Conditions for effective gender integration in policy instruments in agriculture.

Madeleine Jonsson

EAEPE Conference 2015 – Research area: [K] Gender Economics and Social Identity

Title: Conditions for effective gender integration in policy instruments in agriculture. A Kenyan Case Study.

Author: Madeleine Jönsson
PhD Student
AgroParisTech
INRA SAD – Institut National de Recherche Agronomique
Madeleine.jonsson@agroparistech.fr
Mobile: +33 608 89 60 87

---

1. Introduction and background

Prior to the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), the government delivered agricultural services, most often through direct farm advisory services (Hugon, 2013 [1993]; Rodrik, 2006; Williamson, 2005; Stiglitz, 1998; Kolodko, 1999). After the adjustments, the policy landscape underwent large structural changes, in particular in the context of agricultural extension services and how information and knowledge was transmitted. It led to the introduction of new implementing institutions, the development of new policy devices, e.g. knowledge-based platforms, and action guidelines, e.g. gender mainstreaming (Davis, 2008; Adolph, 2010; Faure et al., 2010). These changes occurred in a number of African countries, Kenya being one of them (Eicher 2004). They are in turn having an impact upon women, more particularly rural women. (Barker and Feiner, 2007; Manfre et al., 2013).

Agriculture is an important sector in the Kenyan economy, contributing 26 percent of the GDP annually (GoK, 2011; WB database 2014). 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 labor force in small-scale agriculture (Alila and Otieno, 2006). Nevertheless, women in rural areas are disadvantaged when it comes to access to resources, i.e. land, capital, knowledge and information (Adolph, 2010; Berlekom et al., 2009; FSD, 2013; UN Women, 2002). For instance, Kenyan women are less literate than men (WB Database, 2014). 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.

Hence, economic and institutional models and their explicit (i.e. known, transparent, intentional) and implicit (i.e. somewhat unknown, less intentional, yet to be revealed) components have altered with the introduction of a number of actors other than the government, and thus the intentions, mandate and objectives of respective government (Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007; Adolph, 2010). Indeed, there are changes in the delivery of agricultural services and how knowledge is transmitted. It has been revealed by different authors that female farmers have less access to agricultural extension services compared to male farmers, as a result of privatization of these services during the SAPs and the introduction of new extension methodologies, e.g. Training and Visit Systems (Verma, 2001; Davis, 2008). It is thus possible to observe a fragmentation of policy devices and action guidelines, i.e. policy instruments, disposing of different ways and capacities of procuring knowledge and information to rural women.

In this setting, a number of modifications are supposed to this situation, e.g. the reinforcement of action guidelines (Council of Europe, 2005; Dauphin, 2010) followed by the development of new or emerging

policy devices (via public private partnerships) to facilitate the access to knowledge to the public at large (Dhiab et al., 2014; Dougherty, 2004; Gallouj, 2002; Hertog, 2000). The hypothesis is that these alterations have led to new discrimination mechanisms for women.

It is thus required to question and review the conditions for effective gender integration in one policy instrument in agriculture, i.e. a knowledge based platform combined with gender mainstreaming. The discussion questions the content of the knowledge based platform as being the major obstacle for these women to access the policy device. This will be exemplified by a case study from Kenya.

2. State of the Art

2.1. Conditions for effective gender integration in farm advisory interventions

There are ways of analyzing the conditions for an effective gender integration in policy devices (to provide rural women with adequate knowledge and information). A literature review (Jönsson et al. 2014) of the effectives of gender integration in public farm advisory interventions identified two major sets of indicators of effectiveness (1) direct access to farm advisory services and; (2) impact of farm advisory services on women's practices and skills. The second type of indicators, contained four sub-categories, namely; (2a) adoption of practices; (2b) agricultural output linked to the awareness of improvement; (2c) the acquisition of new knowledge and; (2d) the transformation of the social status of women.

It is, however, difficult to draw any general conclusions on the effectiveness of gender integration in (public) farm advisory interventions since the results varies depending on geographical and demographical criteria's. Also, the papers that were identified in this review are focused on public extension services, where knowledge is exchanged between farmers and public advisors. The papers do not question the relative effectiveness of different policy principles that may guide such intervention.

As one may notice, newly emerged policy devices, e.g. knowledge-based platforms, and action guidelines, e.g. gender mainstreaming, combined, do not analyze the conditions for an effective gender integration. Thus the particular interest in emerging policy devices and action guidelines in the context of agricultural development, and how rural women gets access to knowledge and information, brings us to the following sections.

2.2. Traditional and emerging policy devices

There are various types of agricultural support systems, e.g. direct farm advisory services (providing technical support, management, etc., supporting agricultural producer groups, training, dissemination of information via media, etc.) (Faure and Compagnone, 2011; Labarthe and Laurent, 2013). These interventions are generally financed or co-financed by corresponding government but as of late this have changed, where new stakeholders and service providers have appeared (e.g. NGOs, private sector). These changes have also occurred in Kenya (Adolph, 2010; Labarthe and Laurent, 2013). Consequently, public private partnerships are emerging, mainly to compensate for the decreased supply of services previously delivered by different governments. Such devices are for instance knowledge-based platforms.

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), and were later 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, guaranteeing 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 types of resources, in particular access to agricultural resources and services.

Further, knowledge-based platforms are, as previously mentioned, virtual spaces. Hence, the user needs to have access to a computer and an Internet connection. This is equally supported by Walby (2011). However, it is also necessary to analyze other dimensions / different performance categories.

The above discussed policy device is one form of intensive knowledge based services (KIBS), i.e. services where the knowledge is seen as different inputs and outputs (Muller and Zenker, 2001; Den Hertog, 2000; Windrum and Tomlinson, 1999). This paper will emphasize on one knowledge based platform and its performance from a gender perspective.

KIBS performance analyses have been discussed and developed by different authors, namely Dhiab et al. (2014); Desmarchelier et al. (2012); Muller and Doloreux (2007); Gallouj (2002); Muller and Zenker (2001); Den Hertog (2000). In this regard, Dhiab et al. (2014) developed an innovations platform performance analysis, assessing how agricultural advisory service organizations generate the knowledge required by farmers to reduce the use of pesticides (cf. table 1).

Table 1: Analysis framework for advisory service performance

Dimensions	Indicators
Financial	*Profitability of the advisory service
Technical	*Productivity of the advisory service: -Ratio farmers/advisor -Surface areas under crops/advisor -Quantity of seed potatoes sold/advisor *Level of standardization -Is there a standardization of advisory services? *Rate of dysfunctions -Are there indicators of the advisory services' success?
Relational	*Personalization -Frequency of visits -Duration of visits *Client loyalty -Turnover of producers -Turnover of advisors *Nature of the contract
Innovation	*Share of the total budget devoted to the back office *Number of back-office staff *Back-office activities -Experiments -Databases -Scientific monitoring -Training
Civic	*Taking into account controversies over the use of pesticides -Health -Equity

Source: Dhiab et al., 2014, pp. 16.

Based on this analysis, Dhiab et al. (2014) could analyze the KIBS performance of different firms, more precisely the performance of delivered knowledge services to potato growing farmers in France. Thus, this type of framework gives the opportunity to assess various performance registers of a policy device, not only focusing on access to the device but also on the content. This framework is equally relevant to analyze the performance of knowledge-based platforms from a gender perspective, although with some changes and inputs to the framework, as the integration of women will be done differently.

