Applying the principles of data feminism in agricultural research leads to more transformative outcomes (15 words)

# Abstract (70 words, at 78)

Agricultural research reflects complex institutional and interpersonal relationships that have historically been, and continue to be, subject to power imbalances. Recently, the Data Feminism framework was developed to aid scientists in understanding and addressing power imbalances inherent in their work. We present evidence that its application in agricultural research concomitantly fosters creativity and leads to more transformative outcomes. Many researchers already practice data feminism; formalizing those efforts will make the work more intentional, visible, and in time, ubiquitous.

THE WORD RELATABLE?

# Introduction

Power may be defined as a relationship through which one can obtain one’s will even in the face of resistance from others(CITE). Fundamentally, agriculture involves the cultivation of land to produce food; as the former becomes a prerequisite for the latter, power dynamics emerge. Indeed, over thousands of years and across civilizations, agriculture has enabled, fomented, and reflected power hierarchies(CITE). It follows that the interpersonal and institutional relationships upon which agricultural research is built mirrors those artifacts, with potentially profound ethical and social consequences. This is not unique to agricultural research; global recognition of the need to intentionally examine how power interacts with science has spurred the creation of new academic fields(CITE). While social scientists have long recognized these interactions(AllenSachs), technical scientists are increasingly being asked to consider the context of their work. There have been calls for and attempts to codify reflexivity in the fields of food studies and agroecologyCITEagroecologythingsdeWitNickLiebmanpaper, but it remains a formidable task in agriculture.

We believe the recently developed Data Feminism frameworkCITE, which targets technical scientists, is particularly well-suited to support agricultural researchers in this pursuit. The framework is rooted in empirical studies of power and emphasizes intersectionality, or the inability to study dimensions of power in isolation (XX). It is action-oriented and domain-agnostic, and D’Ignazio and Klein’s (2020) work has been highly cited in numerous disciplinary contexts. To our knowledge, it has had limited interpretation in the context of agriculture, though a recent study evaluated the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) agency of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) on their data reporting practices through the lens of Data Feminism(CITERISSING).

We posit that explicit application of the data feminism framework would positively contribute to research creativity, stakeholder participation, and agricultural sustainability writ large. To support this, we discuss the application of data feminism themes (power, reciprocity, and framing) in the research process with accompanying activities with demonstrably positive outcomes (Table 1).

### Table 1. Summary of paper structure

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data feminism-derived theme** | **Research phase(s)** | **Agricultural research activities** |
| Research for the public good should seek to equalize power | Hypothesis generation and study design | Technical audits, listening to and serving the margins, incorporating other ways of knowing |
| Farmer-researcher relations should be reciprocal | Conducting and implementing research | Compensation, metrics for success |
| All research is values-informed | Analysis and dissemination | Diverse framing as a strength, co-existance of multiple truths |

The goal of this paper is to interpret the Data Feminism framework in an agricultural setting, demonstrate its utility, and serve as a resource for more intentional work in this area. Our perspectives are strongly framed by our collective experiences in the agricultural systems of the United States (US), and specifically of those in the maize-producing areas of the Midwest. However, while the specifics of a given system vary, the topics are universal. This is not meant to be a comprehensive review of power issues in agriculture, nor a thorough documentation of efforts to address those issues. Rather, our hope is that this perspective supports technically trained agricultural scientists in connecting their work to its broader societal implications and in sculpting that work to contribute to a more equitable society.

# Research for the public good should seek to equalize power

The facts that power is unevenly distributed and experienced in this world, and that without intentional examination and intervention power disparities will be exacerbated are both central to data feminismCITE.This foundation is particularly relevant in agriculture; overarching features such as labor exploitation(both historicalCITE and modernCITE), Native land dispossession(CITE), and land ownership criteriaCITE render power inequities deeply embedded. Research seeking to support public good requires an understanding of how that research legitimizes or challenges power artifacts. However, power is a complex topic with dedicated scholars, and it is not reasonable to expect agricultural scientists to be experts.

To aid non-experts in contextualizing their work, Data Feminism applies Collins’ (1990) matrix of domination to elucidate where and how power inequities may manifest, and therefore clarify how they may be challenged. To demonstrate the relevance of this tool for agricultural scientists, Table 2 presents an adaptation of the matrix with select examples from modern US agricultural systems. The examples are not meant to be an exhaustive accounting of power in US agriculture - they were chosen to help agricultural scientists understand that power differentials are real and quantifiable.

