Overview: Sex- and Gender-based Analysis as Process

Defining the Issue(s)



- Research, policy and planning often derive from observations or perceptions that there is a "problem" to be addressed, there is an issue about which we know little, or there is a population that is facing particular challenges.
- Defining the issue includes sorting out why an issue has been identified and by whom.
- Be alert for evidence of bias: who is on the "winning" and "losing" sides
 of an issue; who is missing or ignored; is a double standard at work?

Describing the Population(s)



- Addressing a research, policy or planning issue also involves an appreciation of who is affected and/or in need as well as what we know

 or don't know – about diverse populations and communities.
- Issues play out differently in different places, at different times and for different groups of people.
- When identifying and working with populations, we need to consider: sex and gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity, age, class and other determinants of health.

Assembling the Evidence



- Assembling the evidence includes finding out what data are available.
- When evaluating the evidence, we need to pay attention to whether or not it speaks to the core concepts of sex, gender, diversity and equity.
- If we can, we should draw on different kinds and sources of evidence and information.
- Quantitative data ("the numbers") includes survey and statistical information.
- Qualitative data ("records and experiences captured in words and pictures") includes interviews, group discussions, observation, document reviews, etc.

Analyzing the Implications



- Consider the ways in which sex, gender, diversity and equity influence –
 or should influence health status, health policy and planning, health
 care delivery and health research in relation to the issue and population
 you are considering.
- Pay attention to potential biases in your analysis, such as privileging one group over another, excluding a group, or applying a double standard to the issues and populations under consideration
- Keep in mind that the same analytical approach applied to different issues and/or populations may lead to different implications for future program delivery and policy directions.

Structuring the Recommendations



- When making recommendations it is important to identify the intended audience and what kinds of information they need to act as champions for change.
- Need to be aware of how the environments in which audiences work influence their ability to absorb and respond to the recommendations.
- When crafting recommendations it is essential to recognize the strengths and opportunities as well as the limitations and obstacles afforded by the context in which the issue is being addressed (e.g., social, political, economic, historic, and geographic).

Some questions to guide SGBA

Defining the Issue(s)

What is the issue to be addressed?

Why has the issue been identified?

Who is defining this issue?

Does the description of the issue have enough information about the causes, symptoms, background and importance of the issue?

What other evidence exists that might suggest a different way of looking at this issue?

Describing the Population

Who is most affected?

Who is not represented?

Can we identify the details of the populations that we believe to be most affected or who can benefit the most from resolving the issue?

What do we need to know about the populations? Where are we finding the information? What information are we missing about sub-populations?

Are we talking about both females and males or a single sex?

Does our data set include information about transgendered individuals or groups?

Do we have evidence about females and males of all ages or for adults or children only?

Do we have information about diverse ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds?

Assembling the Evidence

What are the sources for the information or evidence?

What value are we placing on the evidence? Are we missing key information? Where else should we look for evidence?

Can we appraise the merits and limitations of both quantitative and qualitative evidence and is the research trustworthy?

How well does it speak to the core concepts of sex, gender, diversity and equity?

With quantitative and qualitative data, are we considering who is asking the questions, as well as who is answering the questions?

Which aspects of the issue are addressed and which are overlooked; are some populations included while others are excluded?

As gaps in knowledge are identified, are we are prompted to look for further or different evidence or to re-evaluate the original research question or policy inquiry?

Analyzing the Implications

Does the analysis address the core concepts of sex, gender, diversity and equity? Does the analysis address a range of other factors – social, political, economic, historic, geographic and so on?

Are we making any assumptions about the issue, population, or evidence? Are we overgeneralizing, applying a double standard, exaggerating differences or ignoring similarities?

Are we returning regularly to the definition of the issue, the identification of the population and the evidence to be sure we are asking the right questions?

Are we checking regularly to see if SGBA is changing our analysis in any way? Do we understand why or why not SGBA is affecting our interpretation of an issue?

Structuring the Recommendations

Have we considered the context fully?

Do the recommendations address a range of factors – social, political, economic, historic, geographic and so on?

What are the strengths and opportunities that the recommendations offer? What are some of the obstacles and threats created by the recommendations? For whom are the recommendations written?

Who else might be interested to support or implement these recommendations? Have we considered a timeframe for the analysis, parameters for the inquiry, identified appropriate audiences for the recommendations and strategies to present the recommendations?