Firstly, in order to make Dhiab et al's (2014) framework gender sensitive, and ensure the possibility of measuring proper gender integration into the innovations performance framework, we need to get an

understanding if and how emerging policy devices are gendered (Walby, 2011; Webb et al., 2006; Walby, 2004). According to Walby (2011), networks and how knowledge is delivered (and even defined) are gendered. The knowledge society (includes governance and educations, as well as an historic perspective) is more encompassing compared to the knowledge economy (structured and scientific knowledge, social institutions are given consideration if they are having key implications for the knowledge economy) where for instance institutions are given different roles. Walby (2011), takes the example of "gendered digital exclusion"; *"…gendered digital exclusion in society, in the differential gendered use of the computer and Internet, e-mail, information searching and online services, buying goods and services online and interaction with public authorities. Women can be information-poor because of their income levels, socioeconomic situations and traditional cultures. New forms of Internet provision may reproduce traditional gender imagery. The use of market mechanisms may exacerbate these gender divides. There are both increases and decreases in gender equality"* (Walby, 2011, pp. 11). This statement is important for this discussion since the author explicitly points out that emerging policy devices have implicit gender dimensions, also coinciding with the research made by Webb et al. (2006).

In second, for a complete innovations performance framework from a gender perspective, a review and understanding of the assessed gender policy principle for this discussion is required.

2.3. Analysis of a gender policy principle

In this discussion, one gender policy principle is examined; gender mainstreaming. The action guideline can be defined as **'**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).

Gender mainstreaming (GM) is a strategy (or approach) that has been analyzed by various authors. (Tolhurst et al., 2012; Dauphin, 2010; Debusscher, 2011; Lewis, 2006; Stratigaki, 2005; Giraud and Lucas, 2009; Jenson and Saint-Martin, 2006; Walby, 2002; Dauphin and Sénac-Slawinski, 2008; Szikra and Szelewa, 2009; Lewis, 2006; Council of Europe, 2004). In Lewis's (2006) view, gender mainstreaming gives large room for interpretation, seeing the strategy as the reinventing or 're-branding' of feminism, effectively neutralizing the power of feminist discourses by creating an 'acceptable' and depoliticized alternative to discussing female subordination. *"Mainstreaming as one element in the policy process stands in danger, first, of being 'ticked off' as having been 'considered'; second, of being used instrumentally to serve the dominant policy frame (i.e. the process of co-option)…; and third, of losing any possibility of becoming a policy priority, because it treats gender equality as a 'horizontal principle'…Hence, implicitly (issue of mainstreaming) it depends on what extent it relies on equal treatment, on positive action on behalf of women, and/or measures to promote change in the behavior and position of both men and women."* (Lewis, 2006, pp. 427)

According to Tolhurst et al. (2012), which is supported by authors such as Dauphin (2010) and Lewis (2006), gender mainstreaming dispose a lack of clear methodology for change, particularly in regard to the strategic issue of engagement with the state. Consequently, *"A common critique of GM is that it has diluted or even undermined a feminist agenda and has insufficiently engaged with power relations…GM has been described as "a concept in search of a methodology"* (Tolhurst et al., 2012, pp. 1828).

Moreover, in a number of articles, GM is used to promote and work with gender equality in the development sector (Stratigaki, 2005; Walby, 2002). 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; Lewis, 2006). As highlighted by different authors, such an instrument could have been developed to mask inequalities yet of present, 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; Lewis, 2006).

Moreover, findings from different authors suggest that as a result of structural changes, a number of services and actions got privatized (Hugon, 2013 [1993]; Eicher 2003; Verma, 2001), and GM as action guideline is currently applied across various sectors and institutions (Dauphin, 2010). Yet the strategy was developed for the public sector and it is questionable whether this principle is appropriate for any sector and/or any type of intervention.

As illustrated, neither gender policy principles (action guidelines) nor policy devices, have the ability to address the present gender inequalities. It therefore seems that this particular action guideline should to be analyzed in combination with a selected policy device (together constitutes as policy instrument). This brings us to a literature review on policy instruments.

2.4. Policy instruments and women's priorities and expectations

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, pp. 4).

The explicit and implicit properties followed by the meaning of a policy instrument has been analyzed by different authors such as Lascoumes and Le Gales (2007); Schneider and Ingram (1993); Schneider and Ingram (1990). Behind the rationality of organizations, there is a need to describe and analyze the influence of instruments and the explicit and implicit factors (Lascoumes and Le Gales, 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 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), also with regards to the inherent gender dimension. In the case of agricultural extension, the economic and institutional model, technical and social dimension of a given instrument and target group will differ depending on the dynamics between actors (Bourdieu, 2005; Boudieu 1989; Bourdieu 1980; Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007).

Hence, the clarification of a policy instrument and more importantly the choice behind an instrument brings us to the connection between policy instruments and the expectations and priorities of women, as it appears that there is a gap between women's priorities and expectations and the implicit gender dimension in policy instruments.

Existing literature is showing that the expectations of women are multidimensional. (UNDP, 2013; UNDP, 2004; GGGR, 2013; AGDI, 2011; Ura et al., 2012). It has been repeated and synthesized in various gender indexes, e.g. The Gender Inequality Index (GII); The Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) and; The African Gender Development Index 2011 (AGDI). The major limitation, however, of the different gender indexes is that they do not always comprehend non-economic (and non-substitutable) indicators, such as informal work, unpaid and reproductive work, time-use (also non-economic), access to information and knowledge. These are critical in understanding women's participation in the economy since a large amount of their work falls outside the formal sector. Hence, the Gross National Happiness (GNH) Index from Bhutan is presented as an index seemingly more appropriate in the context of the research as it is a multidimensional and non-substitutable index (Ura et al., 2012). Also, the GNH Index combines economic as well as non-economic indicators, i.e. considered equally to achieve happiness. (Ura et al., 2012). Moreover, the index is of interest

since it is based on historic-institutional economics (Laurent, 2012; Lee, 2008; Rutherford, 2001; Hodgson, 1998). Rather than opposing two answers or using the principle of substitution, e.g. economic indicators such as revenue can act as a substitute to non-economic indicators; historic-institutional economists would rather assess and weigh different economic and non-economic indicators based on the principle of complementarity, history, institutions and structural forms. It is also based on a set on individual behaviors, partly determined by their integration in historically constructed institutions and where individual choices are made consciously and unconsciously.

This connection between women's priorities and expectations and the implicit dimension in policy instruments, enables us to better link up to the analysis as presented in the coming sections; presenting the performance of selected policy instruments from a gender perspective, for rural women to dispose of the adequate knowledge to implement and sustain their agricultural projects.

3. Consequent methodologies

The paper has drawn upon primary data from (i) household interviews for the purpose of a practical and tangible analysis and (ii) institutional interviews to gather information on the effectiveness of one knowledge based platform, complemented with (iii) policies and administrative documents and (iv) an analysis of existing scientific literature on the performance of innovation platforms.

3.1. First data collection: household and institutional interviews in Kenya

Some initial data was collected from individuals working on an institutional level (n=7) and small-scale female farmers (n=10) from Machakos District, 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 were 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.

3.2. Second data collection: Household interviews with rural women in Kenya

The second data gathering (and questionnaire) was based on the findings of the first data collection. The main difference was the format of the survey; developing a more extensive questionnaire in a number of dimensions coming out as important from the first set of interviews and peer review. Hence, the priorities and expectations of rural women in Kenya were analyzed using as base the Gross National Happiness (GNH) Index survey comprehending nice different dimensions; (1) health; (2) Education; (3) Time use; (4) Psychological well-being; (5) Community vitality; (6) Ecological diversity and resilience; (7) Good governance; (8) Living standards and; (9) Cultural diversity and resilience. Nevertheless, the GNH Index for the interviewed women will not be calculated in this discussion.

