

**THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF MARKETS II
PROJECT ON SOYBEAN FEMALE FARMERS IN CHIKUN
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA**

BY

KIENDE ALINAH

EL/ARM/00721/2014

**A RESEARCH PROPOSAL PRESENTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD
OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT**

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

MASENO UNIVERSITY

MARCH, 2016

MASENO UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT
THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF MARKETS II PROJECT ON SOYBEAN
FEMALE FARMERS IN CHIKUN LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA
STATE, NIGERIA

Abstract

Development organizations in Africa have been at the forefront in fighting for women inclusion in agriculture but little has been documented on how these initiatives impact on women's lives'. This study explored the extent at which MARKETS II – an agricultural value chain project whose stated objective is to economically empower female farmers – has increased women's participation in agricultural activities in Kaduna State, Northern Nigeria. The objectives of the study include: (1) To evaluate the extent to which MARKETS II project has influenced women participation in soybean farming in Kaduna state; (2) to determine the change in productivity and gross margin for MARKETS II soybean female farmers in Kaduna state; and (3) to find out how women negotiate their challenges in soybean production through participation in MARKETS II project. The study will focus on soybean crop due to its broad usage since it can be easily processed at household level after harvest thus gives chances to show impacts on women. The study will be guided by social cognitive theory by Albert Bandura (1977), which acknowledges the influential role of evolutionary factors in human adaptation and change, but rejects one-sided evolutionism in which social behavior is the product of evolved biology. The theory recognises that gender is a social construction rather than a biological given. Cross-sectional research design will be employed and purposive sampling methodology will be used. The study will generate qualitative data that will be used to gauge women's level of participation in relation to their previous situation prior to the introduction of the MARKETS II project as indicated by qualitative data available from the project's baseline study, midterm evaluation report and other related studies. Focus group discussions and key informant interviews will be used to collect qualitative data. Soybean farmers working with the project in Kaduna state will form the study population. Kaduna state has both Muslim and Christian populations and patriarchal system are in existence thus good to determine MARKETS II impacts. Five FGDs and 10 key informant interviews will be conducted for both female and male farmers and gender specialists. The qualitative data collected will be analysed using content analysis. Relevant quantitative data already collected by MARKETS II will be presented in form of descriptive statistics to complement the qualitative data.

Kiende Alinah. EL/ARM/00721/2014. SignDate.....

Dr. Fred Ikanda. Maseno University. Sign..... Date.....

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Operational Definition of Terms | iv |
| Acronyms | v |
| Chapter 1: Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background to the Study | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of the Problem | 5 |
| 1.3 Research Questions | 6 |
| 1.4 Objectives of the Study | 7 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study | 7 |
| 1.6 Scope of the Study..... | 8 |
| 1.7 Theoretical Framework | 8 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review..... | 12 |
| 2.1 Level of Women Participation in Agricultural Activities..... | 12 |
| 2.1.1 Gender Disparities in agricultural activities..... | 12 |
| 2.1.2 Bridging the Gap of Gender exclusion in Agriculture by Development Partners | 13 |
| 2.1.3 MARKETS II Perspective in Addressing Women Exclusion in Agriculture..... | 14 |
| 2.2 Productivity and Gross Margin | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Women and Productivity in Agriculture | 16 |
| 2.2.2 Women and Gross Margin in Agriculture..... | 17 |
| 2.3 Negotiation of Agricultural Challenges by Women | 18 |
| Chapter 3: Research Methodology | 22 |
| 3.1 Research Design..... | 22 |
| 3.2 Study Area..... | 22 |
| 3.3 Study Population | 23 |
| 3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size | 23 |
| 3.5 Data Collection Methods..... | 23 |
| 3.5.1 Focus Group Discussions..... | 23 |
| 3.5.2 Key Informant Interviews | 23 |
| 3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation | 24 |
| 3.6. 1 Primary Data | 24 |
| 3.6. 2 Secondary Data | 24 |
| 3.7 Ethical Considerations..... | 24 |
| References | 26 |
| Annexes | 33 |
| Annex 1: Focus Group Discussion Guide | 33 |
| Annex 2: Key Informant Interview Guide | 37 |
| Annex 3: Study Area Map | 39 |

Operational Definition of Terms

Gender- Gender refers to the economic, social, political, and cultural attributes and opportunities associated with being male or female. The social definitions of what it means to be male or female vary among cultures and change over time (OECD, 2012).

Gender equality- Gender equality consists of equal enjoyment by women and men of socially valued goods, opportunities, resources, and rewards (SIDA, 1997).

Gender equity- Gender equity is the process of being fair to women and men. To ensure fairness, measures must often be available to compensate for historical and social disadvantages that prevent women and men from otherwise operating on a level playing field. Gender equity strategies are used to eventually attain gender equality. Equity is the means; equality is the result (CIDA, 1999).

Gender mainstreaming- is an approach that considers why gender analysis is integral to the policy and programme process and incorporates women's views and priorities into the core of policy decisions, institutional structures, and resource allocations. It is the conceptualizing stage of a gender management system (Saulnier et al., 1999).

Gross Margin- This is the difference between the total value of sales of the agricultural item or livestock and the cost of producing that item, divided by the total number of units (hectares for crops) in production (MARKETS II Performance Monitoring Plan, 2012, p32).

Self-efficacy- This refer to people's beliefs in their capacity to produce actions that are necessary for achieving desired outcomes/attainments (MARKETS II Performance Monitoring Plan, 2012, p34).

Women Participation in agriculture- Participation in this case means any activity that women partakes across the given agricultural value chain, ranging from actual farming activities such as land preparation, planting, weeding, harvesting and post harvesting activities such as winnowing, sorting and processing to make other products

Acronyms

| | |
|------------|--|
| ATA | Agricultural Transformation Agenda |
| CEO | Chief Executive Officer |
| CGIAR | Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research |
| CIAT | International Center for Tropical Agriculture |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| CRPs | CGIAR Research Programmes |
| DFID | Department for International Development |
| ECA | Education Credentials Assessment |
| ICGARDE | International Consortium on Gender, Agriculture, Rural Development and Environment |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| IFPRI | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organizations |
| FCT | Federal Capital Territory |
| FGDs | Focus Group Discussions |
| FGM | Female Genital Mutilation |
| FMARD | Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development |
| GSE | Generalized Self-Efficacy |
| KIIs | Key Informant Interviews |
| LGA | Local Government Area |
| MARKETS II | Maximizing Agricultural Revenue and Key Enterprises in Targeted Sites |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| NDP | Net Domestic Product |
| NGOs | Non-Governmental Organizations |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| R&D | Rural and Development |
| SIDA | Swedish International Development Cooperation |
| SPSS | Statistical Package for Social Sciences |
| TGNP | Tanzania Gender Networking Programme |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| URT | United Republic of Tanzania |
| USAID | United State Agency for International Development |
| USD | United State Dollar |
| USG | United State Government |

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

According to Mehra and Rojas (2008), women in many developing countries face discrimination even though they play an important role in economic production. In India for instance, women plant, weed and harvest but are not land owners. Similarly, Kabeer (2009) argues that many rural women in Africa have weak property and contractual rights to land, water and other natural resources. Gender inequality in access to land and property is due to discriminatory inheritance practices, unequal access to markets and gender-biased land reform (Kabeer, 2008). Many programmes dealing with allocation of titles deeds are for example grounded in the notion of individual land rights, as opposed to co-ownership. This notion is rooted in the biased assumption that women in Africa and Latin America are not farmers and thus not interested in owning land (Deere & Leon, 2001). This literature points out the fact that lack of land ownership rights for women is a major hindrance to their participation in agriculture. However, the authors did not put into consideration the fact that women may also have access to land even without owning it. They also assume that there is no family land accessible to both men and women for agricultural production without attaching the ownership to either man or woman in that family. This study will therefore explore the status of land ownership and access by women participating in agriculture and how land ownership status affects their participation in agriculture.

It is against this backdrop that the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)- a consortium of 15 research organizations and works in developing countries in close collaboration with hundreds of partners, including national and regional research institutes, civil society organizations, academia, development organizations and the private sector- has been upfront in ensuring women inclusion in agriculture. For instance, the Consortium Gender Strategy which was launched in 2010, came up with a binding commitment that the CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs) needed to develop agricultural technologies, farming systems, and policies to support rural women in improving agricultural productivity and their livelihoods. The CGIAR Gender and Agriculture Research Network was set up to promote cross-cutting research to benefit rural women and integrate gender into all CRPs (CGIAR, 2012). The CGIAR has a long history of analyzing gender issues to identify innovations that benefit poor rural women. In the 1980s the International Rice Research Institute developed the Women in Rice Farming Systems Programme, which

reduced drudgery and gave women more access to new rice production and postharvest technology (Kaaria & Ashby, 2001). However, little information exist to show whether these strategies are working and the specific impacts they are creating to ensure women involvement in agriculture.

