



**HAL**  
open science

## The implicit gender dimension of policy instruments in agriculture

Madeleine Jonsson, Monica Caggiano, Catherine E. Laurent, Pierre P. Labarthe

► **To cite this version:**

Madeleine Jonsson, Monica Caggiano, Catherine E. Laurent, Pierre P. Labarthe. The implicit gender dimension of policy instruments in agriculture. 26. Annual EAEPE Conference, European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy (EAEPE). INT., Nov 2014, Nicosia, Cyprus. 10.13140/RG.2.1.3912.0804 . hal-02738488

**HAL Id: hal-02738488**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02738488v1>**

Submitted on 2 Jun 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## EAEPE Conference 2014 - [K] Gender Economics and Social Identity

**Title:** The implicit gender dimension of policy instruments in agriculture. The Case of Kenya.

---

**Main author:** Madeleine Jönsson

PhD Student

AgroParisTech

INRA - Institut National de Recherche Agronomique

Madeleine.jonsson@agroparistech.fr

Mobile France: +33(0)6 08 89 60 87

Mobile Kenya: +254(0)712 61 65 60

Mobile Sweden: +46(0)72 503 35 05

---

**Co-authors:** Dr. Monica Caggiano

[monicacaggiano@yahoo.it](mailto:monicacaggiano@yahoo.it)

INRA SAD

Paris, France

Dr. Catherine Laurent

[Catherine.laurent@grignon.inra.fr](mailto:Catherine.laurent@grignon.inra.fr)

INRA SAD

Paris, France

Dr. Pierre Labarthe

[Pierre.labarthe@agroparistech.fr](mailto:Pierre.labarthe@agroparistech.fr)

INRA SAD

Paris, France

---

## **Abstract**

The objective of this discussion is to assess the mechanisms that are considered important to secure the effectiveness of gender integration in public farm advisory intervention. A tangible case study from Kenya is presented. A set of two policy devices combined with two action guidelines is used for the assessment, resulting in four policy instruments. The policy instruments are; (1) direct public farm advisory services via gender mainstreaming; (2) direct public farm advisory services via affirmative action; (3) and Public-Private Platforms via gender mainstreaming; (4) Public-Private Platforms via affirmative action.

The literature review illustrates a changing policy landscape (with present and emerging action guidelines and policy devices), where possible exclusion mechanisms in regards to women's priorities, needs and expectations seem to be emerging.

Based on this type of ex-ante analysis, we can conclude that it gives the possibility to compare the different limits and advantages of a certain policy instrument (regarding effectiveness for women to dispose of the adequate knowledge to implement and sustain their agricultural projects). In addition, we expect to be able to determine whether or not these emerging policy devices and action guidelines, e.g. knowledge-based platforms, compared to less recent ones, comprehend properties potentially increasing the discriminating factors against women and widening the gender equality gap.

Conclusively, based on the results and discussion, there is a larger socio-political concern behind the choice of policy instruments as they does not seem to be directly linked to the needs and priorities of the target group. It is also possible foresee an eventual discrepancy between the priorities, expectations and needs of rural women and the implicit gender dimension in policy instruments.

## **1. Introduction and background**

There are changes in agricultural development, in particular in the context of agricultural extension services since the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) (Hugon, 2013 [1993]; Eicher 2003). This is in turn having an impact upon women, more particularly rural women (Barker and Feiner 2007 [2004]; Manfre et al., 2013). These changes have occurred in all African countries. However, it is necessary to refer to specific contexts to fully understand their determinants and impact. It is why this presentation will draw on observations made in Kenya. In this country, the government shifted their interventions from state to market-led as a consequence of structural adjustments occurring from the mid-1980s, in the context of the Washington Consensus (Rodrik, 2006; Williamson, 2005; Stiglitz, 1998; Kolodko, 1999). The landscape of farm advisory services in Kenya has indeed changed, going from one major actor providing and delivering services, i.e. the Government, to a multiplicity of actors, where the state is partly delegating its services through actors with various institutional forms, mandates and objectives, e.g. in the case of agricultural extension (Davis, 2008; Adolph, 2010; Faure et al., 2010). This equally led to the development of new policy devices and action guidelines and hence policy instruments.

Agriculture is the backbone of the Kenyan economy, contributing 26 percent of the GDP annually (GoK, 2011, WB database 2013). The sector provides more than 70 percent of informal employment in the rural areas in Kenya. It has been stated that rural Kenyan women contribute to 75 percent of the

labour force in small-scale agriculture and manage 40 percent of the small-scale farms (Alila and Otieno, 2006). However, women in rural areas are disadvantaged when it comes to access to resources, e.g. land, capital, knowledge and information (Adolph, 2010; Berlekorn et al., 2009; FSD, 2013; UN Women, 2002). Kenyan women are less literate than men; 7.81 percentage points difference between literacy rates in Kenya between women and men since year 2000 (WB Database, 2013). Further, Kenyan females expected years of schooling compared to that of males is lower by on average one year and the female share of graduates in agriculture in Kenya was 27% in 2000 and 30% in 2001. Also, 29 percent of those earning a formal wage in Kenya are women, leaving a large percentage of women to work in the informal sector.

Thus, economic and institutional models, and their explicit (i.e. known, transparent, intentional) and implicit (i.e. somewhat unknown, unexpected, less intentional, yet to be revealed) components, have altered with the introduction of a variety of actors and hence the intentions, objectives and mandate of corresponding government (Verma, 2001; Elson, 1995; Adolph, 2010; Elson and Catagay, 2000; Bergeron, 2003; Ongile, 1999). It has led to new forms of discrimination for women after the structural adjustments and in the context of the Washington Consensus. In particular there are changes in the delivery of agricultural services and how knowledge is produced and transmitted (Davis, 2008; Adolph, 2010). It has been mentioned (Barker and Feiner 2007 [2004]; Verma, 2001; Kiptot and Franzel, 2011) that female farmers have less access to agricultural extension services as compared to male farmers. This, as a result of privatisation of these services during Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) and of the introduction of new extension methodologies (e.g. Training and Visit (T&V) systems) (Verma, 2001; Davis, 2008).

In this context, several changes are supposed to improve the situation: the reinforcement of action guidelines of how to integrate gender issues, such as gender mainstreaming (GM) (Dauphin, 2010) or affirmative action (Stratigaki, 2005; Dauphin, 2010), but also the development of new public-private partnerships or the creation of knowledge-based platforms in order to facilitate the access to knowledge to the public at large.

We can hence see a dispersal of various policy devices and action guidelines present within agricultural development and farm extension services; a fragmentation of the ways of transmitting and procuring different social groups with knowledge (both explicit and tacit) as well as the emergence of new types of hybrid devices (e.g. private-public partnership for knowledge-based platforms, supposed to support public intervention). These changes arise new issue(s) for rural women and require new analytical tools.

## **2. State of the Art**

### **2.1. Integration of women in farm advisory interventions**

A literature review<sup>1</sup> based on articles essentially from political economics, including references from heterodox feminist economics, was conducted to identify the mechanisms that are considered important to secure the effectiveness of gender integration in public farm advisory intervention.