The author conducted a purposive sample of 16 semi-open interviews with rural small scale female farmers in the coffee banana belt in Machakos District in Kenya during the month of July 2015. The selected sample of n=16 are as a result of a reached saturation level (attained at approximately 12 interviews). An additional four interviews were conducted to avoid any type of deviations. The aim of these interviews were to assess the mechanisms by which gender inequality effects are produced. Each interview took on average two hours per individual and all interviews were conducted in person accompanied by a translator. Almost all the interviews were recorded. The interviewees were asked questions related to their access to, control

over, priorities, expectations and needs to different resources, knowledge and information (according to the different dimensions as described above). The results from the household interviews were used as complement to the institutional analysis and to develop the priority rationales presented in the innovations platform framework in Appendix 1.

3.3. Policy instruments and institutional interviews

Based on the state of the art, the contextual analysis and the article of Jönsson et al. (2014), it was possible to develop a research framework of one policy instrument (specifically developed for this discussion). One policy instrument is a combination of one policy device and one action guideline (cf. table 2).

Table 2: Presentation of the analyzed policy instrument

Policy instrument	Policy device	Action guideline	Assessed policy instrument
Policy instrument	Knowledge based platform	Gender Mainstreaming	Agri-ProFocus platform using Gender Mainstreaming as crosscutting gender integration strategy

Source: adapted from Jönsson et al., 2014.

This discussion questions and reviews the conditions for an effective gender integration in one policy instrument. In order to assess such conditions, and to ensure the accuracy of empirical evidence for the research, I chose to analyze gender mainstreaming combined with the Agri-ProFocus knowledge based platform (Agri-ProFocus, 08.07.2015).

The Agri-ProFocus platform was selected for four major of reasons; (i) it is a policy device and a knowledge based platform having activities in Kenya; (ii) it is promoting farming entrepreneurship and the target group is the farm entrepreneur; (iii) it is using gender mainstreaming as a gender principle / action guideline and the platform has a specific knowledge base on “gender in value chains”. Moreover, the network conducts both online and offline activities with both members and non-members, also in the case of gender related activities. Indeed, the network has published a number of gender related materials (books and training materials) and; (iv) it is a demand driven network, free of access.

In total, eight open interviews with individuals working directly or indirectly with the Agri-ProFocus (APF) platform were conducted. The interviews took between one to two hours per individual. The interviews were recorded and either conducted online or over a meeting in person. The interviewees were asked different questions about the organizational structure of the platform, how the platform works with gender equality and more specifically gender mainstreaming, who the (implicit) target group is, what type contracts are established between them and the platform, interaction modes, use of back- and front-office resources and what the priorities of rural women are according to them. All the interviews were transcribed in full.

The analysis of the performances of the platform was developed based on former research on KIBS (cf. Table 1 and Appendix 1). The analysis contains five different dimension as follows.

- The financial dimension assesses the profitability of the platform’s services, followed by the added value of the activities / services. Thus, if gender is an important dimension in the policy device, part of the budget and financial monitoring and reporting should be bound to gender activities.
- The technical dimension illustrates the productivity of the platform and the level of standardization of the services and content of the services. This component also assess the dysfunctional rates of the platform. In this case, if gender is an important dimension in the policy device, it is expected that the services and the content of the services are adjusted based on the target group (in this case the female and male smallholder farmer) priorities and expectations. In addition, it is expected that the indicators to assess dysfunctionalities of the policy device are subject to a number of gender criteria’s.

- The relational dimension evaluates the relationship between the types of services that are delivered by the platform to their target group (in this case the small scale farm entrepreneur). It also assesses clients' loyalty and whether or not the priorities and expectations of rural women are reflected in the online platform or the offline activities. This dimension also analyses the nature of the contract established between target group and supplier. If gender is an important dimension in the policy device, then the priorities and expectations of rural women should be reflected in the policy device and the content should be adjusted accordingly.
- The innovation dimension relates to the number of back office activities that are carried out by the policy device, assessing the platforms' capacity to invest in knowledge acquisition, production and renewal. If the gender dimension is important in the policy device, it is expected to find gender related back office activities and staff working on such issues (e.g. gender researcher).
- The civic dimension analyses the platforms' ability to integrate equity or societal issues. This dimension, has been completed with a gender dimension compared to the original framework developed by Dhiab et al. (2014). It also considers if and what priorities and expectations of rural women that are considered in the platform, e.g. time use, access to resources, knowledge and information. In addition, this dimension analyses the platforms' general understanding of gender issues and how it is working with gender related issues, in particular gender mainstreaming. Hence, if gender is considered as important, the policy device should be using gender mainstreaming and / or affirmative action as action guideline, all policy documents should comprehend a gender dimension.

The following section presents the findings from the first and second household and institutional interviews.

4. Results

4.1. Results from first data collection in Kenya

The results from the data initial collection in Kenya illustrates different obstacles, hindering the interviewed rural women (n=10) to get appropriate access to knowledge and information according to their priorities and expectations. These results coincides with the results from the first institutional interviews (n=7) and are summarized as follows.

- Rural women do not get the same access to knowledge and information as rural men.
- The interviewed women have are a number of priorities; ensuring they have enough income to cover for school fees and household expenses; attending various groups; having a family; access to various institutions; sense of belonging, i.e. community vitality and; receiving agricultural and livestock knowledge.
- Farm advisory services are essentially demand based since the SAPs, 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/or their lack of access to institutions, e.g. mainly men are part of councils that design extension programs and; access to the service provided by the institution.
- 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.
- These rural women's priorities have 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 the there are no parameters in action guidelines or policy devices assessing the barriers of marginalized groups prior to delivery or diffusion of the service.

- Most interviewees stated that they adopt the technologies they receive information about, but that the information is insufficient. The reasons for this lack of information is that (a) the husband receives the training and does not share the information with his spouse; (b) they 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 therefore excluded.
- Some of the interviewed women mentioned that it is rare that someone asks for their advice on agricultural or livestock issues (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 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, agricultural land and/or time.

These findings are tied to the results from the second data collection, presented in the coming sections.

4.2. Results from interviews with rural women in Kenya

4.2.1. Rural women's priorities and expectations

The purposive sample contained 16 rural Kenyan women. All the interviewees are on average part of three groups and most of these groups are micro-finance groups of some sort (cf. table 3 for the rationales per group). Being a member of various groups is a priority to these women as it is one of the major source of information and knowledge. On average, they spend 1 hour and 25 minutes per week in group meetings[1] which is relatively high given the amount of time they spend on "personal development" hours; 2.8 hours / day, versus number of working hours per day; 13.6 hours / day. Table 3 presents the summarized group rationales per group, i.e. the benefits these groups provide to the interviewed women and hence why it is a high priority be a member and participate in these groups.

Table 3: Group rationales / n=16

Groups	Rationales						
	Financial support	**Access to (agricultural) knowledge**	**Psychological / moral support**	**Access to basic needs**	**Access to material needs**	**Spiritual growth**	**Access to different institutions**
Agricultural producers group – 3/16	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Livestock producers group – 2/16	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
VSLA[2] group – 8/16	Yes	Yes in some cases	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Income generating group – 2/16	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Micro-finance group – 16/16	Yes	Yes but not in all groups	Yes	Yes to food	Yes	Yes	No
Forestry group – 1/16	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Local community group – 11/16	Yes sometimes	No	Yes	Yes to food	Yes	No	No

[1] Not all groups meet every week.
[2] VSLA = Village Savings and Loans Group

Religious group – 1/16	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Other micro-finance group – 3/16	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, to some extent	No	Yes

Source: Primary data collected during the month of July 2015.