In Tanzania, Discrimination and cultural stereotyping in patriarchal ideology victimize women (Kombo & Minungu, 2012). Entrenched patriarchy and cultural stereotypes have contributed to marginalizing women in the decision-making process. In Tanzania, for example, such assumptions include those that define the man as the head of the household, those that perceive women as being the weaker sex and others that assume that women are less intelligent or are less emotionally stable than men (Kombo & Minugu 2012). These stereotypes have been used by men and women to ensure women are at lower positions compared to men, which is a form of gender bias. In response to these kind of biases, the governments and nongovernmental organizations have recently initiated a number of interventions to help reduce these biases.

In Nigeria, there is a gender unit in the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD), which works towards women involvement in every part of agricultural activities. In 2014, a two-day sensitization/stakeholder's workshop on Gender Mainstreaming in the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) was held for gender desk officers of departments, agencies and state offices under FMARD (FMARD, 2014). In attendance was the Permanent Secretary, Ibukun Odusote, who noted the concerns of women in agriculture, being the disadvantaged group, which she said needed to be addressed, adding that their integration would bridge the gender gap, empower women and enhance poverty reduction. She pointed out that the ministry was conscious of the fact that a more proactive strategy is required to ensure that its projects take into account the existing gender imbalances, promote equitable access to resources and benefits, and motivate both men and women to participate in project activities, adding that it is the reason women and youth form the critical target area of ATA. This shows that the Nigerian government is working on alleviating gender gaps and encouraging women involvement in agriculture. However, little information is available on the impact this is creating on women. The study will therefore

seek to know if such interventions have any effect on the number of women participating in agricultural activities.

Kaduna state, which is the study area, is dominated by Hausa language speakers followed by Fulanis. Other ethnic groups include the Yorubas, Igbos, Igala, Nupes and Ebiras. Two major religions in the area are Islam and Christianity. Generally, socio-cultural patriarchy is well established in these rural settlements and they encourage women discrimination (Ayoola et al, 2011). However, Saba Mohamood (2001) and Abu-Lughod (2002) have shown, for example, that contrary to western views that Muslim women are voiceless and oppressed, there are multiple ways in which these women exercise agency while striving to achieve their objectives. In other words, women in their Egyptian context freely inhabit the norms that Westerners might consider repressive. Therefore, women and men's conditions are context specific as opposed to being similar in all contexts. Ayoola et al. (2011) and others such as Kombo and Minungu (2012) who have written on such socio-cultural biases do not review how women overcome this challenge to fully participate in agriculture. This study will therefore explore how women navigate these challenges to enable them participate in agriculture.

According to Kebbeh et al. (2003), the average farm size of male farmers in Kaduna and Niger States of Nigeria is higher than that of women, probably due to the cultural land tenure system that gives the heritage and control of land to men in most parts of the region. Ajani (2008) reported that patriarchal structures and authorities give more resources to men in Nigeria, resulting in women having less access to productive resources, particularly land, which is perhaps the most economic constraint for most rural women. Similar to Ajani's study, this study was carried out in an area that has strong patriarchal structures that consists of both Christians and Muslims. The study will explore the relationship between farm size owned and that utilized by either men or women for agricultural activities.

In the 1970s most of the researches carried out on the agricultural activities of women particularly in northern Nigeria showed that women involvement was low. For example, Salihu and Ohwona (1995), found out that in Giwa and Makarfi Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Kaduna state, women's agricultural productivity was grossly inadequate. Lately, however and due to economic realities, the role of women as food producers has increased

substantially to between 60% - 80% even though little data exists on the agricultural and economic activities of rural women (Odugbesan, 2008). Nigerian women produce about 60-80 percent of food in the country (Buckland & Haleegoah, 1996; Rahman et al 2004), and contributing about 60-80 percent of agricultural labour force in addition to their contribution towards household wellbeing through their income generating activities (Mgbada, 2000).

Studies have shown that more women are participating in agriculture (Odugbesan, 2008). This could be attributed to development projects but they may not be the case entirely. It could be that women are also working towards improving their lives. Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (2008) indicated that women are now opting for financial independence by getting involved in stable formal and informal careers. For instance, Adeleke et al., (2008) in their research in Nigeria on gender and productivity reported that there is no difference in women's and men's productivity among maize farmers. Although Klasen (2002) reported that women are missing out in agriculture, such report is not surprising since his study was conducted in Middle-East Africa, where, there is strong religious constrain on women participating in economic activities. In the case of Nigeria, Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (2008), reported that women are active in agricultural activities. There is therefore need to get more information on what women are doing to overcome their challenges to participate in agriculture.

Theorists like Bandura (1977), Moore (1988) and Ortner (1974; 1996) have tried to explain the reason for women discrimination by pointing out to cultural influences as opposed to biological determinism. If this is the case, efforts to change cultural perceptions that hinder women participation in agriculture may be the solution to reaching out to more women. It is on this basis that development organizations have been targeting women by trying to conquer negative perceptions and stereotypes that keeps them away from being involved in agriculture. To understand the contribution of these strategies designed to empower women through their involvement in agriculture, Maximizing Agricultural Revenue and Key Enterprises in Targeted Sites (MARKETS II) will be used as a case study. MARKETS II project (a value chain based agricultural project that has been at the forefront in advocating for women involvement in agriculture) has heavily relied on extension agents to deliver interventions to its beneficiaries MARKETS II started in April 2012 but was a follow on

project of MARKETS project which had worked with Nigerian farmers since 2005 and its design had strong emphasis on women involvement. Given this design to focus on women and the duration this project has been operating, it presented a good opportunity to study its impacts on women.

According to MARKETS II baseline report (2012), women farmers owned an average of 1.46 hectares of land as compared to 1.82 owned by men. This was close as compared to the yielding capacity between men and women. In women farms, they produced an average of 0.84 tonnes per hectare as compared to 1.08 tonnes per hectare for their men counterparts. According to the same report, MARKETS II had managed to reach 43% female farmers, while the remaining 57% were male. The target was to reach 50% each for both men and women (MARKETS II, 2013). The study will seek to find out if this is still the case and if strategies employed to bridge the gap between male and female production made any difference.

To increase women participation in the project, MARKETS II project together with the government of Nigeria have engaged women extension agents to roll out its technologies to women beneficiaries. For example, in northern Nigeria, where women are not allowed to freely socialize with men due to Islamic prescriptions about gendering space (see Abdulrahim, 1990; De Voe, 2002; Abu-Lughod, 2013), female extension agents are engaged to work with women through the project. Women farmers are more comfortable working with fellow women and thus female extension agents have been effective in the reaching out of women (MARKETS II, 2014). To mitigate against low involvement of women in agricultural activities in Nigeria, MARKETS II for example, targeted 50% of its beneficiaries to be women. The data available does not show the impacts of this intervention to female farmers. The researcher would also want to know if MARKETS II has actually followed the initial plan to include 50% women as beneficiaries.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Development organizations including MARKETS II project have been at the forefront in designing projects with an aim to empower women through including them in agricultural activities. Despite the documentation of strategies employed to ensure women inclusion in soybean farming,

there is little information that exist to show whether these strategies are working and the specific impacts they are creating to ensure women involvement in agriculture. This study proposes to evaluate the strategies and show whether they achieved the intended objectives with respect to women inclusion and empowerment. The researcher will find out how these strategies impacted on soybean female farmers in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state.

There was no clear evidence to show the effects of land ownership on women's agricultural income. Many studies assume lack of land ownership by women translates directly to failure to participate in farming. To address this problem, this study will explore how the effects of land ownership and access by women affect their participation in agriculture as well as their household income. To understand this, the study will assess the impact of land ownership and farmers' agricultural productivity and gross margin.

Little information is available on the effect the government interventions have on women. The researcher will therefore find out if the government policies have any tangible impact on women participating in farming activities.

Various studies undertaken concerning women so far identify women disempowerment without considering measures women themselves had adopted to overcome these challenges. Other studies have shown that contrary to western views that Muslim women are voiceless and oppressed, there are multiple ways in which these women exercise agency while striving to achieve their objectives. In other words, women in different contexts are doing something to overcome the challenges imposed by socio-cultural obstacles. Therefore, women and men's conditions are context specific as opposed to being similar in all contexts. This study wanted to find out how women negotiate cultural beliefs and stereotypes to fully participate in soybean farming. This will provide new knowledge on various challenges, including the recent challenges and how they overcome them to participate in agriculture.

