the quantitative data collected in the first part of the guide can help the researcher develop a profile of the couple, including background and demographic data, information on their asset ownership, and spousal roles and responsibilities, among other relevant information to better understand the couple being interviewed.

5. Conclusion

Dyadic interviews create a rather unique opportunity for two participants to come together to interact and respond to open-ended questions that focus on their relationship. While rarely used by qualitative or quantitative studies that investigate intra-household decision-making in rural agricultural contexts in low-income countries, this working paper presented the learning from a study that piloted a dyadic interview guide for use with couples to help better understand decision-making processes within the household. Along with carrying out a review of the existing tools and methods used to examine intra-household decision making, the paper reviewed the literature on dyadic interviews that informed the original design of the qualitative dyadic interview guide. A participatory process was set up to review and finalize the guide for piloting with participants who were part of a CSA project in Zanzibar and Morogoro Region in mainland Tanzania. Overall, the guide contained questions and guidance for the research team to collect relatively rich data; thereby enabling this study to explain how and why different agricultural and non-agricultural decisions were made within the household. The guide also helped researchers to identify decisions that were made jointly versus those that were made individually by either spouse, and the types of contributions that each spouse makes during a given decision-making process.

Other sets of questions focused on spouses' perceptions on general decision-making in their marital relationship, on decisions they tend to agree and disagree on, and how they have changed their decision-making patterns throughout their marriage. Post-interview questions suggest that the dyadic interviews were viewed positively by study participants who highlighted the learning that was brought to bear during the interview about how they make decisions within their relationship. Future qualitative or mixed-methods studies that use a similar guide and approach could consider following up study participants to determine whether any transformative changes have occurred to their decision-making patterns. Finally, while studies on decision-making within polygynous households are rare, this study interviewed a few dyads in a polygynous relationship (i.e., a husband and one wife) but did not determine whether the tool is appropriate for use when interviewing a husband and two wives (triads). However, it is believed that the tool and approach could be modified to accommodate triads or larger groups. As polygynous marriages continue to persist in many parts of this and other regions in Africa, this is a frontier area of research that should be prioritized.

References

Acosta, M., van Wessel, M., van Bommel, S., Ampaire, E.L., Twyman, J., Jassogne, L., and Feindt P.H. (2019). What does it mean to make a 'joint' decision? Unpacking intra-household decision making in agriculture: Implications for policy and practice. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 56(6), 1210-1229. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2019.1650169

Alkire, S., Meinzen-Dick, R., Peterman, A., Quisumbing, A., Seymour, G., and Vaz, A. (2013). The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index. *World Development*, 52, 71–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.06.007

Ambler, K., Doss, C., Kieran, C., and Passarelli, S. (2017). *He says, she says: Exploring patterns of spousal agreement in Bangladesh*. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01616. IFPRI: Washington DC. http://ebrary.ifpri.org/utils/getfile/collection/p15738coll2/id/131097/filename/131308.pdf

Anderson, C.L., Reynolds, T.W., Biscaye, P., Greenaway, M., and Merfeld, J. (2016). *Polygamous households and intrahousehold decision-making: Evidence and policy implications from Mali and Tanzania*. EPAR Technical Brief #330 (Preliminary Draft). Evans School of Public Policy and Governance: University of Washington. https://epar.evans.uw.edu/sites/default/files/EPAR_UW_330_Polygamy%20and%20Intrahousehold%20Decision-Making_Brief_6.22.16_0.pdf (accessed November 28, 2021)

Anderson, C. L., Reynolds, T.W., and Gugerty, M.K. (2017). Husband and wife perspectives on farm household decision-making authority and evidence on intra-household accord in rural Tanzania. *World Development*, 90, 169-183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.09.005

Arksey, S. (1996). *Collecting data through joint interviews*. Social Research Update 15. http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU15.html (accessed September 4, 2020)

Ashraf, N. (2009). Spousal control and intra-household decision making: An experimental study in the Philippines. *American Economic Review*, 99(4), 1245–1277. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.99.4.1245

Becker, S., Fonseca-Becker, F., and Schenck-Yglesias, C. (2006). Husbands' and wives' reports of women's decision-making power in western Guatemala and their effects on preventive health behaviors. *Social Science and Medicine*, 62 (9): 2313–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.10.006

