



DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IMPACT ON EMPOWERMENT

A Minor Field Study of How Public-Private
Partnerships in Development Can Facilitate
Empowerment of Poor People by Interviewing
Coffee Farmers in Tanzania

Moa Skyllberg Persson

Master's Thesis:	30 higher education credits
Programme:	International Administration and Global Governance
Date:	2015-05-26
Supervisor:	Anna Persson
Words:	19512

Abstract

Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) and Empowerment are two approaches that are becoming more important and acknowledged in development efforts. Despite the recognition of these approaches, there is not much literature on the linkage between the approaches e.g. whether and how PPP, which function as a means of external governments' development policy, can facilitate empowerment of poor people, which consequently is the aim of this research. By using a theoretical framework that is based on theory on PPP and Empowerment, but specifically the linkage on how PPP can facilitate empowerment, the aim is to develop the theoretical and empirical understanding of such linkage.

The research is conducted as a qualitative time comparative case study of a 'typical' PPP program for empowerment that aim to strengthen capacity building of smallholding coffee farmers in Tanzania in order to improve their livelihood. The narrow research objective is to examine whether and how PPP can led to a perceived improvement in 'social', 'political' and/or 'psychological' power among the farmers, but also if such empowerment is independently of their position and gender, for which data is collected through sixteen semi structured respondent interviews of farmers.

The result of the empirical study in Tanzania suggests that PPPs in general is successful to facilitate empowerment of poor people, which is particularly attributed to the mobilization of the farmer group structure, although patterns indicate people with lower social positions, especially women, perceived to be slightly less empowered than people in higher social positions.

Key Words

Public-Private Partnership, PPP, Empowerment, Development, Aid, Mobilization, Poverty, Coffee Farmers, Agriculture, Farmer Groups, Social Power, Political Power, Psychological Power, Tanzania, Sub-Saharan Africa, Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the wonderful people at Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Africa, the inspiring and amazing people that agreed to participate in this research, my translator James Siame, my friend Blaga Zlateva and my supervisor Anna Persson for your invaluable support throughout this memorable journey.

“I can impact what is happening in my life. I can impact local politics. I have the confidence to try to influence what is going on in the village. I now understand my own power and how I can use it. Both politicians and companies listen more to us now when we are together in a farmer group than when we were alone. I feel that I have a stronger voice now”

- Ndele Sawanga



Abbreviations

AB	Advisory Board
ADA	Austrian Development Aid
CCM	Chama Cha Mapinduzi (Party of the Revolution)
CFAT	Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DC	Depot Committee
FFS	Farmer Field Schools
HRNS	Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PO	Producer Organization (or Farmer Group)
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
SHIVIWAKA	Former Highest Level in the Farmer Organization
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TaCRI	Tanzania Coffee Research Institute
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
Yara	Fertilizers and Pesticides Company

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theory and Previous Literature.....	4
2.1 Concepts and Definitions	4
2.1.1 Understanding of Public-Private Partnerships.....	4
2.1.2 Understanding of Empowerment.....	5
2.1.2.1 ‘Social Power’	5
2.1.2.2 ‘Political Power’	6
2.1.2.3 ‘Psychological Power’	8
2.2 PPPs Ability to Impact Empowerment	9
2.2.1 Gender Literature Linkage	9
2.2.2. Literature on PPP in Development	9
2.3 Research Aim and Questions	13
3. Methodology	14
3.1 Operationalization	14
3.1.1 ‘Social Power’	14
3.1.2 ‘Political Power’	15
3.1.3 ‘Psychological Power’	16
3.1.4 Operationalization Scheme.....	16
3.2 Method	17
3.2.1 Qualitative and Abductive Approach	17
3.2.2 Case Study	17
3.2.2.1 Case Selection.....	18
3.2.2.2 CFAT and its Objectives.....	19
3.2.2.3 Characteristics of this Public-Private Partnership	20
3.2.3 Semi-Structured Respondent Interviews	21
3.2.4 Sampling of Interviewees	22

3.2.5 Analysis	23
3.2.5.1 Criteria for Conclusion	24
4. Analysis	26
4.1 ‘Social Power’	26
4.1.1 Income and Life Situation	26
4.1.1.1 Access to Food.....	27
4.1.1.2 Sending Children to School	27
4.1.2 Loans and Credit.....	28
4.1.3 Property and Tools	29
4.1.4 Health and Medical Accessibility.....	30
4.1.5 Education and Knowledge.....	31
4.1.5.1 Practical Farming Methods.....	31
4.1.5.2 Entrepreneurial Skills and Gender Equality	32
4.1.6 Surplus Time	32
4.1.7 Summary of ‘Social Power’	33
4.2 ‘Political Power’	33
4.2.1 Ability to Take Action and Impact.....	33
4.2.1.1 Political Influence	34
4.2.1.2 Influence over the Farmer Groups	36
4.2.1.2 Influence over CFAT	37
4.2.2 Strengths and Achievements of Mobilization	39
4.2.2.1 Bank Loans and Water Taps.....	39
4.2.2.2 Higher Coffee Prices.....	40
4.2.2.2 Improved Knowledge	42
4.2.3 Summary of ‘Political Power’	43
4.3 ‘Psychological Power’	44
4.3.2 Self Confidence, Potency and Opportunities.....	44
4.3.2.1 Confidence to Express Oneself.....	45
4.3.3 Confidence to Engage in Goals and Activities.....	45
4.3.4 Knowledge Boost Confidence.....	47

4.3.5 Financial Obstacles Lowers Confidence	47
4.3.6 Summary of ‘Psychological Power’	48
5. Discussion and Conclusion	49
5.1 Answering the Research Questions.....	49
5.2 Implications for the Broader Context.....	51
References	53
<i>Annex 1</i>	56
<i>Annex 2</i>	58

1. Introduction

The private sector is today playing a large part in development efforts and many actors within this field argues that it can tackle poverty because of its drive for economic growth, employment creation and its innovation and skills (Billing et al. 2012, p. 1). Because of these benefits, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) considers the private sector as an “important strategic partner for the UNDP in achieving its vision to help countries eradicate poverty and reduce inequalities and exclusion within broader sustainable development” (UNDP, *UNDP and the private sector*, retrieved 2015-02-13). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) recognizes how contributions from the private sector are becoming more significant (2011, p.3). Further indications of the important role of the private sector is the creation of the Global Compact, which is a universal UN initiative for increasing corporate social responsibility (CSR) (United Nations Global Compact, *Overview of the United Nations Global Compact*, retrieved 2015-02-03).

Public-Private Partnerships (hereinafter PPP) is one approach to development that is connected to private sector initiatives. This approach to development has gained much attention among scholars and practitioners and “has been celebrated by international development agencies as a key strategy for delivering services to cities of the third world” (Mirabaf 2004, p. 89). Supporters argue that PPPs can reach outcomes that neither public nor private actor could achieve alone. It can combine the strengths and overcome the weaknesses of the two actors, which will benefit all involved (Ferroni & Castle 2011, p. 11ff; Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 546; Billing 2012, p. 3). Proponents further claim that PPPs are innovative and beneficial institutional arrangements for cooperation that are established in a new organizational setting (Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 546). Opponents nevertheless view PPPs as substitutes for commercial privatization and contracting out practice (Wettenhall 2003, p. 78; Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 547). In line with this view, PPPs are only involved in development in order to legitimate their power and meet their own interest (Banerjee 2008; Prügl & True 2014, p. 1141). Intense debates of PPPs actual ability to deliver public services, and what kind of governance structure of the PPP that can enable this, constitutes the literature.

Another approach to development that is considered important is empowerment, which the new slogan of the UNDP accordingly demonstrate; “Empowered lives. Resilient nations” (UNDP, retrieved 2015-02-07). In general terms, empowerment refers to people’s ability to control their own life (Sen 1997; Kabeer 1999; Sen 1999; Hill 2003; Friedmann 1992). The following quote by the World Bank can summarize the definition; “Empowerment refers broadly to the expansion of freedom of choice and action to shape one’s life. It implies control over resources and decisions” (The World Bank 2002, p. ‘The Meaning of Empowerment’). Scholars recognize the importance of empowerment since it is the key to individual well being (Hill 2003, p. 118). Poverty is a result of little social and political empowerment (Friedmann 1992, p. 8). Development therefore has to focus on empowering individuals by improving the conditions in their lives (Friedmann, 1992 p. 35). Additionally, the ability to have control over one’s life also concerns people’s self-expression, such as the ability to impact the surrounding societal and political environment by raising one’s voice (World Bank 2002, p. 21f; Sen 1997, p. 2f; Osmani 2000, p. 18ff). The participation aspect of empowerment is important for development since it can create opportunities for poverty reduction and strengthen quality of governance. The pressure from citizens will force government officials to be more accountable (Sen 1997, p. 19; The World Bank 2002; Osmani 2000, p. 18ff).

Despite the recognition of the importance of PPP and empowerment in development, there is not much research about the link between the approaches, such as whether and how PPP can facilitate empowerment. A very small amount of literature on this linkage lies in the field of gender and women’s studies rather than development (Prügl & True 2014; Bexell 2012). The aim of this research is consequently to increase the understanding and fill the gap in the literature of *whether and how Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments’ development policy, can serve to facilitate empowerment of poor people*. The research will focus on a specific Public-Private Partnership program that, through a holistic and bottom-up approach, intends to strengthen capacity building in order to improve the livelihood of smallholding coffee farmers in Tanzania (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Application Form – Public Private Partnership, Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 8f). The applied definition of PPPs for development is “cooperation agreements between a governmental donor agency and business for the provision of assets and delivery of services that allocates responsibilities and risks among the partners” (Billing et al. 2012, p. 3). Consequently, this study intends to focus on PPPs in development, where the PPP is part of an external government’s international development policy, although it does not focus on

service delivery but whether and how partnerships can facilitate empowerment of the people. The objective of the intervening government is similar to unilateral development, but there is hence a difference in the approach since the goals, risks and costs are shared with a private actor (Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 546).