### Table 2. Domains through which power may be expressed and experienced (adapted from Collins 1990)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Description** | **Select examples of uneven distribution or experience of power from modern US agriculture** |
| **Structural domain** | Laws and policies that distribute power | Racially tiered implementation and funding of US land-grant university system (Croft 2019; Sharp 2004, Martin 2018)  Discriminatory design of US land heirship laws (Deaton 2007; Baily and Thomson 2022)  Discretionary implementation of eminent domain laws (Fraley) |
| **Disciplinary domain** | Entities that implement and enforce (or fail to implement and enforce) laws and policies distributing power | USDA credit granting discrimination based on race and gender (Carpenter 2012)  Systematic exclusion of groups via USDA NASS2 census collection formats (Pilgeram et al. 2020; Dentzman et al. 2020)  Barriers to participation of American Indian lands in NRCS3 programs (Johnson 2019) |
| **Hegemonic domain** | Entities that circulate ideas related to who has power | Cultural things about how should own land…  Public extension and conservation programs focused on top-down, technical solutions (Belshaw 1979; Johnson et al. 2021)  Focus on Western science in agricultural curriculums (Snively and X 2001) |
| **Interpersonal domain** | Individual experiences, expression, and awareness of who has power | In- and out-group mentalities in agricultural practitioners (Kniss XXXX), gendered experiences of fieldwork and farmer interactions (Chiswell and Wheeler 2016, the trans one?); gender biases in agricultural students (Basche and Carter 2020) |
| 1United States Department of Agriculture  2National Agricultural Statistics Service, an agency responsible for collecting and reporting information related to agricultural production within the USDA  3Natural Resource Conservation Service, an agency that provides technical and financial assistance to land owners | | |

To help agricultural researchers envision how their work may integrate into a larger effort to rebalance power in one or more domains, we present three thematic opportunities with positive experiences of their application.

## Technical audits

By leveraging their scientific training, agricultural scientists have great potential to contribute to documentation of issues in the four power domains (Table 2). In an example of rebalancing power in the structural domain, a series of studies documented significant soil degradation and crop yield losses following the remediation efforts accompanying underground pipeline installation (Brehm and Culman 2022a; Brehm and Culman 2022b; Ebrahimi et al. 2022a; Ebrahimi et al. 2022b). This research documented the previously unquantified long-term impacts pipeline installations have on productive agricultural land (a globally limited resource) and challenges the laws that allow pipeline installation companies to impact landowners, farmers, and the public without fair compensation. In the hegemonic domain, university nutrient application recommendations have traditionally been generated using top-down, siloed experiments with little transparency or opportunity for the public, farmers, or even other scientists to provide input. A recent study challenged the appropriateness of this arrangement, exposing flaws in traditional experimental designs that render them unable to deliver meaningful recommendations (Miguez and Poffenbarger 2022). This occurred against the backdrop of stakeholders demanding more accountability with regards to agricultural nutrient management (CITE?). In response, in 2022 the state of Iowa launched an ambitious effort to democratize and support horizontal knowledge exchange in generating nitrogen recommendations (IowaNitrogenInitiative). As part of the initiative, farmers volunteer (see Reciprocity section) to perform nitrogen rate trials in their own production contexts, and the data is collectively pooled to drive transparently calculated recommendations and to support public model development. Similarly, in 2022 a grassroots farmer organization, Practical Farmers of Iowa, launched a regional program paying farmers (see Reciprocity section) to test nitrogen rates of their choice using replicated trials and sharing their individual and pooled results with the public (CITE). These efforts represent an exciting shift in the hegemonic power universities traditionally exercise in generating nutrient recommendations.

