Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Adequacy cutoff (z_j)	• The threshold at which a person is considered to have adequate achievement in an indicator <i>j</i>	NA
Adequate	 Meeting or exceeding the defined adequacy cutoff (z_j) for a specific indicator Person <i>i</i> is considered adequate in indicator <i>j</i> if his or her level of achievement in that indicator, x_{ij}, is equal to or greater than the adequacy cutoff, z_j, for the indicator (i.e., x_{ij} ≥ z_j) 	Individual
Agency	 "Ability to make strategic choices" (Kabeer 1999) Pro-WEAI measures three types of agency: intrinsic agency (power <i>within</i>), instrumental agency (power <i>to</i>), and collective agency (power <i>with</i>) For other definitions and reviews of the literature see: Alsop et al., 2006; Gammage et al., 2016; Klugman, 2014; Sen, 1999. 	NA
Censored inadequacy headcount ratio ($h_j^\prime(k)$)	 Proportion of women or men in the sample who are disempowered and simultaneously inadequate in an indicator k Mathematical notation: h'_i(k) = ¹/_n∑ⁿ_{i=1} g'_{ij}(k) Here, g'_{ij}(k) is equal to g_{ij}, the inadequacy status of person i in indicator j if c_i > k (i.e., if the disempowerment score of person i is greater than the disempowerment cutoff k, meaning person i is disempowered) and g'_{ij}(k) = 0. otherwise (i.e., if the disempowerment score of person i is empowered) and n is the number of women or men in the sample 	Sample
Censored disempowerment score ($c_i'(k)$)	 Equal to the disempowerment score (c_i), if person i is disempowered, and equal to zero, otherwise (i.e., if person i is empowered) Mathematical notation: c'_i(k) = c_i if c_i > k and c'_i(k) = k if c_i ≤ k 	Individual
Censoring	 Process used in pro-WEAI to focus measurement on the disempowered 	NA
Collective agency	 Power with (others) Power derived from acting together with others 	NA

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Contribution to disempowerment	 The index of disempowerment, M₀, can be decomposed to show the contribution of each indicator Absolute contribution of indicator <i>j</i> to disempowerment: w_j × h'_j(k) Relative contribution of indicator <i>j</i> to disempowerment: ^{w_j × h'_j(k) M₀} Here, w_j refers to the weight of indicator <i>j</i>, h'_j(k)refers to the censored inadequacy headcount ratio, and M₀ refers to the disempowerment index. Whenever the relative contribution to disempowerment of an indicator greatly exceeds its weight (always equal to 1/10 in pro-WEAI), this suggests that the disempowered are disproportionally more inadequate in this indicator compared to other indicators. 	Sample
Disempowered	 Does not satisfy the empowerment cutoff Adequate in <i>less than</i> 8 of 10 indicators, or 80% of the indicators Person <i>i</i> is considered disempowered if their disempowerment score is greater than the disempowerment cutoff (<i>c_i > k</i>) 	Individual
Disempowerment cutoff (<i>k</i>)	 Maximum share of weighted indicators in which a person may be inadequate but not be considered disempowered Pro-WEAI sets the disempowerment cutoff at 20% A person is identified as disempowered if they are inadequate in more than 2 of the 10 indicators 	NA
Disempowerment headcount ratio (H_p)	 Proportion of women or men in the sample who are disempowered Preferred mathematical notation: H_p = ^q/_n, where q is the number of disempowered women or men and n is the number of women or men in the sample Alternative mathematical notation: H_p = 1 - H_e, where H_e is the proportion of women or men in the sample who are empowered 	Sample