1.3 Research Questions

1. Do the strategies adopted by MARKETS II project targeting women increase their participation in soybean farming in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state?
2. Is there change in productivity and household income realized by soybean farmers participating in MARKETS II project?

3. To what extent has MARKETS II project empowered soybean female farmers to overcome challenges that hinder their participation in agricultural activities?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Main Objective: To assess the impacts of MARKETS II project on soybean women farmers in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state.

Specific Objectives

1. To evaluate the extent to which MARKETS II project intervention strategies have influenced women participation in soybean farming in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state.
2. To determine the change in productivity and gross margin for MARKETS II soybean female farmers in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state.
3. To find out how women negotiate their challenges in soybean production through participation in MARKETS II project.

1.5 Significance of the Study

There have been projects that are targeting inclusion of women in agriculture, but it is not clear whether these projects are actually living up to their expectations and objectives. Majority of USAID and DFID projects have gender indicators for ensuring that both men and women are benefitting from their initiatives. This study presents an opportunity to critically look at the contribution of development projects in empowering women through inclusion in agriculture as well as provide lessons learnt that can be used to guide the design of future agricultural projects aimed at empowering women.

The study will seek to investigate the participation of women in agricultural activities based on the strategies aimed at including women in agriculture. It will analyse some of the benefits to the women (impact) and the household at large, when they are active participants in agriculture. The study will assess efforts made by this development project and try to document the findings regarding the welfare of women through active participation in agriculture. The study will also go beyond identifying challenges facing women's participation in agriculture and also look at how they manage to overcome these challenges.

The findings will inform other development organizations on the lessons learnt through the strategies of the current organizations and also some of the strategies that have created huge

impacts in women involvement in agriculture. This study will contribute in generating new knowledge on why women empowerment in agriculture has not been successful and possible ways of breaking such barriers. This may also trigger abolishment of some gender bias such as land ownership rights so that women have access to land to enable them fully participate in agricultural production.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study will interview farmers residing in the regions where MARKETS II project operates in within Kaduna state. The study will concentrate on women inclusion in the production of soybean value chain in Kaduna state. Kaduna state is ideal for the study because it is in northern Nigeria, where majority of women do not own land for agricultural production but rely heavily on their husbands for decision making on how and when to use the land. It has patriarchal structures, as well as different religious beliefs. Since the project has been working there to ensure they reach out to women despite the dynamics of the state, the study will be well suited to evaluate how effective the project has been to female farmers. The study will examine the impacts achieved by the project so far especially on productivity and gross margin realized due to women inclusion in the project. Key informant interviews will target other key stakeholders, especially in gender, from other development organizations.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

The study will be guided by social cognitive theory by Albert Bandura (1977), which acknowledges the influential role of evolutionary factors in human adaptation and change, but rejects one-sided evolutionism in which social behaviour is the product of evolved biology. The theory argues that behaviour is determined by social and environmental factors and not due to biological changes in human body. This theory therefore shows that women's position in the society is not because they are biologically inferior but due to the cultural and societal beliefs. This theory is linked to Ortner's (1974) work where she rejected biological determinism ideology. Biological determinists argue that there is something genetically inherent in male species that makes them the naturally dominant sex. Biological determinants argue that something is lacking in females and as a result women are not only naturally

subordinate but in general quite satisfied with their position since it affords them protection and the opportunity to maximize maternal pleasures, which to them are the most satisfying experiences of life (Ortner, 1996).

According to Bandura (1986,1999), social cognitive theory subscribes to a model of emergent brain activities that exert determinative influence. According to him, how people think determine influence on their actions. This means that messages people receive in their environment or surroundings determines how they will react. Bandura's theory sought to explain that biological evolution has little to do with our actions. This ideology is also explained by Ortner (1974) who says that the creativity of anthropology derives from the tension between two sets of demands: that we explain human universals, and that we explain cultural particulars. By this canon, woman provides us with one of the more challenging problems to be dealt with. The secondary status of woman in society is one of the true universals, a pan-cultural fact. Yet within that universal fact, the specific cultural conceptions and symbolizations of woman are extraordinarily diverse and even mutually contradictory. Further, the actual treatment of women and their relative power and contribution vary enormously from culture to culture, and over different periods in the history of particular cultural traditions (Ortner, 1974: 67).

Bandura (1977) explained that human beings sometimes do the wrong things intentionally after they are convinced their actions will be beneficial to them. This can explain why men would feel threatened by women and decided to act in an oppressive way towards them in order to maintain their dominance. Bandura (1986) said that human beings manipulate their their immediate environment to fit their desired future. This ideology was earlier discussed by Ortner (1974: 71) as she was trying to explain that culture and social environment determines actions rather than biological factors. She began with the proposition that female subordination is universal, since this condition is not inherent in the biological differences between the sexes, an alternative explanation must be found. Starting from the idea that biological differences between men and women take on significance only within culturally defined value systems, she located the problem of sexual asymmetry at the level of cultural ideologies and symbols (Ortner, 1974: 72; Moore, 1988). From this it can be assumed that culture of men being the dominant characters and engaging in farm activities could be the

cause why women are lagging behind in agriculture. These sentiments may be confirmed by the study, but there is a possibility that time may have also affect the women position in the society.

In her later work, Ortner (1996) concluded that biological facts might not be completely ignored, or that men and women are not different, but that these facts and differences only take on significance of superior/inferior within the framework of culturally defined value systems (Ortner, 1996). This implies that the cultural setting highly influence the position of women in the society. With the patriarchal structures in Kaduna state, it is expected that women's position will be ranked lower than men and this may impact negatively in their involvement in agriculture. However, with various project interventions, this may not be the definite picture until the results have been analysed.

Bussey and Bandura (1999) further emphasised Ortner's sentiments that social construction determines women's position in the society rather than their biological evolution. The sources of gender differentiation lie more in social and institutional practices than in fixed properties of the individual (Bussey & Bandura 1999). Geis (1993) also joined them in this arguments by stating that gender stereotypes shape the perception, evaluation and treatment of males and females in selectively gendered ways that beget the very patterns of behaviour that confirm the initial stereotypes. If a development project uses the right approaches that will counter various stereotypes in women involvement in agriculture, there might be a change in how women and the society view their participation in agriculture. The contribution of these approaches have not been fully scrutinized on how they can change women's participation in agriculture and their effect on socio-economic status of the community especially women empowerment.

In agriculture, women's participation is also determined by social structures as stated by Eagly (1987a). He said that many gender differences in social behaviour are viewed as products of division of labour between the sexes that get replicated through socio-structural practices governed by disparate gender status and power. Being a man or woman should not limit participation in agriculture. From this theory, I deduce that women inclusion in agriculture depends on the take of the community and how they have been socialized into it and not because of their biological orientation.

Women are not taking these gender bias lying low. Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (2008) indicated that women are now opting for financial independence by getting involved in stable formal and informal career. For instance, Adeleke et al., (2008) in their research in Nigeria on gender and productivity reported that there is no difference in a woman's and man's productivity among maize farmers. Although Klasen (2002) reported that women are missing out in agriculture, such report is not surprising since his study was conducted in Middle-East, where, there is strong religious constrain on women participating in economic activities. In the case of Nigeria, Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (2008), reported that women are active in agricultural activities. For example, in her study on fishing communities in Nigeria, she reported that women dominates in fishing, fish processing and marketing of fish and fishing products. The implication of such findings indicate that, gender specific socio-economic characteristics do not reflect any difference in the productivity levels of male and female levels of productivity. This assumption is quite informative especially when agriculture provides the bulk of employment, income and food for the Nigerian populace. Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (2008) concluded by stating that almost every profession that was earlier touted as being masculine are now been pervaded by women.

From the literature reviewed, it is clear that culture defined the position of women in the society and not the biological determinism. It's not surprising that more women are participating in agriculture as a result of conquering cultural barriers. This means that there are interventions targeting cultural beliefs and stereotypes against women involvement in agriculture. Also it means women themselves are working their way out of these challenges. The study used this social cognitive theory to explore the impact of women efforts as well as efforts of development organizations' interventions in ensuring more women are participating in agriculture.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Level of Women Participation in Agricultural Activities

2.1.1 Gender Disparities in agricultural activities

Objective 1: To evaluate the extent to which MARKETS II project intervention strategies have influenced women participation in soybean farming in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state.

Very often, value chain interventions tend to overlook gender issues, mainly because women are usually concentrated in less profitable and less visible areas of the value chain. For example, women's important contribution to cash crop farming is often ignored. Thus, when value chain interventions introduce new cultivation methodologies, this can result into increase in women's labour, but it does not necessarily increase women's ability to control income (Mayoux & Mackie, 2007). As a result, lack of understanding of gender issues in a given value chain can contribute to perpetrating gender inequalities thereby limiting impact on poverty reduction and food security. All parts of value chain is important and studies should recognize all efforts made by women to be involved in agriculture. Women participation in harvest, post-harvest and processing is still important. This could mean that women are actually participating in agriculture but their participation is seen as not important.

In one of their reports, CGIAR stated that there is a widespread misconception that compared to other regions in the world, women have a very marginal role in employment in all sectors of the economy including that of agriculture and that they participate mostly in consumption and reproductive activities from within the boundaries of their household and under the dictatorship of male members of the family (CGIAR, 2013a). Ortner (1996) supported these sentiments by saying that people have the assumption that women can just be satisfied with their reproductive function and thus excused from economic growth efforts. women have many roles and they are trying their best to play all of them. Development projects are coming in to support women to participate in development work, including agriculture. This study therefore sought to know if these development efforts are achieving results, or if women themselves are learning to participant in development work on their own.

Women work hard in the farm, and I don't see why their produce should not be as good. It is therefore unfair to let them work without being recognized for it. Zafar (2003) noted that women mostly work simultaneously as mother, household laborers and social production workers, but still economic value of their contribution is undervalued. He also mentioned that women's individual contribution in agriculture matches their productivity, but their efforts are rewarded on the basis of non-economic criteria such as sex which raises serious questions of equity and human justice. He goes on to suggest that the development planning must be backed by developmental objectives instead of basing decisions on physical input and outputs, which ignores the perspective of human resources, and the social dimensions of agriculture. That's where then development projects needs to come in. They will present an opportunity to encourage more women to participate in development work and also monitor and report their progress. This project work will present a chance for the researcher to evaluate how development organizations have encouraged women participation in agriculture and their impacts. The findings will try to find out if social cognitive theory is justified to argue that women are discriminated upon due to cultural beliefs and stereotypes and not because of their biological nature of being women.

2.1.2 Bridging the Gap of Gender exclusion in Agriculture by Development Partners

Development organizations have been at the forefront in advocating for women involvement in agriculture. For instance, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations produced a report on women in agriculture with a clear and urgent message: agriculture underperforms because half of all farmers who are women lack equal access to the resources and opportunities they need to be more productive (FAO, 2011). How do women overcome such challenges? Are there women who have been able to overcome such challenges? This information needs to be available to show the full impact of development organizations.

For almost two decades, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Intra-Household Research Programme has demonstrated that gender-disaggregated economic models are fundamental to shaping food policy. These models show that women producers have unequal access to land, credit, agricultural extension services, and technology, and that this unequal access prevents them from producing as efficiently as men (IFPRI, 2010).

IFPRI, in their report on Global Food Policy, cited that two recent flagship reports, the Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO's) State of Food and Agriculture 2010–2011 and the World Bank's World Development Report 2012, are emphasizing women's contributions to agriculture in developing countries. The State of Food and Agriculture 2010–2011 highlights the need to close the gender gap in access to agricultural resources, education, extension, financial services, and labor markets; to invest in labor-saving and productivity-enhancing technologies and infrastructure to free women's time for more productive activities; and to facilitate women's participation in flexible, efficient, and fair rural labor markets (FAO, 2012). Other donors like USAID and DFID are out to ensure implementing partners are disaggregating data by gender, to be sure women are being empowered to be involved in agriculture. The literature shows that women have unequal access to land than men. It however doesn't prove that women are not participating in agriculture due to lack of land as they have not considered family land and leased land.

2.1.3 MARKETS II Perspective in Addressing Women Exclusion in Agriculture

From the project documents, it is clear that the project was designed with a view of ensuring inclusion of women in agriculture especially in Nigeria. To understand the contribution of the project towards this course, the study intends to critically analyze the activities undertaken by the project and their effect on women with respect to economic empowerment as well as their response to challenges to achieve improved economic and social status. MARKETS II project has been implemented in Nigeria for the past three years and is a five year USAID funded project being implemented by Chemonics International. Before MARKETS II, there was MARKETS Project which was implemented from 2005 for 5 years, then bridge to MARKETS II, which was in operation for 2 years and paved way for MARKETS II in 2012. MARKETS II is a market-led value chain project initially designed to start by identifying ready market before networking farmers who are trained and linked to input dealers.

This project had initially targeted farmers with farm sizes of 1 to 5 ha who are linked to large scale processors and input suppliers. However, due to the project's efforts to include more women in the project's activities, it changed its implementation strategy mid-way to start working with women as small scale processors in cassava and soybean value chains (MARKETS II Annual Report, 2014:53). The project also included women with farm sizes

of less than one hectare. In its 2014 annual report, MARKETS II explained why it had surpassed some of its women related indicator-targets by stating, “The MARKETS II programme changed strategies to include women with less than 1 ha of land in the programme as the size of farm has been excluding many women from supported project intervention; and to focus more closely on project interventions in other areas of targeted value chains more inclusive to women, including micro and small-scale processing. These changes, especially through credit from women focused microfinance organizations, have successfully brought in increasing numbers of female beneficiaries” MARKETS II, 2014: 46. The programme has also specifically targeted women from dry areas with drip irrigation for homestead farming. Women are also trained on basic business concepts and household nutrition for sustainable and healthy families. Overall, the project is also targeting 50% women, which is the same number of men targeted (MARKETS II, 2014). There is need to know whether the project managed to achieve its target of including 50 percent of women as their beneficiaries, including their strategies and the impacts on women. Even if their target was met, there is need to understand other factors that contributed to this, apart from project intervention.

Extension Agents (EAs) have played a huge role in the implementation of MARKETS II project. Training of EAs presents an exit strategy by the project as the best practices are already passed on to them. Also, the work of EAs is to work with farmers and government has paid them for that. They know farmers and thus the project rides on this premise to reach out to farmers, and especially female farmers by female EAs (MARKETS II, 2013). The project doesn't however show whether extension agents were already doing this before the commencement of the project.

According to MARKETS II baseline report, women farmers owned 1.46 hectares of land as compare to 1.82 owned by men. This was close as compared to the yielding capacity between men and women. In women farms, they produced an average of 0.84 tonnes per hectare as compared to 1.08 tonnes per hectare for their men counterparts. According to the same report, MARKETS II had managed to reach 43% while the remaining 57% are male. The target was to reach 50% each for both men and women (MARKETS II, 2013).

2.2 Productivity and Gross Margin

Objective 2: To determine the change in productivity and gross margin for MARKETS II soybean female farmers in Chikun LGA of Kaduna state.

2.2.1 Women and Productivity in Agriculture

According to FAO (2011), yields on plots managed by women are lower than those managed by men. This is not because men are better farmers than women. Indeed, extensive evidence shows that women are just as efficient as men. They simply do not have equal access to the same inputs as men. If they did, their yields would be the same as that of male farmers, they would produce more and overall agricultural production would increase. Countries with lower levels of gender inequality tend to achieve higher average cereal yields than countries with higher levels of inequality (FAO, 2011). Ayoola and colleagues (2011) found out that women in Nigeria are less productive in the farm than men, due to low access to inputs and farm land (Ayoola et al., 2011). Research done by FAO (2011) confirms that closing the gender gap in agriculture can improve agricultural productivity, with important additional benefits through raising the incomes of female farmers, increasing the availability of food and reducing food prices, and raising women's employment and real wages. There was little information on the women productivity, especially on women. There also need for information on other factors that increase women productivity that was not available for review.

In a study done by Dogbe et al. (2013) on soybean production in Saboba and Chereponi districts of the Northern Region of Ghana based on gender, results showed that women produced more soybean compared to men. Estimation of profitability of soybean production in Saboba and Chereponi districts was disaggregated by gender. Female farmers on the average out yielded their male counterparts in the Chereponi district; which also translated into revenues received from soybean produce. Analysis of the result indicates that female soybean farmers on the average received slightly higher prices for their produce as compared to their male counterparts. The higher prices received by females could be due to better bargaining and marketing skills as compared to their male counterparts (Dogbe et al. (2013). This means that arguments saying women are less productive because they are women are not valid and social cognitive theory wins.

According to FAO (2011), if women had the same access to productive resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20–30 percent. This could raise total agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5–4 percent, which could in turn reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 12–17 percent. The potential gains would vary by region depending on how many women are currently engaged in agriculture, how much production or land they control, and how wide a gender gap they face.

Despite the immense contributions of women to agriculture, various findings have reported that women farmers generally, and particularly in Nigeria, lack access to adequate productive resources such as land, credit, agricultural inputs, education, extension services, and appropriate technology, due to various socio-economic factors (Ayoola, 2011). Thus, gender has become a critical cross-cutting factor in innovation process to promote equity and enhance the relative access of female and male farmers to necessary resources in programmes targeted at promoting household food security and poverty reduction (Ayoola, 2011).