Bernard, T., Doss, C., Hidrobo, M., Hoel, J., and Kieran, C. (2020). Ask me why: Patterns of intrahousehold decision-making. *World Development*, 125, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104671

Bjørnholt, M. and Farstad, G.R. (2014). 'Am I rambling?' On the advantages of interviewing couples together. *Qualitative Research*, 14(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112459671

Bomuhangi, A., Doss, C., and Meinzen-Dick. R. (2011). *Who owns the land? Perspectives from rural Uganda and implications for land acquisitions*. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01136. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute. http://ebrary.ifpri.org/utils/getfile/collection/p15738coll2/id/126766/filename/126977.pdf

Bokemeier, J., and Monroe, P. (1983). Continued reliance on one respondent in family decision-making studies: A content analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 45(3), 645–652. https://www.jstor.org/stable/351669?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Challiol, H. and Mignonac, K. (2005). Relocation decision-making and couple relationships: A quantitative and qualitative study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 247-274. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4093940

Cole, S.M., Kantor, P., Sarapura, S., and Rajaratnam, S. (2014). *Gender transformative approaches to address inequalities in food, nutrition, and economic outcomes in aquatic agricultural systems in low-income countries*. Penang, Malaysia: CRP AAS. Program Working Paper: AAS-2014-42. https://hdl.handle.net/10568/68525

Deere, C.D. and Twyman, J. (2012). Asset ownership and egalitarian decision making in dual-headed households in Ecuador. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 44(3), 313–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613412446043

Deere, C.D, and Leo´n de Leal, M. (1982). *Women in Andean agriculture: Peasant production and rural wage employment in Colombia and Peru*. Geneva: International Labour Office. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/297?ln=ru

Doss, C. (2013). Intrahousehold bargaining and resource allocation in developing countries. *World Bank Research Observer*, 28 (1): 52-78. http://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkt001

Duflo, E. (2003). Grandmothers and granddaughters: Old-age pensions and intrahousehold allocation in South Africa. *World Bank Economic Review*, 17(1), 1–25. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/17173

Duflo, E. and Udry, C. (2004). *Intrahousehold resource allocation in Cote d'Ivoire: Social norms, separate accounts and consumption choices*. National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), Working Paper 10498. https://www.nber.org/papers/w10498

Eisikovits, Z. and Koren, C. (2010). Approaches to and outcomes of dyadic interview analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(12), 1642-1655. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732310376520

Elias, M., Raneri, J., Petesch, P., and Kennedy, G. (2018). *Using vignettes to explore gender dimensions of household food security and nutrition*. GENNOVATE resources for scientists and research teams. CDMX, Mexico: CIMMYT. https://www.bioversityinternational.org/e-library/publications/detail/using-vignettes-to-explore-gender-dimensions-of-household-food-security-and-nutrition/

Forbat, L. and Henderson, J. (2003). 'Stuck in the middle with you': The ethics and process of qualitative research with two people in an intimate relationship. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(10), 1453-1462. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732303255836

Haddad, L.J., Hoddinott, J., and Alderman, H. (1997). *Intrahousehold allocation in developing countries: Models, methods and policy*. Washington DC: The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the John Hopkins University Press. http://ebrary.ifpri.org/utils/getfile/collection/p15738coll2/id/126667/filename/126878.pdf

Hamilton, S. (2000). The myth of the masculine market: Gender and agricultural commercialization in the Ecuadorean Andes. In *Women Farmers and Commercial Ventures: Increasing Food Security in Developing Countries*, ed. Anita Spring, 65–88. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Hung, L.S. (2018). Gender, intra-household dynamics, and household hurricane preparedness: An exploratory study employing a dyadic interview approach. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 9(1), 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-018-0158-9

Jejeebhoy, S.J. (2002). Convergence and divergence in spouses' perspectives on women's autonomy in rural India. *Studies in Family Planning*, 33, 299–308. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4465.2002.00299.x

Mayanja, S., N. Mudege, and D. Naziri. (2018). *Validation of the gender in value chains analytical tools*. Technical Report, IPC, Lima. https://www.slideshare.net/CGIAR/validating-gender-in-value-chains-tools-the-case-of-the-pmca

Mavhandu-Mudzusi, A.H. (2018). The couple interview as a method of collecting data in interpretative phenomenological analysis studies. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917750994