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Disempowerment index (M_0)	 Reflects the overall level of disempowerment among women or men in the sample population Captures the percentage of women or men who are disempowered, as well as the average share of indeguasies that they experience. 	
	 Can be decomposed into the contribution of each indicator to disempowerment (see Contribution to disempowerment). Calculated as the product of the disempowerment headcount ratio and the mean disempowerment score among disempowered (intensity of disempowerment (preferred mathematical notation). Can alternatively be expressed as the complement of the three domains of empowerment index (3DE) (see alternative mathematical notation [a]) or the average censored disempowerment score among women or men (see alternative mathematical notation [b]) Preferred mathematical notation: M₀ = H_p × A_p 	Sample
	• Alternative mathematical notations: (a) $M_0 = 1 - 3DE$; (b) $M_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c'_i(k)$, where n is the number of women in the sample	
Disempowerment score (<i>c_i</i>)	 Share of weighted indicators in which a person is inadequate Calculated by summing the inadequacy status of all indicators, each multiplied by their corresponding weight, w_j = 1/10 (all 10 indicators in pro-WEAI are equally weighted) Mathematical notation: c_i = ∑¹⁰_{j=1} w_j × g_{ij}, where w_j is the weight of indicator j (in pro-WEAI, this is 1/10 for every indicator), and g_{ij} is the inadequacy status of person i in indicator j. Sometimes referred to as the inadequacy score 	Individual
Domains	 Refers to the 3 domains of empowerment, or types of agency, measured in pro- WEAI: intrinsic agency, collective agency, and instrumental agency. 	NA
Dual-adult household	A household with both female and male adult decisionmakers	NA

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Empowered	 An individual is considered empowered if he/she is adequate in at least 80% (or 8 out of 10) of the indicators, thereby satisfying the empowerment cutoff. Individuals below the cutoff are considered disempowered Satisfies the empowerment cutoff Person <i>i</i> is considered empowered if their disempowerment score is less than or equal to the disempowerment cutoff (<i>c_i</i> ≤ <i>k</i>) We use adequacy to express how an individual fares with respect to each indicator and empowerment to express how someone fares across all 10 indicators. For example, an individual who is adequate in only 5 indicators is considered disempowered. Corresponding variable created by weai command in Stata: empowered 	Individual
Empowerment	 A process of change by which people expand their ability to make strategic life choices in contexts in which this ability had been denied to them (Kabeer 1999). "The ability to exercise choice encompasses three dimensions: resources (defined to include not only access but also future claims to material, human, and social resources), agency (including processes of decision-making, negotiation, and even deception and manipulation), and achievements (well-being outcomes)" (Malapit et al. 2019). For other definitions and reviews of the literature see: Alsop et al., 2006; DAW, 2001; Mosedale, 2005; Narayan, 2002; Oxaal & Baden, 1997; Raj, 2017; VeneKlasen & Miller, 2002. 	NA
Empowerment cutoff	 Minimum share of weighted indicators in which a person must be adequate to be considered empowered Pro-WEAI uses an empowerment cutoff equal to 80%, meaning a person is identified as empowered if they are adequate in 8 or more of the 10 indicators 	NA
Empowerment score	 Reflects the share of weighted indicators in which a person has achieved adequacy Calculated as the complement of the disempowerment score (1 - c_i) or, alternatively, by summing a person's adequacy status (1 = adequate; 0 = inadequate) across all 10 indicators, each multiplied by their corresponding weight of 1/10 Often used in regressions (as a dependent or an independent variable) as a metric of individual- level empowerment Mean values can be calculated separately for empowered and disempowered individuals (i.e., mean empowerment score for the empowered, mean empowerment score for the disempowered) Sometimes referred to as the adequacy score Corresponding variable created by weai command in Stata: emp_score 	Individual/sample

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Female-only household	A household with no male adult decisionmaker (only female adults)	NA
Gender parity	 A household achieves gender parity if either of the following conditions are true: (a) the woman is empowered or (b) the woman's empowerment score is equal to or greater than the man's empowerment score This means that all dual-adult households in which the female decisionmaker is empowered have achieved gender parity. Gender parity can only be assessed in dual-adult households Corresponding variable created by weai command in Stata: gender_parity 	Household
Gender Parity Index (GPI)	 A composite index that measures two aspects of empowerment (at the household-level) in the sample population: (a) the proportion of dual-adult households that achieve gender parity and (b) the average empowerment gap among households that lack gender parity The GPI reflects the extent (prevalence) and intensity (depth) of gender parity in the sample. The GPI adapts the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke Poverty Gap measure to reflect gender parity. One of two sub-indices that comprise pro-WEAI (GPI comprises 10 percent weight). Mathematical notation: GPI = 1 - (H_{GPI} × I_{GPI}), where H_{GPI} is the % not achieving gender parity, and I_{GPI} is the mean empowerment gap 	Sample
Inadequate ($g_{ij}=1$)	 Failing to meet the defined adequacy cutoff (z_j) for a specific indicator Person <i>i</i> is considered inadequate in indicator <i>j</i> if his or her level of achievement in that indicator, x_{ij}, is less than the adequacy cutoff, z_j, for the indicator (i.e., x_{ij} < z_j) Formally, each person in each indicator is assigned an inadequacy status g_{ij} = 1, if x_{ij} < z_j, and g_{ij} = 0, otherwise. 	Individual
Indicators	 Refers to the 10 indicators of empowerment included in pro-WEAI: autonomy in income, self-efficacy, attitudes about intimate partner violence against women, input in livelihood decisions, ownership of land and other assets, access to and decisions on financial services, control over use of income, work balance, visiting important locations, and group membership There are also 2 optional indicators in pro-WEAI: respect among household members, and membership in influential groups 	NA