The result from the empirical study conducted in Tanzania reveals that Public-Private Partnerships were quite successful to facilitate empowerment among poor people since there was an overall significant perceived improvement in their life situation and many people were able to climb the social ladder, which was mostly attributed to the mobilizations of the farmer group structure. But patterns in the result also show that PPPs were not able to fully empower poor people independently of their position and gender since PO members, with a lower social position, perceived to be slightly less empowered than people in higher social positions such as the DC, which was particularly evident for women in terms of 'political' and 'psychological' power.

2. Theory and Previous Literature

This chapter provides the theoretical and empirical foundation for this research. The first section on concepts and definitions gives a theoretical insight to the key concepts. The second section on previous literature provides the theoretical and empirical linkage between PPP and empowerment, which function as the fundamental theoretical base since the aim of the research similarly is to examine whether and how PPPs can facilitate empowerment.

2.1 Concepts and Definitions

2.1.1 Understanding of Public-Private Partnerships

There are multiple definitions and practical usages of PPPs, but in general, it is understood as a relationship between public and private actors, including non-governmental, “based upon agreement, reflecting mutual responsibilities in furtherance of shared interest” (Buse & Walt 2000, p. 549f) as well as “cooperative institutional arrangements between public and private sector actors”. The PPP enables the actors to mutually develop products or services by sharing risks and costs (Ibid 2007, p. 546). Proponents view PPPs as innovative and beneficial institutional arrangements for cooperation that are established in a new organizational setting (Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 546). Opponents however claim that previous language surrounding “privatization”, “competition” and “contracting out” is being rephrased by “public-private partnerships, cooperation and relationships” as well as “new governance structures associated with ‘joined-up’ government” (Wettenhall 2003, p. 78). They furthermore argue that PPPs are a “feature” of contracting-out practice. It is a commercial practice between the public and the private sector through a legal contract (Wettenhall 2003, p. 78).

The definition of PPPs in this research is fundamentally based on such description, but since the research take place within the field of development, where the public actor is a governmental development agency, a more specific and accurate definition of PPPs for this research is a “cooperation agreements between a governmental donor agency and business for the provision of assets and delivery of services that allocates responsibilities and risks among

the partners” (Billing et al. 2012, p. 3). As stated however, there is not a focus on service delivery but rather PPPs ability to facilitate empowerment of poor people.

2.1.2 Understanding of Empowerment

As with most theoretical definitions, there is no coherent understanding of empowerment. Scholars however talk about somewhat similar dimensions, which can be grasped into the following ‘powers’.

The word itself indicates that Empowerment is related to power. Empowerment is a change of power relations in favor of those who previously had limited power over their lives (Sen 1997, p. 2; Kabeer 1999, p. 437). It is a process of gaining power and control over one’s life, such as access to resources and the ability to express oneself (Sen 1997, p. 2). “Empowerment refers broadly to the expansion of freedom of choice and action to shape one’s life. It implies control over resources and decisions” (The World Bank 2002, p. ‘The Meaning of Empowerment’).

According to Friedmann, empowerment of the household and the individual through access to ‘social’, ‘political’ and ‘psychological’ power (1992, p. 33) is a “model of how poverty can be overcome and a genuine development promoted” (Ibid, p. 70). Access to these matters increases the household’s “productive wealth” since it can enable them to “set and attain objectives” (Ibid, p. 33). For Friedmann, development is a process of social and political empowerment, where individuals are empowered through their involvement in social and political actions- by empowering people the long-term objective is to rebalance the power structure in society through more accountable state action, a strengthened civil society and more socially responsible corporate business (Ibid, p. 31ff).

2.1.2.1 ‘Social Power’

Consequently, Friedmann argues that poverty is the result of lacking social and political empowerment (1992, p. 8). Well-being can only be achieved when people have power and freedom over their own life (Hill 2003, p. 118). Friedmann continues to stress the importance of development to focus on empowering households by addressing their needs and rights, hence create “improvement in the conditions of the life and livelihood” (1992, p. 35). Furthermore, Amartya Sen’s initial concept of capabilities concerns individual’s ability to control their life. It refers to the opportunity and freedom to “lead the kind of lives they value” (1999, p. 18). His theoretical thinking revolves around “development as freedom” which is “the *process* that allows freedom of actions and decisions, and the actual *opportunities* that people have, given their personal and social circumstances” (1999, p. 17f). Naila Kabeer view

capabilities as the “potential that people have for living the lives they want, of achieving valued ways of being and doing” (1999, p. 438). Being empowered means having the choice to choose between alternatives. She recognizes the link between disempowerment and poverty since the inability to meet one’s basic needs often limits the possibility to exercise choice (Ibid, p. 437).

In order to be empowered and being able to make thoughtful decisions, it is necessary to have access to various resources. The resources can be materialistic in a conventional economic sense (Kabeer 1999, p. 437), such as financial income and financial tools of formal and informal credit arrangements, as well as physical tools that facilitate the daily life of the household and the formal and informal livelihood household production (Friedmann 1992, p. 69). But the resources also comprises of human and social resources that can “enhance the ability to exercise choice”. These are social and institutional domains that make up the society such as “family, market, community” (Kabeer 1999, p. 437). ‘Social power’ also concern territorial ownership, spare time outside life surviving activities, as well as having knowledge and skills about various issues that affect individuals lives through formal and informal education (Friedmann 1992, p. 68). Sen argues that it is important that development projects both address control of life and access to resources; if people are conscious and have control over their life but do not have access to resources, there will be a sense of hopelessness and people will quite the process (Sen 1997, p. 2).

2.1.2.2 ‘Political Power’

Another aspect of gaining control over one’s life is the ability to impact and influence the processes and mechanisms that constitute one’s life situation and the political environment. The World Bank outlines this aspect through the following statement. “Empowerment is the expansion of assets and capabilities of poor people to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control, and hold accountable institutions that affect their lives” (2002, p. ‘The Meaning of Empowerment’). Friedmann defines individuals’ access to the processes that impact their lives as their ‘political power’, and it is highly important that development address this issue (1992, p. 31ff). Many societies in poor areas face institutional barriers that prevent actions and choices that can improve people’s well-being. Consequently, institutional inequalities make poor people voiceless and powerless in their relation to the state and market (The World Bank 2002, p. ‘The Meaning of Empowerment’). Empowerment requires the removal of these obstacles through improved access to information and transparency between state and citizens. Informed citizens are better equipped to stand up for themselves and to hold officials

accountable (The World Bank 2002, p. 'Four Key Elements'; Sen 1997, p. 19). Empowerment also requires accountability of public officials, as well as participation of citizens and local organizational capacity (The World Bank 2002, p. 'Four Key Elements'). Empowering poor people can strengthen quality of governance. "When citizens are engaged, exercise their voice, and demand accountability, government performance improves and corruption is harder to sustain" (The World Bank 2002, p. 'Summary').

Many scholars recognize the importance of mobilization, for instance through civil society, social movements and non-governmental organizations for effective empowerment that can lead to poverty reduction (Sen 1997, p. 9ff; Osmani 2000, p. 18ff; World Bank 2002, p. 21f). Osmani argues that empowerment of the poor can only be achieved through mobilization and strengthening of civil society and non-governmental organizations. Due to economic insecurity, illiteracy and lack of self-confidence, it is important that such organizations are encouraged (2000, p. 19). In poor communities, people turn to, and depend on each other for support. When communities are well organized and, importantly, connected with other community organizations in the formation of networks, they have a much better chance of raising their voices and influence the surrounding societal and political matters. The World Bank thus claim that "Local organizational capacity is key for development effectiveness" (2002, p. 21f).

However, mobilization of civil society might not result in empowerment for all people due to local contextual inequalities, which has gained wide attention among scholars (Osmani 2000; Hill 2003; Mohan & Stokke 2000; Sen 1997; Arora & Romijn 2011). There is a problem of assuming that empowerment for everyone can be achieved on the local level since communities are not homogenous, but are constituted of different "economic, social, cultural and political relations and flows of commodities, information and people" (Mohan & Stokke 2000, p. 264). Local communities often constrain of strict hierarchies that will neither facilitate equal participation in civil society (Osmani 2000, p. 18ff) nor facilitate an even allocation of resources (Sen 1997, p. 6). Difference in capital, ethnicity or other make some people better off and create hierarchies. These elite people often perceive themselves as leaders, or the voice of the whole community, although they might benefit themselves at cost of less fortunate community members in their relation with external development agencies (Arora & Romijn 2011, p. 491ff). Another important aspect of local inequalities is the issue of gender. Women are often less privileged in terms of education and labor, which leads to a higher vulnerability to poverty (Sen 1997, p. 7f). Many Sub-Saharan countries legally restrict several civil rights for women, often in favor of the husband. Wives are often denied financial

resources and decisions over their labor situation. But women in Sub-Saharan Africa are often denied various civil rights in general- for instance are the hours and the type of work that women can perform restricted as well as the right to own and inherit property (The World Bank, Hallward-Driemeier & Hasan 2013, p. 10ff). Women are also more excluded from the public and political sphere (Osmani 2000, p. 13). Hill argues that this uneven access of capabilities between different groups can mostly be attributed to the allocation ability of institutional framework but also to historical and social contexts (2003, p. 130).