Mbweza, E., Norr, K.F., and McElmurry, B. (2008). Couple decision making and use of cultural scripts in Malawi. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 40(1), 12-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2007.00200.x

Meinzen-Dick, R., Rubin, D., Elias, M., Mulema, A.A., and Myers, E. (2019). *Women's empowerment in agriculture: Lessons from qualitative research*. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01797. Washington DC: IFPRI. https://ebrary.ifpri.org/digital/collection/p15738coll2/id/133060

Mellor, R.M., Slaymaker, E., and Cleland, J. (2013). Recognizing and overcoming challenges of couple interview research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 23, 1399-1407 https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732313506963

Morgan, D.L., Ataie, J., Carder, P., and Hoffman, K. (2013). Introducing dyadic interviews as a method for collecting qualitative data. *Qualitative Health Research*, 23(9), 1276–1284. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732313501889

Morris, S. M. (2001). Qualitative health research joint and individual interviewing in the context of cancer. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(4), 553-567. https://doi.org/10.1177/104973201129119208

Petesch, P. and Bullock, R. (2018). *Ladder of power and freedom: A qualitative data collection tool to understand local perceptions of agency and decision-making*. GENNOVATE resources for scientists and research teams. CDMX, Mexico: CIMMYT. https://repository.cimmyt.org/xmlui/handle/10883/19343

Rijken, A. and Knijn, T. (2009). Couples' decisions to have a first child: Comparing pathways to early and late parenthood. *Demographic Research*, 21(26), 765-802. https://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol21/26/

Seale, C., Charteris-Black, J., Dumelow, C., Locock, L., and Ziebland, S. (2008). The effect of joint interviewing on the performance of gender. *Field Methods*, 20(2), 107-128. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X07313837

Seymour, G. and Peterman, A. (2018). Context and measurement: An analysis of the relationship between intrahousehold decision making and autonomy. *World Development*, 111, 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.06.027

Story, W. and Burgard, S.A. (2012). Couples' reports of household decision-making and the utilization of maternal health services in Bangladesh. *Social Science and Medicine*, 75(12), 2403-2411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.09.017

Taylor, B. and de Vocht, H. (2011). Qualitative Health Research Interviewing Separately or of Authenticity of Method. *Qualitative Health Research*, 21(11), 1576-1587. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732311415288

Thompson, L. and Walker, A.J. (1982). The dyad as the unit of analysis: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 44(4), 889–900. https://www.jstor.org/stable/351453?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Tiruneh, A., Tesfaye, T., Mwangi, W., and Verkuijl, H. (2001). *Gender differentials in agricultural production and decision-making among smallholders in Ada, Lume, and Gimbichu Woredas of the Central Highlands of Ethiopia*. Working paper. Mexico, DF: International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) and Ethiopian Research Organization (EARO). https://repository.cimmyt.org/handle/10883/1018

Twyman, J., Useche, P., and Deere, C.D. (2015). Gendered perceptions of land ownership and agricultural decision-making in Ecuador: Who are the farm managers? *Land Economics*, 91(3), 479-500. http://le.uwpress.org/content/91/3/479

Wood, A., Downer, K., Lees, B., and Toberman, A. (2012). *Household financial decision making: Qualitative research with couples*. Department for Work and Pensions: UK. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/193442/rrep805.pdf

Zarhin, D. (2018). Conducting joint interviews with couples: Ethical and methodological challenges. *Qualitative Health Research*, 28(5), 844-854. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317749196

Annex: Dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

Dyadic interview protocol

Important considerations when administering the guide

The guide is intended to enable the research team to focus on the relationship between spouses in a marital dyad or between two people cohabiting regarding the approaches they employ and the overall process that unfolds when making decisions. This could include people in a polygynous marriage, where the research team could focus on the relationship between a man and one of his wives or more than one wife, although carrying out the interview with the man and each wife separately in the latter case. The guide encourages such couple types to focus on specific decisions, which the research team records and uses when asking subsequent questions. It is important that the research team captures nonverbal interactions or negotiations or looks that spouses give to each other during the interview (e.g. when responding to a question by one spouse, another spouse might look 'surprised' or 'confused' or 'excited' or possibly 'angry'). While most of the questions in the guide are intended for both spouses to respond to, some sets of questions get asked to one spouse, but encourage the other spouse to participate and/or respond as they feel the need or to clarify or agree or disagree. And thereafter, the same questions are repeated for the other spouse to respond to.