It is possible to observe that all the interviewed women are members of one or multiple micro-finance groups, generally solely women's groups. Within these groups, they are also accessing direct agricultural knowledge, which is most often provided from a contact farmer. In addition, sometimes, the groups are informed that the cooperative society is organizing a training and thus attends such activity together (if the society allows them to attend). In this case, the groups also gives these women a certain access to various institutions. Nonetheless, it is not the primary functions of these groups. Their most important dimension is the financial aspect, where they manage to save and borrow money either as individuals for household expenses (to cover for school fees, food, water and firewood) or as a group. It is also functions as a moral support group, which came out as another important dimension.

Other priorities for these women are access to various trainings and training institutions. All the interviewees mentioned that they require additional training to improve their skills in agriculture and livestock related activities (also coming out from the results from the initial data collection). The most popular options where; (i) sustainable coffee management; (ii) fruit management; (iii) poultry keeping; (iv) goat rearing for milk production and; (v) dairy management. If they could be trained in these topics, it was mentioned that these women felt capable of implementing the practices since they believe having the financial ability and organizational capacity for it.

In addition, the groups also provides these women with access to material needs, i.e. they take loans to purchase inputs or devices (cf. table 3). All of the interviewees have access to a phone, most of them to a radio and / or a television. The table also shows that they can organize themselves. Thus, there are certain information channels by which they can access cognitive resources (and if aware, they would probably organize themselves to get access to a certain type of knowledge). It is worth reflecting upon what means these women would use to get access to the content of a knowledge based platform, if a priority to them.

Regarding sources of information the interviewed women prefers, they were asked to rank the five highest preferences out of 13 options, namely; (i) individual visits on farm (individual trainings); (ii) demonstration days; (iii) field visit to other farms; (iv) agricultural shows; (v) group trainings; (vi) television program; (vii) office call; (viii) radio program; (ix) video tape; (x) leaflets and posters; (xi) farmer field schools; (xii) newspaper / bulletin; (xiii) information on-line (internet). The five highest rankings are shown in table 4.

Table 4: Preferred sources of extension services (1=highest preference) / n=16

Source of information	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Individual visits on farm (individual trainings)	10	1	3	1	0
Demonstration days	2	2	3	4	2
Field visits to other farms	0	8	1	6	0
Agricultural show	1	3	1	1	3
Group trainings	2	1	7	1	3
Office call	0	0	0	0	1
Radio program	0	0	0	0	2
Video tape	0	1	0	1	2
Leaflets and posters	0	0	0	0	1
Farmer Field Schools	1	0	1	2	2

Total number of answers	**16**	**16**	**16**	**16**	**16**

Source: Primary data collected during the month of July 2015.

There is a distinct preference for individual trainings / visits on the farm. Another preference is field visits to other farms followed by group trainings. Thus, in person trainings is an important source of knowledge for the interviewees. This coheres with the results from the state of the art and the findings from the first data sampling. The major reasons to as of why they prefer these training types are; (i) it supports them to acquire new knowledge; (ii) it improves the farm output / productivity and; (iii) it motivates them to adopt new technologies.

4.2.2. Rural women's access to resources and knowledge

All of the interviewed women have met with an extension officer once per month (n=5), once in six months (n=6) or never (n=1). The officers most often come from the Ministry of Agriculture, financial institutions such as Banks, or as a local contact farmer (Trainer of Trainers). In most cases, the officers are invited by the coffee cooperative union. In order to attend the trainings organized by the cooperative societies, one must be a member or have the consent from the husband to attend the training on their behalf since usually, the husband is the member. There is thus a difference between direct and indirect access to information, knowledge and resources depending on marital status of the interviewees and in particular direct versus indirect access to the coffee cooperative society (cf. table 5). This is equally corresponding with the first data collection results.

Table 5: Direct and indirect access to knowledge (n=16)

Marital status of interviewees	Direct access to knowledge	Indirect access to knowledge	Grand total
Married, i.e. non-widowed	29%	71%	100%
Widowed	89%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**63%**	**38%**	**100%**

Source: Primary data collected during the month of July 2015.

Regarding access to resources and institutions, the interviewees most often have direct access, i.e. meaning that they have their own bank account and controlling their own income, possibility to take a loan (most often through the micro-finance groups), selling of fruits and crops but, depending on marital status, have direct or indirect access to the cooperative society. The major resource that they do not control is land, i.e. the formal title deeds, where they are most often in the husband's or the husband's father's name (2 out of 16 have the land title deed in their name). Another resource that they do not have access to is a computer. None of the women owns or uses a computer, mainly as a result of IT illiteracy and lack of financial means (and in some cases, non-access to electricity). In order to get access to a computer with Wi-Fi they need to travel to the closest town, which in this case is Machakos town.

The results also shows that the interviewed women are organized and if they were aware and interested in the type of information, e.g. Agri-ProFocus provides, they could organize themselves accordingly to get access to the platform. Hence, there could be an issue related to the content of the knowledge based platform. Even though they lack access to resources and knowledge, there is also an issue on behalf of the service provider, not developing and creating enough incentives for these women to connect to the platform. This thus connects the results from the household interviews to the institutional interviews section.

4.3. Second data collection: Results from institutional interviews

The results from the household interviews (both first and second data collection) were used as complement to the institutional analysis. A thorough innovation platform (IP) performance analysis framework comprehending an integrated gender dimension of the Agri-ProFocus (APF) platform is presented in Appendix 1.

Regarding the financial dimension, the network receives most of their funding from the Dutch Government. Part of the funding is also coming Dutch network members. From the interviewees, the network is changing their financial strategy, where the aim is to become less financially dependent on the Dutch Government and rely increasingly on revenues from paying members. This is also a dimension that came out from the Kenya country branch. On the other hand, there is a pressure from the Dutch donors to work with gender issues and in particular gender mainstreaming. Implementing a long-term "donor independent" financial strategy also implies that there is a risk for decreased implementation of gender equality policies and/or mainstreaming of gender issues into the network policies and activities. Moreover, from the findings, one staff is paid one day per week to work with gender issues. In regards to gendered financial monitoring and reporting, it is only the gender in value chains knowledge base that is subject to this. None of the other knowledge bases are tied to gender monitoring and reporting, in exception for overall gender disaggregated data. The counter factual hypothesis for this dimension states that if gender is an important dimension in the policy device, part of the budget and financial monitoring and reporting should be bound to gender activities. The results from interviews and administrative documents illustrates that this is not the case for the Agri-ProFocus platform. This indicates that gender issues are not prioritized in this dimension.

Vis-à-vis the technical dimension, the network has around 11,000 online members on the international platform (and 900 of these members are linked to the Gender in Value Chains knowledge base) and the Kenyan platform have approximately 1,700 members. The interviewees could not tell the number of active versus passive members of the network but throughout the interviews it was insinuated that the platform has a higher number of passive than active members. The network develops and publishes training materials, and amongst these a number of gender related materials (cf. Appendix 1). It is possible to download soft versions of the various training materials under the Gender in Value Chains knowledge base[3]. In regards to the level of standardization, the services and the content of the training material is adapted depending on the demand from the members. However, if a specific gender training is carried out in cooperation of one of the network members, the developed methods and tools of the training material, will not be changed. It is rather the selection of tool and methods that alters. Concerning the rate of dysfunctions, APF performs annual client satisfaction surveys' and an increased client satisfaction has been noticed from 2013 to 2014. This appears as being the case for Kenya as well.

