

Collective Action, Gender Relations and Social Inclusion in African Agricultural Markets

Introduction

Concerns expressed since the 1970s about women being excluded from mainstream rural development activities in Africa have fostered numerous women-specific activities designed to address this gender inequality. These actions have, more recently, been supported by arguments and evidence linking gender inequality with adverse agricultural productivity and welfare outcomes (FAO 2011). Views are divided on this approach: feminists such as Razavi (2009) have described such arguments as static and ahistorical, because as argued by O’Laughlin (2007) they ignore the larger processes of accumulation and impoverishment that have occurred in the context of capitalist transformation in the countryside. Meanwhile, recent reports suggest that, to varying degrees, rural women have benefitted from their involvement in certain types of women-specific development programmes (Buvinic et al. 2013).

This Policy Brief takes a critical look at one such activity – the engagement of women farmers in formal groups (referred to here as ‘collective action’) that are organised principally for economic purposes, including for acquiring finance, inputs and new technologies; for the bulking of produce for sale; for sharing marketing information and collective sales; and for developing linkages to more distant or remunerative markets (Thompson et al. 2012). The literature on smallholder collective agricultural marketing is large but relatively few studies address gender dimensions of group organisation in this context. The Brief draws on the findings of primary research undertaken by Oxfam between 2010 and 2012 on women’s collective action in agricultural markets in Ethiopia, Mali and Tanzania, as well as other sources, to address this knowledge gap.

Oxfam’s research found that women derived significant economic benefits such as improved access to credit, better marketing opportunities and related higher revenues from their group

membership compared with similar women who were not organised into groups (Baden 2013). The Oxfam research confirms other evidence that, under the right conditions, women as well as men farmers can benefit from working collectively, and especially can reduce the risks of their engagement with new, often more distant markets (Buvinic et al. 2013; Action Aid et al. 2012; Charman 2008; Penrose-Buckley 2007)ⁱⁱ.

However, collective action is by no means a panacea for ensuring small farmer engagement in markets – whether by women or men. Benefits must outweigh the costs of cooperation, while these can be impacted significantly by external interventions. The scope for effective collective action in markets, and the extent of such gains, depends on a range of factors including the level of pre-existing social capital, the specific sector of activity and the characteristics of the groups themselves. As this Brief explains, gender relations mediate each of these factors.

Collective action as a mechanism for achieving the commercialisation of small-scale agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa

Collective action initiatives among rural women in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) build on a long history of informal organisations such as ROSCAs or tontines (sometimes called rotating savings and credit associations), organisations of individuals with special skills and self-help groups of various kinds, in addition to community-level organisations. By contrast, large ‘top-down’ cooperatives formed during the colonial and post-colonial era for the marketing of tropical export commodities such as cotton, tobacco, cocoa and coffee through parastatal marketing boards (Wanyama et al. 2009) have tended to be composed predominantly of men regarded as representatives of either

joint decision-making farm households or of smallholdings managed and controlled by them (Razavi 2009).

As well as enabling states to generate revenues from agricultural exports, such cooperatives were, and in many instances continue to be, used as tools for political mobilisation and control of rural populations. Over time, members grew to distrust these organisations because of political interference, mismanagement and corruption amongst the leaders. In some instances this led to the virtual collapse of the cooperatives themselves (Chirwa et al. 2009; Wanyama et al. 2009; Bernard and Spielman 2008; Coulter 2007) while others survived, albeit with less than satisfactory performance.

In recent decades, processes of democratisation have altered the landscape of rural economic organisation. Surviving as well as ‘new generation’ agricultural cooperatives have been joined by a wide range of other groups, from natural resource management groups (around water, forests, marine resources etc.) to what might be referred to as knowledge/learning groups, such as farmer field schools. These reflect different understandings about the role of the established state agencies of agricultural research and development in rural areas, the need to engage wider networks of learning and knowledge, and processes of innovation that include the rural populations themselves. This wide range of actors forms the institutional setting within which policy is introduced, and even sourced.