If possible, the interview should be audio recorded. If this is not possible, the note taker should take detailed, close-to-verbatim notes as she/he can.

Once the interview is over, the researchers should debrief with the couple, asking both spouses how they felt about the interview, and other questions that aim to create a space for couples to reflect on the questions asked and determine if they had thought about the topics prior to participating in the interview. It is also important for the research team to ask if the interview caused an unintended positive or negative emotion or the like, and if either spouse requires any follow up after the interview. The use of a consent form should inform the couple from the start that while the questions are not sensitive per se, how each spouse responds to the questions could result in a positive or negative experience for the other spouse or the couple as a whole. If either spouse expresses concern about being interviewed together, the dyadic interview should not be conducted. The researcher can then make the choice to carry out the interview separately with each spouse using a modified guide.

The interview should be carried out in the privacy of the couple's home or surrounding area with no other people attending. However, if it is customary to have children or other family members around, the content included in the guide is not of the sensitive nature to prevent others from being present. If a private interview is not possible, it should be noted who is present during the interview (including children). The research team should modify and pretest the interview guide prior to conducting interviews with couples on specific decision-making topics or if the research is being carried out under a specific project.

Sampling
Sampling depends on the nature of the research and/or the project focus. At the very least, the tool in its current form should target married or cohabiting couples, including women and men in polygynous marriages. Whether to include certain other types of married or cohabiting couples, again, depends on the research focus. Newly-wedded or recently formed couples may not have adequate time together to meaningfully respond to the questions in the guide, for example. Importantly, interviews should not be carried out with couples who are experiencing significant troubles in their marriage or when it is known that violence has occurred within the household in the past. Thus, it is critical that the research team identifies local research assistants or project officers or other relevant people to assist in identifying couples for interviewing. Regardless of the research focus, it may be important to interview a variety of couples from different demographic or socioeconomic backgrounds, if variation in couple experiences based on age or wealth or educational status or ethnicity or religion, is of interest. This would also ensure that a more intersectional approach is adopted when sampling couples.

Research team
A two-person team should carry out the interviews. One researcher should ask the questions, while the other should record responses and/or oversee recording the interview using a device. Both researchers should be well trained and experienced in carrying out and recording content from qualitative interviews. This entails having strong facilitation and note taking and transcription skills. Both researchers should be proficient in the language spoken by study participants. The guide was designed to ask all questions, in each set of questions, in order. As indicated above, the note taker should take detailed notes and verbatim as much as possible. This will save time when translating and when entering the notes into the computer. In addition, both researchers must have a good understanding of the concepts that underlie the questions and need to listen for points related to these concepts.

Anticipated time required to administer the guide: around 1.5 hours

Data entry and management
The data collected using the first part of the interview guide should be entered into an MS Excel data sheet. The data collected using the second part of the interview guide should be translated and transcribed in MS Word or another word processing software. Both should be developed with the researchers in charge of carrying out the interviews and collecting the data, if possible.

Dyadic interview guide to explore intra-household decision-making

Interview information

Region, district, ward/shehia, village	
Interview date (d/m/y)	
Interview start/end time	
Name of interviewer	
Name of note taker	

PART A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Demographic characteristics of both participants in the dyad

	Sex (F/M)	Age (years or year born)	Edu level[$]	Ethnicity (ethnic group)	Religion 1=Muslim; 2=Christian; 3=Other (specify)	Main occupation*	Second occupation*
Spouse 1							
Spouse 2							

[$]0=No formal; 1=Primary (Standard 1-6/7 or Grade 1-6); 2=Secondary (Form 1-4); 3=Advanced Secondary (Form 5-6); 4=Vocational training; 5=Certificate; 6=Diploma (Grade 12+2); 7=Degree (Grade 12+4); 8=Post-graduate (M.Sc., PhD); 9=Other (specify)
*0=None; 1=Farming; 2=Salaried employment off-farm; 3=Salaried employment on-farm; 4=Casual labor on-farm; 5=Casual labor off-farm; 6=Self-employed off-farm; 7=Housekeeping; 8=Student; 9=Other (specify)

Marital type (circle)	Cohabiting	Monogamous customary/religious	Monogamous state-recognized	Polygynous customary/religious	
				# of wives	
Number of years (or months) together					
Household size (includes all members)					
Children (sex and ages)	Sex	Age	Sex	Age	