The counter-factual hypothesis states that if gender is important in the technical dimension, it is expected that the services and the content of the services are adjusted based on the target group [in this case the female and male smallholder farmer] priorities and expectations. In addition, it is expected that indicators should assess the dysfunctionalities of the policy device, based on a number of gender criteria's. Moreover, if p_1, p_2, p_3, $p_4 \ldots p_n$ is considered as important by the interviewed women, then these services / knowledge components should be present in the knowledge-based platform (i.e. implying that it is actually a supply based model rather than demand based). Where $p_w = p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \ldots p_n$ and p_w is the dependent variable representing the sum of the priorities of women and p_1, p_2, p_3, $p_4 \ldots p_n$ are different independent variables representing different priorities of women. The suggested priorities are; p_1 = individual or group trainings on sustainable livestock and agriculture management; p_2 = attending weekly group meetings; p_3 = paying school fees and covering for basic household needs; p_4 = being in good physical and mental health; p_5 = access to health, financial, educational, religious and legal institutions; p_6 = having a sense of belonging (family and neighbors). These priorities coincides with these of the interviewees from the first data collection. The institutional results indicates some of the priorities are considered in the gender in value chains knowledge base but not in the other bases. Moreover, the content is not applicably addressing women's priorities and the dysfunctionality indicators are not tied to a number of gender criteria's. This shows that gender issues are not prioritized in this dimension.

[3] In total, the platform has six knowledge bases; (i) Gender in Value Chains; (ii) Access to Finance; (iii) Organized farmers; (iv) Sustainable Agriculture; (v) Youth in Agribusiness and; (vi) Dairy and Livestock.

In regards to the relational dimension, APF offer two major types of services to their clients; (1) activities on the online platform and; (2) offline activities. The online platform offers various online services to the APF members. The membership is for free but it is a prerequisite to become a member to get access to the different services. The offline activities provides complementary activities linked to the online platform. These activities includes workshops, trainings, organized fairs, innovation and knowledge events as well as Business-to-Business workshops. Another example of an offline activity is the gender coaching track; APF staff trains gender coaches (member organizations of the network) that in turn train small holder farmers. APF staff visits on rare occasions their target groups, i.e. the small holder farmers. It occurs occasionally during the offline activities. When it comes to obstacles identified in the platform, the interviewees stated a number of important issues (in particular related to gender); (i) the inaccessibility and non-usability of the online platform, i.e. requires access to a computer and internet; (ii) it is a large and broad platform thus leading to a high number of passive members (and to certain members not willing to share information); (iii) gender blindness on behalf of the members (as it is a demand driven network); (iv) issues with the performance of the different knowledge bases not being used efficiently; (v) lack of financial means to access a number of members (for trainings, events, fairs). The interviewees are aware of these obstacles, in particular the first three but it seems that there are no immediate solutions presently. There is an ongoing discussion about making the information from the platform accessible via SMS to the end user but it has not yet been implemented. Based on the results from the household interviews, it comes out that the interviewed women have access to personal mobile phones and are using them. In addition, they appear as being good adopters of new practices. This implies that if an SMS technology would be available to them (through e.g. awareness creation), they would most likely adopt the technology (or at least organize themselves to get access to it).

When it comes to contractual agreements [relational dimension], it appears that there are no such agreements between the services delivered by the platform and the target group for both the online and offline activities. The only required criteria is to become member of the platform, which is free of charge. For the gender coaching track activity, a contract can be established in the form of an informal agreement between supplier and target group. It involves a number of physical follow up visits to the farm households or over the phone. Nevertheless, it is not directly implemented by the APF staff; it is the members of APF that are the implementers. In addition, the results from the first data sampling illustrates there is a lack of information flow between suppliers and “clients” or target groups; where the first 12 interviewed women mentioned that is it unusual that someone asks for their advice or knowledge. Consequently, it implies that the content within APF is not based on what these women expect (or need). Moreover, the lack of follow-up is stated as an issue on behalf of the interviewees from the first data collection findings, i.e. that there is no “priority assessment” prior to, during and after service delivery, whilst this actually appears as a demand from these rural women’s side.

Hence, if gender is important in the relational dimension, then the priorities and expectations of rural women should be reflected in the policy device and the content should be adjusted accordingly. Yet, women’s (and men’s) priorities are not entirely reflected nor formulated as such in the platform.

The platform does not focus on the innovation dimension, where no financial means is devoted to back office activities. In addition, according to the interviewees and the APF documents, the network has no database subscription nor back office staff. In addition, there is no staff that is fully employed by APF to work on gender issues. If the gender dimension is important in the policy device, it is expected to find gender related back office activities and staff working on such issues (e.g. gender researcher). Thus, if the platform considered women and their concerns as a priority, gender research activities and gender back office staff should be present, yet it is not. This illustrates that gender issues are not prioritized in this dimension.

Designated priorities of rural women were selected as part of the effectiveness criteria’s under the civic dimension. The chosen priorities are based on the results from the household interviews with the rural women in Kenya and from the peer review. A number of the APF interviewees recognize similar priorities

as to those of the rural women. Part of the priorities are considered in the gender in value chains knowledge base, e.g. women's access to knowledge and information, but they are not reflected nor mainstreamed across the other knowledge bases. An aspect that should be highlighted in regards to the gender in value chains knowledge base and subsequent gender activities, e.g. the gender coaching track, is that it is not implemented in all country branches. For instance, the gender in value chains knowledge base does not exist in Kenya. Furthermore, according to APF0415, gender issues are not integrated nor prioritized in the country. The network in Kenya was however one of the pilot countries to test and implement the gender coaching track offline activity. It started in 2012 but was disrupted and the re-started again in 2013. It has not been successful in the country due to various reasons depending in the different interviewees and reports. The major reasons being: (1) not a demand from the members; (2) lack of motivation from network coordinators; (3) difficulty in working with the topic due to a lack of understanding; (4) difficulty for members to work continuously with the gender coaching track as it requires in house funding.

The APF network does not have a definition of gender equality nor of gender mainstreaming [civic dimension]. According to APF0315, the strategy is explained during trainings but there is no explicit definition on the platform website nor in the annual reports or plans. They network is, however, monitoring the number of female and male registered members for both the offline and online activities. In Kenya for instance, 31% of the registered members in 2014 were women. As mentioned, this is a demand from the Dutch donors and hence not an initiative taken from the network itself.

If gender is considered as important in the civic dimension, the policy device should be using gender mainstreaming as action guideline and all policy documents should comprehend a gender dimension. Moreover, from a historic-institutional perspective, since the last 10 years, if gender mainstreaming has allowed for reflexions and changes in regards to women's priorities then we expect to find p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6 being complementing services for these women, obtaining an exhaustive knowledge-based platform. As observed, the results shows that the answers to the two counter factual hypotheses is negative. This illustrates that gender issues are not appropriately addressed in this dimension.

In summary, based on the innovations platform performance analysis framework with an integrated gender dimension, it is possible to conclude that none of the five performance areas prioritize gender issues.

4.4. Priorities and expectations of rural women and policy instruments

Generally, the interviewed women does not appear as being entirely deprived from resources, knowledge and information (in exception for one of the individuals). However, much of their access depends on their marital status and thus social status in society, e.g. direct versus indirect access to (agricultural) knowledge and institutions. In addition to this, their access to information and knowledge is heavily dependent upon the 'granted' access to the cooperative society since they are not the formal owners of the major resource, namely the land. This implies that they are at risk from knowledge and resource deprivation, since a number of the interviewed women does not control their access. These findings concurs with the results from the first data collection. Women's access to land has been raised as an issue in the institutional interviews but presently, it is not an area of focus for the network.