2.1.2.3 'Psychological Power'

There are however scholarly debates regarding the interventional approach to empowerment. Sen argue that “governments do not empower people; people empower themselves”. Actors in development can create opportunistic environments or “act as a barrier to the empowerment process” but they cannot enforce or create empowerment themselves, it has to come from within. When viewing the process of empowerment in a way that development actors are “empowering” people, there is too much emphasize on the provision of access to resources that for example will increase incomes, assets and employment. The focus should instead lie on the core of empowerment, which is confidence and self-esteem e.g. capacity building that is the foundation of change (1997, p. 3). It is important that individuals are confident and have a sense of potency. When individuals are confident and thus have a certain “power within”, they tend to view their capabilities in a better light and they are more likely to engage in activities and reach outcomes. More self confidence can hence strengthen and encourage individuals to define their goals, act upon them and reach them (Friedmann 1992, p. 33; Kabeer 1999, p. 438).

When individuals have been socially and politically empowered, psychological empowerment is often a result. The feeling of potency and power, e.g. being psychologically empowered, can have positive effects on a continued struggle for social and political power (Friedmann 1992, p. 33). The sequence of empowerment might also start with psychological power, since when individuals feel empowered and strengthened, they might demand political and social power as well.

2.2 PPPs Ability to Impact Empowerment

Why then should we examine and envision a link between PPP and empowerment? Consequently, why and how can we envision that PPP can facilitate empowerment of poor people, but also why is it even relevant to examine this? This section presents answers to such questions through the literature, since it shows that there is a gap in previous studies, and the literature also theoretically and empirically suggests how PPPs could facilitate empowerment.

2.2.1 Gender Literature Linkage

First of all, it is relevant to envision that PPP could have a positive impact on empowerment since it has characteristics that can facilitate such empowerment, which is presented below. Second, and equally important, it is relevant to examine such linkage since there has not been a lot of research on whether and how PPP could facilitate empowerment. A very small amount of literature that theoretically suggests such linkage lies in the field of gender and women's studies (Prügl & True 2014; Bexell 2012).

Previous literature writes that PPPs for gender equality and women's empowerment can enable new options and cooperation (Prügl & True 2014, p. 1159). The solution to enable companies need for profit and increase women's empowerment is to combine the needs- to "make it market embedded and re-emerging as a business opportunity" (Bexell 2012, p. 398). Neoliberal economic policy provides the possibility for women's empowerment since it encourages individual initiatives and entrepreneurship as well as regulation through "incentives and normative standard rather than enforcement". Such informal approaches increase reflection that allows alternative solutions (Prügl & True 2014, p. 1157). PPPs can however make empowerment as well as human rights lose their value, since they become instruments to obtain the goals of economic growth and development. Notions of empowerment are subordinated "demands of effectiveness within neoliberal market criteria" (Bexell 2012, p. 403).

2.2.2. Literature on PPP in Development

Consequently, there has not been much research about PPPs ability facilitate empowerment apart from the small literature within gender and women's studies. Most previous literature on PPP does not emphasize on empowerment, but instead concerns a wide range of development aspects where the essence lies on the *governance structure* of PPPs to enable *delivery of public services* to poor people (Mirafab 2004; Stadtler 2012; Hodge &

Greve 2007; Buse & Walt 2000; Marin 2009; Wettenhall 2003; Mukhopadhyay 2011; Bovaird 2005; Cruz & Marquez 2013). Even though the ‘PPP in development’ literature does not concern empowerment, it consequently emphasize on governance and power structures that touch upon issues of accountability, power sharing and participation in order to enable service delivery, which also could have an impact on empowerment since aspects of empowerment are embedded in such features. The following section hence presents the theory and empirics of how PPP in development can enable *service delivery* to poor people, which emphasizes on the governance of PPP.

Previous literature on the characteristics of PPP, and what positive implications this can have on the broader context within development, is attributed to its win-win opportunity. Through the PPP, the public and the private actor are mutually developing products or services by sharing risks and costs, which will benefit all involved (Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 546). Public and private actors have different strengths and weaknesses- through a joint partnership they could “enable sustainable outcomes that no single party could achieve alone” (Ferroni & Castle 2011, p. 1066f). In agriculture, collaboration between these actors can limit the “business sector’s inherent inability to operate where there is no market, and the public sector’s limited ability to market research outputs” (Ibid 2011, p. 1066f). Corporations have a practical and technical knowledge, a problem solving capacity and financial resources whereas public actors can contribute with their aim and knowledge of developing market capacity through functioning financial institutions (Billing et al. 2012, p. 3). Other even claim that the involvement of the private sector can fill the public service gap of what the governance was unable to deliver (Prügl & True 2014, p. 1141).

Opponents argue that PPPs have arisen from neoliberalism and that it is a language game (Wettenhall 2003; Hodge & Greve 2007). Previous language surrounding “privatization”, “competition” and “contracting out” is being rephrased by “public-private partnerships, cooperation and relationships” as well as “new governance structures associated with ‘joined-up’ government” (Wettenhall 2003, p. 78). Expressions that have departed from neoliberalism generate less opposition and “invite more people and organizations to get a market share or public provision” (Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 547). Others argue that PPPs are a “feature” of contracting-out practice. It is a commercial practice between the public and the private through a legal contract (Wettenhall 2003, p. 78). According to Prügl and True, the new attention of the business sector to gender equality and women’s empowerment, conforms the transformation of state governance toward neoliberalism (2014, p. 1138) where PPPs are the instrument of economic growth and development. PPPs for empowerment become market

embedded and a possibility for business (Bexell 2012, p. 403). Hence, businesses are often involved in development to meet their own interests such as to legitimize and consolidate their power (Banerjee 2008, p. 52) as well as to push their agendas, rather than meeting development needs (Prügl & True 2014, p. 1141).

Literature on the characteristics within the PPP, but also in its relation with stakeholders, thus mostly emphasize on governance such as accountability, power sharing and participation. It is important to pay attention to, and acknowledge whose voices and knowledge that are being heard (Bexell 2012, p. 390). PPPs are a responsible and accountable body in itself, but due to its unique constellation, there is uncertainty to whom it should be accountable to (Bovaird 2004, p. 203) since companies are accountable to their shareholders and public partners to their citizens (Buse & Walt 2000, p. 705). PPPs need to be responsible to the other partners and especially toward the public partner since they are the most responsible to the citizens (Stadtler 2012, p. 30f). According to Wettenhall however, the public partners accountability toward their citizens suffers when involved in a PPP (2003, p. 91f). There is a risk that the public partner is over run by the private sector if the drive for commercialization is strong (Ibid, p. 99).

Accountability and participation can depend on the management of the PPP. In a top down or 'lead organization structure', the responsibility (Stadtler 2012, p. 48) and decision making lies with one actor where the beneficiaries are invited to "share their insights and needs" (Ibid, p. 39f). Such a structure can be effective if the desired solution can accept less joint coordination, and the lead partner has the competences and resources for the project (Ibid, p. 48). Private sector lead is often more effective than public lead (Prügl & True 2014, p. 1157), but such structure seem to limit beneficiary involvement in favor of the company itself, which results in low accountability (Stadtler 2012, p. 48) Public partners however, care more for the inclusion and participation of women (Prügl & True 2014, p. 1157).

Similar to the previous theory on local contextual inequalities, there are thus assumptions that the playing field of PPPs is equal but friction and inequality between the PPP and the beneficiaries exists. Bexell writes how markets are not gender equal and therefore "lock out certain visions of empowerment, women and gender, and favor others" (2012, p. 403). There is a problem with limited representation of the recipients, which can make the interest of the local community and result in having little influence of the project agenda (Buse & Walt 2000, p. 704ff). It is important to have improved coordination between the partners and inclusion of the recipient country. They should be part of the leadership and hence have ownership (Ibid, p. 706f). Mirafab similarly argues that there has to be joint

action, but especially equity between the partners. The public should practice a regulatory role for this purpose. Decentralization of state responsibilities to facilitate private sector participation, often result in less equitable partnerships since they require a strong regulatory public role. Equitable processes and outcomes cannot be solved through the contract, instead the project needs to relate to and address issues in the sociopolitical and historical contexts that the other partners are positioned within. Otherwise the recipient state might be unable to engage in and take over the project, which can result in an unequal power sharing that does not benefit the poor (Mirafab 2004, p. 98).

Even though there is not much research on the linkage, the previous theory and empirics makes it possible to envision that PPPs can have a positive impact on empowerment due to its beneficial characteristics. PPPs can combine its strengths and therefore achieve greater outcomes (Ferroni & Castle 2011, p. 1066f; Billing et al. 2012, p. 3; Hodge & Greve 2007, p. 546), but also, if PPPs are being accountable, responsible and equal (Bexell 2012; Bovaird 2004; Buse & Walt 2000; Stadtler 2012; Wettenhall 2003; Mirafab 2004) one can argue that PPPs can impact empowerment since such institutional arrangements can assist to facilitate opportunities for empowerment.