2. Asset ownership

Do you own, rent, or borrow land?	Yes		No	
Who owns, rents, or borrows this land?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Someone else
Number of total acres/hectares of land?	For cultivation?	For grazing?	For other uses? (specify)	
How did you acquire your land?				
Farm assets Please list important farm assets you manage or take care of on your own or jointly with your spouse (ask to each spouse)	Asset	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint
	Hand hoe			
	Plough			
	Wheelbarrow			
	Tractor			
	Spray machine			
	Ox or donkey cart			
	Power tiller			
	Seed planter			
	Sheller or thresher			
	Canoe/boat			
	Treadle pump			
	Other			

Livestock Please list important livestock you own (ask to each spouse)	Livestock	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint
	Cattle			
	Goats			
	Sheep			
	Pigs			
	Rabbits			
	Donkey			
	Horse			
	Mule			
	Chicken			
	Ducks			
	Pigeon			
	Fish			
	Other			
Non-farm assets Please list important non-farm assets you manage or take care of on your own or jointly with your spouse (ask to each spouse)	Asset	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint
	Kitchenware			
	Bicycle			
	Motorcycle			
	Vehicle			
	Refrigerator			
	Stove			
	Mattress			
	Table			
	Radio			
	Phone			
	Television			
	Solar panel			
	Other			

3. Banking and savings options

Do you use a bank account or village banking or savings services (e.g. SACCOS, VICOBA)? Who owns or oversees the account?	Yes	No	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint

4. Agricultural production

List three main crops cultivated by the household	Crop 1	Crop 2	Crop 3	
Who is more involved in managing to marketing crop 1?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
Who is more involved in managing to marketing crop 2?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
Who is more involved in managing to marketing crop 3?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
List three main livestock you keep (includes fish) as a household	Livestock 1	Livestock 2	Livestock 3	
Who is more involved in managing to marketing livestock 1?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
Who is more involved in managing to marketing livestock 2?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
Who is more involved in managing to marketing livestock 3?	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other

5. Weather information and use of climate-smart agriculture practices and technologies

Do you access weather forecast information?	Yes		No		
Indicate your source of information?					
Who accesses this information?	Spouse 1		Spouse 2	Both	
Did this information inform your decision to use or adopt CSA practices and technologies in any way? And how?	Yes	No	How?		
Please list any climate-smart agriculture practices you use (ask to each spouse)	CSA tasks		Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint
	No tillage/minimum soil disturbance				
	Rainwater harvesting (bunds)				
	Ridging				
	Retention of crop residues or other soil surface cover				
	Use of crop rotations				
	Use of drought/flood-tolerant varieties				
	Integrated practices (e.g., crop-livestock)				
	Agroforestry practices				
	Pasture management/zero-grazing				
	Manure management				
	Other (specify)				

6. Other important roles and responsibilities

Who is more responsible for carrying out the following expenditure-related tasks?	Task	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
	Food-related				
	School-related				
	Health-related				
	Any other? (specify)				
Who is responsible for carrying out the following domestic tasks?	Task	Spouse 1	Spouse 2	Joint	Other
	Caring for children				
	Caring for older adults or those who are sick				
	Drawing water				
	Collecting firewood (or purchasing charcoal)				
	Any other? (specify)				

7. Participation in cooperatives, clubs, community-based organizations, fellowship groups, and meetings

Are you involved in any groups, associations, cooperatives, clubs, religious fellowship groups? Indicate two most important groups (ask to each spouse)	Spouse 1 - Yes / No		Spouse 2 - Yes / No	
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 1	Group 2
Do you attend agriculture or water or natural resource management meetings or trainings, field days or farmer field school? Give example (ask to each spouse)	Spouse 1 - Yes / No		Spouse 2 - Yes / No	
	Example		Example	

PART B. INTRA-HOUSEHOLD DECISION-MAKING

1. The process couples used to make important decisions[5]

To start the conversation, could you two please think of an important decision you made over the past year? (The decision could be on agriculture, on purchasing an asset, on school or education related issues, etc.) Please let me know what this is. Is this type of decision typical of other important decisions you've made in the past?

Now, this decision on [XXXX], I'm going to ask a set of questions FOR YOU BOTH TO ANSWER TOGETHER (as a couple). Please feel free to discuss while answering the questions, there are no right or wrong answers, but rather I am trying to understand how you go about making important decisions as a couple.

NOTE: document the decision they agreed to discuss on and use in place of [XXXX] below

Decision:
1.1. Can you describe to me how you planned how you would do [XXXX]?
1.2. Who initiated the discussion on [XXXX]? OR Who started talking about [XXXX] first?
1.3. What prompted you to initiate the discussions on [XXXX]?
1.4. How did each of you go about talking about the plans on doing [XXXX]?
1.5. Whose ideas were mostly taken into consideration when making the decision on [XXXX]?
1.6. What were the reasons why [Her/His] ideas were taken into consideration?
1.7. How did you finally resolve how to do [XXXX]? OR How was a final decision made on [XXXX]?
1.8a. Who made the final decision on [XXXX]?
1.8b. Why did [She/He) have the final say?
1.9a. Did you consult other members inside the family before making a decision on [XXXX]? Y/N
1.9b. How did this work (please explain the process)?
1.9c. What were the reasons for consulting these family members?
1.10a. Did you consult other members outside the household before making a decision on [XXXX]?
1.10b. How did this work (please explain the process)?
1.10c. What were the reasons for consulting these members outside your household?
1.11a. Were you satisfied with the outcome from the decision? Y/N
1.11b. Please explain why

5 Informed by: Challiol and Mignonac (2005); Mbweza et al. (2008); Wood et al. (2012); Acosta et al. (2019)

2. The process each spouse used to make specific decisions on their own[6]

Now I would like to ASK EACH OF YOU about an important decision you made ON YOUR OWN. Can you please think of a specific decision that you made on your own (or mostly on your own) over the past year? Please let me know what this is. Is this type of decision typical of other important decisions you've made on your own in the past?

Now, this decision on [XXXX] that you made on your own, I'm going to ask a set of questions for you to respond to, and if spouse wishes to provide their thoughts as well, please feel free to comment.

NOTE: document the decision each spouse indicated to discuss on and use in place of [XXXX] below

SPOUSE 1

Decision:
2.1. Can you please first explain why you made [XXXX] decision on your own? Why is [XXXX] an important decision that you make?
2.2. Can you describe to me how you planned how you would do [XXXX]?
2.3. How did you consider the different options to do [XXXX] when making the decision?
2.4a. Did you consult or inform [spouse] about the ideas you were considering before making a final decision on [XXXX]?
2.4b. Why?
2.5. If you consulted or informed [spouse], at which stage of the decision-making process on [XXXX] did you inform [spouse]? (Probe: early, mid-point, late or just before making a final decision)
2.6a. How significant is making [XXXX] decision to the welfare of you and your family members?
2.6b. Please explain. (Probe: on the significance first for [Her/Him] and then [spouse] and then other family members)
[Questions to other spouse]:
2.7. Did you feel you had an opportunity to influence [Her/Him] in making [XXXX] decision? Please explain.
2.8a. Is this [XXXX] decision something you would have liked to have been involved in making with your spouse?
2.8b. Why?

SPOUSE 2

Decision:
2.1. Can you please first explain why you made [XXXX] decision on your own? OR Why is [XXXX] an important decision that you make?
2.2. Can you describe to me how you planned how you would do [XXXX]?
2.3. How did you consider the different options to do [XXXX] when making the decision?
2.4a. Did you consult or inform [spouse] about the ideas you were considering before making a final decision on [XXXX]?
2.4b. Why?

6 Informed by: Acosta et al. (2019); Seymour and Peterman (2018)

2.5. If you consulted or informed [spouse], at which stage of the decision-making process on [XXXX] did you inform [spouse]? (Probe: early, mid-point, late or just before making a final decision)
2.6a. How significant is making [XXXX] decision to the welfare of you and your family members?
2.6b. Please explain. (Probe: on the significance first for [Her/Him] and then [spouse] and then other family members)
[Questions to other spouse]:
2.7. Did you feel you had an opportunity to influence [Her/Him] in making [XXXX] decision? Please explain.
2.8a. Is this [XXXX] decision something you would have liked to have been involved in making with your spouse?
2.8b. Why?

3. Couple's perceptions about general decision making in their relationship[7]

Now I'm going to ASK YOU GENERALLY how you feel about the decisions you made in your marriage and whether you would prefer to have more or less input into these decisions.