## Listening to and serving the margins

Conducting research that is inspired by and supportive of those who have been institutionally excluded is another effective means for agricultural scientists to challenge hegemonic and interpersonal power structures. Institutional exclusion can manifest through multiple avenues, including individual characteristics (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, age, language, sexuality, formal education level, technology use, socioeconomic status) (Leslie et al. 2019; Carter 2019; Pilgerum et al. 2022; Pfammatter and Jorgenden 2023; Shih and Fan 2009) and farm-level features (e.g., production system, degree of farm mechanization, farm location, farm size, utilized markets, long-term ambitions for the farm)(Wheeler 2008; Belshaw 1979;). This systemic and cultural exclusion often translates to exclusion from agricultural research activities. This is a serious issue that can not only hinder more equitable agriulcutral systems, but also deprive the greater public from benefiting from needed knowledge. There are significant opportunities for improving agricultural conservation outcomes by supporting peer-to-peer learning amongst institutionally excluded groups (Mahajan 2019; Diiro et al. 2018; Wells and Eells 2011; Carter and chrisoffel 2022). For example, a group of farmers formed Practical Farmers of Iowa in 1987 partially in response to feeling neglected by the Land Grant institutions (CITE). One of those farmers’ low-input system inspired one of the most scientifically productive crop diversification experiments in the US (PFI something; Davis et al 2012; Hunt XX). Similarly, Latino farmers have had little institutional support, and in response Practical Farmers of Iowa recently launched a Latino Engagement program (<https://practicalfarmers.org/programs/agricultores-latinos/>). Serving the margins is a way for agricultural researchers to leverage their privilege to help build legitimacy within the margins (de Wit and Alastair I think), reducing the hegemonic and interpersonal powers of exclusion.

## Legitimizing other ways of knowing

The idea that there are ’multiple ways of knowing’ originates in Indigenous epistemologies but has migrated into common vernacular. At its most basic level, it recognizes the diverse means through which individuals and groups understand the world around them, including empirical observation and logical reasoning, but also intuition, personal experience, cultural traditions, and spiritual insights, among others. In dismissing knowledge originating outside of traditional scientific methods, scientists wield power by reinforcing the dominance of a single scientific paradigm and limit the potential contribution such knowledge can have in enriching scientific understanding (Peltier 2018). It follows that utilizing non-traditional measurements is one way agricultural scientists can honor multiple ways of knowing within a scientific framework. An apposite example is USDA NASS reporting of a ‘workable field day’, defined as day where weather and field conditions allow producers to work in fields a major portion of the day (NASS <https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/National_Crop_Progress/Terms_and_Definitions/index.php#days>). While it is based on scientific principles relating to soil moisture (Earl 1997), it represents a deeply personal interaction between the farmer and the land that has evaded modelling attempts (Huber et al. 2023). Perhaps because of the connection to personal experience, survey data on workable field days is often used in extension settings, but to our knowledge has not been extensively used within scientific frameworks. In an example of challenging the hegemonic power concerning knowledge generation, Practical Farmers of Iowa has launched a study wherein farmers will quantify their experiences with cover cropping through the metric of workable field days (<https://practicalfarmers.org/2024/04/putting-soil-to-the-test/>CITE). This effort does not detract from nor undermine the numerous scientific publications relating cover cropping to changes in soil-water dynamics – rather, it will enrich it by producing results that are based on other, meaningful ways of knowing (Robertson et al. 2001). Similar efforts to incorporate alternative knowledge bases are being explored in relation to complex topics such as soil and agricultural system health (Gage2015 book; Maeder; Freidrichson2021).

# Farmer-researcher relations should be reciprocal

In addition to what research is done, the way it is done presents opportunities to redistribute power more equitably. For over a century, experimental plots managed by researchers have been the workhorse of agricultural research. As agricultural research evolves, there are exciting opportunities for blending research plots with farm fields to perform more statistically powerful and relevant public research in collaboration with farmers (igancio’s paper, laila’s, mother daughter stuff, participatory breeding thing; Stone 2016; Lacoste2021, Kravchenko2017; Koehler-Cole2023; Laurent2022). However, these arrangements require careful consideration to support equitable and fair power relations.There are numerous guides for farmers in conducting on-farm research (Chaney 2017, Stefan’s list), but to our knowledge there are fewer resources suggesting best practices for the scientists, researchers, and organizations the farmers may be collaborating with. The Agroecology Research-Action Collective’s Principles and Protocols provide useful guidance on working with communities and organizations in general (de Wit et al. 2022). However, we feel the researcher-farmer collaboration merits explicit attention for agricultural scientists.

