LEAVE NO WOMAN BEHIND

“We cannot succeed when half of us are held back.” —Malala Yousafzai, 2014 Nobel Peace Prize laureate and champion for girls’ education

Continued discrimination against women and girls would make it impossible to end hunger and poverty. Women farmers produce much of the food consumed in low-income countries, but gender discrimination lowers their productivity. Women are expected to complete most household chores, which are not only unpaid, but more difficult and time-consuming in low-income households without amenities such as running water and electricity. Increased investments in education would make it possible for more girls to realize their full potential and end cycles of intergenerational poverty.

A Closer Look: Half the World Deserves Better

A key factor in ending hunger is ending pervasive gender inequities. In 2013, Bread for the World Institute’s 2013 Hunger Report, Within Reach, featured Gilma, a 5-year-old girl living in the Dry Corridor region of Guatemala—an area that suffers frequent droughts due to climate change. During a severe drought in 2012, U.S. food aid provided a buffer between families and hunger, but the aid delivered to Gilma’s family was not enough for them all.

In many societies, women and girls are expected to eat last, eat less, and in times of scarcity not eat at all. Gilma is the only girl among the five children in her family. To put it bluntly, the boys got to eat while she starved. By the time aid workers with Save the Children—the organization distributing the food aid—learned of her situation, Gilma had already reached a deadly stage of hunger: severe acute malnutrition. Gilma nearly died. Not because she is a poor child in a region where food is often scarce, but because she is a girl.

Women play a pivotal role in ending hunger because they are both economic producers and caregivers. In the world’s poorest countries, most women live in rural areas and work as farmers, producing 60 to 80 percent of the food crops. Yet, people in rural areas are more likely to be hungry, and women’s ability to produce more food is constrained by inequities in access to productive resources. The most important of these is land.

In more than half the countries in the world, women do not have land ownership rights equal to those of men. In these countries, a widow or daughter usually cannot inherit land upon the death of her husband or father. Countries that have reformed their laws to grant land-tenure rights to women have found that significant improvements in health, nutrition, and education follow for both women and their children. In Nepal, children are 33 percent less likely to be severely underweight in households where women own land.

Inequities based on gender also include less access to other resources such as seeds, fertilizer, and credit. The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that if all women smallholder farmers had equal access to productive resources, they could produce 20 to 30 percent more food, and between 100 million and 150 million fewer people would be hungry.

Education is one of the most powerful drivers of progress against hunger, and the education of girls has paid off in all regions of the world. Improvements in education reduce child hunger. In an analysis of 63 developing countries, improvements in women’s education was credited for 44 percent of the reduction in child hunger over 25 years—more than the 26 percent
Each additional year of primary school boosts women’s wages in adulthood by 10 to 20 percent, and each additional year of secondary school by 15 to 25 percent.7

Men also increase their earning potential with more education. But in the effort to improve the health and standard of living of children and families, women’s education is more important. Research from all parts of the world shows that women are more likely to spend their earnings on their children’s education, health care, and nutrition. Their priorities are different from men’s, which is one reason development programs that include cash assistance generally distribute money directly to mothers.

In low-income countries, despite progress, girls are still less likely to be in school than boys. This is particularly true of secondary school. In some situations, girls risk their lives to get an education. In October 2012, Pakistani schoolgirl Malala Yousafzai, now a world-renowned advocate for girls’ education usually known as simply “Malala,” was shot in the head by a Taliban gunman. Yousafzai’s family is from Pakistan’s SWAT Valley, a conflict-affected region that is a stronghold of the Pakistani Taliban. The Taliban are extremists who oppose women’s education. The gunman stormed the school bus Malala Yousafzai was on and threatened to kill every girl on board if no one would identify the one who was “making trouble.”

Malala recovered from the shooting. In 2014, when she was 17, she became the youngest-ever Nobel Peace Prize laureate for courageously standing up to extremists and championing the rights of girls. The same year, 276 school girls in northern Nigeria were abducted by members of the terror group Boko Haram, who also oppose educating girls in the belief that women should not think independently.