Studies that have measured productivity of men and women farmers without attempting to take into account women's lower access to resources have found women to be less productive than men. Quisumbing (1996) documents the difficulty in comparing levels of productivity between men and women. The author attributes this to methodological and conceptual difficulties, which arise from defining appropriate measures of productivity in different farming systems, omission of individual characteristics in attempts to measure productivity differences by sex, and the lack of clarity regarding the measurement of sex and gender differences (Njuki et al., 2006).

2.2.2 Women and Gross Margin in Agriculture

Gross margin can be defined as the difference between the gross farm income and the total variable cost. The gross farm income is the total physical product multiplied by the unit price of the product (Odoemenem & Inakwu, 2011).

Raufu et al. (2013) did a study and found that the Gross Margin of the male respondents was found to be N73,020.31 which was higher than N54,442.77 obtained by the female respondents. This indicated that the male peri-urban farmers made more profit than the female respondents, the profit of the male respondents was N62,634.36 while that of the

female was N47,226.98. (Raufu, 2013). The study did not however consider challenges that may have led to low gross margin in women.

In a research carried out in Congo by Birachi in 2013 to find out factors that affect gross margin in both men and women gave an explanation of how gross margin is influenced by various circumstances. The regression results show that the size of land under bean production was inversely related to the amount of gross margin achieved by the farmers. Farmers with smaller land holdings, most of whom were women, were more likely to achieve higher gross margins from their beans. Due to their relatively poor economic status, women in this study grew beans in land that was not purchased or rented, they did not hire labor and transport equipment and services as their male counterparts did. Thus, they operate relatively smaller plots than men. It would also imply that farmers that had larger land holdings used more inputs, hired labor and equipment which increased the costs of production and transporting beans to markets, thus reducing their overall returns. Conversely, smaller farmers (women) used very low levels of production inputs resulting in relatively less costs (Birachi, 2013).

The time taken to reach markets also had some minimal and negative influence on the gross profit margins reported. Longer times to markets appeared to reduce the amount of gross profit margins achievable by the farmers as this increased the costs of accessing markets or prevented farmers from accessing more profitable markets, ending up selling at lower prices. The longer distances hampered the purchase and transportation of inputs necessary to achieve higher production due to various reasons including lack of regular, reliable motorized transport system. This also affected farmers' capacity to transport their produce to the market and bring back the required farm inputs. Most often farmers carried their commodities on heads or backs to reach market places. Due to very poor infrastructure, farmers may not afford to pay for transport (Birachi, 2013).

2.3 Negotiation of Agricultural Challenges by Women

Objective 3: To find out how women negotiate their challenges in soybean production through participation in MARKETS II project.

Women are aware of some of their challenges and they are devising ways of overcoming them. For instance, women have come to the realization that even if they do not own land, they can be involved in other parts of the value chain, such as processing (Mayoux & Mackie, 2007).

Women have taken advantages of being left behind as a result of urbanization to be fully involved in agriculture. This is because leave the villages in search for formal employment and thus women take over farming responsibilities. Rummana (2014) argued that migration of male population due to urbanization or for better work opportunities is a reason which could impact well in increasing female population in agriculture but on the other hand it also increases their responsibilities. He however mentioned that it is important to facilitate female in all senses of agriculture by making them familiar with the technologies which enhance their productivity and reduces the pressure of burden. This could therefore mean that development projects' intervention may not be the only factor contributing to women involvement in agriculture but the circumstances and their new role as house heads.

Research evidence such as those given by Adeleke, Adelalu, Matanmi and Olaniyi (2008); Adegoroye and Adegun (2008); Okokie (2000) and Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (1998), cited in Oyeyinka and Adeyinka 2008, have all indicated that women are now opting for financial independence by getting involved in stable formal and informal career. For instance, Adeleke et al., (2008) in their research on gender and productivity reported that there is no difference in a woman's and man's productivity among maize farmers. In the case of Nigeria, Oyeyinka and Adeyinka (2008), reported that women are active in agricultural activities. For example, in her study on fishing communities in Nigeria, she reported that women dominates in fishing, fish processing and marketing of fish and fishing products. The implication of such findings indicate that, gender specific socio-economic characteristics do not reflect any difference in the productivity levels of male and female levels of productivity. This assumption is quite informative especially when agriculture provides the bulk of employment, income and food for the Nigerian populace. According to the World Bank Report, in Sub-Saharan Africa, agriculture accounts for 70 percent of the total stable food supply. Almost every profession that was earlier touted as being masculine are now been pervaded by women. Women have realized that it is high time to contribute fully to economic

growth and thus this could be the reason why they are participating in agriculture. There is need to look at other factors and ways women have overcome their challenges to be fully involved in agriculture because this information is not revealed in the literature reviewed.

Women who own land sometimes are not as productive as men and this is used as a justification why they should leave farming for men, without looking at the root cause of this low productivity. To understand why agricultural productivity is often lower for women, we need a broader understanding of the obstacles women face. For example, Udry (1994) found that the productivity per unit of land on female-managed plots in Burkina Faso was 30 percent lower than on male-managed plots within the same household because labor and fertilizer were more intensively applied on men's plots. Zafar (2003) sought to give an explanation for this. He said that women have limited access to a wide range of agricultural inputs including seed and fertilizer, technological resources, equipment, land, and so forth. In addition, women often lack the capacity needed to deploy these resources. For example, women may have access to land but lack access to the fertilizer needed to farm the land productively or lack the knowledge of how to properly apply fertilizer. Furthermore, many non-tangible assets, such as social capital, human capital, rights, and decision-making power, are more difficult for women to access. This study will therefore seek to explore if women working with development partners still use lower inputs compared to male farmers and what influences their decisions to use lower quantities of agricultural inputs. It will also find out if women have been able to overcome these challenges through their participation in different program activities. Before any study decides women are less productive due to their women related functions, they need to look at the specific challenges that prevent women from being as productive as their male counterparts. Studies therefore need to focus on how women can negotiate these challenges to fully participate and become productive in agriculture

Development organization are more aware of the extent to which women are participating in their intervention via gender based analysis which keeps women inclusion in check. A gender approach to value chain analysis can provide an understanding of men's and women's specific roles and responsibilities in the chain and how gender inequalities influence the distribution of benefits to value chain actors. For instance, a gender analysis of the shrimp value chain in Bangladesh (USAID, 2006) reveals that women are less involved in the

production part of the value chains but outnumber men in processing activities. The analysis also shows that the terms and conditions of employment along the value chain do not favor women (USAID, 2006). Such analysis are bound to trigger the need for devising more ways of increasing women participation.

To emphasize the central role that women play in agriculture, FAO (2014) pointed out that rural women everywhere play a key role in supporting their households and communities in achieving food and nutrition security, generating income, and improving rural livelihoods and overall well-being. The report continues to say that women contribute to agriculture and rural enterprises and fuel local and global economies. As such, they are active players in achieving the MDGs (FAO, 2014). There is however need for more information on how women have been able to overcome their challenges to be involved in agriculture.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

A cross-sectional research design will be used in collecting qualitative data that will be compared with the results of an earlier quantitative baseline survey and mid-term evaluation that were conducted by MARKETS II to gauge the project's impact on women's lives. Cross-sectional research design will enable the researcher compare different variables from both qualitative and quantitative data for a wider analysis scope. The design of data collection questions used for both FGDs and key informant interviews will be guided by the objectives of the study. This will ensure that the research problem will be answered by the data collected. The existing quantitative data will be used to generate descriptive statistics.

3.2 Study Area

Kaduna state will be the study area for this study. Kaduna state is located in Northern Nigeria. It has both Muslims and Christian populations. Muslim communities are more conservative than Christians and the patriarchal family structures limit women involvement in some activities, especially farming. This state will showcase the effect the project has had on women despite all the cultural and religious constraints that hinder women participation in agriculture. In this state, MARKETS II carries out its interventions in maize, sorghum and soybean. Soybean was introduced in this area to empower women and also improve nutritional value of the household members. This is because soybean does not only provide on-farm activities but also off-farm, such as small scale processing that women can easily participate in. Through project interventions in soybean, more women were expected to benefit from the program, improve their household income, increase their soybean productivity and improve nutritional status of their households. Being mostly inhabited by people of Muslim faith, women are still regarded as conservative hence male farmers own agricultural land and control productive assets (Ayoola et al, 2011). In this regard, the project intended to empower women through their increased inclusion in agriculture. Main economic activity is farming. It is also an education center with a university, colleges and technical institutes. Kaduna used to be the hub of textile printing though this slowed down with time, but it is still considered a commercial city.