## Compensation

The context for farmer involvement in research can vary widely (Toffolini and Jeuffroy 2022; Jackson-Smith and Veisi 2023). While much work has been done to describe collaboration contexts, the topic of compensation is seemingly taboo - to our knowledge there are few studies on mechanisms for farmer compensation, and even fewer exploring how those mechanisms influence collaboration dynamics. This omission is problematic; research participants should always be compensated, and the form this compensation takes is particularly germane to the topic of power.

It is common for farmers to be compensated by *the experience and knowledge gained from the activities*, *access to research findings*, *better productivity*, or a similarly non-tangible exchange. In its most egregious forms, this arrangement is elitist, extractive, and disrespectful. We acknowledge individual researchers may be constrained in their access to unrestricted grant money to pay participants, but they are often coming from institutions with well-funded endowments. Research participants may view the researcher as representative of said institution, and therefore without an offer of monetary compensation, may reasonably intuit a devaluation (hegemonic domain). Moreover, failing to provide compensation further exacerbates historical biases, favoring well-resourced farmers in access to on-farm research activities (disciplinary domain).

Granting agencies clearly have a role to play in supporting fair compensation for farmer participation in research. While some grant funders allow for farmer-participant support (e.g., stipends, travel reimbursements), to our knowledge none require it. To assist researchers in compensating farmers in ways that equalize opportunities and power distributions, funding sources should explicitly require tangible renumeration of farmers for their participation in research projects, and provide associated funding categories to support it. This is in the best interests of everyone involved; fair remuneration supports formation of equitable partnerships that are more likely to be sustained in the long-term. For example, the grassroots organization Practical Farmers of Iowa has a robust farmer cooperator program that is still in operation after more than 30 years, facts attributed in part to their policy of monetarily compensating farmers for their participation in on-farm research (but see Metrics for Success section). The Iowa Nitrogen Initiative (see Technical audits Section), for comparison, was not allocated money for farmer-participant compensation, and they have capacity for more participants than they can secure. While research on farmer compensation and project outcomes is scarce, blending of monetary compensation with other forms that support learning, sharing, development, and growth are likely to be most effective (Thornely 1990, Liebig 1999, Laila’s paper, Thompson and Thompson 1990, de Wit thing), and could be used to specifically support institutionally-excluded groups’ needs (e.g., childcare, language interpretation). Support such as conference registrations, formal training opportunities, technical assistance, provision of inputs, or in-kind support should have exact dollar values calculated and communicated. The authors provide examples of blended compensation packages that coincided with high participant satisfaction in supplemental files as a resource (SFX).

## Metrics for success

In addition to compensation, both researchers and farmers should aim for relationships defined beyond simple transactions. We believe many researchers strive to build rich relationships with their farmer collaborators, however they often lack metrics that help them articulate and measure that success. Building on recommendations from various sources (D’Ignazio and Klein XX; Carter Roesch-McNally XX; agroecologypaper), we suggest the following four broad metrics be incorporated into project evaluations:

1. Was trust was built?
2. Were power and resources shared?
3. Did learning occur in both directions?
4. Were both entities transformed as a result of the collaboration?

Incorporating these metrics *a priori* can help guide activity planning, and help ensure anticipated outcomes are aligned within a relationship of reciprocity. The success of this type of model can again be demonstrated by the longevity of the Practical Farmers of Iowa (hereafter shortened to Practical Farmers) on-farm research program, which has been in place since 1987. Practical Farmers has continually refined their post-program participation surveys, and through deep, critical reflection and constant iteration, their current survey successfully quantifies outcomes in the four metrics described above (see SFX). As these questions have become metrics for success, Practical Farmers has designed their program to support these metrics, resulting in highly satisfied participants (Can I cite something? A PFI report?) which translates to more consistent funding. Other researchers and entities likely utilize some form of these metrics, but to our knowledge they are not widely employed by granting agencies or at an individual researcher level. file).