2.3 Research Aim and Questions

Due to the above described theoretical and empirical background, it becomes interesting to further examine the link between PPPs and empowerment. Several gaps in the previous literature has consequently been identified where the aim of this research therefore is to fill these gaps by increasing the understanding of *whether and how Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments development policy, can serve to facilitate empowerment of poor people*. Most importantly, there has not been much research about PPPs impact on empowerment of poor people- the research on empowerment instead focuses on gender and women's empowerment rather than on development objectives. But the majority of the literature on PPPs in development in turn concerns PPPs ability to deliver public services to poor people, not focusing on empowerment. Also the applied definition of PPPs that is used have not been widely examined, e.g. PPPs as a means for external governments development policy. The following specific research questions will assist to answer the aim of the research;

1. *Has Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments development policy, led to a perceived significant improvement in 'social power', 'political power' and/or 'psychological power' among poor people, if so, how?"*
2. *Do Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments development policy, serve to facilitate empowerment among poor people independently of their position and gender, if so, how?*

3. Methodology

3.1 Operationalization

The operationalization is based on John Friedmann's and Naila Kabeer's empowerment theories since a combination of their understanding provides the 'essence' and enriches the framing of the theory. Also, their 'conditions' for empowerment, e.g. Friedmann's 'powers' and Kabeer's 'dimensions', enables and facilitates the measurement of the research.

3.1.1 'Social Power'

'Social power' is measured in terms of people's perception of their accessibility to the following key definitions; *'sufficient income and life situation'*, *'access to loans and credit'*, *'sufficient tools for household and work activities'*, *'territorial ownership'*, *'good health and medical accessibility'*, *'surplus time'*, *'access to education that brings knowledge and skills'*.

Material resources, which can be conventional economic (Kabeer 1999, p. 437), are measured by individuals' access to income and financial tools of formal and informal credit arrangements (Friedmann 1992, p. 69) that can facilitate a sufficient life situation. A measurement of material resources is also sufficient access to "instruments of work and livelihood" that refer to tools for life and production. In the domestic sphere, it refers for instance to having kitchen instruments and toilet facilities. For informal and formal production, the instruments concerns tools for production such as shovels, fertilizers, bicycles, sewing machines, access to water and land, that provides for a healthy and sustainable livelihood. Material resources also include having physical strength and health, which implies access to conventional healthcare (Ibid, p. 69).

'Social power' hence concern social aspects, which is partly measured through having a 'defensible life space', e.g. individuals have the possibility to own and use a property, such as house and land. The social aspects are furthermore measured through having 'surplus time', which is time to spend on other things than life surviving activities. Thus, whether individuals have additional time besides the time it takes to travel to work, to collect food, water and fuel, to perform the essential domestic duties, as well as spend time on issues caused by illness (Ibid, p. 67f).

Other measurements of 'social power' are whether individuals have 'knowledge and skills' to maneuver their life. This is measured through people's access to formal and informal education, such as conventional school as well as practical and technical training that will enable them to effectively maneuver their work and life. Education can improve the 'appropriate information' that is necessary for knowing how to increase development and livelihood of the household, such as methods that can improve production (Ibid, p. 68).

3.1.2 'Political Power'

'Political power' is measured in terms of people's perception of their accessibility to the following key definitions; *'ability to take action'*, *'ability to impact life and surrounding societal and political matters'*, *'raise the voice'*, *'possibilities to mobilize'* and *'strength and achievements of mobilization'*.

It is the power to take action and impact, as well as the "power over" the agency of others (Kabeer 1999, p. 438). 'Political power' can be measured as individuals ability to raise their voice, be involved in and influence the processes and mechanisms that impact the decisions and environment, which affect their life situation e.g. to impact and influence the surrounding societal and political environment (Friedmann 1992, p. 33, Kabeer 1999, p. 438). Concrete examples of such influential mechanisms are whether individuals can impact political decision making, for instance through voting in political elections (Kabeer 1999, p. 438; Friedmann 1992, p. 33), impact activities and decisions in the farmers groups as well impact the occurrences and activities of CFAT.

'Political power' can be exercised and measured by individuals or by a local assembly on the community level. But the ability to influence is more effectively fought collectively and can make the most impact in a larger space. When many people raise their voices and opinions, it is more likely to have an impact on the surrounding societal and political environment. Collective action and mobilization can for instance be exercised through bargaining, negotiation and resistance of peasant groups and networks, labor organizations, social movements, interests groups and parties (Ibid). Concrete measurements of mobilization as well as strengths and achievements of mobilization, is people's ability to form farmer groups and whether such groups can enable people to decide over and achieve things that was previously difficult. Thus, can it enable the farmers to impact the surrounding societal and political matters that affect them and thereby improve their life situation. For instance, to advance and control the processes that increase the coffee price, for instance quality and quantity of the coffee, marketing channels and when their coffee will be auctioned.

3.1.3 'Psychological Power'

'Psychological power' is measured in terms of people's perception of their accessibility to the following key definitions; '*self confidence*', '*mental strengths*', '*sense of potency*', '*confidence to create goals*' and '*confidence to engage in activities*'.

This power can be measured as individual's sense of potency and self confidence, e.g. the "power within", which lead to the meaning and motivation to engage in an activity (Friedmann 1992, p. 33; Kabeer 1999, p. 438). It concerns how the individual person views its own capability to achieve certain things. More specifically, it is measured in terms of the individual's inner strength and confidence to reach an outcome (Friedmann 1992, p. 33). It is henceforth about having the ability and to define a goal, and then also the potential to act upon it (Kabeer 1999, p. 438).

3.1.4 Operationalization Scheme

Key Definitions of the Operationalization		
'Social Power'	'Political Power'	'Psychological Power'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'sufficient income and life situation' • 'access to bank loans and credit' • 'sufficient tools for household and work activities' • 'territorial ownership' • 'good health and medical accessibility' • 'surplus time' • 'access to education that brings knowledge and skills' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'ability to take action' • 'ability to impact life and surrounding societal and political matters' • 'raise the voice' • 'possibilities to mobilize' • 'strength and achievements of mobilization' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'self confidence' • 'mental strengths' • 'sense of potency' • 'confidence to create goals' • 'confidence to engage in activities'

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Qualitative and Abductive Approach

This research intends to increase the understanding of whether and how PPPs can serve to facilitate empowerment, which requires a deeper understanding of farmer's conditions and contexts. It is therefore relevant to use a qualitative method since such approach explores the situation people are in (Silverman 2011, p. 8) and uses "naturally occurring data" to answer more in-depth questions (Ibid, p. 17). The strength of qualitative method is hence that the data is based on the natural social environment and that it is possible to conduct a deep and detailed research (Denscombe 2009, p. 398).

The study leans toward an Abductive approach. The research emerges from theory on PPP, Empowerment and the linkage between the concepts, which forms the theoretical foundation of the research. The empirical and theoretical linkage is however quite insignificant, which makes it relevant to theoretically examine this relation. The empirical data from the research is then used to develop the previous empirics and theory. There is hence a back and forth interaction between theory and data (Esaiasson 2012, p. 276).

3.2.2 Case Study

The strength of Case Studies is that it enables to study a complex phenomenon deeper and in detail (Denscombe 2009, p. 60), which correspond with the aim of the research. A 'Within-Case' analysis is conducted, but not in the sense of a causal 'Process Tracing' (Mahoney 2007, p. 131), rather it examines one case, which is the 'Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania' (CFAT), although there is a time comparison of ten years within the case- before the farmers were part of the program, which started in 2006 and today. Esaiasson et al. argue how case studies cannot plainly be considered as having *one* unit of analysis, since there are often many units within the case. They therefore argue that there is not a large difference between case studies and comparative studies (2012, p. 109).

The time comparison of the two units- before 2006 and in 2015 focuses on analyzing a potential change- farmer's perception of a potential *improved* empowerment (Ibid, p. 146). It is appropriate to conduct a 'with-in time comparison case study' since the aim of the research is to explore the perception of the farmers within the program. Interviewing farmers outside the program could potentially be beneficial since it is good in general to have a reference point, but such method cannot be considered valid in this research since that does not give an

insight to the perception of those who are in the program and thus does not correspond with the aim. A negative implication on such method is however that the farmers might not remember correctly or perceive themselves as less or more empowered than they actually are. Despite these obstacles, interviewing farmers within the program about their individual perceptions is still the most valid method for this research.

3.2.2.1 Case Selection

The case is a specific Public-Private Partnership program that work to strengthen capacity building in order to improve livelihood through a holistic bottom-up approach among smallholding coffee farmers in Tanzania (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Application Form – Public Private Partnership, Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 8f). The program is implemented by the German non-governmental organization Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung (HRNS) that focuses on running international projects aiming to sustainably improve working and living conditions of (mostly) smallholding coffee farmers (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Toward a level playing field*, retrieved 2014-12-17). The research hence aim to examine how PPPs can impact empowerment of *poor people*, and farmers therefore function as the case of poor people, since farmers in developing countries are a typical example of people living in poverty.

The program is a so called ‘critical case’, which is divided in ‘most likely cases’ versus ‘least likely case’. CFAT is on the one hand a ‘most likely case’ for examining empowerment, meaning that it is a favorable case to facilitate empowerment, since it has a clear bottom-up empowerment and ownership approach toward the farmers (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Application Form – Public Private Partnership, Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 2ff). But it is on the other hand a ‘least likely case’, e.g. a less favorable case for examining empowerment (Esaiasson et al. 2012, p. 163; Denscombe 2009, p. 65f) since the program governance is rather top-down. What might become critical is to what extent the partners, stakeholders as well as the farmers and their communities can impact the decision making process of such top-down PPP, since these actors only have an advisory position. Being a least and a most likely case makes it in the end a quite balanced or typical/common case.

Since the case comprises of both favorable and less favorable characteristics for facilitating empowerment it can, on the whole, be considered as a balanced or a typical/common case, which enables generalization to many other cases. If this case that to some extent is unfavorable for facilitating empowerment, still fosters empowerment, it is a validation that the result is accurate and applicable in most cases (Esaiasson et al. 2012, p.