3.3 Study Population

Soybean farmers benefitting from MARKETS II activities in Kaduna state will form the study population. The unit of analysis will be household whereby 134 households in Kaduna state will be analysed.

3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

The sample will consist of five focus group discussions, three for female and two for male farmers. Purposive sampling will be used to identify 10 knowledgeable persons on gender and women involvement in agriculture that will be interviewed as key informants. The researcher decided to focus on the given number, however this may be revised during data collection if there is still new information from various groups until there is no evidence of new information.

3.5 Data Collection Methods

3.5.1 Focus Group Discussions

The five FGDs will include a minimum of 7 and a maximum of 12 farmers. The researcher will train two research assistants who understands Hausa language to facilitate and take notes. The guide will be interpreted in that language prior to the discussions. However, the researcher will be present during the discussions to ensure the discussions are going on well and also be in a position to revise the number of FGDs up to information saturation point.

3.5.2 Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews will be conducted to generate data from opinion leaders knowledgeable on agricultural activities and gender issues in the state. The opinion leaders will include heads of farmers (In Nigeria, every village has a head of farmers who influences their farming decisions) in the regions where the FGD will be carried out; directors of household economic strengthening, monitoring and evaluation, productivity and the managing director (MARKETS II); and a gender specialist from Nigerian agricultural projects such as International Fertilizer Development Center's (IFDC's) Agro-Input to Production Expansion (APEX) project, Catholic Relief Services' (CRS) Support to Vulnerable Households for Accelerated Revenue Earnings (SHARE) project and Mercy Corps Nigeria. The researcher will also interview the head of women department at Kaduna

Agricultural Development Program (ADP) as well as the director of extension. The researcher will personally carry out the interviews.

3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

Two sets of data will be analyzed and presented in this study and they include quantitative and qualitative data.

3.6.1 Primary Data

Qualitative data will be sourced from primary sources. The researcher will transcribe qualitative data from the FGD facilitators' notes and KII responses. Content analysis steps will be followed to analyze qualitative data, such as; reading through the transcripts while making short notes, categorize the data into themes, linking identified themes into major and minor themes, considering the relevance of themes to the objectives of the study, study the themes once again in details and see if some themes can be combined and finally using the qualitative information to explain the impact of MARKETS II intervention by comparing this data with the results of the baseline study, midterm evaluation and other MARKETS II reports.

3.6.2 Secondary Data

The results from quantitative data collected by MARKETS II will form a basis against which to compare the impact of MARKETS II interventions on women's lives.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Informed consent will be sought before FGDs and key informant interviews commence. Farmers will not be forced to participate in the discussions. They will be made aware of the objectives of the study and allowed to decide to participate voluntarily.

The data collection assistants will clearly explain the aim of the research and assure the audience of the confidentiality of the information they will give. The respondents' responses will be transcribed without indicating the names of the contributors but allocating numbers to the respondents.

Data to be used in this study will be got from MARKETS II project (quantitative data already collected and qualitative to be collected from its beneficiaries). The permission to use

MARKETS II quantitative data has been granted by the project as well as the implementing organization (Chemonics International).

In northern Nigeria, married women are not allowed to socialize freely with male counterparts, thus the researcher, being a female, has an edge while conducting discussions with women.

References

- Abdullahi, A. 2012. Comparative Economic Analysis of Rice Production by Adopters and Non-Adopters of Improved Varieties among Farmers in Paikoro Local Government Area of Niger State. *Nigerian Journal of Basic and Applied Science*, 20(2): 146-151.
- Abdulrahim, D. (1990); Islamic law, gender and the policies of exile. The Palestinians in West Berlin: A case study. In C. Mallat & J. Connors (eds), *Islamic Family Law*; (pp. 181-201). London: Graham & Trotman.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila (2002). Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving?: Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and its Others. *American Anthropologist*. Vol 104(3): 783-790
- Abu-Lughod, Lila (2013). Do Muslim Women Need Saving? Harvard: *Harvard University Press*.
- Adegoroye, A. O. & Adegun, O. A. (2008). Gender disparity in the informal sector employment opportunities in a Nigeria state economy. *The Social Sciences Journal*, 3(1):1-5.
- Adeleke, O. A., Adelalu, K.O., Matanmi, H.M. & Olaniyi, O.A. (2008). Gender and productivity differentials in maize production in Afijo Local Government Areas of Oyo State. *Medwell Agricultural Journal*, 3 (2008): 199-203.
- Ajani, O. I. (2008). Gender Dimensions in Agriculture, Poverty, Nutrition and Food Security in Nigeria; *Nigeria Strategy Support Program (NSSP)*. IFPRI. Pp 5-7
- Ayoola, J. B., Dangbegnon, C., Daudu, C.K., Mando, A., Kudi T.M., Amapu, I.Y., Adeosun, J.O., & Ezui, K.S. (2011). Socio-economic factors influencing rice production among male and female farmers in Northern Guinea Savanna Nigeria: lessons for promoting gender equity in action research. *Agriculture and Biology Journal of North America*, 4(1): 211
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. *Upper Saddle River*, Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Begum, R. & G. Yasmeen. (2011). Contribution of Pakistani women in agriculture: productivity and constraints. *Sarhad J. Agric.* 27(4): 637-643
- Birachi, E., Zozo, R., Vanlauwe, B., Chianu, J. & Chiuri, W. (2013). An Analysis of the Determinants of Household Level Production and Marketing of Beans in Eastern Congo. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 8(31):4231-4238, 15.
- Buckland, L., & Haleegoah J. (1996). Gender analysis in agricultural production. 11TA Research Guide 58 training Programme of International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA); (Pp10-12). Ibadan: Nigeria.
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106: 676-713.

- Catalyst (2005). Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners and Catalyst Census of Women Board Directors: <http://www.catalyst.org>.
- CGIAR (2012). Research on Gender and Agriculture. www.cgiar.org/our-research/research-on-gender-and-agriculture/
- CGIAR (2013a). CGIAR Annual Report 2012: Partnership for Impact. CGIAR Montpellier, 49: 23-34
- CGIAR (2013b). Standards for collecting Sex-disaggregated Data for Gender Analysis: a guide for CGIAR researchers. *CGIAR Gender and Agriculture Research Network*, 2013: 1-6
- Charlton, S. E. M. (1984). *Women in Third World Development*. Epping: Bowker.
- Chinwe, J. O. (2012). Agricultural Transformation Agenda in Nigeria: How Prepare is the Technology Transfer Sub-System. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Helathcare*, 4(2):2224-3208
- CIDA (1999). *CIDA's Policy of Gender Equality*. Hull, Quebec:CIDA.
- Collett K. & Gale C. (2009). *Training for Rural Development: Agricultural and Enterprise for Women Smallholders*. *City and Guild Centre for Skills Development*, London.
- De Voe, P. (2002). Symbolic Action: Religion's Role in the Changing Environment of Young Somali Women. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 15(2): 234-246.
- Debdulal, D. R. (2009). Self-Efficacy of Agricultural Farmers: A Case Study. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, July 2009, 35 (2):323-293.
- Deere, C. D., & Leon, M. (2001). Who owns the land? Gender and land-titling programmes in Latin America. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 1(3), 440–467
- Dogbe W., Etwire P. M., Martey E., Etwire J. C., Inusah I. Y. & Aliyu S. (2013). Economics of Soybean Production: Evidence from Saboba and Chereponi Districts of Northern Region of Ghana. *University for Development Studies*, Ghana.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987a). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987b). *Reporting sex differences*. *American Psychologist*, 42, 755-756.
- Edmunds, D., Sasser, J. & Wollenberg, E. (2013). *A Gender Strategy for Pro-Poor Climate Change Mitigation*. *CCAFS Working Paper*, 36. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- FAO (2011). *State of Food and Agriculture in 2010-2011*. *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations* (2011). Rome.
- FAO (2014). *Focus on Women and Food Security*. <http://www.fao.org/focus/e/women/sustine.htm>

- Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2014). Agricultural Ministry Committed to Addressing Gender Disparity through Agricultural Transformation. Retrieved from *Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development website, Nigeria*. http://www.fmard.gov.ng/news_inside.php?nid=119
- Foster, B. B. (2001). Choices: A dilemma of women agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(3), 1-10.
- Foster, B. B. (2001). Women in agricultural education: Who are you? *Proceedings of the 28th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference*, 384-395.
- Foster, R. M., Pikkert, J., & Husmann, D. E. (1991). Self-perception of gender bias among women agriculture teachers. *Proceedings of the National Agricultural Education Research Meeting*, 238-245.
- Gallina, A. (2010), Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – International Literature Review, *Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency/UTV Working Paper* (3), Stockholm: Sida
- Gary T. & Steve S. (2004). *Social Identities: A Multi-Disciplinary Approaches*. Routledge, Abingdon.
- Geis, F. L. (1993). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A social Psychological view of gender. In A. E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *the psychology of gender* (pp. 9-54). New York: Guilford Press.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Idyorough, A.E. (2005). *Gender: concepts and issues in Nigeria*, Makurdi: Aboki Publishers
- Jenyo-Oni, A. (2007). Gender division in the fishing communities of Lagos Coastal wetlands, Nigeria. *Journal of Fisheries International*, 2 (3): 207-210.
- Kaaria, S. K. & Ashby, J. A. (2000). *CGIAR Programme on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation*; Working Document Number 13. Cali, Colombia.
- Kaaria, S.K. & Ashby, J.A. (2001). An approach to technological innovation that benefits rural women: the resource-to-consumption system. *Working Document*, No. 13. PRGA Program. Cali, Colombia.
- Kabeer Naila (2009). *Social Exclusion, Poverty and Discrimination: Towards an Analytical Framework*. IDS Bulletin, 31(4): 83-97.
- Kabeer, Naila (2008). *Mainstreaming gender in social protection for the informal economy*, London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

- Kabuli, A. Phiri, M.A.R. and AbdiKhalil, E. (2005). Economic assessment of the benefits of soybeans incorporation in smallholder maize-based farming systems and the factors affecting its adoption in Malawi. *African Crop Science Conference Proceedings*, 7: 881-885. Kampala.
- Kadiri, F., Eze, C., Orebiyi, J., & Onyeagocha, S. (2014). Resource-use and Allocative Efficiency of Paddy Rice Production in Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Research*, 2(4): 11-18.
- Kathleen, D. K. (2007). Overcoming Gender Bias with Self-efficacy: A Case Study of Women Agricultural Education Teachers and Pre-service Students. Oklahoma State University. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 48(1): 52 – 63
- Kebbeh, M. S. Haefele & S.O. Fagade (2003). *Challenges and opportunities for improving irrigated rice productivity in Nigeria*. Abidjan: WARDA.
- Kelkar, G., Nathan, D. & Jahan, R. (2004). “Redefining women’s ‘samman’: Micro credit and gender relations in rural Bangladesh”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 30(32): 3627–3640.
- Klasen, S. (2002). The impact of gender inequality in education and employment in the Middle East and North Africa. *Background paper for World Bank Report on gender in MENA region*.
- Kombo I. & Minungu L. (2012). *Gender Imbalance in the Leadership of Local Government Authorities in Tanzania: The Case Study of Dodoma Municipality*. London, England.
- Mahmood, H. U. (2011). *Characteristics of Women Farmers and Food Security in Girei Local Government Area of Adamawa State Nigeria*. Department of Agricultural Education Federal College of Education, Yola, Nigeria.
- Mamman, M. (1995). *Population and Women in Food Production*. Savanna. Vol.16 pp 110-119
- MARKETS II (2012). *MARKETS II Performance Monitoring Plan*. Submitted to USAID, Nigeria.
- MARKETS II (2013). *MARKETS II Baseline Survey*. Submitted to USAID Nigeria
- MARKETS II (2014). *MARKETS II quarter 4 Report-July to September*. Submitted to USAID Nigeria.
- MARKETS II (2016). *MARKETS II Midterm Evaluation Report*. Submitted to USAID Nigeria.
- Mayoux, L. and Mackie, G. (2007). *Making the strongest links: a practical guide to mainstreaming gender analysis in value chain development*. ILO, Addis Ababa.
- Mbilinyi, M. (1998). Searching for utopia: The politics of gender and education in Tanzania. In *Women and education in sub-Saharan Africa: Power, opportunities, and constraints*, edited by Marianne Bloch, Josephine A. Beoku Betts, and B. Robert Tabachnick. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

- Mehra, R. & Rojas, M. H. (2008). *Food security and agriculture in a global marketplace: A significant shift*. Washington, D.C.
- Mehra, R. and Rojas, M. H. (2008). *Women, Food Security and Agriculture in a Global Marketplace; A significant Shift*. International Center for Research on Women
- Meinzen-Dick, R. et al. (2001). Engendering Agricultural Research, Development, and Extension. *International Food Policy Research Institute*. Washington DC.
- Meinzen-Dick, R. et al. (2010). Engendering Agricultural Research. *IFPRI Discussion Paper 00973*. Environment and Production Technology Division.
- Mgbada, J.U. (2000). Production of staple crops by rural women in Enugu and Ebonyi States. Lessons for enhancing poverty alleviation programmes. In T.A. Olowu (eds). *Agricultural extension and poverty alleviation in Nigeria*. Proceedings of the 6th Annual National Conference of the Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria. Pp11
- Moore, H. L. (1988). *Feminism and Anthropology*. University of Minesota Press; South Minneapolis: Great Britain
- Mouffe, C. (1992). *Feminism, Citizenship and radical Democratic Politics: Theorize the Political*. Rouledge, New York.
- Nigeria Committee on Elimination of Discrimination against Women (2004). Report
- Njuki, J., Kihyo, V., Tingati, A. & Place F. (2006). Productivity Differences between Male and Female Managed Farms in the Eastern and Central Highlands of Kenya. *Contributed paper prepared for presentation at the International Association of Agricultural Economists Conference*, Gold Coast, Australia
- Odoemenem, I. & Inakwu, J. (2011). Economic analysis of rice production in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, 3(9):469-474.
- Odugbesan, J. A. (2008). Gender and Sustainable Agriculture in Nigeria. *Journal of Geography, Environment and Planning*. Vol.4. No 1. pp 134-138.
- OECD (2012). *Closing the Gender Gap: Act Now*. OECD Publishing, Paris
- Okokie, M. (2000). *A new millennium: what to take from the past, what to leave behind*. Imprimis, 2 (3).
- Ortner, B. S. (1974). 'Is female to male as nature is to culture?' In M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds), *Woman, Culture and Society*, 67-88. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ortner, B. S. (1996). *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Owoyemi, O. & Olusanya, O. (2014). *Gender: A Precursor for Discriminating Against Women in Paid Employment in Nigeria*. University of Lagos, Nigeria.
- Oyeyinka, G. and Adeyinka, S. (1998). *Gender inequality in education and employment*. www.Learningchannel.org

- Quisumbing, A., Meinzen-Dick, R., Raney, T.L., Croppenstedt, A., Behrman, J.A. & Peterman, A. (2014). *Gender in agriculture: Closing the knowledge gap*. Springer/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
- Rahman, S.A., Gabriel, J. & Marcus N.D. (2004). Gender differentials in labour contribution and productivity in farm production. Empirical evidence from Kaduna State of Nigeria. *Paper presented at the National Conference*
- Raufu, M.O., Akintola, R.O., Osikoya, A.T., Olotuah, O. & Azeez, F. (2013). *Gender Analysis of Land Access among Peri-Urban Farmers of Lagos State*. Department of Agricultural Economics, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH), Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.
- Roshan, L., Ashok, K. (2011). *Gender Issues: The role of women in agriculture sector*. ISSN 2249 8826, 1(1).
- Rummana, Z., Aniq, Z. & Sanam K. (2014). Women participation in Agriculture in Pakistan: An overview of the constraint and problems faced by rural women. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(2):2319-7668.
- Saba Mahmood (2001). Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival. *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 16(2):202-235.
- Saito, K.A., Mekonnen, H. & Spurling, D. (1994). Raising productivity of women farmers in sub-Saharan Africa. *World Bank Discussion Paper 230*. Washington, DC.
- Salihu, A.A & Onwana, A. (1995). New Perspectives on Women Empowerment and Sustainable Rural Development in Nigeria. *Savanna*. Vol.15 (16): 48-59.
- Sanginga, P.C., Adesina, A.A., Manyong, V.M., Otite, O. & Dashiell, K.E. (1999). *Social impact of soybean in Nigeria's southern Guinea savanna*. IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Saulnier, C., Bentley, S., Gregor, F., MacNeil, G., Rathwell, T. & Erin S. (1999). *Gender Mainstreaming: Developing a Conceptual Framework for En-Gendering Healthy Public Policy*. Maritime Centre of Excellence for Women's Health Publisher, Canada.
- Sharma, U. (1980). *Women, Work and Property in North-West India*. London: Tavistock.
- SIDA (1997). *Evaluating Gender Equality: Policy and Practice*. An Assessment of SIDA's Evaluation in 1997-1998, Lennart Peck.
- Susan, P., Maria, E. & Quito M. (1999). *Rethinking Differences and Rights in Sexual and Reproductive Health: A Training Manual for Providers*. Research Triangle Park, NC: Family Health International.
- Susan, V. P. (1991). The Role of Gender in Agricultural Development. *Consultative Group on Agricultural Research, CGIAR Secretariat*. Washington DC.