A major feature of current programmes in which each of these organisational types are involved is their concern with the engagement of women and men in new value chains. As a consequence, governments, donors, NGOs and private companies all see cooperatives,

along with other forms of collective action, as mechanisms for achieving this policy goal with smallholder farmers, including women farmers now being targeted to maximise output and efficiency (Prügel et al. 2013). This reflects a shift in the agricultural development paradigm from a focus on productivity increases to a 'commodity value chain' approach which will 'integrate production with commercialisation in order to elevate smallholder farmers from subsistence to commercial oriented production systems' (CAADP 2011: 32). The emphasis is on group formalisation as a means of engaging with new, often powerful globalised buyers who change the dynamics of exchange between producers and markets.

While both men and women small-scale farmers face significant barriers to engaging in markets, their patterns of market engagement differ. In general, women farmers in SSA are less active, or active in a narrower range of markets than men. For example, women often trade in relatively small volumes of perishable crops, poultry, small ruminants or processed foods in local retail markets, while men trade in larger volumes of staples, non-food cash crops or livestock (Harriss-White 2000). Women's capacity to engage in markets – and in marketing groups – is also differently constrained by their more limited assets and control of productive resources and constraints on their time and mobility.

Nevertheless, especially in West Africa, there are markets that are dominated by women, some of whom have gained considerable economic and political power – the Ashanti 'market queens' being the most celebrated. In particular, it is women's successful engagement in post-harvest activities – in buying, selling and processing – rather than in production where the individual skills of women are acknowledged and accepted.

Furthermore, men's and women's relative positions in markets are continuously evolving. High value niche export markets have emerged for 'traditional' products such as Shea butter and Allantoin where women have long played significant roles. As traditional women's crops become commercialised, the organisation of groups may lead to men 'taking over'. Such was reported in the banana sector in Kenya, where expanding production and economies of scale led to more centralised control within household production systems (Fischer and Qaim 2011).

Group membership, gender and inclusion

In spite of the current emphasis on small-scale producer engagement in marketing, estimates suggest that overall membership of formal cooperatives designed for marketing agricultural products in SSA remains low, possibly at less than ten percent of small farmers. For women farmers, rates of participation are reportedly even lower, possibly between four and six percent, although estimates are few in number even where there is a policy of registrationⁱⁱⁱ.

Men and women tend to join different types of collective action groups, with men concentrated in formal groups oriented towards marketing and politics, and women in informal collectives such as savings and credit, labour and self-help groups (Gotschi et al. 2008; Abdulwahid 2006). These differences do not simply reflect choice: they are also a result of historical processes described above and of persistent gender divisions in household responsibilities as well as social norms and rules. Women's cooperative membership has hitherto been subsumed under 'household' membership and remains limited in practice to female household heads and possibly senior married

women in 'male-headed' households. Prevailing social attitudes also shape women's scope for participating in different types of organisations. In Oxfam's research, across all three countries, women participating in marketing groups were vocal about the importance of support from husbands and families in enabling their participation (Baden 2013).

Reforms to cooperative laws by SSA governments including Mali and Ethiopia, consistent with international principles, underline that discrimination in membership is not allowed on the grounds of gender, among other factors.^{iv} However, such changes in national policies have not necessarily filtered down to the local level. In Ethiopia, for example, membership in cooperatives often remains predominantly male or limited to female household heads (Assefa and Tadesse 2012). NGOs have initiated efforts to challenge these practices at the local level (see Box 1) but the scale of these interventions is thus far limited.

While the composition of formal, mixed groups is shifting in favour of women, Oxfam is aware that not all women (or men) are group members. Consistent with wider evidence, across all three country programmes and subsectors covered in Oxfam's research, women who were group members came from better-off households (measured in terms of household livestock or durable assets), leaving women from poorer households behind (Baden 2013; Francesconi and Heerink 2010; Barham and Chitemi 2009; Bernard and Spielman 2008).

However, the extent to which particular kinds of wealth are associated with group participation can be country and sector specific. In Ethiopia and Tanzania, women from households with larger land plots were less likely to be in groups – perhaps unsurprisingly in Ethiopia, where land is not a pre-requisite for participation in the honey sector studied. In Mali, by contrast, larger household land plots was correlated with higher levels of group participation, perhaps due to the greater access to Shea trees for women in these

Box 1: Changing gender composition of groups in Ethiopia's honey sector

There are 42 honey cooperatives in Amhara Region in Ethiopia, with an average of ten percent of women members. Thanks to concerted efforts of NGOs, in a few years, cooperatives in some districts of Amhara region have dramatically increased women's membership of formal groups. SOS Sahel supported cooperatives to target female heads of households for membership. Oxfam worked with cooperatives, to influence them to allow dual membership of husbands and wives rather than one member per household as was the norm. At the same time, self-help groups initiated by Oxfam, linked to the cooperatives, have created a space for women, especially poorer women, to develop technical as well as leadership skills and the confidence to participate actively in mixed groups. The combined impact of these interventions is that honey marketing cooperatives have become more inclusive.