161f). Furthermore, the selected samples comprise of a slight variety of people with different social status, although they are all poor, which is contextually similar to most other developing countries. There is also a quite good amount and spread of the interviewees-sixteen farmers in two districts, in which there are six different DCs and six different POs, which are further described below. Examining such a balanced or typical/common case hence enables internal generalization to other people involved in CFAT in Tanzania, as well as externally (Esaiasson et al. 2012, p. 154f) to people in other countries under the umbrella of HRNS, but also to other PPPs that have similar contexts.

3.2.2.2 CFAT and its Objectives

The program functions as HRNS's 'country program' in Tanzania, which is implemented in the southern districts of Mbeya Rural, Mbozi, Rungwe and Ileje, as well as the northern districts of Kilimanjaro and Arusha. It targets approximately 25 000 farmer households, which is about 125 000 people (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Tanzania – The Country Program*, p. 2). This wide range country program is today often referred to as 'Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania' (CFAT) since the program started as a pilot project in 2006 in Mbeya Rural and Mbozi, and was in 2010 up scaled to today's existing regions, defined as 'CFAT' (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 4). The program comprises of different program components with complementing objectives that cover all farmers.

The overall program components aim at building and strengthening farmer organizations, raising productivity, improving coffee quality, commercialization and market improvement as well as access to financing and strengthening the position of women (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Application Form – Public Private Partnership, Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 2ff).

Within such a scope, the most fundamental objective is the creation and strengthening of farmer organizations, which are supposed to become member driven, business orientated, democratic, economically self-sustaining and able to provide knowledge to their members (Ibid, p. 8). "The structures that are established are owned by the farmers and such sustained by these" (Ibid, p. 18). Individual households are in a first step mobilized into village level farmer groups (POs), which contains about fifty members (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, retrieved 2015-03-13, p. 25). It is on this level that coffee is produced, most training take place and where members are voted for

positions within the groups and for the higher instance (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 7).

In a second step, the farmer groups (POs) come together to establish a higher instance, a Depot Committee (DC). One DC comprises of about twelve farmer groups (POs). The tasks at this level are to collect parchment coffee, maintain quality control, enable provision of financial services and handle the further processing (milling) and marketing of the coffee (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, p 24). HRNS are in the process of assisting DCs to legally register as Associations under the Ministry of Home Affairs since this enables the farmers to independently sell at the National Auction, open bank accounts and enter legal contract (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Africa, *Blaga Zlateva Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator*, retrieved 2015-05-10).

In order to reach its objectives, CFAT provides trainings in the villages. The trainings aim to encourage and teach the farmers how to organize themselves into groups, teach them entrepreneurial skills to handle their own business, finance and marketing as well as improve their agronomical practices (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, retrieved 2015-03-13, p. 24ff). The trainings are either hold with common members or representatives from the farmer groups. CFAT is promoting ‘farmer-to-farmer’ learning through Farmer Field Schools (FFS), whereby the farmers learn from each other in an informal setting through observation, experimentation and knowledge sharing. Through such capacity building, CFAT ensure that the farmers receive the necessary technical support, but at the same time improve their own management skills and become experts on their own field, rather than being top-down governed by the organization (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 4f).

3.2.2.3 Characteristics of this Public-Private Partnership

Since the start of the program in 2006, several partners have constituted the Public-Private Partnership, although financing different program components. The public partners are for instance Sida, Austrian Development Aid (ADA) (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 5), the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Africa, *Blaga Zlateva Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator*, retrieved 2015-03-02) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Norwegian Government (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 5). Since these actors are governmental development agencies, their involvement in the program functions as their external

development policy, as indicated by Sida (Sida, *Public Private Development Partnerships, Collaboration with the private sector*, retrieved 2015-04-07). The private partners are mainly constituted of several European coffee companies, for instance Luigi Lavazza S.p.A and Löffbergs Lila but also non-governmental partners, for example Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, p. 5).

Besides the public and private partners, HRNS cooperates and receives input from several other stakeholders in Tanzania in order to improve and embed their activities in the local and national context (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, retrieved 2015-03-13, p. 30).

In terms of program governance, HRNS function as the managing and implementing partner of the program, although in cooperation with the partners (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, retrieved 2015-03-13, p. 50). As discussed in the theory section, the partnership has a private top-down or “lead organization structure” (Stadtler 2012, p. 48). HRNS is in charge of the entire program including financing, controlling and reporting back to the partners. The extent of interaction and influence the partners have over the program depends on their agreement with HRNS (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, retrieved 2015-03-13, p. 50ff).

An Advisory Board (AB), comprising of HRNS and various local, national and international stakeholders, meet on an annual basis in order to have sound interaction, discuss activities and receive input (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, retrieved 2015-03-13, p. 53). The AB has however not authority over decision making.

In sum, the governance of the selected case is top-down and bottom-up at the same time that makes it a rather balanced or typical case, which could have implications on the possibilities to facilitate empowerment.

3.2.3 Semi-Structured Respondent Interviews

In order to examine the impact of PPPs on empowerment of poor people, it is mostly relevant to ask the farmers themselves. Data will therefore be collected through semi-structured respondent interviews since this approach emphasizes on the farmers own perception, e.g. the respondent is the study object itself (Esaiasson et al. 2012, p. 228). There were however considerations about conducting interviews with for example NGOs, local

politicians and/or HRNS, but since this would not reflect the farmers own views, and besides whom would know how the farmers felt about their empowerment better than themselves, such interviews were never conducted. An additional method such as direct observations was considered, but it proved practically difficult to stay in remote villages for a longer period due to language barriers and accommodation issues. Scholar argue that one method is preferable over triangulation since this indicates that the research aim is clear, but also, triangulation can complicate and prolong the analysis (Silverman 2011, p. 45; Denscombe 2010, p 189f) and is risky since different methods might indicate different results (Denscombe 2009, p. 190).

Semi-structured interviews is a suitable method since such interviews have fairly structured questions that will guide the interview, but at the same time encourages the respondent to elaborate its answers in order to deepen the understanding, the researcher therefore needs to be flexible with questions, sequence and response (Denscombe 2009, p.234f).

The interviews lasted as long as around two hours since the language had to be translated. The idea from the beginning was to take notes but depend on the recording through transcription. The first interviews proved that recording was not necessary since having a translator enabled taking fully detailed notes.

3.2.4 Sampling of Interviewees

The interviewees are selected through theoretical sampling where its characteristics are connected to empowerment theory, which is further discussed below (Silverman 2011, p. 70f). The characteristics of the samples have been thoughtfully selected, but since I am not highly familiar with the context in Tanzania and have restricted financial resources, I have been dependent on HRNS to assist me selecting the samples and organize the transport. This has worked well in most cases since the characteristics of the samples have been clearly explained to HRNS.

Due to limited time and resources, interviews have been conducted exclusively in the southern districts of Mbeya Rural and Mbozi where the program has run the longest time, hence since 2006. There is quite a good amount of interviewees as well as a good spread within the districts- a total of sixteen interviewees in six different DCs and six different POs, which covers large parts of the districts. Choosing these two districts is valid since it is essential to conduct the research where the program has been the longest time. Also, focusing on these two districts is not expected to have implications on the reliability of the result since HRNS works equally in every district.

Again, sixteen farmers have been interviewed, eight in each district. There is no consensus on the amount of interviews for research using qualitative, semi-structured and theoretical sampling methods, but several scholars claim that these methods, in comparison to quantitative methods, are allowed to have smaller samples (Denscombe 2009, p. 52; Silverman 2011, p. 44; Mahoney 2007, p. 131). Considerations about saturation are important, or as some scholars refer it to- theoretical and empirical saturation. According to Denscombe, when the sample is large enough the precision of the research will not increase with a larger sample since it is already saturated (2009, p. 49). Sixteen semi-structured respondent interviews which allows for the interviewee to deepen its answers, is argued enough for this research since the last interviews did not reveal any new information and the amount was indeed saturated.

The sample categories constitute of four men and four women who are PO members and simply members in their village farmer group, and four men and four women who hold influential positions in the higher DC level, often Secretaries who function as the manager and has the most influence, and FarmPromoters who is in charge of organizing and trainings (Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D), "Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania (CFAT)"* p. 7). The reason for these sample categories lies in the previous presented theoretical assumption that differences in farmer group position and gender might reflect their social status and perhaps impact their level of empowerment.

It was initially planned to be an equal spread of the sample categories between the districts, but this proved difficult due to lack of DC women in one district. It is therefore a majority of DC men in Mbeya Rural and hence a majority of DC women in Mbozi. This is however not expected to have a larger impact on the result since there is a representation of all sample categories in both districts.

3.2.5 Analysis

The analysis is based on the dimensions, e.g. the 'powers' of empowerment and the operationalization of those. Since the aim of the research is to examine whether and how PPP can facilitate empowerment and the research consequently examines a *change or potential improvement* over time, it is valid to analyze the data by grading such change. Thus, the change or improvement in empowered firstly has to correspond with the operationalization, and then a grading to what *extent* the farmers have been empowered is conducted, which is done by categorizing the data as 'low', 'modest' or 'significant' improvement in

empowerment (Esaiasson et al. 2012, p. 137). Such rating of change or potential improvement is a way to systematize and further clarify the result. One can imagine that there is a change in most dimensions, but it is important to discover and present potential differences.

Even though there are three dimensions in which farmers can be empowered differently, this research does not aim to consider empowerment of the dimensions independently. All three dimensions are dependent on each other and are necessities for full empowerment. Since the dimensions are dependent on each other they are sometimes also similar. Because of these reasons, the dimensions cannot be viewed as entirely mutually exclusive. Empowerment of the farmers consequently has to be considered coherently.

3.2.5.1 Criteria for Conclusion

The following quotes are examples of how a change or improvement in empowerment is analyzed and categorized as ‘low’, ‘modest’ or ‘significant’. The first three quotes are three farmers answering about their access to production tools today compared to before, in ways that are categorized in three different ways. The first quote represents a perceived ‘significant improvement’ since the farmer has been able to purchase expensive tools such as a bike, a machine for coffee and a body pump;

“Since I joined CFAT I’ve added one more pesticides pump and a machine or sink for the coffee. I’ve also bought a motorbike and a net for the covering the coffee”

This second citation is categorized as ‘moderate improvement’ since the farmer perceives that he has a bit more and better tools for production, although not enough. He cannot afford enough necessary tools or pesticides;

“There have been improvements in this as well. Before being part of CFAT we used to expose our coffee on the ground but now we have learned how to properly dry it (...) I don’t have enough farming tools, I do have pesticides but it not enough”

The third quote hence represents data that is categorized as ‘low improvement’ since the farmer perceives that he/she cannot afford enough production tools;

“I do not have enough tools for production. I do not afford enough fertilizers for my coffee”

The following three quotes are three different answers on whether they can impact and influence political matters. The first is an example of ‘significant improvement’ since the

farmer is a member of a party and that he/she perceives to have a voice and an ability to influence village matters through the party;

“Yes I can influence the local level. I’m a member of CCM. Through the party I can influence the politics in the village since the party needs to listen to their members. I can raise my voice through the party. This year I will be able to influence people on how to vote”

This citation represents ‘modest improvement’ as the farmer feels too shy in general to engage more in political matters, but he/she has still raised the voice to impact important village matters;

“I’m very shy even though I’m a member of the group. I don’t try to influence political matters. But some years ago I tried to ask politicians on the higher instances to install water taps in our village and now they are finally here”

The last citation is analyzed as ‘low improvement’ since the farmer expressed that he/she is forbidden through his position as a pastor to get involved in politics;

“I’m a pastor so I just want to influence people to be peaceful, that’s it. And I can influence my members on these things due to my position. But since I’m a pastor I’m forbidden in the church laws to engage on political matters. I therefore mostly influence people to be peaceful, but I don’t know what impact this has on my members in reality but I try”

To summarize, the dimensions of empowerment and its operationalization are used to define whether and how PPP can facilitate empowerment, where the categorization into the degrees of change assists to systematize and further specify the result.

4. Analysis

This chapter provides the analysis and result of the two research question, which aim to answer whether and how PPP has led to a perceived significant improvement in ‘social’, ‘political’ and/or ‘psychological’ power, and if PPP could facilitate empowerment of poor people independently of their position and gender. The analysis is structured in terms of ‘social’, ‘political’ and ‘psychological’ power, and within these dimensions in accordance with the operationalization.

4.1 ‘Social Power’

The results indicate that there was an overall significant perceived improvement in ‘social power’ among the farmers since all of them experienced an improved life situation, although there is a variation among the farmers as well as between the sample categories where the PO male and the DC female sample categories perceived to be less empowered compared to the other. One can also distinguish an important role of the farmer groups to facilitate empowerment since it enabled bank loans and credit but also functioned as the platform to education.

4.1.1 Income and Life Situation

All farmers, independently of their position or gender, however revealed that their income and life situation has improved in general;

“There is a very big change. For example my friends that are not part of CFAT are not doing as good. CFAT has helped me a lot, for example to market our coffee and we now know how to cultivate our land. Because of the knowledge that we have gained through CFAT we know how to properly grow coffee, which has improved our income.” (DC Male, interview 3)

“Yes my life has changed a lot! It is not bad, it’s middleclass (...) This organization is really good! We’ve learned so much about farming so my life has changed! The production has increased and we’re earning more. We can eat good food now. The only

thing that makes it harder is all the school fees we have to pay. After the school fees are paid we must pay for fertilizers and pesticides. I have so many things to say about HRNS. Life was so tough before! Life was bad, it was the lowest level of life, a bad standard.” (PO female, interview 16)

4.1.1.1 Access to Food

The farmers often defined such improved income and life situation in terms of being able to buy better and more food;

“It is better now compared to before. When I wasn’t part of CFAT my family was hungry. But no one is hungry in our house anymore, there is plenty of food.” (DC male, interview 8)

“I have a middle class life. Before I had nothing, but now I have a good life. Nowadays I can eat what I need, one day there can be chicken, the next day meat or whatever. Before CFAT we only ate beans.” (DC female, interview 10)

4.1.1.2 Sending Children to School

Another change due to improved income and life situation that all farmers expressed and primarily emphasized on were that they were now able to send their children to lower school but also university;

“In this village not many people leave and study at the university, most people marry a local and stay here. Most people believe in marriage and not education since they think that education cannot help anything. They particularly think so for girls, even if girls go to school they cannot contribute with anything anyway. I have really tried my best to send all my children to lower school and university. I think I’ve changed the mindset in this village a bit.” (DC female, interview 11)

“It has helped me because I’ve been able to build a good house and I’ve sent my children to school. I’m paying school fees for about 1 600 000 Shillings a year. I’ve also been able to send my younger brothers children to school.”(DC male, interview 6)

“Our lives has changed, I can afford to send my children to school. I have one child that study at the university.” (PO female, interview 9)

4.1.2 Loans and Credit

The majority of the farmers perceived an improved access to bank loans and credit, especially the DC male sample category. They said that the reason for this was that they, as a group, were more financially trusted, and so they were able to both open a bank account and take loans and credit *as a group*. Some farmers took bank loans, others got credit from the input supplier company Yara, and a few people even paid cash or organized their farmer group as a bank;

“We are able to get small bank loans for fertilizers and pesticides through the farmer groups, but also for harvesting. Bank loans are only possible through the farmer groups, not when I’m on my own. When we are together in a group we are more financially trusted than the individual farmer.” (DC male, interview 3)

“Through the group we can get credit for fertilizers from Yara. The prices are much better when we buy as a group compared to before. When we were alone the price was much higher so we could afford only a little. HRNS tells us that we shouldn’t take bank loans, to not rely on it. Instead we try to open an account for our group and take bank loans through that account.” (DC male, interview 13)

“Bank loans are not recommended by HRNS since they have such a high interest. Our group functions as a bank, we borrow from each other. We don’t take fertilizer credit, we just buy it cash.” (PO female, interview 16)

There were however a few farmers in the other sample categories, particularly the PO men, who felt like they did not have good access to loans and credit since it was provided too expensive;

“Yes a little bit better opportunities to take loans but not as much as I hoped for. When I take a credit on fertilizers it is more expensive to buy it. So I do not buy enough fertilizers. It has not been as good as I fought. I can take bank loans but sometimes it takes a long time to be approved.” (PO male, interview 1)

“CFAT has helped us to connect with the fertilizer companies. However the companies do not really understand our issues. The main problem is that the companies are selling the fertilizers too expensive. We get, or borrow the fertilizers but then we do not get enough profit from the coffee so we cannot pay back the loan (...) The bank needs to

know that we are able to pay back the bank loans, but often we cannot. It is hard to get the loans.” (PO male, interview 2)

“No we don’t have the opportunity for bank loans or credit for fertilizers but we’re in the progress of getting it.” (DC female, interview 15)

4.1.3 Property and Tools

The increased income has furthermore enabled all farmers to renovate or purchase new houses or land, as well as to upscale their household and tools for work activities. But the extent of up scaling differed a lot both among the farmers in general and between sample categories.

All farmers, independently of their position or gender, furthermore stated that they had full ownership rights of their property. Given the ownership obstacles of women that were discussed in the theoretical section, the women in this program perceived that they had ownership of their property. Even if the husband passed away, the wife was still entitled the inheritance.

The farmers had full ownership of their properties and the majority express how they had been able to greatly extend their properties or buy expensive tools such as motorbikes, electricity or animals. The DC male sample category however stood out in a positive way as they perceived a significant improvement;

“I own the land. When my husband died I got it from my in-laws. I’m able to use it as I want.” (PO female, interview 4)

“Yes I own my property and I can use it as I want. I inherited it from my father. But I have also bought a new land.” (DC male, interview 3)

“I don’t have better tools for the household. Although I have built two new small houses and added a piece of land and also bought a couch and a radio (...) There’s a light in my life. I didn’t expect that I one day would be able to own and build these houses. You know, now I also have nice clothes. Years ago I didn’t have real clothes just some dirty textile hanging roughly on the body and we didn’t have a bed, now we have one (...) I’ve bought bicycles but also smaller things for the farming like buckets. And I’ve bought a cow.” (DC female, interview 11)

We’re planning to build an even better house. We had a mud house before, you know without bricks. We didn’t have a good bathroom and kitchen before so we’ve renovated

that (...) We've bought a solar system for electricity and a sewing machine so that I can sew clothes for the family (...) I've bought an animal pull plough and two cows to pull it. I've bought a motorcycle, a pesticides pump, scissors and a fork hoe. So most of these things I've bought with the coffee money." (PO female, interview 16)

Many farmers thus experienced some obstacles in up scaling their tools, especially the PO men and DC women. They were able to slightly renovate their houses- replacing a grass roof with iron or moderately upscale their household and production tools, but not to the same extent as the previous citations indicate;

"I don't have enough tools for my household. The money that I've earned could only cover some renovations on my house, nothing else. I've put on an iron roof compared to the grass roof that was there before. But I can also buy food and clothes (...) I've bought hand hoes and two bags of fertilizers. I didn't have these things before so it is slightly better. But these things are not enough." (PO male, interview 14)

"I have a better house and bathroom compared to before. It's not good but it's better. The bathroom didn't have roof but now it has. We've also done some renovations on the house (...) A little better tools for farming but not enough. I have bought a pesticides pump, scissors and a cut saw." (DC male, interview 13)

4.1.4 Health and Medical Accessibility

The majority of the farmers perceived that they had improved opportunities to see the doctor when necessary, either through enough savings or life insurance;

"I can now go to the doctor, compared to before. With better farming knowledge I get higher income so I'm able to go to the doctor. Prior to CFAT we only went to the local doctor, which was cheaper and obviously now as good, today we can afford to visit the official doctor." (DC male, interview 3)

"Yes right now I can see the doctor anytime. I can afford it and I can also travel there on my motorcycle. I couldn't do that before, we couldn't afford. We just bought medicine but didn't go to the hospital." (PO female, interview 16)

But there were a few farmers in each sample category who expressed that they had financial obstacles, which limited their access to healthcare;

“I’m able to see the doctor when necessary. But I can’t afford any serious diseases, for example operations or similar. My life was bad before and I could definitely not go to the doctor, I had to ask my neighbors for help. If I need to go to the hospital now I can sell my chickens.” (DC male, interview 8)

“I cannot afford to go to the doctor because I have so savings. All of my money goes to my children’s school.” (PO female, interview 7)

4.1.5 Education and Knowledge

Most farmers revealed that the main reason for the increased income and improved life situation was attributed to the practical trainings and education from HRNS. The trainings contributed to raising their production and improve the quality of the coffee.

4.1.5.1 Practical Farming Methods

Most farmers expressed that they have learned new practical farming methods on how to care for their soil- specifically how to apply fertilizers and pesticides, how to plough branches and how to ‘locally’ dig holes for the coffee trees instead of ploughing all the soil. But also how to control soil erosion, broadcasting, welding, use of quality tools and make the trees resistant from disease and rain. The following quotes present the most common skills;

“I won’t forget all the education and skills I’ve got from CFAT. I’ve learned to keep farming records about profit and expenses and to apply fertilizers and pesticides properly. I would like to thank HRNS that have helped us so much. I want to ask them to keep teaching us. We really have learned so much.” (DC male, interview 13)

“CFAT has taught us to increase our productivity, how to grow coffee properly. We didn’t know that we had to cut the long branches on the coffee trees before, but CFAT taught us. There was also a lot of work to remove weeds, we dug holes by hand. But now we just apply pesticides.” (PO female, interview 7)

“Farming knowledge, like how to spread the seeds called broadcasting, how to cut unwanted branches and welding. I have learned how to cultivate my land, how to store the coffee and the formation of it.” (PO male, interview 5)

4.1.5.2 Entrepreneurial Skills and Gender Equality

The farmers furthermore expressed that they had learned more about business and entrepreneurship. They knew about finance and budgeting, leadership and marketing;

“They have taught us about how to save money through financing and budgeting, as well as laws about farming. So they teach us entrepreneurial skills. We have more knowledge about how to run a business. CFAT has created a farm class and we learn a lot from that class about how to run the farm. That has been really good! (PO female, interview 4)

“They have taught us entrepreneurial skills so that we can run our farms and business properly and also how to supervise and lead others.” (DC male, interview 6)

CFAT has a gender equality component in their program, and one DC man emphasized and embraced the knowledge he got from those trainings;

“If you don’t have knowledge about equality, you don’t know how to treat and organize your family. In our family we try to be equal and work as a family. We don’t have special tasks for the man and the woman. For example, I don’t tell my woman to light the fire just because she is a woman. Everybody can do everything, as a family. We have learned this from CFAT.” (DC male, interview 3)

4.1.6 Surplus Time

All farmers perceived that they did not have much time to engage in other activities besides working on their farm or other income generating activities;

“I’m afraid I don’t have time to do much else than working on the farm. Since I’m working with a hand hoe it takes a lot of time. But I do manage to go to church every Sunday.” (PO male, interview 14)

“I spend some hours on the farm in the morning. After that I go to my restaurant. I don’t have much time for other things.” (PO female, interview 16)

4.1.7 Summary of ‘Social Power’

As indicated in the beginning, the result suggests that it is possible to conclude that there was an overall perceived significant improvement in ‘social power’ among the farmers. This conclusion is however not obvious since there were several farmers in all sample categories who perceived obstacles, especially regarding access to improved household and tools for household and work activities as well as medical accessibility. There were also patterns that showed negative differences between the PO male and the DC female sample categories compared to the other categories, since they experienced slightly more difficulties to get loans and credit and upscale their houses and tools for the household and production.

But all farmers, independently of their position and gender, were in general expressing an improvement in their lives, and most people were earning more so they could afford to send their children to school, they could eat more and better food, acquire bank loans and credit, own and improve their household and production, as well as acquire an education that improved their opportunities in life.

Even through patterns indicate that empowerment was not fully independently of position and gender since some sample categories perceived to be less empowered than others, one can argue that the overall result leans toward a significant improvement in ‘social power’ as the majority of the farmers were experiencing such a significant improvement in most areas, and there were more people who perceive a modest over a low improvement.

4.2 ‘Political Power’

Based on the result, one can argue that there was a significant improvement in ‘political power’ as most farmers experienced better opportunities to impact the surrounding societal and political environment and that the mobilization of farmer groups facilitated this since it strengthened them individually and collectively. Hence, all the farmers indicated that the mobilization of the farmers groups played a crucial role for such improvement. Many farmers expressed how the mobilization strengthened them to act individually, as well as enabled the collective to be stronger and achieve things that the farmers would otherwise not accomplish.

4.2.1 Ability to Take Action and Impact

Most of the farmers expressed that they were more concerned about occurrences in their near-by surroundings, and more interested and confident to act upon and raise their voices to

impact those occurrences today compared to when they were not part of CFAT. The result indicates that such improvement to some extent could be attributed to the trainings;

“HRNS has taught us to be more critical and ask questions on what is going on in the village.” (DC female, interview 11)

CFAT consequently emphasized on leadership and strengthening individuals to raise their voices, but it did not specifically train the farmers to engage in political matters. Interestingly so, it was however possible to identify a triple over effect to engage in both the official political environment and other social and political forums.

4.2.1.1 Political Influence

The ability to engage in and impact political matters was significant in most sample categories. The result indicated that DC women expressed an improvement that was similar to the result of both male sample categories, which is surprising due to the previous theory and empirics that show a subordinate position of women.

It is however important to add that there was a distinct negative difference between the PO female sample category and the other categories since the PO women did not perceive that they had good opportunities to impact political matters. Furthermore, the farmers were mostly able to impact the local village level and not as much on higher district levels, and rarely on the national level.

The farmers expressed how the trainings through CFAT both boosted their confidence, and that the mobilization of farmers groups facilitated involvement and made it possible to impact village politics;

“Yes I can impact what is happening in my life. I can impact local politics. I have the confidence to try to influence what is going on in the village. I now understand my own power and how I can use it. I like to influence what is happening in my village and that is no problem (...) Both politicians and companies listen more to us now when we are together in a farmer group than when we were alone. I feel that I have a stronger voice now, but only when I’m with my farmer group. We have been complaining about the high taxes and the (national) government has listen to us and lowered the taxes (...) The possibility to meet with politicians and input supply companies has improved. It happens if there is a problem. It usually happens through the farmer group.” (PO male, interview 1)

“I am able to impact both local and national politics, but mostly through the farmer groups. We have impacted local politics since we have had meetings with local councilors about how other farmers should apply their fertilizers, so about farming methods (...) As a member of CFAT people like to hear me speak, people respect me. I have power and impact because of CFAT (...) But the national government does not care about the local farmers. They just despise us. We do not have a voice there.” (PO male, interview 2)

Most farmers, even the DC women, were either involved in village party politics or voted into village government positions;

“I used to be the local Chair Person of UWT, which is a national women’s organization connected to CCM. I am a famous woman in this area and most people like me. This year I will run for the Councilor position in the Ward, which is on a higher level than the village. The only thing that lets me down is that I don’t have money. Money is very important in politics here as there is so much corruption. When I speak people are clapping their hands. They like me but I don’t have money (...) It helps me that I’m a confident person, I talk a lot. I feel that I can impact higher levels, like in the ward or even nationally. And I feel like politicians listen to me.” (DC female, interview 12)

“I can influence local politics since I’m a Chairman of the leading party of Tanzania, CCM. I’m a Chairman of the Branch which is the lowest level of the party. My main responsibilities in the Branch are to lead our members and bring proposals from the Branch to the higher party level in the village. I must participate in decision making and vote about party matters since I’m a Chairman. Other responsibilities of a Chairman are to ensure that the village maintains its peace and that the party grows (...) I have been able to impact things since I’m under the leadership of the party. For example, I’ve written to the local government in the village to create a government assembly that can represent all parties and people. Once we have an assembly where everyone can be represented, we can start working together to develop this village.” (DC male, interview 8)

As mentioned above, there was quite a distinct negative difference between the PO female sample category and the other categories. Most PO female members said that they were either not interested, had a possibility or were too shy to impact local political matters;

“I’m very shy even though I’m a member of the group. I don’t try to influence political matters. But some years ago I tried to ask politicians on the higher instances to install water taps in our village and now they are finally here. The local politicians and I understand each other (...) When we are in the program and raise our voices politicians do listen. It has improved a bit now when we’re together.” (PO female, interview 7)

“I’m not concerned about politics I just listen. No I don’t try to impact things in village. People that are concerned with things in the village, often the village leaders, conduct meetings among themselves and I don’t think that I can impact anything there. Politics often leads to conflict and I don’t want to engage in that. We have basic needs in our community. If my friend is raising her voice to building a bridge or a hospital for example and I would agree with that, I would also raise my voice to get that and I have done that. Politicians listen to me on important issues like building a bridge or a hospital.” (PO female, interview 16)

4.2.1.2 Influence over the Farmer Groups

The ability to impact and influence internally within the farmer groups was generally high, although the PO female sample category again voiced some difficulties.