# All research is values-informed

The feasibility (or even desirability) of objectivity in science has long been debated, and recent discussions highlight its role in colonialism, racism, and other forms of oppression (X). Today, many disciplines embrace interpretation, plurality of methods, critical reflexivity, and fallibilism as inherent in the pursuit of knowledge, while still valuing the foundations of empirical evidence and systematic investigation. Rather than pursuing objectivism (insinuating it is possible), Data Feminism acknowledges that all research is framed by the background, values, and experiences of the researcher. In a Data Feminism framework, this is desirable. This does not mean all perspectives are equally valid, or that there are no objective truths. Rather, this mentality opens us up to diverse perspectives and leads to productive conservations, particularly in applied fields such as agricultural research.

## Coexistance of multiple truths

A book written to illustrate how underlying value systems shape individuals’ perspectives on solutions to complex global challenges unwittingly uses agricultural research as its backdrop. ‘The Wizard and the Prophet’ (CITE) explores the worldviews of Norman Borlaug and William Vogt, two white, Western men coming from divergent backgrounds, as they work on agricultural topics during the 20th century.

Borlaug, raised on a Midwestern US farm, experienced the rural transformation accompanying the introduction of tractors. He is portrayed as the *wizard*, embodying a technocentric worldview that prioritizes technological innovation and human ingenuity as the means to address global issues. Vogt began his life in a rural area surrounded by unbuilt environments, but moved to the city and witnessed the urban development of his place of birth. Vogt is portrayed as a *prophet*, emphasizing the need to live within ecological limits. Borlaug, the wizard, researched ways to leverage technology to intensify agricultural practices to increase food production, an effort that contributed to a larger collection of innovations referred to as ‘the Green Revolution’ and for which Borlaug won a Nobel Peace Prize (CITE). Vogt used science to formally develop the idea of ecological carrying-capacity (CITE) and advocated for limiting population growth rather than increasing food production, developing a model for environmental activism that is still used today. Borlaug and Vogt were both excellent scientists, but their divergent approaches and conclusions were shaped by their personal values and experiences. The differing motivations do not invalidate their truths, but rather demonstrate how multiple truths can co-exist.

Examining how a particular set of values can influence scientific outcomes produces productive conversations, and can expose new lines of inquiry. For example, recent research has explicitly analyzed how various framings dictate weed management goals, exposing novel research questions that emerge only when all framings are taken seriously (MacLaren et al 2020; Weisberger et al. 2024). Comparative analyses, article responses, and commentaries are also avenues for productively exploring what analytical decisions are made, what may have motivated those decisions, and how they impact conclusions. Complex agricultural topics such as herbicide use (Kniss), climate impacts of ethanol production (XX, XX, Hill 2022), and organic agriculture (Wilbois 2019; Swedish organic reviewer paper) have benefited from dissecting how XX framings can influence data analyses choices.

## Diverse framings are a strength

In the context of policy making, the acknowledgement of multiple truths, such as the coexistence of abundance and starvation, is understood as an inherent complexity in addressing multi-faceted issues (Stone 2022). In this context, the broader the set of realities that are available, the more complete the overall picture becomes, and concomitantly the possibility for more equitable solutions. Scientists who acknowledge and navigate the existence of multiple truths are better equipped to provide solutions that do not preferentially disadvantage vulnerable groups (Jordan about world views paper). Although the worldviews of Borlaug and Vogt are divergent, they represent two American males of European descent as written by an American male of European descent. This demonstrates how even classical delineations such as race and gender portend very little in regard to value systems, and lends us to imagine the insight that would be gained from adding more framings. Today, an increasing availability of diversely framed reflections concerning the Green Revolution have led to significantly more nuanced understandings of the motivations, impacts, and XX of the Green Revolution (PBS series, https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/films/man-who-tried-to-feed-the-world/

others). As calls for a ‘second Green Revolution’ proliferate (XX), the ability of society to leverage diverse voices will be a great asset. S

# Conclusions

In this paper, using the principles of data feminism as our guide, we demonstrate how (1) agricultural scientists can uniquely contribute to examining and challenging power through technical audits, serving and listening to the needs of the minoritized, and embracing multiple ways of knowing, (2) building farmer collaborations with reciprocity metrics codified in the project leads to better outcomes for the farmers and researchers, and (3) embracing framing as an inevitable and positive attribute leads to more transparent, creative, and effective research. SOMETHING MORE.

As agricultural scientists, we found the principles helpful in guiding our own work, and hope to support our fellow agricultural researchers in intentionally incorporating Data Feminism into their work.