---

<sup>1</sup> This work benefited from a first review established by Guidotty (2014). The review only included papers where this effectiveness was assessed.

Two main determinants were identified; (1) direct access to farm advisors (Agholor et al., 2012; Ani et al., 2004) and; (2) impact of farm advisory services on women's practices and skills (Moumouni et al., 2013; Nneoyi et al., 2008; Page et al., 2008; Okuande, 2007; Odurukwe et al., 2006; Sabo, 2005; Manjula, 2005; Lawal and Jibowo, 2004). The main results, presented in table 1, are structured under the following four categories; (i) adoption of practices; (ii) agricultural output linked to the awareness of improvement; (iii) acquisition of new knowledge and; (iv) transformation of social status of women.

**Table 1:** Literature review results of the effectiveness of gender integration in public farm advisory interventions

<b>(1) Access to public farm advisory services</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Varies depending on gender (Agholor et al., 2012)</li> <li>Positively correlated to higher levels of education (Ani et al., 2004)</li> <li>Not related to marital status (Ani et al., 2004)</li> <li>Negatively related to an increasing number of years of agricultural experience (Ani et al., 2004)</li> </ul>
<b>(2) Impacts of farm advisory services on women (results presented under parameters (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv))</b>
<p><b>(i) Adoption of practices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A measurement of the levels of adoption (of various agricultural practices) (Lawal and Jibowo, 2004)</li> <li>The results from Moumouni et al. (2013) shows that females were more likely to adopt organic practices promoted in South Benin (connected to the fact that low amount of input was required and women were the ones have less access to various inputs, which is liked to their needs in this case)</li> </ul>
<p><b>(ii) Agricultural output</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most female farmers wants to participate in diverse forms of agricultural service trainings to increase their output (Sabo, 2005)</li> <li>The concerned female farmers do not want to have access to agricultural services for other reasons, e.g. improved access to financial services or agricultural inputs (Sabo, 2005)</li> </ul>
<p><b>(iii) Knowledge acquisition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge is according to Okuande (2007), measured as increased competence and changing behaviours amongst female farmers</li> <li>Preference tools for receiving advice: on farm and demonstration days (Okuande, 2007)</li> <li>Three major forms of service delivery is preferred by the concerned female farmers; (a) large numbers; (b) in groups; (c) individual level (Okuande, 2007)</li> <li>"Group effect" has a positive impact on the rates of adoption for female farmers (Page et al., 2008; Nneoyi et al., 2008)</li> </ul>
<p><b>(iv) Transformation of social status</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An evaluation of positive impacts of the social status of women by Odurukwe et al. (2006), where after being part of a programme promoted by the World Bank, show that they have managed not only to increase their production but also become more respected by their husbands.</li> <li>Findings from study by Odurukwe et al. (2006) shows that barriers still exist, such as access to various natural resources (land) and institutions.</li> <li>Issues of social status (and socio-economic factors) for these women still remain unaddressed (in direct farm advisory services) to improve agricultural productivity (Odurukwe et al., 2006). This also comes out from the study made by Ani et al. (2004).</li> </ul>

**Source:** Adapted from Agholor et al., 2012; Ani et al., 2004; Moumouni et al., 2013; Nneoyi et al., 2008; Page et al., 2008; Okuande, 2007; Odurukwe et al., 2006; Sabo, 2005; Manjula, 2005; Lawal and Jibowo, 2004.

Although it was not considered in the inclusion criteria, the papers that were identified in the review are focused on public extension services, where knowledge is exchanged between farmers and public

advisors. They do not question the relative effectiveness of different policy principles that may guide such intervention (e.g. gender mainstreaming and affirmative action).

## **2.2. Assessment of gender policy principles**

In the literature, two major principles are analysed regarding women's integration in public intervention: affirmative action and gender mainstreaming (GM). Affirmative action (or positive action) can be defined as “specific measures to eliminate, prevent or remedy past discrimination. It goes beyond legislation on equal treatment by promoting substantive equality (equality of outcomes), for example, by addressing structural disadvantages rather than merely aiming for equality of opportunity or prohibitions on discrimination.” (Eurofund, 2014).

Affirmative action is an action guideline used to combat inequalities between women and men (Dauphin, 2010; Stratigaki, 2005). The basis of the tool is to have a clear distinction between “formal equality” and “actual equality”, i.e. even if a right is considered as attained, it does not imply that it has been effectively implemented (Dauphin, 2010). Some of the inherent properties of the tool is that it (1) acts in an ex-post situation, “catching-up” with the rights already provided to the opposite sex or as compared to (in this case) men’s situation; (2) is a temporary, short-term measure, taking place over a precise period in time; (3) is only legitimate/justifiable once the inequality has been formally recognised and is designed to cease once the equality objective/target has been achieved; (4) disposes of a restoring dimension and; (5) is based on the principle of equal opportunity.

GM is an approach that is analysed by various authors (Dauphin 2010; Debusscher, 2011; Stratigaki, 2005; Giraud et Lucas, 2009; Jenson and Saint-Martin, 2005; Walby, 2002; Dauphin et Sénac-Slawinski, 2008; Fraisse et al., 2008; Szikra et Szelewa, 2009). GM is ‘the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy-making.’ (Debusscher, 2011, pp. 40; referring to Council of Europe, 1998, pp. 13).

In certain articles (Stratigaki, 2005; Walby, 2002) GM is used to promote and work with gender equality in the development sector and is integrated into a number of development programmes. The action guideline assumes that policies are not neutral devices and could cause inequality effects. Since it is “integrated” as an action guideline into other tools, it has a relatively flexible structure, malleable to a number of assumptions (Fraisse, 2008). As highlighted by different authors, such an instrument could have been developed to mask inequalities yet of present, before stressed via affirmative action increasing the risk of doing “gender washing”, i.e. integrating gender as a concept into projects and programmes simply for the “purpose of” e.g. required by donors. (Stratigaki, 2005). Moreover, findings from different authors suggest that as a result of structural changes, a number of services and actions got privatised (Hugon, 2013 [1993]; Eicher 2003; Verma, 2001), and GM as an action guideline is currently applied across various sectors and institutions (Dauphin, 2010). Yet GM was developed for the public sector and it is questionable whether this principle is appropriate for any sector and/or any type of intervention.

Therefore it appears that these action guidelines have to be analysed together with the specific characteristics of the extension device that is set up.

### **2.3. Development of new types of extension devices**

Traditionally, there are various types of agricultural support systems; farm advisory services (techniques, management...), supporting agricultural producer groups, information supply on sanitary issues, and so forth (Faure and Compagnone, 2011; Labarthe and Laurent, 2013). Farm advisory services are generally financed or co-financed by respective government. However, as of late (and namely since the structural adjustment programmes in developing countries) new service providers have appeared, taking part of the farm advisory services stakeholder landscape, e.g. in Kenya (Adolph, 2010; Labarthe and Laurent, 2013). As a consequence, recent public-private devices have started appearing; also to compensate for the reduced supply of knowledge based services previously provided by different governments. Such devices are for instance public-private platforms, equally emerging in developing countries such as Kenya.