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Indicator weight	 Each indicator of the pro-WEAI is equally weighted to add up to 1. Each of the 10 indicators in the pro-WEAI receives a weight of 1/10. For projects using the additional 2 optional indicators, each of the 12 indicators receives a weight of 1/12. 	NA
Instrumental agency	 Power to Ability to make decisions in one's own best interest 	NA
Intrahousehold inequality score	 Difference between the empowerment scores of the man and woman within a household Ranges from -1 to +1 A positive score indicates that the man is more empowered than the woman, while a negative score indicates that the woman is more empowered than the man. A score of 0 indicates that there is no difference in their empowerment scores. Higher intrahousehold inequality scores indicate a larger gap between the empowerment of husband and wife. Often included in regressions (as a dependent or an independent variable) as a household-level metric Corresponding variable created by weai command in Stata: hh_ineq 	Household
Intrinsic agency	 Power within One's personal sense of agency or internal voice, self-respect, or self-confidence 	NA
Mean disempowerment score among disempowered (A _p)	 Reflects the intensity or breadth of disempowerment among women or men. Mathematical notation: A_p = Σⁿ_{i=1} c_i(k)/q where q is the number of disempowered women or men and c_i(k) is the disempowerment score 	Sample

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Mean empowerment gap (I _{GPI})	 The mean or average empowerment gap is the average percentage shortfall that a woman without parity experiences relative to her partner. The mean empowerment gap reflects the average difference between the empowerment scores of the man and woman in the household, and is only calculated for those households that do not achieve gender parity. In other words, the mean empowerment gap is the average intrahousehold inequality score for households that do not achieve gender parity. This gives us an idea of the performance of households that do not meet gender parity. Average percentage gap between the censored disempowerment scores of women and men living in dual-adult households that lack gender parity Mathematical notation: I_{GPI} = ¹/_h ∑^h_{l=1} ^{c'_l(k)^M}/_{1 - c'_l(k)^M}, where c'_l(k)^W and c'_l(k)^M are the censored disempowerment scores of the woman and man, respectively, living in household <i>i</i> and <i>h</i> is the number of dual-adult households that lack gender parity. 	Sample
Percent achieving empowerment	 Proportion of women or men in the sample who are empowered Also referred to as the adequacy headcount ratio 	Sample
Percent not achieving gender parity (H_{GPI})	 Proportion of households in the sample that achieve gender parity Preferred mathematical notation: H_{GPI} = ^r/_m, where r is the number of households that lack gender parity and m is the number of dual-adult households in the sample 	Sample

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
	• The project-level Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (pro-WEAI) is a successor of the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI), and was developed to assess impacts and evaluate outcomes of agricultural development projects with women's empowerment objectives.	
	 A composite index that reflects the extent of women's individual empowerment in the sample population based on the 3DE and GPI sub-indices 	
	• Mathematical notation: $pro - WEAI = \frac{9}{10}3DE + \frac{1}{10}GPI$	
Project-level Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (pro-WEAI)	 The weighting scheme, 90 percent 3DE and 10 percent GPI, reflects the greater overall importance attributed to women's individual empowerment. The smaller weight assigned to GPI acknowledges the importance of empowerment dynamics within the household, but also recognizes that the GPI can only be calculated in households where both men and women respondents are present. The pro-WEAI score therefore encompasses the two elements of the 3DE, the % achieving empowerment and the empowerment score among the disempowered, and the two elements of the GPI, the % of households achieving gender parity as well as the average empowerment gap. As the 3DE reflects the extent (prevalence) and intensity (depth) of individual women's empowerment in the sample and the GPI reflects the extent (prevalence) and intensity (depth) of gender parity into consideration. Ranges from 0 to 1, where higher values indicate greater empowerment Sample-level metric (as opposed to individual- or household-level) Not a percentage 	Sample