On the other hand, it is not (only) the access being the issue, but rather the content of the knowledge based platform. In this regard, by assessing the interviewees' preferences concerning type of trainings, all women prefer individual or group trainings. None of them mentioned online information as a source of knowledge. The result indicates that the interviewees are not aware of online information as a solution but it does not imply that they would not use the resource if they were aware of it. According to the institutional results, there is a general awareness of this issue and different solutions are under discussion but not presently implemented. Thus, there seems to be discrepancies emerging between the priorities and expectations of the interviewed women and the information and knowledge available on the APF platform, using gender mainstreaming as an action guideline.

5. Discussion and concluding remarks

Based on the innovations platform performance analysis, it was possible to analyze the conditions for effective gender integration in one policy instrument in agriculture, i.e. a knowledge based platform combined with gender mainstreaming. The results and the counter factual hypotheses are confirming that a number of rural women's priorities are not reflected in the analyzed knowledge based platform. The counter factual hypotheses similarly shows that none of the dimensions in the performance analysis framework prioritizes gender issues.

Likewise, it was possible to confirm, based on such framework, that the content of the knowledge based platform represents an obstacle for these women to access the policy device (and not the access per se). The findings equally coincides with Walby's (2011) findings on gendered digital exclusion. The results demonstrate that the interviewed women are not lacking of energy nor the organizational capacity the get access to a certain type of knowledge or resource (hence not exclusively the lack of access). It is therefore an issue of content; meaning that the knowledge content in the policy device is not appropriately addressing women's priorities and expectations. It implies that there are a number of gendered exclusion mechanisms embedded in the knowledge society and economy, pointing towards not only an issue of access but questioning the tangible content of the (knowledge) resource.

Moreover, gender mainstreaming appears as an insufficient action guideline to address the present gender inequalities in this specific case, in particular for women to dispose of the adequate knowledge to implement and sustain their agricultural projects. This conclusion equally corresponds to findings from different authors such as Tolhurst et al. (2012); Lewis (2006) and; Stratigaki (2005). This therefore implies that there is, in this case, a discrepancy between the inherent gender dimension in policy instruments and the priorities and expectations of rural women.

References

Literature

Adolph, B., 2010. Rural Advisory Services Worldwide: A Synthesis of Actors and Issues, GFRAS Synthesis Report, GFRAS (Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services), 2010.

AGDI, 2011. The African Gender Development Index 2011, Promoting Gender Equality in Africa, Economic Commission for Africa, 2011, pp. 1-65.

Agri-ProFocus, 08.07.2015. http://www.agri-profocus.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.

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.

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.

Bourdieu, P., 2005. *The Social Structures of the Economy,* Polity Press, Cambridge, 2005, ISBN: 978-0745625409.

Bourdieu, P., 1989. Social Space and Symbolic Power, *Sociological Theory,* 1989:7(1), pp. 14-25.

Bourdieu, P., 1980. Le capital social, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales,* 1980 :31, pp. 2-3.

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*

Desmarchelier, B., Djellal, F., Fallouj, F., 2012. Knowledge intensive business services and long term growth, *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, Elsevier, 2012, pp. 1-17.*

Dhiab, H., Labarthe, P., Laurent, C., 2014. Societal challenges in the back office of farm advisory services: the case of pesticides use reduction in the French seed potato industry, Article prepared for and presented at the RESER (European Association for Research on Services) Conference, 2014.

Dougherty, D., 2004. Organizing Practices in Services: Capturing Practice-Based Knowledge for Innovation, *Strategic Organization, 2004:2(35), pp. 35-64.*

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.

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., Gasselin, P., 2010. SYNTHESE 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

FSD, 2013. Gender Equity Issues in Kenya, Foundation for Sustainable Development (FSD), 24.08.2013. http://www.fsdinternational.org/country/kenya/weissues.

Gallouj, F., 2002. Services Innovation: assimilation, differentiation, inversion and integration, *Munich Personal RePEc Archive, 62174:16.*

GGGR, 2011. The Global Gender Gap Report, The World Economic Forum, 2013. ISBN 978-92-95044-43-2.

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.

Hertog, P. D., 2000. Knowledge-Intensive Business Services as co-producers of innovation, *International Journal of Innovation Management, 2000:4(4), pp. 491-528.*

Hodgson, M., G., 1998. The Approach of Institutional Economics, *Journal of Economic Literature, 1998:36(1), pp. 166-192.*

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.

Jenson, J., Saint-Martin, D., 2006. Building blocks for a new social architecture: the LEGO™ paradigm of and active society, *Policy and Politics,* 2006:34(3), pp. 429-451.

Jönsson, M., Caggiano, M., Laurent, C., Labarthe, P., 2014. The implicit gender dimension of policy instruments in agriculture. The Case of Kenya. Article prepared for and presented at the EAEPE (European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy) Conference, 2014.

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.*

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.*

Lascoumes, 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.*

Laurent, C., 2012. *Plurality of Science and rational integration of knowledge*, in New Springer Approaches to the Unity of Science, J. Symons, J.M. Torres and O.Pombo, (Ed. Springer), 2012.

Lee, S., F., 2008. Heterodox Economics, *A Journal of Informed Opinion, 2008:7(1), pp. 23-30.*

Lewis, J., 2006. Work/family reconciliation, equal opportunities and social policies: the interpretation of policy trajectories at the EU level and the meaning of gender equality, *Journal of European Public Policy, 2006:13(3), pp. 420-437.*

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.

Muller, E., Doloreux, D., 2007. The key dimensions of knowledge-intensive business services (KIBS) analysis: a decade of evolution, *Arbeitspapiere Unternehmen und Region, No. U1/2007*

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.

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.*

Rodrik, 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.*

Rutherford, M., 2001. Institutional Economics: Then and Now, *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 2001:15(3), pp. 173-194.*

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.*

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.*

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

Tolhurst, R., Leach, B., Price, J., Robinson, J., Ettore, E., Scott-Samuel, A., Kilonzo, N., Sabuni, P., L., Robertson, S., Kapilashrami, A., Bristow, K., Lang, R., Romao, F., Theobald, S., 2012. Intersectionality

and gender mainstreaming in international health: Using a feminist participatory action research process to analyse voices and debates from the global south and north, *Social Science and Medecine, 2012:74, pp. 1825-1832.*

UNDP, 2004. Human Development Report 2004, The Rise of the South, Human Progress in a Diverse World, UNDP, 2013. ISBN 978-92-1-126340-4.

UNDP, 2013. Human Development Report 2013, The Rise of the South, Human Progress in a Diverse World, UNDP, 2013. ISBN 978-92-1-126340-4.

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

Ura, K., Alkire, S., Zangmo., T., 2012. *Case Study: Bhutan. GROSS NATIONAL HAPPINESS AND THE GNH INDEX, Part II, WORLD HAPPINESS REPORT,* The Earth Institute, Colombia University, 2012.

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., 2011. Is the Knowledge Society Gendered? *Gender, Work and Organization, 2011:18(1), pp. 1-29.*

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, 2014. The World Bank Database, November, 2014, http://databank.worldbank.org/data/.

Webb, S., Brine, J., Jackson, S., 2006. Gender, foundation degrees and the knowledge economy, *Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 2006:58(4), pp. 563-576.*

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.*

Institutional interviews

Code	Interviewing date	Type	Country
APF0115	11.06.15	Skype	Holland
APF0215	11.06.15	In person	Kenya
APF0315	12.06.15	Skype	Holland
APF0415	23.06.15	In person	Kenya
APF0515	03.07.15	Skype	Uganda
APF0615	03.07.15	Skype	Zambia
APF0715	20.07.15	In person	Tanzania
APF0815	28.07.15	Skype	Uganda

Household interviews

Code	Questionnaire ID	Area	Interview date
Person 01	MA11	Machakos	13.07.2015
Person 02	MA12	Machakos	13.07.2015
Person 03	MA13	Machakos	13.07.2015
Person 04	MA14	Machakos	14.07.2015
Person 05	MA15	Machakos	14.07.2015
Person 06	MA16	Machakos	14.07.2015
Person 07	MA17	Machakos	15.07.2015
Person 08	MA18	Machakos	15.07.2015
Person 09	MA19	Machakos	15.07.2015
Person 10	MA20	Machakos	16.07.2015
Person 11	MA21	Machakos	16.07.2015
Person 12	MA22	Machakos	16.07.2015
Person 13	MA23	Machakos	17.07.2015
Person 14	MA24	Machakos	17.07.2015
Person 15	MA25	Machakos	17.07.2015
Person 16	MA26	Machakos	18.07.2015

Appendix 1: Innovation platform (IP) performance analysis framework with an integrated gender dimension of the Agri-ProFocus platform (data used for the year of 2014)

Dimension	**Indicators and results**	
I. Financial	***International level***	***Kenya level***
a. Total income of the IP (€) in 2014 before added interest of previous year balance	**4.752.054 €**	**297.034 €**
b. Total income of the IP (€) in 2014 with added interest of previous year balance	**4.764.931 €**	**347.171 €**
c. Source of revenue of the IP (€) in 2014		
- Total funding DGIS/DDE	2.953.537 €	125.000 €
- Total funding members (Dutch)	1.020.074 €	66.943 €
- Service delivery programmes	-	56.598 €
- Local stakeholders / partners	-	41.594 €
- Food and Business Knowledge Platform	-	-
- Balance 01.01.2014	-	50.137 €
- Interest	12.877 €	-
- Other income	778.443 €	6.900 €
d. Capital mobility of the IP (€) in 2014 (for trainings, for R&D, hiring consultants…)		
- Personnel costs (number of staff in Holland, employed by APF: 28.5 full time equivalent and number of staff in Kenya, employed by APF: 2 full time staff, one staff at 60% and one staff at 20%)	478.734 € (10% of total spending)	**81.008 € (28% of total spending)**

- Housing costs	65.249 € (1% of total spending)	-
- **Local country network cost**	**4.123.828 € (87% of total spending)**	-
- General costs	97.120 € (2% of total spending)	-
- **Business and partnership brokering**	**-**	**110.182 € (38% of total spending)**
- Innovation communities	-	38.234 € (13% of total spending)
- Platform for debate and learning	**-**	59.889 € (21% of total spending)
Budget tied to gender activities and staff	One staff is paid 1 day / week to work with gender issues	No
Financial monitoring and reporting tied to gender activities	Yes but only related to the gender in value chains knowledge base not to the other knowledge bases	No
II. Technical		
a. Productivity of the IP		
- Total number of members in 2014	11,183 around 900 members are linked to the Gender in Value Chains knowledge base)	1,704
- Active members (members using information within the IP) in 2014	N.A.	N.A.
- Number of training material used in 2014	The published material is to be found under the Innovation Communities delivery area and when typing the e.g. “gender in value chains” or “gender toolkit agriprofocus” in Google	The published material is to be found under the Innovation Communities delivery area
- Number of participants downloading material in 2014	Not available and interviewees could not tell	Not available and interviewees could not tell
b. Level of standardization		
- Process (services adapted or not based on demand from target groups?)	From interviews (depends what type of activity they are carrying out)	From interviews (depends what type of activity they are carrying out)
- Content (content of material adapted or not based on demand from target groups?)	From interviews (depends what type of activity they are carrying out)	From interviews (depends what type of activity they are carrying out)

c. Rate of dysfunctions (success versus failure, advisory service evaluation system)		
- Are the indicators of the IP successful?	According to the Annual Plan 2015, illustrating the results from 2014, the results from the APF Client satisfaction survey (based on a set of baseline indicators), they noticed an increasing client satisfaction from 2013.	According to the Annual Report 2014, during the annual appreciation survey, the IP members were asked to rate the quality of the activities they participated in. The overall ratings indicate a higher rating of the quality of the services delivered by the platform (3.4 / 4) across all thematic areas compared to 2013 (3.2 / 4).
III. Relational		
a. Personalization (number of personal relations with female farmers)		
- Type of services delivered to target group (monthly membership, subscription access to a certain service, information free of access…)	Online platform: Different online information and knowledge offered to members (free onetime online subscription but you need to be a member to get access to the different services). You can download trainings materials from the different knowledge bases (innovation communities) et also access information about organized fairs, events, and purchase and sell agricultural inputs, and various stakeholders (other members). Offline activities: the offline activities provides additional activities (linked to the online activities). These activities includes workshops, trainings, organized fairs, innovation and knowledge events, B2B workshops. One such example (APF0115) is a large agricultural networking fair event that was held in Kenya (>500 persons attending) where different smaller events were held, such as meetings between farmers, selling of different produces, demonstration stalls, workshops, B2B meetings, etc.). Thus one events can contain and deliver an amount of smaller activities. Another such example is the gender coaching track activity. This is an offline activity, where APF staff trains gender coaches (member organizations of the network) that in turn train small holder farmers.	Online platform: Different online information and knowledge offered to members (free onetime online subscription but you need to be a member to get access to the different services). You can download trainings materials et also access information about organized fairs, events, and purchase and sell agricultural inputs, and various stakeholders (other members). Offline activities: the offline activities provides additional activities (linked to the online activities). These activities includes workshops, trainings, organized fairs, innovation and knowledge events, B2B workshops. One such example (APF0115) is a large agricultural networking fair event that was held in Kenya (>500 persons attending) where different smaller events were held, such as meetings between farmers, selling of different produces, demonstration stalls, workshops, B2B meetings, etc.). Thus one events can contain and deliver an amount of smaller activities.
- Frequency of visits	None	Very rare occasions – it is the member organizations that are in direct touch with the farmers. Sometimes, during fairs, events and workshops, the APF staff meets directly with the target group (i.e. the farmers).
- Duration of visits	None	Very rare occasions – it is the member organizations that are in direct touch with the farmers. Sometimes, during fairs, events and workshops, the APF staff meets directly with the target group (i.e. the farmers).
b. Client loyalty		
- Turnover of producers	N.A.	N.A.

- Obstacles identified to platform	- (In)accessibility and non(usability) of the online platform - Big and broad platform thus leading to a high number of passive members (and to certain members not willing to share information because of this) - Gender blindness on behalf of members (as it is a demand driven network) - Issues with the performance of the different knowledge bases not being used efficiently - Lack of financial means to access a number of members (for trainings, events, fairs – APF0515).	
- Needs and priorities of female farmers addressed?	It is not a cross-cutting theme within the platform (i.e. not properly gender mainstreamed). The needs and priorities of women (and men) are somewhat addressed in the gender in value chains Knowledge base– cf. a more thorough analysis under section ***V. Civic.***	No
a. Nature of contract (type of contract established between supplier and farmers, e.g. regular physical follow-up, regular follow-up over the phone, service free of charge...)	There are no contracts established between the services delivered by the platform and the target group for the online activities. The only required criteria is to become member of the platform and that is free of charge. Offline activities: Similar as for the online activities. There is no contract established between the services delivered and the target group. They can attend the events and fairs if they are interested in a certain topic (and get access to the information in time). A contract can be established in the form of an informal agreement between supplier and target group when it comes to the gender coaching track activity. But is not a formal agreement. It does involve a number of physical follow up visits to the farm households or follow ups over the phone and the services are free of charge (for the farmer). Nevertheless, this is not directly implemented by the APF staff; it is the members of APF that are the implementers and thus having these type of establishments between themselves and the target group.	There are no contracts established between the services delivered by the platform and the target group for the online activities. The only required criteria is to become member of the platform and that is free of charge. Offline activities: Similar as for the online activities. There is no contract established between the services delivered and the target group. They can attend the events and fairs if they are interested in a certain topic (and get access to the information in time).
IV. Innovation		
a. Share of the total budget devoted to back office activities	0€	0€
- Back office gender research activities	0€	0€
b. Number of back office staff	It depends on the needs. APF cooperates with Wageningen University and carries out, generally via Master students, different annual studies (in total 2 studies done) e.g. on gender in the dairy value chain by Silja Heyland (Bachelor study). They are in contact with two MSc students at the moment and two PhD students.	None

- Number of back office staff working with gender research	None	None
c. Back office activities		
- Number of type of experiments	Approximately 2 studies per year	None
- Number of type of databases	No database subscription	No database subscription
- Scientific monitoring	Not existent	Not existent
- Number of type of trainings	None	None
V. Civic		
APF as one online platform		
Taking into account gender equality and the needs and priorities of women	**Are the priorities and expectations explicitly taken into account / considered within platform, i.e. within the different knowledge base?**	**Are the priorities, needs and expectations implicit within the platform – according to the interviewees' responses (not reflected as required action points in platform)?**
- Physical health	No, not considered in any knowledge base or other service areas of the platform, thus not considered in different country branches that are not implementing the gender in value chains knowledge base	Not mentioned by any of the interviewees (0%, i.e. 0/8)
- Time use	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases	Yes, the importance of time (related to rural women's priorities) was mentioned by all interviewees' on exception of one person (88%, i.e. 7/8)
- Education (linked to social status, i.e. decision making and control)	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases	Yes, the importance of access to education was mentioned for rural women was mentioned by all interviewees (100%, i.e. 8/8)
- Knowledge and information (linked to social status, i.e. decision making and control)	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases	Yes, the importance of access to knowledge and information was mentioned for rural women was mentioned by almost all interviewees (88%, i.e. 7/8)
- Resources (in particular natural resources – linked to social status, i.e. decision making and control). This also includes access to basic needs such as food, water, land, firewood, etc.	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases. In Tanzania, even though this country branch is not implementing the gender in value chains knowledge base, they started an "access to land" group, because the platform members had requested to start such group. This groups was however dissolved after two years because of a decreased interest from the group members.	Yes, the importance of access to (and control over) resources was mentioned for rural women was mentioned by all interviewees (100%, i.e. 8/8)

- Revenue (linked to social status, i.e. decision making and control)	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases.	Yes, the importance of access to (and control over) revenue / income was mentioned for rural women was mentioned by all interviewees (100%, i.e. 8/8)
- Institutions (and governance – linked to social status, i.e. decision making and control)	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases. One particular institutions that the APF network is trying to connect women to is markets.	Yes, it was mentioned by a few of the interviewees but it was not something that came out as striking – (50%, i.e. 4/8). APF0115, 0315 and 0415 really highlighted the importance of women having access to markets and financial institutions.
- Mental health	No, not considered in any knowledge bases or other service areas of the platform, thus not considered in different country branches that are not implementing the gender in value chains knowledge base	Not mentioned by any of the interviewees (0%, i.e. 0/8)
- Religion	No, not considered in any knowledge bases or other service areas of the platform, thus not considered in different country branches that are not implementing the gender in value chains knowledge base	Not mentioned by any of the interviewees (0%, i.e. 0/8) but it was not something that came out as striking – (25%, i.e. 2/8).
- Social security (community vitality)	Yes, within the gender in value chains knowledge base but it is not considered within the other knowledge bases.	It was mentioned by two of the interviewees (in particular by APF0715)
	International level	***Kenya level***
a. Understanding of gender issues		
- Have a specific gender policy	Yes	No; using the gender policy for the overall APF
- Gender integrated in other policies	No	No
- Definition of gender equality	Not present	Not present
- Gender disaggregated data	Yes	Yes
- Total reach out to females and males	About ¼ of the total number of registered members are women (in 2014)	31% of the registered members in Kenya are women (in 2014)
- Type of action guideline used (GM, affirmative action) and how it is used	Within the gender in value chains knowledge base, Gender Mainstreaming is generally applied but not in the other knowledge bases. There is no official definition of Gender Mainstreaming (GM) on the online platform (confirmed by APF0115 and APF0315). GM is defined when carrying out specific gender equality trainings to members of the platform.	The gender in value chains knowledge base does not exist in Kenya. Furthermore, according to APF0415, gender issues are not integrated nor prioritized in the country. The network in Kenya was however used as one of the pilot countries to test and implement the gender coaching track offline activity. It started in 2012 but was disrupted and the re-started again in 2013. It has not been successful in the country due to various reasons depending in the

	Affirmative action does not appear as being used within the APF Network (they do not have any specific quotas on number of females and males that should be employed, present in the board, etc. within the network nor having any sex specific requirements for the members, both in regards to offline and online activities.	different interviewees and reports. The major reasons being: (1) not a demand from the members; (2) lack of motivation from network coordinators; (3) difficulty in working with the topic due to a lack of understanding; (4) difficulty for members to work continuously with the gender coaching track as it require in house funding.
- Why is the network working with gender issues? (I.e. as per demand from donors, part of the core values of the network…)	Initially; as per demand from Dutch donors	They are not working with gender issues as of present
b. Work with gender issues	The network is working with one major gender activity in the platform (online) which is the promotion and development of the gender in value chains knowledge base (although not mainstreamed across the knowledge bases). They have recently started working with a youth knowledge base and in some country branches started mainstreaming gender in other knowledge bases (e.g. in the dairy knowledge base in Zambia for instance). One of the major offline activity in regards to gender is the development and implementation (in certain country branches) is the gender coaching track.	In Kenya, APF not does really work with gender issues (in exception of gender disaggregated data). They started with the gender coaching track in 2012 and 2013 but it was not continued in 2014. It does not appear as if it will be taken up again in Kenya. *"In regards to gender: with Kenya specifically, I think from the previous gender coaching track, we lack the drive from our members. They do not presently see it as a need; it needs to be demand driven. And we you look at the programmes that our members are doing, gender is not a large focus, is one of these crosscutting issues that is rarely dealt with or mentioned in the document. So we are not focusing on it as a large component since it is not something that it demanded from our partner organisations." (APF0415, 23.06.15).*
- Type and number of training material that is "gender equal", i.e. developed for this purpose	- The Challenging Chains to Change book (published in 2008) - The Gender Coaching Track Offline Activity (started in 2012) - The Gender in Value Chains Toolkit (published in 2014) - The Gender Unchained film (published 2014) - The Sustainable Coffee as a Family Business Toolkit (published in 2014)	This material is also available at the APF Office in Kenya (but can also be accessed online in soft copy)