A knowledge-based platform is a device assessed by various authors (Purvis et al., 2001; Swaans et al., 2014; Kilelu et al., 2013; Tiftonell et al., 2012; Braun et al., 2000; Zack, 1999). The notion of "knowledge based platforms" refers to various devices that started appearing in the mid-90s to ensure the systematic acquisition, storage, and dissemination of knowledge (Purvis et al., 2001). Initially, these devices were developed for private purposes (Zack, 1999), which later were adjusted to suit public-private needs, e.g. OECD's "Responsible Agro-Investment" platform. The role of a knowledge-based platform is to ensure a sustainable access to the available knowledge, ensuring for a given sector, various functions; (1) shared repository for various types of cognitive resources; (2) a virtual space or forum (a) for knowledge suppliers and users and; (b) where the criteria's assessing the quality of knowledge is debated, discussed, stored and disseminated leading to different types of interventions/activities/actions. It can also be used as a gateway, providing access to other type of resources. Further, knowledge-based platforms are, as previously mentioned, virtual spaces. Hence, in order to get access to the knowledge resource stored in a platform, the user needs to have access to an electric device and most often an Internet connection.

In conclusion, even if both platforms and farm advisory services are two forms of intensive knowledge based services (KIBS), meaning services where knowledge is seen as inputs and outputs (Muller and Zenker, 2001; Hertog, 2000; Windrum and Tomlinson, 1999), the integration of women will be done differently. In order to analyse how women have been and are integrated in the context of public KIBS, it is necessary to connect two different dimensions: policy action guidelines for women integration and policy devices containing KIBS features. This brings us to a literature review on policy instruments.

### **2.4. Policy instruments**

The explicit and implicit properties followed by the meaning of a policy instrument has been analysed by different authors such as Lascoumes and Le Gales (2007); Lascoumes (2007); Schneider and Ingram (1993) and; Schneider and Ingram (1990).

Behind the rationality of organizations, there is a need to describe and analyse the influence of instruments and the explicit and implicit factors (Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007; Lascoumes, 2007; Schneider and Ingram, 1990). Presently, the multiplication of actors and coordination of institutional instruments have been noticed in an increasing number of sectors (Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007). Consequently, public policies are less hierarchized and organized within a sector, defined and structured by powerful stakeholders risking to deny the interplay of social interests and of masking

power relations. Hence, the choice of public policy instruments and how interventions are defined and implemented will depend on the type of governmental priorities, the stakeholder landscape and their respective objectives. Lascoumes and Le Gales (2007) exemplify the need to assess the analytical principles of the role of policy instruments.

A policy instrument (and the role of a policy instrument) can be defined as, "...A device that is both technical and social, that organize specific social relations between the state and those it is addressed to, according to the representations and meanings it carries (explicit and implicit). It is a particular type of institution, a technical device with the generic purpose of carrying a concrete concept of the politics and society relationship, sustained by a concept of regulation. It may involve different types of partnerships, private and/or public. In this context, public policy instrumentation involves not only understanding the reasons that drive towards retaining one instrument rather than another, but also envisaging the effects produced by these choices" (adapted from Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007, pg. 4).

This definition will enable us to better link up to the analysis as presented in the coming sections on action guidelines and policy devices (that combined constitutes different policy instruments), to evaluate the effectiveness of gender integration in public farm advisory interventions.

### 3. Methodological consequences

#### 3.1. Policy tools

Based on the literature review and the context analysis, it was possible to develop an in depth research template of four policy instruments, illustrated in table 2 as a combination of one action guideline and a policy device.

**Table 2:** Presentation of policy instruments

	<b>Action guideline</b>	<b>Policy device</b>	<b>Example of an instrument</b>
<b>Policy instrument 1</b>	Gender mainstreaming	Direct public farm advisory services	Direct public farm advisory services, targeting women getting access to a particular type of knowledge
<b>Policy instrument 2</b>	Affirmative action	Direct public farm advisory services	PanAAC Platform, Sorghum value-chain programme; specific trainings for women and youth groups using sorghum for different types of food preparation, i.e. cake and bread making.
<b>Policy instrument 3</b>	Gender mainstreaming	Knowledge-based Platform	Pan African Agribusiness and Agroindustry Consortium (PanACC) Platform <sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> **PanAACs** mandate is to mobilize the private sector through assisting the development of agribusinesses in Africa. (PanAAC, 08.07.2014). It is presently covering 14 African countries, with the aim of covering 28 countries by end 2015. The Consortium collaborates with the African Union (AU) and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) to found the platform for agribusiness partnerships in Africa and globally. PanAAC is as of present the sole continental private sector driven platform, working with agribusiness, agro-industry value-chains and support services. The network provides a forum for different private and public sector actors, providing them with a space/forum for interaction between small-scale farmers in order to manage a sustainable flow of goods



<b>Policy instrument 4</b>	Affirmative action	Knowledge-based Platform	Agri-ProFocus (APF), having a specific gender theme; Gender in Value Chains. Created in 2008, it is focusing on integrating women and gender equality into different value chains. In addition to this, the network has recently published a Gender toolkit manual (2013) on Gender in Value Chains <sup>3</sup> .
----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------	--

Sources: PanAAC, 08.07.2014; Agri-ProFocus, 08.07.2014

### 3.2. Testing the relevance of the choices

An analysis of existing scientific literature was used as primary data for this research. Some of the major references are; Agholor et al., 2012; Ani et al., 2004; Moumouni et al., 2013; Nneoyi et al., 2008; Page et al., 2008; Okuande, 2007; Odurukwe et al., 2006; Sabo, 2005; Manjula, 2005; Lawal and Jibowo, 2004; Adolph, 2010; Dauphin 2010 and Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007.

In order to develop the template analysis (*cf. table 5*), in addition to the literature review, some primary data was collected from seven persons working on an institutional level and ten small-scale female farmers from Machakos District in Kenya. Both questionnaires (institutional and household level) where open interviews, each interview taking approximately three hours per individual.

On an institutional level, the interviewees were asked different questions related to historical changes in agricultural extension services and the agricultural landscape in Kenya, who are the defined target groups followed by the role of women in agriculture and vice versa.

On a household level, the women where randomly selected using the Line Transect Method. The women were asked to describe their daily lives, their roles in decision-making (according to them) in the household and at the farm, their [lack of] access to information, knowledge, institutions and resources.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Results from contextual analysis in Kenya

In order to validate the theoretical approach for this discussion, (*cf. table 4 and 5*), a case from Kenya is illustrated. Based on the local contextual analysis (as presented in the methodology), various dimensions should be considered to properly address women's priorities, expectations and needs and hence assess the implicit gender dimension in policy instruments.