Term	Definition	Level of Metric
Three Domains of Empowerment Index (3DE)	 The 3DE is based on the Alkire Foster methodology and reflects: Incidence of empowerment: The percentage of women who are empowered. Adequacy among the disempowered: The weighted share of indicators in which disempowered women achieve adequacy. These two elements capture how widespread empowerment is, and how close disempowered individuals are to becoming empowered. The 3DE therefore reflect the extent (prevalence) of empowerment and intensity (depth) of empowerment in the sample. Considering both of these elements is important for understanding disempowerment within a sample population. This reflects the extent of individual empowerment in the sample without taking gender parity into consideration. Note that 3DE is calculated using information from all women in the sample, regardless of whether she belongs to a dual-adult household, where both male and female decisionmakers are present, or a female-only household, where there is no male decisionmaker present. One of two sub-indices that comprise pro-WEAI Preferred mathematical notation: 3DE = H_e + (H_p × A_e), where H_e is the proportion of women in the sample who are empowered, H_p is the proportion of women in the sample who are empowered, and A_e is the mean empowerment score of disempowered women. 	Sample
Uncensored inadequacy headcount ratio (h_j)	 Proportion of women or men who are inadequate in an indicator <i>j</i>, regardless of whether they are empowered or disempowered Mathematical notation: h_j = ¹/_n ∑ⁿ_{i=1} g_{ij}, where n is the number of women in the sample 	Sample

• Note: Keep in mind that the 3DE, GPI, and thus pro-WEAI as a whole, can only be calculated at the project-, population- or treatment arm- level. Only empowerment status and empowerment score can be calculated at the individual level. Gender parity status and intrahousehold inequality scores can be calculated at the household level.

References

Alsop, R., Bertelsen, M. F., & Holland, J. (2006). Empowerment in Practice: From Analysis to Implementation. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

DAW. (2001). Empowerment of Women Throughout the Life Cycle as a Transformative Strategy for Poverty Eradication. Paper presented at the the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), New Delhi; India. <u>http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/empower/reports/Final_report.pdf</u>

Gammage, S., Kabeer, N., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2016). Voice and Agency: Where Are We Now? Feminist Economics, 22(1), 1-29.

- Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment. *Development and Change*, *30*(3), 435–464. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00125
- Klugman, J., Hanmer, L., Twigg, S., Hasan, T., McCleary-Sills, J., & Santamaria, J. (2014). Voice and agency: Empowering women and girls for shared prosperity. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank Publications
- Malapit, H., Quisumbing, A., Meinzen-Dick, R., Seymour, G., Martinez, E. M., Heckert, J., Rubin, D., Vaz, A., & Yount, K. M. (2019). Development of the projectlevel Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (pro-WEAI). *World Development*, *122*, 675–692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.06.018

Mosedale, S. (2005). Assessing women's empowerment: Towards a conceptual framework. Journal of international development, 17(2), 243-257.

Narayan, D. (Ed.). (2002). Empowerment and Poverty Reduction: A Sourcebook. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Raj, A., McDougal, L., & Trivedi, A. (2017). EMERGE Project Report: Theoretical and Definitional Basis for Identification of Measures of Gender Equality and Empowerment. Center on Gender Equity and Health (GEH), University of California, San Diego School of Medicine. San Diego, CA.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Oxaal, Z., & Baden, S. (1997). Gender and empowerment: Definitions, approaches and implications for policy (I. o. D. Studies Ed. Vol. 40). Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies (IDS).
- VeneKlasen, L., & Miller, V. (2002). A New Weave of Power, People and Politics: The Action Guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishers.