

Land O'Lakes

The Importance of Gender in a “Gender Blind” Asset Transfer Program: Lessons from Dairy Development in Mozambique

COUNTRY: MOZAMBIQUE

YEAR(S) OF PROJECT STUDY: 2008-2012, WITH GAAP STUDY FROM 2011-2012

PROJECT CONTACT(S): NANCY JOHNSON (N.JOHNSON@CGIAR.ORG)

BACKGROUND

The Manica Smallholder Dairy Development Program (MSDDP) in Manica Province, Mozambique, has two primary objectives: 1.) rebuilding Mozambique's dairy industry to meet market demand and 2.) increasing smallholder farmers' incomes through participation in a sustainable dairy value chain. The program provided training and improved dairy cows to households and supported the establishment of producer cooperatives and milk collection centers in communities in Manica province. Households in the province needed to meet a variety of criteria to participate and, for those that did, two members were required to attend trainings. This was a modification from an earlier requirement that only one member was required to attend training. Households chose the members themselves, and as a result of this change in requirements, over 60 percent of households had a woman trained. Once household members had completed the training, the household was given a pregnant heifer, registered in the name of the household head. The study looked in particular at women's participation in the program and the program's effects on gendered distribution of assets (like livestock and agricultural tools) and decisionmaking power.

METHODOLOGY

Land O'Lakes partnered with ILRI to examine the gendered impacts of this initially “gender blind” program, using both qualitative and quantitative tools. For the quantitative component, two household surveys were conducted in 2011 (125 households) and 2012 (150 households) in Manica and Gondola districts in Manica Province. The surveys collected information on household dairy productivity; food security; sex-disaggregated data on demographics, assets, and agricultural labor; and retrospective data on pre-program assets. There was no control group; the analysis looked only at beneficiary households and their outcomes pre- and post-program. Comparisons were drawn between those households that had completed training and received their cows with those households that were still in the process, as well as between households that had female trainees with households that did not.

For the qualitative component, LOL and ILRI conducted focus group discussions (FGDs) in program communities. In 2011, 15 FGDs were conducted that discussed the MSDDP, local understandings of assets and asset ownership, and gendered roles in dairy production. Two more focus groups were conducted in 2013 that looked at gendered control of income. The groups were divided into women's groups and men's groups, and were segregated by geographical location and whether or not households had already received their dairy cows.

FINDINGS

- *Rights to Assets:* Households increased their ownership of exotic cattle and land by a significant amount during the program period. However, the gendered distribution of assets did not change. There is a high degree of joint ownership of cattle and other assets and, according to FGDs, much of the joint ownership consists of women having rights to use assets that men control. However, these use rights did not necessarily mean women had control over milk, other livestock products, or income.

- *Production and Consumption:* Households that participated in the program reported higher milk production and sales than households that had livestock but did not participate in the program. These increased levels of production and sales, however, went hand in hand with high input costs and more labor hours for men, women, and children. The program's impacts on nutrition were positive, with participant households having higher levels of milk consumption and greater dietary diversity. Interestingly, the amount of milk allocated to either household consumption or sale did not differ greatly depending upon whether men or women made the allocation decision.
- *Gendered Control of Income and Investment:* Income from dairy production dramatically increased for households that received cows, but most of this income was controlled by men. Even though women contributed greatly to labor and "jointly" owned cows, this did not result in control over income. In many cases, even when women reported having control over income, this often meant that they made purchases only after first consulting their husbands. Men tended to use milk income to invest in draft animal technologies and cow feed/drugs. Women used income on immediate household needs. Furthermore, women reported not purchasing any assets with income generated from the sale of bull calves, while men reported purchasing many assets with this money.

FEEDBACK ON A CASE STUDY BASED ON AN INTERVIEW WITH ELIZABETH WAITHANJI:

- Asset-gender dynamics are heterogeneous, complex, and rooted in social, economic and institutional factors – are there any background factors that relate strongly to gender-asset dynamics that you either collected or wish you had collected?
 - I thought that Mozambique was a matriarchal society and thought that gender norms played out differently. In the study sites, however, the community was patriarchal. I would have liked to see how the gender dynamics played out in matriarchal communities.
- What kinds of tools did you use for data collection? Had you ever used these tools before? Was training the enumerators in these tools easy or challenging?
 - We mainly used focus group discussions (FGDs), a PRA tool. Within the FGD checklists different exercises such as proportion piling, rating, ranking, activity calendars, gender role mapping etc were used. Occasionally, key informant interviews (KII) were conducted.
- What are the unique gender-asset questions/indicators you either collected in your survey instrument that you would have implemented differently or you were not able to collect, but which you would have liked to collect and why?
 - The question on joint ownership of assets was complicated because the subject of joint ownership is complicated. Women often considered usufruct rights as ownership un-problematically, although a few women pointed out that usufruct rights did not represent true ownership. What I would like to know/ was not able to establish is the difference that usufruct versus actual ownership makes – by actual ownership I mean the ability of a woman to dispose of the asset with or without seeking permission from the man. If it the type of ownership matters, for who(m), and in what ways does it matter? FGDs might not be appropriate to collect this data. In-depth interviews might be more useful.
- What qualitative tools do you wish you had used in your research? Why did you not use them? Do you plan to use them in future research?
 - In-depth interviews. We did not use them because of the language barrier between the person who could have interviewed and potential respondents – too much meaning could have been lost in translation. I will use them only when there is no language barrier between the interviewer and respondent.
- Anything else you would like to share about the GAAP project and your involvement with it?
 - The language barrier can be a great challenge. I feel like translating questions and answers twice – English-Portuguese-Local language-Portuguese-English – is likely to distort questions and responses – even the most carefully framed ones. The necessity to minimize distortion is especially important in issues such as gender, which often require frequent probing and reframing of questions.

For more information about the Land O'Lakes project please see: Johnson, N., Njuki, J., Waithanji, E., Nhambeto, M., Rogers, M., Hutchinson Kruger, E. 2013. The Gendered Impacts of Agricultural Asset Transfer Projects: Lessons from the Manica Smallholder Dairy Development Program. CAPRI Working Paper 115. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute. <http://www.capri.cgiar.org/pdf/capriwp115.pdf>

For questionnaire(s) and survey instrument(s), please visit: <http://gaap.ifpri.info/tools-used-by-gaap/land-olakes-tools/>

For more information about GAAP, please visit: <http://gaap.ifpri.info/>

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 2033 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006---1002 USA | T. +1.202.862.5600 | F. +1.202.467.4439 | ifpri@cgiar.org | www.ifpri.org

This case study has been prepared as an output for GAAP (led by IFPRI and ILRI) and has not been peer reviewed. Any opinions stated herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by or representative of the International Food Policy Research Institute or its partners. Copyright © 2014 International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. For permission to republish, contact ifpri---copyright@cgiar.org.