All persons that were interviewed for the primary testing on an institutional level mentioned that the agricultural landscape has been for a long time composed of small-scale subsistence farmers. Further, according to the first set of institutional interviews, most of the interviewees high-lighted that since the

---

and services. (PanAAC, 08.07.2014). The Consortium provides guidance in agronomics by linking farmers to research institutions and government extension officers. Moreover, it connects farmers to different markets, given that they meet the quality and quantity required by the market(s).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.agri-profocus.nl/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Final-toolkitEN-24092013.pdf>

extension services in Kenya got privatized in the beginning of the 1990s, most small-scale farmers got negatively affected by this and they were not ready for this change.

Accordingly, the target group is generally the smallholder farmer, not being gender specific. However, certain interviewees point out the farmer is still considered as the male and not the female. Moreover, it is also admitted that generally it is men that are getting better access to services, groups and institutions. On the contrary, all interviewees mention that it is effectively the woman that is considered as the major agricultural work force. This may however not always be the case as it may differ from household to household (depending on family dynamics), culture, ethnicity and norms as supported by other authors, such as Kardam (2004) and Verma (2001). There is, nevertheless, still an evident gap in information and knowledge sharing. To sum up, from the institutional interviews, there is a general agreement that women are the major farm work force but that they are still excluded from decision-making and participation, lack of access to various rights and resources and neglected access to the appropriate information and knowledge.

The results from the interviews with the rural women in Machakos District (Kenya) confirm that their priorities and expectations are (1) access to adequate and relevant information and knowledge; (2) an improved quality of living; (3) good governance and access to institutions; (4) family and security; (5) time use (also non-economic) and; (6) access to education (for themselves and their children). One major barrier in regards to the aforementioned priorities and hence access to certain resources, was the contradiction between the social status of these women concerning their legal rights and the customs and traditions in the society.

Accordingly, the main decision-makers are the men, in exception from the widows. Four out of the ten interviewed females were widows. On the other hand, when it comes to access to knowledge and information, all women seem to have quite limited access to knowledge, even though they are considered as the major work force at the farm. In addition, according to all women interviewed, access to trainings (more importantly physical trainings), attending trainings as well as access to other sources of information<sup>4</sup> appears as a high priority to them.

Some of the major barriers experienced by the women are lack of access to resources (e.g. land ownership) and various types of institutions. Accordingly, a large issue for all of the interviewed women was access to and control over financial resources, cash crops as well as livestock at the farm. On the question of land for example, none of the interviewed female farmers own land or have any title deeds in their name in exception of one woman that owns one out of the four farm plots.

All but two female farmers (out of ten) stated that they would like to own land if they could but there seems to be a number of obstacles hindering them to get access to land namely; (1) access to credit and income (2) their social status as women; (3) the institutional dynamics and; (4) the low access to knowledge. Another priority that became evident throughout the interviews with the female farmers was what they did with borrowed money. Six out of the ten women had borrowed in cash during 2013 and the money in most cases went to school fees for the children and to purchase land.

Moreover, what comes out as interesting from the local contextual analysis is that the interviewed women are perceived as the major work force at the farm but only in rare cases the major decision-

---

<sup>4</sup> Sources of information: most common source of information is radio, TV and neighbours

makers and rarely has access to resources (and capital). This coincides with the results from Guidotty (2014), who is illustrating the debate from different authors on how effectively a certain type of policy device reaches out to women in agriculture. Further, the result can be linked to a hypothesis developed by different authors on the impact of the devaluation of the shilling in Kenya upon women since the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). (Verma, 2001; Ongile, 1999; Elson, 1995). The hypothesis suggests that such type of economic measures (or instruments) used in the agricultural sector, being a feminised sector, makes it socially more acceptable to pay a minimum wage or sometimes non at all. This, since the salary of the woman may be considered as the secondary wage, not majorly contributing to the household wealth. Another argument is, especially in the case of small-scale agriculture, the “over-exploitation” of family labour, in the case mainly the women, is not considered as paid labour but as family labour. In this case, family work force, more particularly the women, acts as a ‘protective’ buffer especially in periods of economic and food insecurity.

Another interesting finding that came out of the institutional interviews is the discrepancy between the perceived outreach of the organisations in capacity building as compared to that of the interviewed rural women. Generally, from the point of view of the concerned institutions, they are reaching out to the farmers’ that are in need of their services. This was nevertheless not the opinion of one of the interviewees, which remained quite critical to the accessibility and the quality extension services as of present (especially public extension). The results on a household level shows that very few of the female famers have been in direct contact with extension officers.

These initial interviews, both on an institutional and household level, confirm the need to better link up the analysis on the principles of gender integration to the actual devices that are set up to support farm extension and knowledge exchange. The results show that there are possible obstacles (depending on the policy instruments) hindering these women to get access to appropriate knowledge and information, according to their priorities and needs.

Table 3 illustrates the different obstacles, hindering rural women to get appropriate access to knowledge and information according to their priorities and needs. The table is based on the results from the institutional and household interviews as well as on the literature review. The obstacles are considered in regards to the fundamental rights of the Individual from the Constitution of Kenya, also providing a guideline on how Kenyan citizens (women and men) should be integrated into policies and policy instruments, i.e. “Whereas every person in Kenya is entitled to the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, that is to say, the right, whatever his race, tribe, place of origin or residence or other local connexion, political opinions, colour, creed or sex, but subject to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest, to each et all of the following, namely (a) life, liberty, security of the person and the protection of the law; (b) freedom of conscience, of expression and of assembly and association; and (c) protection for the privacy of his home and other property” (CoK, 2008 [2001], pp. 71)

**Table 3:** Results of the local context analysis in Kenya on different obstacles

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What came out from both the institutional (especially) and household interviews is that effectively, rural women do not get the same access to knowledge and information as rural men. [Institutional and material access]</li> <li>• The fact that farm advisory services are essentially demand based since the SAPs is hindering women to get appropriate access to knowledge and information. This can be due to various reasons, such as their social status as women and, their lack of access to institutions (both governance, e.g. mainly men are part</li> </ul>
---

of councils that design extension programs and; access to the service provided by the institution, e.g. difficulties to spare time for extension activities) and resources (e.g. lack of money to travel to extension events). [Governance, access].