These incidents occurred in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, respectively, which have the largest gender gaps in education and, not coincidentally, the highest hunger rates.

Gender inequities hurt everyone—men, women, and children. A 2015 report by the McKinsey Global Institute concluded that gender inequality costs as much as $28 trillion annually in lost global GDP.9 That amount is the size of the economies of the United States and China combined. A world where so many people are hungry and poor clearly cannot afford gender discrimination.

**Possibilities and Challenges**

**Leave No Girl Behind**

School meal programs are one of the most effective ways to promote equitable access to education for girls. The food girls receive at school offsets the money they could earn if they stayed home and worked to help support the family, changing parents’ opportunity costs.
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Often, school meal programs include a take-home food package, ensuring that families view keeping their daughters in school as the better option.

The McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, a U.S. food aid program, supports school meal programs for preschool and primary-school age children in 25 countries. The program targets girls at risk of having their educations cut short by a heavy burden of household labor or child marriage.

The program would be even more effective if more of the food that is served were purchased from local farmers, whose children often attend participating schools. Many smallholder farmers are supported by Feed the Future, the U.S. government’s global food security and nutrition program. Recently the McGovern-Dole program has begun to buy some of the food it distributes from local sources, but the majority of its funding must be used to buy products from U.S. farmers.

Smallholder farmers in participating countries, particularly women, would benefit significantly from a legal and policy shift to allow more local and regional purchase. Revenue from U.S. food aid sales is not financially important to U.S. farmers, whose other markets are the source of more than 97 percent of total U.S. farm income. McGovern-Dole’s design calls for a transition to management by each participating country, whether the new national administrator is part of the government, the private sector, civil society, or some combination. In any case, the program will need to integrate local farmers at some point.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) called for achieving gender parity in primary school enrollment by 2015. To date, 66 percent of countries have achieved this goal. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) build on the MDGs by calling for gender parity in primary and secondary enrollment. But development initiatives that focus on girls have tended to overlook adolescents, and we can see this reflected in stark differences in primary and secondary school enrollment. More than twice as many girls of high school age are out of school as primary school girls. In sub-Saharan Africa, 75 percent of girls begin primary school, but less than 10 percent graduate from secondary school.

Poverty is the main reason girls drop out of school. Older girls become caregivers to younger siblings, so their mothers can work. Gender-based violence is another reason so many girls don’t finish school. Girls are vulnerable to sexual violence and harassment at school, and the many who must walk long distances to and from school are at higher risk. Around the world, nearly half of all sexual assaults are committed against girls younger than 16.

Child marriage also stops girls from attending school. One in three girls in low- and middle-income countries is married by the time she turns 18, and one in nine is married by age 15. Most countries have laws prohibiting child marriage, but often the laws are not enforced, or exemptions render them meaningless. The earlier a girl gets married, the more likely it is that she will drop out of school. The longer she remains in school, the less likely she will be married—and perhaps begin having children—before she is an adult.

Investing in universal secondary education can lead to extraordinarily high returns in eliminating childhood stunting and poverty. Education through secondary level is secondary level is estimated to have five times the effect on reducing stunting.

![FIGURE 3B Alarming Percentages of Girls Are Married as Children](image-url)
as primary education. The structural transformation that agriculturally dependent economies are counting on to move huge numbers of their populations out of poverty depends on advances in educational achievement. In low-income countries, it costs on average $1.25 a day to educate a child, whether she is in primary or upper-secondary school. UNESCO estimates that universal primary, universal primary and secondary education could together reduce the global poverty rate by more than half. The effects would be larger in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa: a nearly two-thirds reduction in poverty.

The World Bank contends that universal secondary education could virtually eliminate child marriage. It is impossible to overstate the barrier that child marriage poses to efforts to end global hunger. Child marriage leads to early pregnancy, and the children of young mothers have high rates of malnutrition. This perpetuates a cycle of stunting and hunger. The younger the mother, the higher the risk of infant or child mortality.

Moreover, the lives of mothers are at stake. It is risky for anyone younger than 18 or 19 to carry a pregnancy to term and go through childbirth, and even more dangerous for girls younger than 15. Unfortunately, the leading cause of death among adolescent girls is maternal mortality. Alarming information such as this helps explain why the U.S. State Department, when formulating the United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, concluded, “The welfare and active participation of this population will be an essential determinant of our success in attaining the Sustainable Development Goals.”

Advocacy Impact Story

Rebecca Dali and the Center for Caring, Empowering, and Peace Initiatives

In April 2014, much of the world was appalled by the kidnapping of 276 girls from a secondary school in the town of Chibok in northern Nigeria. The region is a stronghold of the terror group Boko Haram. They were not the first girls abducted for daring to defy Boko Haram’s prohibition of female education, and sadly, they have not been the last. Nearly five years later, more than 100 girls from the Chibok school remain missing. Some of those who escaped or were freed sought help from Dr. Rebecca Dali, who runs the Center for Caring, Empowering and Peace Initiatives (CCEPI). Some of the girls have been rejected by their families and communities because they are rape survivors who have given birth to children whose fathers are terrorists.

Dali founded CCEPI in 1989 to help Nigerian women, children, and orphans. Dali and her colleagues at CCEPI not only offer treatment for the traumas the Chibok girls have endured, but also enable them to learn skills and offer them tools to improve their ability to earn a living.

Dali offers herself as an example to the girls of what they are capable of doing. “I have walked the same path that you are going through,” she tells them. “My history is terrible, but I did not lose hope, so I don’t want you to lose hope.” Dali was raped when she was 6 years old. When she turned 8, her father told her that she must get married to help support the family. She wanted to stay in school, so she ran away. Dali ultimately earned a Ph.D. and has written books documenting what happened to people whom CCEPI has cared for over the decades.

In 2017, Dali was awarded the Sergio Vieira de Mello Award, named for the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights who was killed in Iraq in 2003. “Dr. Dali’s access into the local community and academic research have been invaluable to the advocacy community in the U.S. as we amplify the voices of those affected by violence in northeast Nigeria,” says Nathan Hosler, director of the Office of Peacebuilding and Policy for the Church of the Brethren in the United States. Ekklesiayar Yan’uwa a Nigeria (Church of the Brethren in Nigeria) is the church’s largest national body. Samuel Dali, Dr. Dali’s husband, served for many years as president of the Church of the Brethren in Nigeria, and most of the kidnapped Chibok girls are members. In addition to support from the church, CCEPI receives support from other donors, including USAID, the European Union, the U.N. Refugee Agency (UNHCR), and the International Rescue Committee.

Dali has had many encounters with Boko Haram and has paid a terrible price for treating its victims. In 2014, the group kidnapped her son. He has not been heard from since, and she presumes that he is dead. Despite the dangers, Dali and CCEPI remain committed to their ministry. As she told an interviewer, “If my organization is not there, who will go?”

IN THE UNITED STATES, GENDER EQUITY REQUIRES MORE POLITICAL POWER

“We must reject not only the stereotypes that others hold of us, but also the stereotypes that we hold of ourselves.” —Shirley Chisholm, civil rights leader and the first African American woman elected to the U.S. Congress

Some of the most glaring instances of gender discrimination in the United States occur in the workplace. U.S. policymakers have been slow to respond, and when they do, their actions have generally fallen short of what is actually needed. Because women are breadwinners or co-breadwinners in most households, pay discrimination and other workplace biases threaten the
food security of many families. Improving our economic system so that it works for everyone calls for a more equitable distribution of political power between men and women.

A Closer Look: The Wages of Inequality

Women earn less than men for doing the same work. This is true in all 20 of the most common occupations for women.27 In female-dominated fields, such as nursing assistants and preschool and kindergarten teachers, men on average are paid a higher wage. Women make up approximately 90 percent of the U.S. home healthcare workforce, but men doing the same work are paid more. Nationwide, counting workers in all occupations, women are paid 22 percent less than male peers. The gender wage gap is even larger for women of color.

The gender wage gap is not due to outside factors such as having less education or living in areas with a lower cost of living—the 22 percent is after controlling for race and ethnicity, education, and location.28 This means that women must work the equivalent of an additional 13 weeks each year to have the same income as a male counterpart.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 was supposed to require equal pay for equal work, but loopholes in the law make it easy to avoid compliance. In 1963, when U.S. President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, women were paid 59 cents for every dollar that men were paid.29 There has been some progress, but if progress continues at its average rate from 1963 until today, the gender pay gap will close in 2059. Progress has been slower since 2000 than between 1963 and 1999, and if we use this more recent rate of progress to see when gender pay equity will arrive, we get … 2119.30 You read that right: at the present rate of progress, it will take a century to close the pay gap.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a legislative proposal that would update the Equal Pay Act, closing the loopholes that permit employers to pay different wages to men and women who do the same job and have the same level of experience. This bill was first introduced in 1997. It has been reintroduced several times in the years since, but it has never cleared both houses of Congress.

Equal pay for women would have a profound impact on poverty in our country. The Institute for Women’s Policy Research reported in 2017 that equal pay would reduce the poverty rate by more than half, from 8 to 4 percent.31 Women of color would benefit, especially, because the gender wage gap is substantially higher for communities of color. White women who work full-time, year-round have an earnings ratio with their white male counterparts of 77 percent. Black women who work full-time, year-round are paid 61 percent of what white men are paid, indigenous women 58 percent, and Latinas 53 percent.32

Education should be an equalizer of wage gaps. But obtaining more education will not close the gender wage gap. Women already earn high school diplomas, bachelor’s degrees, and graduate degrees at higher rates than men, and this has been true for some time now. In fact, girls are more likely to graduate from high school than boys in every state.33

Becoming a mother worsens the gender wage gap. Becoming a father, on the other hand, increases a man’s earning power. Mothers with full-time, year-round jobs are paid 71 cents for every dollar that fathers are paid.34 Mothers are the sole or primary breadwinner in more than 40 percent of all families, and a co-breadwinner in another 20 percent.35 All children who rely on their mother’s income to pay the bills are at greater risk of food insecurity. In 2017, 5.6 million children with working mothers lived below the poverty line. If the mothers had had equal pay, there would have been 3.1 million such children—not a small number, but a lot less than 5.6 million. Nearly 26 million children, in poor, near-poor, and higher-income families combined, would have benefited from equal pay.36

Single-parent households led by women have one of the highest poverty rates of all groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean full-time, year-round earnings—men</th>
<th>Mean full-time, year-round earnings—women</th>
<th>Wage ratio</th>
<th>Difference in earnings</th>
<th>Number of women</th>
<th>Women’s cumulative losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-44 years</td>
<td>$67,048</td>
<td>$51,699</td>
<td>77.12%</td>
<td>-$15,349</td>
<td>22,199,000</td>
<td>-$340,732,451,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-46 years</td>
<td>$81,197</td>
<td>$59,056</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>-$22,142</td>
<td>20,706,000</td>
<td>-$458,472,252,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total losses: -$799,204,703,000

to the Institute for Women's Policy Research. Women are more likely to hold low-paying jobs than men, which exacerbates the wage inequity between women and men. There has been little progress on reducing the U.S. economy’s high levels of job segregation by gender and race. This is especially true for women of color, who are overrepresented in nearly all lower-paying jobs.

Nearly half of all home care workers are women of color. Home care workers, who provide health care and personal assistance for seniors and people with disabilities, are one of the fastest-growing U.S. occupations. These workers have always been disproportionately women of color. The median pay of home care workers is slightly more than $23,000 a year. That is not enough to move a family of four over the poverty line. More than half of all home care workers receive some type of federal benefit, and nearly one-third receive nutrition assistance.

Seventy percent of restaurant servers are women. Servers are paid what’s known as a “tipped wage,” a federally established floor that has been set at $2.13 an hour since 1991. Servers are three times as likely to be living in poverty as the rest of the U.S. workforce.