Source: King 2013

households. When the gender implications of household wealth are taken into account, the impact of relative wealth may also change: households with more land may either make more demands on women's labour, or, being wealthier, enforce seclusion more, particularly in Muslim communities.

Across the board, women's gender-based responsibilities for household maintenance and care work means that the opportunity costs of their participation in groups are higher than they are for men (Pandolfelli et al. 2007). These responsibilities are greatly exacerbated for rural women in areas where basic services such as water and energy are scarce or unreliable. Younger women are likely to be faced with more domestic and caring responsibilities than older women, and are less likely therefore to have the time to participate in group activities. Older women may be widowed, or their domestic responsibilities may be lighter because their obligations can be handed to other women – in-laws or co-wives – to fulfil. In Oxfam's study, a number of women reported that other household members, including husbands, were taking on domestic tasks, thereby enabling the participation of their wives in group meetings. The size and location of groups and the regularity and timing of activities have all been shown to influence the degree to which women are able to effectively participate, with women more likely to participate in smaller, less geographically dispersed groups (Assefa and Tadesse 2012).

Group participation, gender relations and equity of outcomes

The participation of women in mixed-sex groups is no guarantee of equitable outcomes amongst members. Even where women are

more numerous in mixed-sex formal agricultural cooperatives, they are rarely well represented in leadership and decision-making positions (Nyang et al. 2010).

Gotschi et al. (2008) in a study of farmers' groups from one district in Mozambique found that although men and women had equal membership rights through established by-laws, and participated equally in group activities that included undertaking communal work, access to leadership positions and the benefits from social capital were unequally distributed. Compared with their male counterparts in the groups, women found it more difficult to transform their membership into improved access to information, markets or help in case of need (Gotschi et al. 2008). Oxfam's research in Tanzania found that in some groups, in spite of high levels of participation, benefits can be very skewed (Box 2). These contrasting outcomes from the same area illustrate how quality of group leadership impacts on equity in the distribution of group benefits.

These examples also underline the importance of women's direct control of productive assets such as land, and of paying sales revenues directly to women members as individuals, both to make visible their contributions and to enhance their control over benefits. Oxfam's research also found that women's participation in informal savings groups, alongside their formal participation in mixed-sex groups, was correlated with greater benefits from formal group participation since this strengthened the capacity of the women to exercise leadership, and as a consequence enabled them access credit (Vigneri et al. 2013). The evidence also suggests that these same women were able to retain control over incomes from their participation.

Box 2: Group dynamics and equity in Lushoto's vegetables sector, Tanzania

Usambara Lishe Trust (ULT)-Malindi group was formed in 1996 and grew to a total of 82 members (50 women and 32 men). For a time, the group successfully secured and diversified markets; established medium or long-term relationships with buyers and negotiated higher prices, leading to important economic returns for members... until a change in leadership occurred, leading a few influential members to co-opt the group. Some of the new group leaders, who are comparatively large-scale, male farmers, started acting as traders for the group and soon ended up 'grabbing' most of the market opportunities for themselves, taking large shares of the orders, instead of distributing them equally amongst members. The resulting deterioration in group dynamics has meant women have been struggling to get their produce sold and many have stopped being active in the group: by 2012 there were only five women and 13 men members. Women interviewed also reported that some men use their wives' names to get orders and earn money for themselves.

By contrast, in the sister group, ULT-Lushoto, husbands agreed to grant their wives access to a vegetable plot of their own so that they could become group members and start producing and selling through ULT. Men and women with access to land register individually as group members, and receive a proportion of the orders for vegetables which ULT gets from its buyers on a weekly basis. This has enabled women to control the revenues from the sale of vegetables through ULT (since payments were made to them directly), and make profits.

Source: Baden 2013: 56-60

Are women-only marketing groups 'effective'?

Overall, the policy and practitioner literature on collective action highlights a variety of factors that influence group performance. These include, for example, the legal status of the group, membership composition, management capacity and governance (Wiggins 2012; Thompson et al. 2008).

In terms of gender, the preference has often been to establish separate women's groups in order to create a space within which women can potentially engage in development outside of reported constraints on their investment and growth potential, in particular demands

of husbands. In terms of group effectiveness, the extensive microfinance evaluation literature has long reported on the positive economic performance of women's groups (Pitt and Khandker 1998; Mersland et al. 2011); however, early concerns about high repayment rates amongst female recipients of microcredit highlighted by Goetz and Gupta (1996), among others, continue to be raised. In the literature on natural resource management, a small number of studies suggest that women's presence in mixed-sex groups contributes to improved dynamics, governance and effectiveness (Westermann et al. 2005; Agarwal 2001; Meinzen-Dick and Zwartareen 1998). Given that a range of development actors approach female farmers through women's associations

or groups, more systematic analysis of their membership, internal dynamics and impacts of participation, across a range of settings, is needed.

There is broad consensus that the existence of social capital and shared norms and values strengthens trust and increases the likelihood of successful group cooperation (Barham and Chitemi 2009; Naravan and Pritchett 1997), but for marketing purposes, arguably, it is the 'bridging' function of social capital (connecting heterogeneous groups of people) which prevails over the 'bonding' function (connecting homogenous groups). Women and men tend to have separate social networks and women less extensive networks than men, along with less time available for making social and political connections – and perhaps for building on their existing networks.

Viewed from this perspective, in a number of social settings women-only marketing groups can face disadvantages if they lack the necessary political connections to perform effectively (Abdulwahid 2006). Barham and Chitemi (2009), for example, find less positive outcomes for women-dominated marketing groups in the cereal sector in Tanzania than for similar mixed or male-dominated groups. Women group members themselves recognise both the limitations and advantages of single-sex groups. In Mali, the Oxfam research found that newly formed women-only groups often incorporated one or two men precisely to perform functions that were difficult for group members, such as travel to more distant markets or negotiating with local authorities (Baden 2013).

Drives to formalise groups as part of policies to promote smallholder commercialisation also risk squeezing the space for informal and inclusive women-specific organisations serving

a variety of important functions. Informal women's groups can evolve successfully into formal marketing structures, with support – as has happened for example for women's cooperatives in the Shea butter sector in Mali – but they often do so at the expense of more inclusive membership (Nelson 1995). In this and similar cases, it would be valuable to have more information about the unexpected outcomes of group formalisation.

Policy and practice challenges

In recent years, many SSA governments and donors have pursued policies to formalise farmer organisations in order to enable them specialise and compete in liberalised markets. In the case of women producers with very small farms or plots, or even small livestock, there is a need for a degree of realism about their scope for participation in formal groups as often their economic activities barely meet their basic needs (Okali 2011). Meanwhile, greater focus and interest is needed in improving the efficiency of women as processors and traders, or service providers within markets.

Development actors – including Oxfam – have tended to focus on group formation and mobilisation and the provision of technical and financial inputs and training. Oxfam's research findings and the wider evidence illustrates that equitable and inclusive collective action is not only about increasing women's formal group membership: interventions also need to address gender relations within marketing systems and power relations within groups (Baden 2013).

The likelihood of successful women's collective action is greater in high value domestic markets and in sectors requiring limited or no land assets. In sectors that are traditionally women-dominated, and where women have experience

of separate organising, supporting women-only producer and marketing groups can be highly effective, as with Shea butter in Mali, and can arguably limit the tendency of men to take over when commercial opportunities expand. Conversely, in sectors such as vegetables in Tanzania where both men and women are economically active and where access to household land and labour is a prerequisite, linking smaller women's groups to mixed umbrella groups and supporting women's involvement in mixed groups is necessary to ensure access to the required productive resources and networks (Baden 2013).

Where women are not already active in groups, efforts may first be needed to build trust between women of different statuses and social backgrounds and to promote attitudinal change towards women's group participation among male group members, leaders and the wider community. Various strategies have proved fruitful in this regard, including working with male as well as female role models and facilitating negotiation of how changes can be made to women's household responsibilities, or tasks redistributed, to enable their participation. Communicating the potential or actual benefits, as well as costs, of women's group membership is important both to ensure the feasibility of interventions and to create incentives for participation.

To ensure women benefit from their participation in formal marketing groups, interventions should also pay attention to fostering accountability in group leadership and positive dynamics of participation and decision-making. Temporary or more permanent quotas can be used to ensure women's presence in leadership in mixed organisations, as in Ethiopia, but for these to be effective in enhancing women's voices requires that male group

leaders and members support the promotion of women's leadership and that women's leadership skills be developed. Creating 'informal' women-only spaces within mixed organisations can also enhance the quality of and benefits from women's participation. Without conscious efforts to target less advantaged sections of the population, women's participation in collective action groups will continue to favour older, married women from better-off households. Rotating leadership functions can redress a bias towards wealthier, more educated, or better-connected women monopolising leadership positions in women's organisations.

At the policy level, a legal framework that promotes equality principles in national cooperative laws and other associative legislation is a necessary but insufficient condition for increasing women's participation in and benefits from collective action. This needs to be complemented by local changes in cooperative and other group by-laws and membership practices through the concerted action of agencies intervening in specific sectors and localities, working closely with male and well as female group leaders and local cooperative and women's affairs offices.

Given limitations on women farmer's capacity to participate in formal groups, there is, in parallel, a need to create a more enabling environment for existing (women's) informal groups. Exploring the scope for policies that support 'alternative' and flexible group structures with limited or reduced registration costs is also recommended. Encouraging stronger links between formal and informal groups can facilitate the membership of individuals with fewer resources and capacities, and thus to enhance the benefits of formal group membership for women.

Finally, policymakers need to engage with private sector investors and finance institutions, as well as NGOs, who are increasingly influential in support to smallholder commercialisation, about strategies to support and strengthen women's collective action, as is beginning to happen in Ethiopia'. Such dialogue can help establish a more accurate picture of women's participation in formal marketing organisations in different sectors, and co-ordinate measures to achieve and sustain more equitable and inclusive collective action, building on successful experiences.

End Notes

- i Consultant Researcher. The author gratefully acknowledges comments and editorial advice from: Dr. Christine Okali and Steve Wiggins of FAC; and external reviewers Dr. Paula Kantor (Senior Scientist, WorldFish, Malaysia), Dr. Nitya Rao (Professor, University of East Anglia). Any errors remain the responsibility of the author. The author also gratefully acknowledges the work of Oxfam GB and her staff in carrying out the RWCA project and all the advisors and field researchers who contributed to the project (see www.womenscollectiveaction.com for full details)
- ii Oxfam's research also looked at empowerment outcomes from women's participation in formal groups (see Baden, 2013, section 6) but found less clear outcomes across the three different countries.. This is an area requiring further research and methodological innovation.
- iii Wanyama et al. (2009) state that around seven percent of the African population overall is involved in cooperatives (of which agricultural cooperatives are only one part). In a study of extension services in Ethiopia, four percent of women compared with 24 percent of men farmers belonged to organisations (World Bank 2010, cited in Peterman et al. 2010). A recent study in Ethiopia found that only six percent of women were members of cooperatives (Assefa and Tadesse 2012).
- iv The Loi No. 01-076 of 2001 in Mali regulates the establishment, functioning and dissolution of cooperative societies. These societies are to be formed according to the principle of solidarity and mutual understanding, and members must have joined voluntarily to achieve common goals of social and/or economic development. Free membership, democratic management and equality in the distribution of benefits accruing from cooperation remain fundamental principles. No discrimination is to be

tolerated on the basis of social position, religion, political affiliation or gender. Proclamation No. 147/1998, A Proclamation to Provide for the Establishment of Cooperative Societies, states that 'Cooperatives are voluntary organisations open to all persons...without gender, social, racial, political or religious discrimination'. Available from ILO NATLEX: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/natlex_browse.subject?p_lang=en&p_classification=11

- v The gender and co-operative working group set up in July 2012 involves the Ministry of Agriculture Women Affairs Directorate, Federal Co-operative Agency/FCA, Agricultural Transformation Agency/ATA, Oxfam, WFP/ Purchase for Progress/P4P, Techno Serve and ACDI/VOCA MADE project. The group has two goals: to promote greater integration and institutionalization of gender in agricultural co-operatives; and to advocate for better representation of women in agricultural co-operatives in decision making positions (Rahel Bekele, Oxfam, pers. comm. 2013).

References

- Abdulwahid, S. (2006) *Gender Differences in Mobilization for Collective Action: Case Studies of Villages in Northern Nigeria*. CAPRI Working Paper 58, Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute
- ActionAid (2011) *Investing in Women Smallholder Farmers: An ActionAid International Briefing*, Johannesburg, South Africa: Action Aid
- ActionAid, Care UK, Christian Aid, Concern Worldwide UK, Find Your Feet and Oxfam GB (2012) *What Works for Women: Proven Approaches for Empowering Women and Achieving Food Security*, London, UK: Action Aid International
- Agarwal, B. (2001) 'Participatory Exclusions, Community Forestry and Gender: An Analysis of South Asia and a Conceptual Framework', *World Development*, 29(10):1623-48
- Assefa, T.W. and Tadesse, F. (2012) *Women's Participation in Agricultural Cooperatives in Ethiopia*. Ethiopian Strategy Support Program (ESSP II), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: IFPRI
- Baden, S. (2013) *Women's Collective Action: Unlocking the Potential of African Agricultural Markets*. Oxfam International Research Report, Oxford, UK: Oxfam
- Barham, J. and Chitemi, C. (2008) *Collective Action Initiatives to Improve Marketing Performance, Lessons from Farmer's Groups in Tanzania*. CAPRI Working Paper No. 74, Washington, D.C.: IFPRI
- Bernard, T. and Spielman, D.J. (2008) 'Reaching the Rural Poor through Rural Producer Organizations? A Study of Agricultural Marketing Cooperatives in Ethiopia', *Food Policy*, 34(1):60-69

- Buvinic, M., Furst-Nichols, R. and Courtney-Pryor, E. (2013) *A Road Map for Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment*, New York: UN Foundation/Exxon Mobil
- CAADP (2009) *Framework for Improving rural infrastructure and Technical Capacities for Market Access*. New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) Pillar 2, Pretoria, South Africa: Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme
- CAADP (2011) *Post Compact Review: Tanzania Country Review Report*, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (forest products)
- Charman, A.J.E. (2008) *Empowering Women Through Livelihoods Orientated Agricultural Service Provision*. UNU-WIDER Research Paper 2008/01, Helsinki, Finland: United Nations University - World Institute of Economic Research
- Chirwa, E., Dorward, A., Kachule, R., Kumwenda, I., Kydd, J., Poole, N., Poulton, C. and Stockbridge, M. (2005) 'Walking Tightropes: Supporting Farmer Organizations for Market Access', *Natural Resource Perspective*, 99:1-6
- Coulter, J. (2007) *Farmer Groups Enterprises and the Marketing of Staple Food Commodities in Africa*. CAPRI Working Paper No.72, Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute
- FAO (2011) *The State Of Food And Agriculture 2010- 2011. Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development*, Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization
- Fischer, E. and Qaim, M. (2012) *Gender, Agricultural Commercialization, and Collective Action in Kenya*. Global Food Discussion Paper 8, Göttingen, Germany: Georg-August-University of Göttingen
- Francesconi, G. and Heerink, N. (2010) 'Ethiopian Agricultural Cooperatives in an Era of Global Commodity Exchange: Does Organisational Form Matter?', *Journal of African Economies*, 20(1):153-177
- Godquin, M. and Quisumbing, A.R. (2006) *Groups, Networks, and Social Capital in the Philippine Communities*. CAPRI Working Paper 55, Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute
- Goetz, A-M., and Gupta, R.S. (1996) 'Who takes the Credit? Gender Power and Control over Loan use in Rural Credit Programs in Bangladesh', *World Development*, 24(1):45-63
- Gotschi, E., Njuki, J. and Delve, R. (2008) 'Gender Equity and Social Capital in Smallholder Farmer Groups in Central Mozambique', *Development in Practice*, 18(4):650-657
- Harris-White, B. (2000) 'Taking Gender: Social institutions as Regulators of Markets', in Kuyvenhoven, A., Moll, H.A. and van Tilburg, A. (eds), *Agricultural Markets Beyond Liberalization*, New York: Springer
- Meinzen-Dick, R., DiGregorio, M. and McCarthy, N. (2004) 'Methods for Studying Collective Action in Rural Development', *Agricultural Systems*, 82(3):197-221.
- Mersland, R., D'Espallier, B. and Guérin, I. (2011) 'Women and Repayment in Microfinance', *World Development*, 39(5):758-772
- Narayan, D. and Pritchett, L. (1997) *Cents and Sociability: Household Income and Social Capital in Rural Tanzania*. Policy Research Working Paper No. 1796, Washington, D.C.: World Bank
- Nelson, N. (1995) 'The Kiambu Group: A Successful Women's ROSCA in Mathare Valley, Nairobi (1971-1990)', in Ardener, S. and Burman, S. (eds), *Money-Go-Rounds: The Importance of ROSCAS for Women*, Oxford, UK: Berg
- Okali, C. (2011) *Notes on Livestock, Food Security and Gender Equity*. Animal Production and Health Working Paper 3, Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization
- Okali, C. and Sumberg, J. (2012) 'Quick Money and Power: Tomatoes and Livelihood Building in Rural Brong Ahafo, Ghana', *IDS Bulletin*, 43(6):44-57
- O'Laughlin, B. (2007) 'A Bigger Piece of a Very Small Pie: Intra-household Resource Allocation and Poverty Reduction in Africa', *Development and Change*, 38(1):21-44
- Pandolfelli, L., Meinzen-Dick, R. and Dohrn, S. (2007) *Gender and Collective Action: A Conceptual Framework for Analysis*. CAPRI Working Paper 64, Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute
- Penrose-Buckley, C. (2007) *Producer Organisations: A Guide to Developing Collective Rural Enterprises*, Oxford, UK: Oxfam
- Pitt, M.M. and Khandker, S.R. (1998) 'The Impact of Group-Based Credit Programs on Poor Households in Bangladesh: Does the Gender of Participants Matter?', *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(5):958-996
- Prügl, E., Razavi, S. and Reysoo, F. (2013) *Gender and Agriculture after Neoliberalism?* Report of a workshop organized by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) and the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (IHEID), 19-20 July 2012, Villa Rigot, Geneva

Razavi, S. (2009) 'Engendering the Political Economy of Agrarian Change', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1):197-226

Thompson, J., Chirwa, E., Omiti, J., Teshome, A. and Hughes, D. (2008) *Scoping Study of Farmers' Organisations in Africa: Lessons from Ethiopia, Kenya and Malawi. A report to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*, Brighton, UK: Future Agricultures Consortium

Thompson, J., Teshome, A., Hughes, D., Chirwa, E. and Omiti, J. (2009) *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective Farmers' Organizations*. Policy Brief No. 32, Brighton, UK: Future Agricultures Consortium

Vigneri, M., Serra, R., and Kaminski, J. (2013) *Women's Collective Action in Agricultural Markets: Synthesis of Quantitative Research Findings in Ethiopia, Mali and Tanzania*, Oxford, UK: Oxfam

Wanyama, F.O., Develtere, P. and Pollet, I. (2009) *Reinventing the wheel? African cooperatives in a liberalized economic environment*. CoopAFRICA Working Paper 1, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: International Labour Office

Westermann, O., Ashby, J. and Pretty, J. (2005) 'Gender and social capital: the importance of gender differences for the maturity and effectiveness of natural resource management groups', *World Development*, 33(11):1783-1799

Wiggins, S. (2012) *Small Farm Commercialisation in Africa: A Guide to Issues and Policies*. Policy Brief 50, Brighton, UK: Future Agricultures Consortium

Acknowledgements:

This Policy Brief was written by **Sally Baden**¹ for the **Future Agricultures Consortium**. The series editors are **Paul Cox** and **Beatrice Ouma**. Further information about this series of Policy Briefs at: www.future-agricultures.org

The Future Agricultures Consortium aims to encourage critical debate and policy dialogue on the future of agriculture in Africa. The Consortium is a partnership between research-based organisations across Africa and in the UK. Future Agricultures Consortium Secretariat at the University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RE UK T +44 (0) 1273 915670 E info@future-agricultures.org

Readers are encouraged to quote or reproduce material from Future Agricultures Briefings in their own publications. In return, the Future Agricultures Consortium requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication.



The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government's official policies.