- Rural women's social status is hindering them from getting the appropriate access to (1) knowledge and information, e.g. their perceived role as women in agriculture development and in the household; (2) relevant institutions, e.g. financial and legal institutions; (3) local organisations such as coffee cooperatives, i.e. to be a member of a coffee cooperative and hence benefit from their suggested trainings, you have to own a plot of coffee. [Access, governance, technical content, concerns about the future]
- These rural women's priorities and needs has not been taken into account prior to, during and after service delivery, i.e. out of the interviewed women, none said that a field officer has asked them what type of subject they would like to be trained in and the follow-up (e.g. levels of adoption). This shows that there are no parameters in action guidelines or policy devices assessing the barriers of marginalized groups prior to delivery or diffusion of the service. [Governance, technical content, assessment criteria]
- The issue of professional versus domestic labour related to rural women's labour contribution in agriculture. Women's labour is not recognised as professional labour but rather as domestic labour, i.e. the woman is not recognised as an employee at the farm but rather as part of the family work force. It implies that her status as worker/employee, being able to benefit from certain legal rights, are not recognised. This is a result coming out from both the institutional and household interviews. [Governance, institutional access; material and immaterial access]
- Most of the women mentioned that they adopt the technologies they receive information about, but that generally, the information is not enough, more particularly the group or individual trainings. They said that some of the reasons for this lack of information is that (a) the husband receives the training but then does not share the information with his spouse; (b) do not have the access to the institution and; (c) certain topics, even though she is the main agricultural worker at the farm, is not considered as a "woman's crop" as is hence excluded. [Status, access, technical content, governance]
- Some of the women also mentioned that it is rare that someone asks for their advice on agricultural or livestock issues; it is most often the husband who is addressed. It implies that a number of rural women probably have a certain amount of knowledge stored (implicit and explicit), which is rarely shared (and put into practice) in larger forums. The interviewed women mentioned that everything they learn (and think is worth sharing) they share with their family and neighbours. They could not say however if the shared knowledge were applied amongst neighbours but the children would reproduce the knowledge. [Technical content, governance]
- The interviewed women mentioned that they could not, even if trained on a certain topic, apply the technology due to for instance lack of consent from husband, lack of finances, lack of agricultural land and/or time. [Access to economic factors]

**Sources:** Institutional and household surveys

The results from table 3 can be linked to the issue of governance, institutional access, technical content, assessment criteria's, material and immaterial access and the future-ability of action guidelines and policy devices (*cf. table 4*). In a number of cases, there is a lack of precise parameters on for instance (a) the effective delivery of direct services to targeted groups depending on priorities and expectations (Nneyi et al., 2008; Page et al., 2008; Sabo, 2005; Dauphin, 2010; Dauphin and Sénac-Slawinski, 2008; Stratigaki, 2005); (b) how to get appropriate access to institutions (Dauphin, 2010); (c) how to stimulate inclusive innovation (Swaans et al., 2014); (d) how to ensure equal access to knowledge and information for various social groups (Dauphin, 2010; Dauphin and Sénac-Slawinski, 2008); (e) how the implicit functionality of a device should be assessed, i.e. how tacit knowledge can be transformed and transmitted to explicit knowledge (Purvis et al., 2001) and; (f) the adequate content and timing according to the priorities and expectations of the target group (Nneyi et al., 2008; Page et al., 2008; Okuande, 2007; Sabo, 2005).

## 4.2. Results from the literature review

Table 4 is a consequential assessment based on the studied and analysed results from table 3. It is equally based on the related results from the literature review. The table illustrates the criteria that should be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of selected policy instruments in providing the adequate knowledge and information to rural women.

**Table 4:** Effectiveness criteria's for policy instrument analysis

Criteria	Clarification
<b>(1) Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Conditions for designing the technical content and target group(s)</li> <li>b. Constitution of women; i.e. are they part of the programme/project, if yes, in what way(s)?</li> <li>c. Various types of knowledge sources have been taken into account in the project/programme taking, i.e. explicit, implicit, local, etc.</li> <li>d. Criteria's assessing the quality of the delivered knowledge and equal/unequal access to knowledge</li> <li>e. If access to information and knowledge is supply and/or demand based, i.e. does the concerned person need to demand to access to the knowledge source or not.</li> <li>f. Defined role (and financial means/contributions) of various partners, i.e. private, public, non-governmental, intergovernmental, research institutions, etc.</li> <li>g. Implicit functionality assessment of policy device</li> </ul>
<b>(2) Institutional access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Evaluation of access/non-access to institutions</li> <li>b. Evaluation of access/non-access to social and cultural factors</li> <li>c. Evaluation of access/non-access to economic factors</li> <li>d. Evaluation of access/non-access to political and legal factors</li> <li>e. Evaluation of access/non-access to environmental factors</li> </ul>
<b>(3) Technical content</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Stimulation of inclusive innovation</li> <li>b. Comprehend adequate and relevant content, i.e. addressing the targeted group(s) expectations, priorities and needs</li> <li>c. Timing of service delivery, i.e. target group may not show up at a training because it is scheduled at the wrong time of the day</li> </ul>
<b>(4) Assessment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The priorities, expectations and needs of target group(s) should be assessed; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i.</i> Prior to;</li> <li><i>ii.</i> During and;</li> <li><i>iii.</i> After service delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Planning, monitoring and evaluation / follow-up of the effectiveness of service delivery</li> <li>c. Criteria to measure effectiveness is agricultural output</li> </ul>
<b>(5) Material access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Assessment on the issue of social status of target group(s), in this case rural women</li> <li>b. Assessment of barriers hindering target group(s) to get access to (a) resource(s), in turn blocking them from putting accessed knowledge into practice</li> <li>c. Assessment of (non) access to various and relevant types of material means</li> </ul>
<b>(6) Immaterial access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Assessment of diversity of knowledge, skills and interest of target group(s)</li> <li>b. Knowledge inventory of stakeholders and more importantly, the target group(s)</li> <li>c. Assessment of (non) access to various and relevant types of immaterial means</li> </ul>

<b>(7) Future-ability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Timeline of the intervention (i.e. is it a short- or a long-term intervention?)</li> <li>b. Evaluation of the impact of time on target groups</li> <li>c. Foreseen risks and opportunities and how they are handled</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

**Sources:** adapted from Agholor et al., 2012; Ani et al., 2004; Moumouni et al., 2013; Nneyi et al., 2008; Page et al., 2008; Okuande, 2007; Odurukwe et al., 2006; Sabo, 2005; Manjula, 2005; Lawal and Jibowo, 2004; Swaans et al., 2014; Kilelu et al., 2013; Adolph, 2010; Dauphin 2010; Dauphin and S n c-Slawinski, 2008; IFPRI, 09.07.2014, Stratigaki, 2005.

Table 5 is a policy instrument analysis, combining a policy device with an action guideline, where the inherent properties of respective device are combined with the inherent properties of the action guideline. Moreover, table 5 is based on the criteria analysis developed in table 4. Accordingly, the table illustrates different criteria's required for e.g. direct public farm advisory services, when using gender mainstreaming as action guideline, which needs to be taken into account in regards to gender equality. In this context (as presented in the state of the art), two policy devices are assessed, combined with two gender action guidelines, which are constituting a set of four policy instruments. These are supposed to deliver Knowledge Intensive Based Services (KIBS) to rural women. We obtain the following four instruments (*also cf. table 2*); (1) Direct public farm advisory services via gender mainstreaming; (2) Public-Private Platforms via gender mainstreaming; (3) Direct public farm advisory services via affirmative action and; (4) Public-Private Platforms via affirmative action.

**Table 5:** Template analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of selected policy instruments for women to dispose of the adequate knowledge to implement and sustain their agricultural projects.

	<b><u>Gender mainstreaming</u></b>	<b><u>Affirmative action</u></b>
	- Integration of a gender perspective into all areas et all levels of a certain intervention	- Specific and short-term interferences to integrate women into a specific intervention
<b><u>KIBS 1: Direct public farm advisory services</u></b> - All types of farms - Promotion of the co-construction of knowledge through interaction between farmers and advisors	<b><u>Policy instrument 1: Public farm extension services, targeting in particular women in accessing knowledge on small livestock management</u></b>  (1) Governance (2) Institutional access (3) Technical content (4) Assessment criteria (5) Material access (6) Immaterial access (7) Future-ability	<b><u>Policy instrument 2: PanAAC Platform, Sorghum value-chain programme</u></b>  (1) Governance (2) Institutional access (3) Technical content (4) Assessment criteria (5) Material access (6) Immaterial access (7) Future-ability
<b><u>KIBS 2: Public-private knowledge-based platform</u></b> - All types of farms Promotion of the access to available knowledge to all farmers	<b><u>Policy instrument 3: PanAAC Platform</u></b>  (1) Governance (2) Institutional access (3) Technical content (4) Assessment criteria (5) Material access (6) Immaterial access (7) Future-ability	<b><u>Policy instrument 4: APF Platform; Gender in Value Chains intervention (women in particular)</u></b>  (1) Governance (2) Institutional access (3) Technical content (4) Assessment criteria (5) Material access (6) Immaterial access (7) Future-ability

For presentation and reading purposes, table 6 is an exemplified extract from table 5. It shows an example of what should be assessed under criteria (5) in regards to respective policy instrument, i.e. (Ex. 1) Public farm extension services, targeting in particular women in accessing knowledge on small livestock management; (Ex. 2) The PanAAC Platform, Sorghum value-chain programme; (Ex. 3) The

PanAAC Platform and; (Ex. 4) The APF Platform; Gender in Value Chains intervention (women in particular).

**Table 6:** Example of criteria (5) Material access

	<b><u>Gender mainstreaming</u></b>	<b><u>Affirmative action</u></b>
<b><u>KIBS 1: Direct public farm advisory services</u></b>	<p><b><u>Example 1: Public farm extension services, targeting in particular women in accessing knowledge on small livestock management</u></b></p> <p><u>(5) Material access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An evaluation of how the delivery of the service has improved or worsened women’s accessibility to the knowledge on small livestock management (also if relevant or not) and; in turn improved or worsened their social status situation</li> <li>• An ex-ante evaluation of the possible barriers hindering the women to get access to resources, e.g. land ownership, agricultural inputs, a certain type of livestock, financial means, thus hindering them from putting the knowledge into practice, e.g. purchasing the animals and/or required feeds.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Example 2: PanAAC Platform, Sorghum value-chain programme</u></b></p> <p><u>(5) Material access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An evaluation of how the sorghum value-chain trainings has improved or worsened the trained women’s accessibility to the development of sorghum products and in turn; if this has improved or worsened their social status situation, e.g. become more respected by their husbands, capable of taking own decisions without consent, etc.</li> <li>• An ex-ante evaluation of the possible barriers hindering the trained women to get access to the resources necessary to put into practice the knowledge acquired on sorghum value chain addition, e.g. financial means for a milling machine, material necessary to sell sorghum bread and cakes, financial literacy, etc.</li> </ul>
<b><u>KIBS 2: Public-private knowledge-based platform</u></b>	<p><b><u>Example 3: PanAAC Platform</u></b></p> <p><u>(5) Material access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An evaluation of how the target group(s) will get access to the knowledge stored in the platform – what information sharing types/techniques have been put in place for e.g. rural women, to get access to the platform knowledge?</li> <li>• Related to aforementioned bullet point, an ex-ante evaluation of the possible barriers hindering the women to get access the knowledge stored in the platform. Can rural women only get access to the knowledge source via a computer connected to Internet? This implies she needs to have IT-skills, literacy skills, access to a source of information telling her that the source exist, either a computer at home (with</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Example 4: APF Platform; Gender in Value Chains intervention (women in particular)</u></b></p> <p><u>(5) Material access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An evaluation of; (i) how the women in different value chains will get access to the targeted knowledge stored in the APF platform and; (ii) what type of learning methods and techniques have been put in place to supply the women with adequate and relevant knowledge</li> <li>• Ex-ante evaluation of the possible barriers hindering the women to get access the knowledge purposely developed and stored for these women in the APF platform. This could also imply social status barriers, i.e. a certain type of crop (and value chain) promoted for women might be considered as “men’s crops” in a community. In this case, the intervention might fail and might even</li> </ul>

	Internet at home), implying a source of power or otherwise transportation means and finances (to pay to get access to the knowledge source).	cause tensions between families within a community. Another aspect to consider is the means to get access to the developed and stored knowledge within the platform (similar to what is stated in example 2).
--	--	---

As shown from the literature review and the local context analysis in Kenya, if used singularly, none of the presented policy devices or the action guidelines takes into women’s priorities, needs and expectations (neither implicitly or explicitly). Certain parameters are to some extent part of the inherent (and explicit) properties of affirmative action, for instance on issues of social status and access to resources (in order to get access to a certain type of knowledge and/or information). In addition, they do not, exclusively, neither implicitly or explicitly, high-light the issue of relevance of delivery for the target group, nor the content of the services, i.e. what type of agriculture the target groups want to develop, the adequacy of content followed by the means to get access to any type of resource. However, combined, functioning as a policy instrument, makes it possible to assess the mechanisms that are considered important to secure the effectiveness of gender integration in public farm advisory intervention. It implies that there is a need for new analytical criteria’s as observed in table 3, 5 and 6.

## 5. Discussion and concluding remarks

Hence, based on this type of ex-ante analysis (in spite of the restrictions of such approach), we can conclude that it gives the possibility to compare the different limits and advantages of a certain policy instrument (regarding the effectiveness for women to dispose of the adequate knowledge to implement and sustain their agricultural projects). In addition, we expect to determine whether or not these emerging policy devices and action guidelines, e.g. knowledge-based platforms, compared to less recent ones, comprehend properties potentially increasing the discriminating factors against women and widening the gender equality gap.

Conclusively, based on the results and discussion, there is a larger socio-political concern behind the choice of policy instruments as they does not seem to be directly linked to the needs and priorities of the target group. It is also possible to foresee an eventual discrepancy between the priorities, expectations and needs of rural women and the implicit gender dimension in policy instruments.