Possibilities and Challenges

Engendering the Political Will to End Hunger

In 2018, a record number of women ran for office and were elected. The 116th Congress looks different, with dozens of younger women now in the House of Representatives. However, women remain significantly underrepresented in Congress—as they have always been. For example, before the election, women held 20 percent of the seats in Congress. Today, they hold 23 percent.

Before the election, representation in state legislatures was only a little better than at the national level for women as a group; women held 25 percent of the seats. Women of color are underrepresented to a greater degree in state legislatures than in Congress. Of all U.S. female members of Congress, 35.5 percent are women of color. In state legislatures, African American women held only 277 of the 7,823 state legislator seats at the beginning of 2018, while other groups of color had less than half that many female legislators.

Women get results once they become lawmakers. An analysis of more than 40 years of U.S. House legislation found that women were more likely than their male counterparts to sponsor bills on civil rights, health care, and education. State legislatures with higher percentages of women have been more successful in lowering the gender wage gap than those with less female representation. Since 2009, bills in Congress sponsored by women have been more likely to be enacted than bills sponsored by men.

She Should Run is a nonpartisan organization that promotes equitable representation of women in political office. Its mission is helping aspiring candidates find their voices and overcome the roadblocks that keep women from running. When Bread for the World board member Dawn Pierce was preparing to launch her run for the Idaho state legislature, she participated in She Should Run’s leadership development training program.

She Should Run supports a national goal of getting 250,000 women—about half the number of all elected offices at the feder-
al, state, and local levels—to run for political office by 2030. “If we expect girls to grow up believing that they can be anything, then it’s on us to show them what is not just possible, but inevitable,” says Erin Loos Cutraro, CEO and founder of She Should Run.\(^{48}\)

Women running for office in the United States win elections at about the same rate as men, but not as many run for office. There are many reasons for this, not least being the difficulty of raising money from primarily male donors who often prove reluctant to contribute to women’s campaigns.

Another discouraging factor is that caregiving still falls mostly to women—hampering their ability to campaign. A study found that potential female candidates were 15 times as likely to be responsible for child care in their families than male candidates.\(^{49}\)

The unprecedented wave of female candidates in 2018 opened the door to changes in the rules and norms about “running for office while a mom.” In May 2018, Gretchen Shirley, a candidate for Congress from New York and also the mother of a 3-year-old daughter and a 2-year-old son, petitioned and received approval from the Federal Election Commission to use campaign funds for child care.\(^{50}\) The ruling will apply to all future candidates of both sexes.

The billions of dollars’ worth of unpaid care of children and elderly family members that society takes for granted is mostly courtesy of women. Like all working parents of young children, women in Congress with young children must balance commutes, child care, and careers. Men in Congress also balance these things, but they can generally rely on help from spouses to a degree that some, but not all, female members of Congress can.

Women of color face additional barriers, says Kelly Dittmar of Rutgers University and the Center for American Women. “The support infrastructure available to women of color has historically not been as strong, particularly when it comes to things like campaign trainings, recruitments, and financial support. It is important to confront not only sexist notions about who can be a leader, but also racist notions of who can and should lead.”\(^{51}\)

A number of countries around the world, of all income levels, designate a specific share of legislative seats for women to ensure that women are not isolated from political life. But the United States does not do this. Some high-income countries adopted such procedures in the 1980s, while many middle- and low-income nations followed suit after the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action called for increasing women’s participation in government. In the United States, people tend to recoil from the idea of “quotas.” Rarely, if ever, do policymakers or officials suggest setting aside designated legislative seats to increase women’s representation in government.

The Gender Equality Goal of the Sustainable Development Goals calls for women’s full and effective participation, and equal opportunities for leadership, at all levels of decision making in public life.

The United States has a long way to go to achieve equity in political representation. On the other hand, swift and dynamic changes are possible. The 2018 elections sent a record number of women to Congress (125), and this increased women’s representation in the House and Senate combined to 23 percent.\(^{52}\) In addition, a record number of women of color (47) were elected to Congress in 2018.\(^{53}\) Women will have a greater impact on policy than ever before. Voters may like what that means.