- The World Bank (2000). *Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook. Agriculture and Rural Development. Conference edition.* Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Ubogu, A.E & Aya, H. (2010) Gender and Intra-Urban Transport in Sabon-Gari Area of Zaria, Kaduna state. A paper presented at the 51st Annual Conference of the Association of Nigerian Geographers held at the Kogi state University, Anyigba on 7th-11th of March 2010.
- Udry, C. (1994). Gender, Agricultural Productivity and the Theory of the Household. Timbergen Institute Discussion Paper, TI94-118.
- Udry, C. (1996). Gender, Agricultural Production, and the Theory of the Household. *Journal of Political Economy*, 104: 1010–1046.
- UNDP (2000). Overcoming Human Poverty. *UNDP Poverty Report*; UNDP, New York.
- URT (2005). *Women Affairs and Children, Bureau of Statistics and Ministry of Community Development*, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
- USAID (2006). Gender Perspectives in Agricultural value chains. *Field Report by FHI 360*.
- USAID (2011). *Tips for Conducting a Gender Analysis at the Activity or Project Level*
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1991). Doing gender. In J. Lorber & S. A. Farrell (Eds.), *the social construction of gender* (pp. 13-37). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yusuf, R. O., Arigbede, Y.A. & Kolade, O. (2010). *Constraint to Women's Participation in Agricultural Production in Rural Areas of Kaduna State, Nigeria*. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria,
- Zafar, I. (2003). *Female labour force in agriculture*. Dawn-The Internet Ed. from <http://www.Dawn.Com>

Annexes

Annex 1: Focus Group Discussion Guide

| | Record accordingly |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Group name | |
| Date of FGD (dd/mm/yyyy) | |
| Town/village | |
| LGA | |
| State | |
| Facilitator | |
| Note taker | |
| Time discussion started | |

Names and positions of focus group discussion participants

| No. | Name of discussants | Sex | Position in the group | Position in community |
|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |
| 4. | | | | |
| 5. | | | | |
| 6. | | | | |
| 7. | | | | |
| 8. | | | | |
| 9. | | | | |
| 10. | | | | |
| 11. | | | | |
| 12. | | | | |

1) Introduction and Awareness of MARKETS II

a) Please tell me a little about yourself?

i) What do you do?

b) Which organization works with you on Agricultural projects? PROBE FULLY

{Moderator – please take note of the names as they all represent markets ii/USAID MARKETS}: (USAID MARKETS, KADP, SG 2000 {Sasakawa}, Grand Cereals, Feed Tech, Da-All Green)

i) {for each organization mentioned} How did you hear of.....? (Mention each organization)?

2) MARKETS II Activities, Implementation and Benefits

I. What activities of MARKETS II are you involved in?

II. FOR EACH ACTIVITY, PLEASE ASK.

- a. What was this activity all about?
- b. How is it done {Farmer's practices}?
- c. Was it timely or not? Why/Why not?
- d. Were these activity implemented as planned? Why/Why not?
- e. What are those measures that made these activities successful/unsuccessful?
- f. What measures do you think should have been put in place to have made these activities more successful? Why do you say so?

3) Gender Specific Questions

- i. What are some of the challenges you face as a woman/man?
- ii. How do you manage to tackle those challenges?
- iii. Do you think being a man/woman affects your participation in agriculture? Explain
- iv. Are MARKETS II activities designed to accommodate both men and women?
- v. What specific interventions/strategies are designed to include women in the project?
- vi. Are there community beliefs/myths against women that MARKETS II program has been able to mainstream? How?
 - a. Land ownership and use
 - b. Cultural beliefs
 - c. Religion
 - d. Technologies
 - e. Knowledge transfer
 - f. Self-confidence
 - g. Leadership

4) What benefits did you obtain from MARKETS II that you would not have, if you were not part of this activity?

{Probe on impact of..... what was it before and what is it now}

- a) Implementation in terms of timeliness
- b) Yield
- c) Income
- d) Credit
- e) Technology
- f) Training/Extension
- g) Inputs
- h) Access to Market/Buybacks

- i) Self-confidence
- j) Leadership

5) How satisfied are you with MARKETS II activities with respect to.....? {Respondent can choose between numbers 1 – 5}.

| | Satisfactory level {1=Very Dissatisfied, 2= Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3=Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied.} | Reason |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------|
| Implementation in terms of timeliness | | |
| Yield | | |
| Income | | |
| Credit | | |
| Technology | | |
| Training/extension | | |
| Inputs (fertilizer, seeds, chemicals) | | |
| Access to Markets/Buybacks | | |
| Women inclusion and empowerment | | |
| Self-confidence | | |
| Leadership | | |

Tip: Involve indirect beneficiaries. Encourage open ended discussion and responses and report satisfaction levels (Not satisfied, Satisfied, Very satisfied, etc.)

- a) Why do you say so?{**PROBE FULLY**}

6) Beneficiary Experience – before and after MARKET II

- i. How is your producer Association using the skills/knowledge gained from the MARKETS II program in.....? {**Mention each aspect listed below**}? How?
 - a) Before MARKETS II (DEPENDING ON WHEN RESPONDENT JOINED), on an average, how was this aspect? Please give exact quantities?
 - b) During MARKET II on an average, how was this aspect? Please give exact quantities? Did you have any....?

| | Before MARKETS II Quantity | During MARKETS II Quantity |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Loans {Value of Loans received in Naira} | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Contract/Buyback | | |
| Yield | | |
| Income | | |
| Credit | | |
| Technology | | |
| Training/extension | | |
| Inputs (fertilizer, seeds, chemicals) | | |
| Women inclusion and empowerment | | |
| Self-confidence (how many women) | | |
| Leadership (how many women) | | |

Tip: Where exact quantities are not available, marginal increases and/or proportions on a before and after basis could be used. Get information from individual members and get average.

Time discussion ended _____.

Annex 2: Key Informant Interview Guide

| | Record accordingly |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| KII name | |
| Organization and Title | |
| Date of KII (dd/mm/yyyy) | |
| Location | |
| Facilitator/Note taker | |
| Time interview started | |

1. Introduction and Awareness of MARKETS II

- a) Please tell me a little about yourself?
 - i) What do you do?
- b) How much do you know about agricultural projects/MARKETS II?
 - i) What is your Interactions or partnerships with agricultural projects/MARKETS II?

2. Can you tell me the activities you were involved in with agricultural organizations/MARKETS II?

a. For each activity, please ask.

- i. What was this activity all about?
 - ii. What are those measures that made these activities successful/unsuccessful?
- b. What measures do you think should have been put in place to have made these activities more successful? Why do you say so?

3. Gender Specific Questions (All respondents including MARKETS II staff)

- i. What are some of the gender specific challenges that farmers face?
- ii. How do they overcome those challenges?
- iii. Do you think being a man/woman affects their participation in agriculture? Explain
- iv. Are agricultural projects/MARKETS II activities designed to accommodate both men and women?
- v. What specific interventions/strategies are designed to include women in the project?
- vi. Are there community beliefs/myths against women that agricultural project/MARKETS II program has been able to mainstream? How?
 - a. Land ownership and use
 - b. Cultural beliefs
 - c. Religion
 - d. Technologies
 - e. Knowledge transfer
 - f. Women inclusion and empowerment
 - g. Self-confidence
 - h. Leadership

4. (I) What benefits have you realized from the program that would not have been possible without the project?

{Probe on}

- a. Knowledge
- b. Income
- c. Jobs
- d. Productivity /Output
- e. “Value-addition”
- f. Product diversification
- g. Women inclusion and empowerment
- h. Self-confidence of women beneficiaries
- i. Leadership of women participants

(II) How satisfied are you with Projects/MARKETS II activities in respect to.....?

{Respondent can choose between numbers 1 – 5}.

| | Satisfactory level { 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2= Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3=Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied } | Why do say so? (Reason) |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Implementation in terms of timeliness | | |
| Knowledge | | |
| Income | | |
| Jobs | | |
| Consistent supply | | |
| Productivity/output | | |
| Value addition | | |
| Product diversification | | |
| Women inclusion and empowerment | | |
| Self –confident (women beneficiaries) | | |
| Leadership (women) | | |

5. Do you think agricultural projects are doing enough to benefit farmers and encourage gender equality in agriculture?

6. What more can be done to bridge gender inequality gap in agriculture?

Time discussion ended: _____.

Annex 3: Study Area Map