## References

- Adolph, B., 2010. Rural Advisory Services Worldwide: A Synthesis of Actors and Issues, GFRAS Synthesis Report, GFRAS (Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services), 2010.
- Agholor I.A., Monde, N., Obi, A., Sunday, O.A., 2013. Quality of Extension Services: A Case Study of Farmers in Amathole, *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2013:5(2), pp. 204-212.
- Agri-ProFocus, 08.07.2014. <http://www.agri-profocuse.nl/> and <http://apf-down2earth.ning.com/page/coordination>
- Alila, P.O., Atieno, R., 2006. Agricultural Policy in Kenya: Issues and Processes A paper for the Future Agricultures Consortium workshop, Institute of Development Studies, 20-22 March 2006, Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi, Final version July 2006.
- Ani, A.O., Ogunnika, O., Ifah, S.S., 2004. Relationship Between Socio-Economic Characteristics of Rural Women Farmers and Their Adoption of Farm Technologies in Southern Ebonyi State, Nigeria, *International Journal of Agriculture & Biology*, 2004:6(5), pp. 802-805.
- Barker, D., Feiner, S.F., 2007 [2004]. *Liberating Economics: Feminist Perspectives on Families, Work, and Globalization (Advances in Heterodox Economics)*, University of Michigan Press, ISBN-13: 978-0472068432.
- Bergeron, S., 2003. The Post-Washington Consensus and Economic Representations of Women in Development at the World Bank, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 2003:5(3), pp. 397-419.
- Berlekom, M., Engstrom, L., Eriksson, M.L., Gallardo, G., Gerhardt, K., Knutsson, P., Malmer, P., Stephansson, E., Von Walter, S., 2009. Natural resource Tenure – a crucial aspect of poverty reduction and human rights, *Sida studies* 23, 2009. ISBN: 978-91-586-8143-9.
- Braun, A.R., Thiele, G., Fernández, M., FARMER FIELD SCHOOLS AND LOCAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH COMMITTEES: COMPLEMENTARY PLATFORMS FOR INTEGRATED DECISION-MAKING IN SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE, *Agricultural Research & Extension Network*, 2000:105, pp. 1-20.
- CoK, 2008 [2001]. The Constitution of Kenya (CoK), Laws of Kenya, Revised edition 2008 (2001), Published by the National Council for Law Reporting with the Authority of the Attorney General, 2008.
- Council of Europe, 1998. Gender mainstreaming. Conceptual framework, methodology and presentation of good practices. Final report of Activities of the Group of Specialists on Mainstreaming, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Dauphin, S., 2010. Action public et rapports de genre, *Revue de l'OFCE*, 2010:114, pp. 265-290.
- Dauphin, S., Sénac-Slawinski, R., 2008. Gender mainstreaming: analyse des enjeux d'un 'concept-méthode', *Cahiers du Genre*, 2008:1(44), pp. 5-61.
- Davis, K.E., 2008. Extension in Sub-Saharan Africa: Overview and Assessment of Past and Current Models, and Future Prospects, *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension*, 2008:15(3), pp. 15-28.

- Debusscher, P., 2011. Mainstreaming gender in European Commission development policy: Conservative Europeanness?, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 2011:34, pp. 39–49
- Eicher, C.K., 2003. FLASHBACK: FIFTY YEARS OF DONOR AID TO AFRICAN AGRICULTURE, Revised version of a paper presented at an International Policy Conference “Successes in African Agriculture: Building for the Future”, sponsored by InWent, IFPRI, NEPAD and CTA, Pretoria, South Africa, December 1-3, 2003.
- Elson, D., 1995. Gender Awareness in Modelling Structural Adjustment, *World Development*, 1995:23(11), pp. 1851–1868.
- Elson, D., Cagatay, N., 2000. The Social Content of Macroeconomic Policies, *World Development*, 2000:28(7), pp. 1347-1364.
- Eurofund, 2014. Positive Action, Eurofund, 2014.  
<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/positiveaction.htm>
- Faure, G., Compagnone, C., 2011. Les transformations du conseil face à une nouvelle agriculture. *Cah Agric* 20 : 321-6. doi : 10.1684/agr.2011.0523
- Faure, G., Desjeux, Y., Gasselien, P., 2010. SYNTHÈSE BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE DES RECHERCHES SUR LE CONSEIL EN AGRICULTURE A TRAVERS LE MONDE, COLLOQUE SFER, Conseil en agriculture : acteurs, marchés et mutations, 14 et 15 octobre 2010 à AgroSup Dijon
- Fraisse, G., et al., 2008. Le gender mainstreaming, vrai en théorie, faux en pratique?, *Cahiers du Genre*, 2008:1(44), pp. 17-26.
- FSD, 2013. Gender Equity Issues in Kenya, Foundation for Sustainable Development (FSD), 24.08.2013. <http://www.fsdinternational.org/country/kenya/weissues>.
- Giraud, O., Lucas, B., 2009. Le renouveau des régimes de genre en Allemagne et en Suisse: bonjour 'Néo matérnalisme'?, *Cahiers du Genre*, 2009:1(46), pp. 17-46.
- GoK, 2011. Agricultural Sector Development Support Programme, Programme Document, Government of Kenya, September 2011.
- Guidotty, E., 2014. Travail de Recherche Bibliographique, Quelle efficacité des méthodes de conseil pour atteindre les femmes travaillant dans le monde agricole? Sujet proposé et suivi par Monica Caggiano de l'UMR SAD APT de l'INRA Paris, AgroParisTech, 27.04.2014.
- Halman, J.I.M., Hofer, A.P., van Vuuren, W., Platform-Driven Development of Product Families: Linking Theory with Practice, *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 2003: 20, pp. 149-162.
- Hertog, P. D., 2000. Knowledge-Intensive Business Services as co-producers of innovation, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 2000:4(4), pp. 491-528.
- Hugon, P., 2013 [1993]. *L'économie de l'Afrique, Septième Édition, Collections Repères*, Éditions La Découverte, Paris, 2013 [1993]. ISBN: 978-2-7071-7638-7.
- Labarthe, P., Laurent, C., 2013. Privatization of agricultural extension services in the EU: Towards a lack of adequate knowledge for small-scale farms?, *Food Policy*, 2013:38, pp. 240-252.