**Advocacy Impact Story**

**Dawn Pierce: Running to End Hunger**

Losing her job in 2010—meaning that she had to turn to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) to feed herself and her teenage son for 14 months—has everything to do with why Dawn Pierce entered politics. Pierce lives in Boise, Idaho. In 2018, she decided to run for state senator on a platform of ending hunger. She did not expect it to be easy. The incumbent, a Republican, had run unopposed for the past several election cycles. Pierce is a Democrat in a conservative state. She cast aside doubts about her chances and decided to run for office to make a statement. She could not remember ever hearing of anyone who had run on an anti-hunger platform. It was about time.

Most people who are hungry don’t want to share their stories. They feel guilt and shame over not being able to provide for their kids. Going to the government for help carries stigma. The stigma is certainly present in Idaho. Pierce felt it herself—when she went to apply for SNAP benefits in 2010, she sat in her car and cried for an hour before going in. But despite her initial reluctance to use federal nutrition assistance, she is not ashamed to talk about SNAP as a lifeline for families that fall on hard times.

At first, she shared her story because she realized that remaining silent only fueled and perpetuated the stigma. As an advocate, her story was what helped her connect with other people interested in creating change. As a candidate for office, her focus is on other people’s stories. “The face of hunger could look like any of us,” she says. That sums up the message of her candidacy.

In the summer of 2017, something else happened that tipped the balance in her decision to run. Pierce, who is a hospice nurse, cared for a patient who died because she could not afford health care. The Affordable Care Act could have made Medicaid
available to this patient when she was less seriously ill. But Idaho was one of several states that took advantage of a Supreme Court decision that allowed states to choose not to expand Medicaid coverage under the Affordable Care Act, so the patient did not have health insurance. Ironically, when she reached a terminal stage of her illness, the state granted her temporary Medicaid coverage, making it possible for her to receive hospice care at the end of her life. Yet when health insurance might have been able to save her life, and would have been funded by the federal government, the state of Idaho refused to give it to her.

Hunger and health are subjects Pierce understands, and she can explain their connection in medical terms from her professional experience. But it is the stories she shares that get people’s attention. After she lost her job in 2010, she was forced to buy less nutritious foods so that there would be enough for both herself and her child. But at the time she lost her job, Pierce was a diabetic. Her blood sugar soared on the diet of cheaper, highly processed foods she relied on to stave off hunger when she was unemployed, and she was nearly hospitalized.

Bread for the World’s *I Vote to End Hunger* campaign encourages voters to ask candidates running for office what they will do to end hunger, alleviate poverty, and create opportunity in the United States and around the world. Pierce flipped the script by volunteering up front her ideas for ending hunger if elected. Her slate of proposals ranges from ending the state’s tax on food, which affects the lowest-income families most, to raising the state minimum wage, still stuck at $7.25 an hour. She supports sentencing reform for nonviolent offenders. One reason is her discovery that between 1980 and 2012, Idaho’s spending on corrections increased at six times the rate of its education spending. Yet improving children’s educational opportunities is essential to breaking cycles of intergenerational hunger and poverty.

Pierce was elected to Bread for the World’s board of directors. Her involvement with Bread developed as she rose to prominence as an anti-hunger advocate in Idaho. Before joining the Bread board, she spoke at the launch of Bread for the World Institute’s 2016 Hunger Report: *The Nourishing Effect: Ending Hunger, Improving Health, Reducing Inequality*. Dawn Pierce gave it her all to make hunger a political issue in Idaho, but she did not win her race for a seat in the Idaho legislature. She did, however, win a larger share of the vote than any of her opponent’s previous challengers. Hunger does resonate with voters in the district. Idaho eventually voted to expand Medicaid coverage under the Affordable Care Act, and Pierce believes her advocacy contributed to that victory. She plans to run again in 2020 on a campaign of ending hunger and creating opportunity for everyone.

---
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