3.1a. Generally speaking, how do you feel about how decisions are made in your relationship?
3.1b. Please explain
3.2a. Would either of you prefer to have more input on decisions in your marriage?
3.2b. Which decisions?
3.2c. And why?
NOTE: refer to these [XXXX] decisions when asking Question 3.3
3.3. What keeps you from having more input on [XXXX] decisions in your relationship?
3.4a. Would either of you prefer to make less input on decisions in your relationship?
3.4b. Which ones?
3.4c. And why?

4. Agreeing and disagreeing on decisions[8]

Now I'm going to ask you about DECISIONS YOU AGREE AND DISAGREE ON. Please feel free to discuss on possible decisions you may or may not agree on before responding.

When responding to these questions, think about all the decisions you make each day, during the week, during certain times of the year, small versus big decisions, on and on.

4.1. Which decisions do you tend to agree on the most? Please discuss and indicate up to three specific decisions.
4.2. Are these important decisions for your family? Y/N In what way?

7 Informed by: Qualitative pro-WEAI (Activity E) https://weai.ifpri.info/files/2018/04/GAAP2-Qualitative-Protocols-no-comments-.pdf

8 Informed by: Mbweza et al. (2008); Qualitative pro-WEAI (Activity D) https://weai.ifpri.info/files/2018/04/GAAP2-Qualitative-Protocols-no-comments-.pdf

4.3. Which decisions do you tend to not agree on the most? Please discuss and indicate up to three specific decisions.
4.4. Are these important decisions for your family? Y/N In what way?

5. Climate-Smart Agriculture-specific decision-making questions[9]

Now I will ask you about SPECIFIC DECISIONS on climate-smart agriculture practices and technologies, either each of you on your own, or together, or perhaps others in your household who make these decisions.

Remembering the list of climate-smart agriculture practices and technologies that we discussed at the start of the interview (no tillage/minimum soil disturbance, rainwater harvesting (bunds), ridging, retention of crop residues or other soil surface cover, use of crop rotations, use of drought/flood-tolerant varieties, agroforestry practices, pasture management/zero-grazing, manure management)

5.1. Which decisions on the use of climate-smart agriculture practices and technologies do you make together? Please indicate.
NOTE: CHOOSE ONE decision to focus the next questions (and document)
5.2. When you decide about [XXXX] together, how much input do each of you contribute when making the decision? (Probe: did they contribute more, less, equally to making the decision)
5.3a. Who has the final say in making the decision on [XXXX]?
5.3b. Why do they have the final say?
5.4a. Do you ever disagree on certain topics when making decisions on [XXXX]? Y/N If no, then skip to 5.5a.
5.4b. If so, what type of disagreements do you have?
5.4c. How is [XXXX] disagreement resolved when making a decision on [XXXX]?
NOTE: no longer mention the [XXXX] decision above, as they now will be asked to choose other climate-smart agriculture decisions they make alone
5.5a. Are there any decisions related to the use of climate-smart practices and technologies that either of you make alone? If no, end these questions.
5.5b. Which ones?
NOTE: CHOOSE ONE decision to focus the next questions (and document)
5.6. Why is this [XXXX] decision made alone versus made together?
5.7. Do you think that the decision on [XXXX] made alone versus made together result in different outcomes for you and your family? Y/N Please explain.

9 Informed by: Qualitative pro-WEAI (Activity D) https://weai.ifpri.info/files/2018/04/GAAP2-Qualitative-Protocols-no-comments-.pdf; Mbweza et al. (2008); Bernard et al. (2020)

6. Changes in decision-making over time

6.1. Think back to how you made decisions on agriculture or on financial or family matters when you were first married. Now think about how you make them today. Have the ways you make these decisions now changed in your marriage compared to when you first got married?
6.2. If yes, how have they changed?
6.3. And what caused them to change?

Post-interview questions:

1. Had you ever given much thought to the issues we discussed today?
2. Did anything you discussed here with your spouse surprise you?
3. What and why?
4. Do you think it is preferable to make decisions together or alone? Which types of decisions and why?
5. How do you feel now that you had these discussions?

Thank the couple for participating in the dyadic interview. Ask each spouse how they are feeling after participating in the interview. Ask if either spouse has any concerns they wish to discuss now or after the interview at their convenience. Remind each spouse that if they wish to contact anyone on the research team, that the contact information is available in the informed consent form that was provided to them.