- IFPRI, 09.07.2014. Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services Worldwide, facilitated by IFPRI, Extension and Advisory Services in Kenya, 09.07.2014. <http://www.worldwide-extension.org/africa/kenya/s-kenya>
- Jenson, J., 2010. Diffusing Ideas for After Neoliberalism: The Social Investment Perspective in Europe and Latin America, *Global Social Policy*, 2010:10(59), pp. 59-84.
- Jenson, J., Saint-Martin, D., 2006. Building blocks for a new social architecture: the LEGO™ paradigm of an active society, *Policy and Politics*, 2006:34(3), pp. 429-451.
- Kardam, N., 2004. The Emerging Global Gender Equality Regime from Neoliberal and Constructivist Perspectives in International Relations, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 2004:6(1), pp. 85-109.
- Kilelu, C.W., Klerkx, L., Leeuwis, C., Unravelling the role of innovation platforms in supporting co-evolution of innovation: Contributions and tensions in a smallholder dairy development programme, *Agricultural Systems*, 2013:118, pp. 65-77.
- Kiptot E. and Franzel S. 2011. Gender and agroforestry in Africa: are women participating? ICRAF Occasional Paper No. 13. Nairobi: World Agroforestry Centre. ISBN: 978-92-9059-293-1.
- Kolodko, G.W., 1999. Transition to a market economy and sustained growth. Implications for the post-Washington consensus, *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 1999:32, pp. 233-261.
- Lascombes, P., Le Gales, P., 2007. Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments – From the nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation, *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 2007:20(1), pp. 1-21.
- Lascombes, P., 2007. Les instruments d'action publique, traceurs de changement: l'exemple des transformations de la politique française de lutte contre la pollution atmosphérique (1961-2006), *Politique et Sociétés*, 2007:26(2-3), pp. 73-89.
- Lawal, B.O., Jibowo, A.A., 2004. Utilization of Improved Practices for Household Food Security and Nutrition by Rural Women in Oyo State of Nigeria, *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information*, 2004:6(4), pp. 63-76.
- Meda, D., 2001. *Le temps des femmes*, Flammarion, Paris, 2001. ISBN: 978-2-0812-1298-5.
- Majula. N., Siddaramaiah, B.S., Manjunath, L., Hosamani, V., 2006. Factors Contributing For the Knowledge Level of Trained and Untrained Farm Women – An Application of Principal Component Analysis, *Journal Agricultural Sciences*, 2006:19(3), pp. 596-599.
- Manfre, C., Rubin, D., Allen, A., Summerfield, G., Colversion, K., Akeredolu, M., 2013. Reducing the Gender Gap in Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services, How to find the best fit for men and women farmers, MEAS Discussion paper 2, April 2013, No. AID-OAA-L-10-00003.
- Moumouni, I. M., Mohamed N.B., Tovignan, S., Gbèdo F., Nouatin, G.S., Vodouhê, S.D., Liebe, U., 2013. What happens between technico-institutional support and adoption of organic farming? A case study from Benin, *Organic Agriculture* 2013:3, pp. 1-8.
- Muffatto, M., Roveda, M., 2000. Developing product platforms: analysis of the development process, *Technovation*, 2000:20, pp. 617-630.

- Muffatto, M., Roveda, M., 2002, Product architecture and platforms: a conceptual framework, *International Journal Technology Management*, 2002:24(1), pp. 1-16.
- Muller, E., Zenker, A., 2001. Business services as actors of knowledge transformation and diffusion: some empirical findings on the role of KIBS in regional and national innovation systems, Working Papers Firms and Region, No. R2/2001, Fraunhofer, Institute Systems and Innovation Research, ISSN 1438-9843.
- Nneoyi, O.I., Henry, M.N., Walter, A.M., Ebingha, E.E., 2008. Group Dynamics and Technology Use among Female Cassava Farmers in Akpabuyo Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria, *Agricultural Journal*, 2008:3(4), pp. 292-298.
- Odurukwe, S.N., Matthews-Njoku, E.C., Ejiogu-Okereke, N., 2006. Impacts of women-in-agriculture extension programme on women's lives; implication for subsistence agricultural production of women in Imo State, Nigeria, Department of Agricultural Extension, Federal University of Technology, Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.
- Okunade, E.O., 2007. Effectiveness of Extension Training Teaching Methods in Acquiring Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes by Women Farmers in Osun State, *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 2007:3(4), pp. 282-286.
- Ongile, G., A., 1999. GENDER AND AGRICULTURAL SUPPLY RESPONSES TO STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMMES, A Case Study of Smallholder Tea Producers in Kericho, Kenya, Research Report No. 109, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsala 1999, ISSN 1104-8425, ISBN 91-7106-440-0.
- Page, S.L.J., Rashid, H.A., Zakaria, A.K.M., Dodsworth, E., 2008. The Good Seed Initiative: Improving Food Security for the Poorest Households in Bangladesh Through the Use of 'Women-to-Women' Videos, *Agricultural Information Worldwide*, 2008:1(3), pp. 102-104.
- PanAAC, 08.07.2014. Pan African Agribusiness and Agroindustry Consortium, 08.07.2014. <http://www.panaac.org/>
- Purvis, R.L., Sambamurthy, V., Zmud, R.W., 2001. The Assimilation of Knowledge platforms in Organizations: An Empirical Investigation, *Organizational Science*, 2001:12(2), pp. 117-135.
- Sabo, E., 2006. Participatory assessment of the impact of Women in Agriculture Programme of Borno State, Nigeria, *Journal of Tropical Agriculture*, 2006:44(1-2), pp. 52-56.
- Schneider, A., Ingram, H., 1990. Behavioural Assumptions of Policy Tools, *The Journal of Politics*, 1990:52(2), pp. 510-529.
- Schneider, A., Ingram, H., 1993. Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy, *American Journal Political Science*, 1993:87(2), pp. 334-347.
- Stratigaki, M., 2005. Gender Mainstreaming vs Positive Action, An Ongoing Conflict in EU Gender Equality Policy, *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 2005:12(2), pp. 165-186.
- Swaans, K., Boogaard, B., Bendapudi, R., Taye, H., Hendrickx, S., Klerkx, L., 2014. Operationalizing inclusive innovation: lessons from innovation platforms in livestock value chains in India and Mozambique, *Innovation and Development*, 2014, pp. 1-19.

Szikra, D., Szelewa, D., 2009. Welfare et socialisme: de certains Concepts relatifs au Genre, *Cahiers du Genre*, 2009:1(46), pp. 77-100.

Rodik, D., 2006. Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? A Review of the World Bank's Economic Growth in the 1990s: Learning from a Decade of Reform, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2006:XLIV, pp. 973–987.

Stiglitz, J.E., 1998. Keynote Address: More Instruments and Broader Goals: Moving Toward the Post-Washington Consensus, *Villa Borsig Workshop Series*, 1998, pp. 11-39.

Tittonell, P., Scopela, E., Andrieua, N., Posthumush, H., Mapfumoi, P., Corbeelsa, M., van Halsemaf, G.E., Lahmara, R., Lugandub, S., Rakotoarisoaj, J., Mtambanengwei, F., Poundh, B., Chikowoi, R., Naudina, K., Triomphea, B., Mkomwab, S., 2012. Agroecology-based aggradation-conservation agriculture (ABACO): Targeting innovations to combat soil degradation and food insecurity in semi-arid Africa, *Field Crops Research*, 2012, pp. 1-7.

UN Women, 2002. GENDER MAINSTREAMING, AN OVERVIEW, United Nations, New York, 2002.

Verma, R., 2001. *Gender, Land, and Livelihoods in East Africa, Through Farmers' Eyes*, International Development Research Centre, 2001. ISBN: 978-0-8893-6929-0.

Walby, S., 2002. Feminism in a global area, *Economy and Society Volume*, 2002:31, pp. 553-557.

Williamson, J., 2005. The strange history of the Washington consensus, *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 2005:27(2), pp. 195-206.

WB, 2013. The World Bank Database, March and April, 2013, <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/>.

Windrum, P., Tomlinson, M., 1999. Knowledge-intensive Services and International Competitiveness: A Four Country Comparison, *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 1999:11(3), pp. 391-408.

Zack, H.M., 1999. Managing Codified Knowledge, *Sloan Management Review*, 1999:40(4), pp. 45-58.