Regarding the ability to impact occurrences and activities in the farmers groups, the farmers perceived that as a welcomed and included member they were strengthened and encouraged to raise their voices in that forum. Many also felt that as a member everyone could express their opinions in the farmer groups;

“Since I am one of the members I have the opportunity to make decisions in the group. When different people come to our group they can visit my farm because it is big. So I do have the possibility to impact what is happening in the group.” (PO male, interview 2)

“Yes I can impact what is going on in our farmer group since we have meetings and I can speak and impact things there.” (PO male, interview 1)

I can impact things in the group. We have a savings account in the farmer group but the leader used the money for his own purpose. I protested and demanded that he would return the money. We then organized meetings in the group and forced him to return the money.” (DC female, interview 11)

The farmers furthermore perceived that they had knowledge and therefore something to contribute with;

“I have high influence because they need my counseling on things and they like to visit my farm.” (PO male, interview 5)

The decisions lie with the group. We need a leader for that and I would say that I am the leader. People in the group therefore listen to me.” (DC male, interview 3)

“I can influence the activities of the farmer group. I’m trying to influence my members not to vote for the upcoming constitution. Another thing I am trying to tell my fellow members is that they shouldn’t depend on bank loans. Our group needs our own saving account to buy things. I’m also trying to encourage the women in the farmer group to start their own businesses and not only depend on the coffee.” (DC female, interview 10)

As mentioned above, the PO female sample category was distinct compared to the other categories since they felt that they were not comfortable and confident to express their own opinions;

“We have discussions of how to cultivate the land and individuals can speak their mind. But I don’t like to speak and express my opinion. But through my position as a Chairman of the Board in the farmer group where I am in charge of finance, I’m able to impact things related to that, for example if people do not pay back.” (PO female, interview 4)

“I cannot influence the farmer group with my own personal opinions. But things that I learn in the DC I can bring to the PO. If I have advice on how to increase the coffee production and other related matters people listen to me.” (PO female, interview 16)

4.2.1.2 Influence over CFAT

The majority of the farmers felt that they had significant opportunities to impact CFAT and all farmers were pleased with their work, although some voiced concerns about HRNS not being on time. But similar to the previous result that suggested a low ability of the PO female sample category to engage and impact political matters and the farmer groups, are they again expressing difficulties to impact CFAT.

The following two quotes exemplifies that the farmers appreciated CFAT and that the majority expressed ability to impact occurrences and activities;

“HRNS are doing good things for us so I don’t even try to change things. But I think they would listen if I complained about something.” (DC female, interview 12)

“SHIVIWAKA sold the coffee before but they weren’t good. Everything that HRNS are doing is good besides the SHIVIWAKA. That’s why we were trying to get rid of the SHIVIWAKA and HRNS listened.” (DC male, interview 8)

No problem! They listen for example when we complained that this office and the trainings were too far away. They then listen and located it here in this building which is closer to the village.” (DC male, interview 3)

Although most farmers were pleased with the work of HRNS and the farmers’ ability to impact, some people voiced concern that HRNS was not doing things on time;

“In general there is not a big issue with CFAT. But there can be a problem with time. If we agree on meeting a specific time they are late. But they listen to us.” (PO male, interview 2)

I’ve tried to change the activities of CFAT but it often takes time for them to take action. They listen but it takes time.” (DC female, interview 11)

There were a few farmers that expressed that they could not impact occurrences and activities on their own- this was mostly possible through the group. Again this was particularly evident for the PO female sample category;

“It’s not easy to do that by myself. HRNS normally organize us into groups and these groups can give feedback to HRNS. But I believe that HRNS are doing well, it’s not much to change.” (PO female, interview 16)

“I’m just a member of the group, we usually discuss things as a group and our opinions go to HRNS. They understand and listen to us.” (PO female, interview 4)

“Yes I can do that but it is mostly through the group. Not so much by myself. In general we have good relation with HRNS. They listen and change activities. If we have a problem they come.” (PO male, interview 1)

4.2.2 Strengths and Achievements of Mobilization

The result indicates that the farmer group mobilization concept, which resembles to a traditional workers union, has had a positive impact on the farmers' lives since it strengthened the farmers both individually and collectively and facilitates opportunities to impact and achieve things they otherwise would not have reached. The mobilization resulted in both 'mentally' and financially stronger individuals, which facilitated opportunities to impact surrounding societal and political matters.

4.2.2.1 Bank Loans and Water Taps

Hence, all the farmers, independently of their position and gender, said that they felt individually and collectively stronger and that they could achieve things that were not possible when they were alone. The farmers thus perceived that they were stronger together;

"I am able to impact things as a member of the farmer group (...) We have a lot of knowledge when we're together in a group, so we can reach our goals better today compared to before. Through the group we're able to sell our coffee at a better price. We can harvest coffee with higher quality since we have more knowledge when we are together." (PO male, interview 2)

"We are stronger when we're together in the group. Other farmers are trying to join our group. When we are together we can help each other on farming and other things in life. We believe that union is power and through such union we can advice each other. It's not good to be alone, you cannot achieve things alone, you're weak." (DC female, interview 11)

They were able to achieve more things when they were mobilized, especially economically. Many farmers thus emphasized on being financially stronger through better opportunities for bank loans and credit. The farmers also expressed that they had bought water taps and that they sold their coffee on their own to higher prices;

"It is because of our group that our village now has water taps. Because of our group (we are) getting drinking water, we could not do these things alone. These are examples of how we are stronger together (...) CFAT has helped us to organize the farmer groups. I have seen some changes because of these groups. We work together and can sell our coffee to higher prices compared to before when the middlemen tricked us to

sell to very low prices. If I have an individual financial problem I can go to the group and we can go to the bank together to get a loan for myself.” (PO female, interview 7)

“As a farmer group we are doing better, we are stronger because we can get better coffee prices. The group has the legal authority from the government to sell the coffee at the auction, individual farmers cannot do this. Through CFAT we have been connected with banks for bank loans.” (DC male, interview 8)

“When officials come to our village they must visit our farm group since we are very strong. We have even more influence now when we are so many, like 82 (...) Before CFAT, we were not able to buy inputs, we could not take bank loans, but now we can do that. The coffee prices are sometimes very low and then we don’t have much money. When this is the case and we need to buy inputs, we can take money from the saving account.” (DC male, interview 6)

4.2.2.2 Higher Coffee Prices

The mobilization of the farmer groups thus generated higher income due to higher coffee prices. As indicated in ‘social power’, one reason was that the trainings improved the farming knowledge that impact quantity and quality. Additional reasons were that the mobilization enabled the farmers to choose better marketing channels and that the mobilization increased quantity and quality that opened up the possibility to sell at the auction. The following quotes indicate the increased coffee prices;

“Yes! Our education from HRNS has improved our production. High quality coffee leads to higher prices. The middlemen didn’t check the quality so we got low prices. We’re getting more than double the price now (...) Before CFAT we sold it to the middlemen coming to the village and they bought it for maybe 2000 Shillings per kg and now it’s 5000 Shillings per kg.” (DC female, interview 12)

“Yes we are getting higher prices now. We sold for maybe 2000-3000 per kg but nowadays it’s 5000/kg.” (DC male, interview 13)

Most farmers said that because of the mobilization they were collectively, as well as financially stronger to decide to whom they would sell their coffee. They were not as desperate to sell it quick and cheap to middlemen or the coffee ‘Union’. All farmers stated that they today sold the coffee collectively through the farmer group organization at the Tanzanian national coffee auction;

“I sell it together with the farmer group to Moshi auction (...) We didn’t have a good system for selling before. Just sold it individually however we liked. If middlemen came we just sold it to them for whatever price they paid. If we for example needed book for the children’s school we had to sell quickly to get money.” (PO female, interview 7)

“We are now selling through our group at the auction and the money goes to a common account. Before we sold the coffee to middlemen and got much less money. But we were in need of quick money.” (PO male, interview 2)

The mobilization furthermore led to increased quantity and quality due to higher and better production from trainings and unification of the farmers, which enabled marketing at the auction that thus often generated better payment;

“We are selling to higher prices today. We sell together through the group at the auction as they prefer larger quantities. The prices we get are higher today. Previously the middlemen were basically stealing and tricking us. They did not weight and measure the coffee properly, they just looked at it and quickly set a very low price.” (PO male, interview 5)

“We are getting higher prices. When we sell together and there is a large quantity of coffee we can sell it at the auction and get higher prices.” (DC male, interview 6)

“We get a good price. As a group we encourage each other to produce high quality coffee, which generates a higher price. So now compared to before the group gets a higher income.” (DC male, interview 3)

The ability to decide when the coffee should be auctioned varies, although the majority of the farmers perceived that they could decide this. It is important to have control over the action date since the earlier the coffee is auctioned the higher is the payment;

“Yes we have the power to decide when the coffee will be auctioned. We work together with the factory that processes the coffee and when they say that the coffee is ready we sell it. The action has however many challenges and prior to the farmer groups we could not decide that. We just had to sell even though the price was low.” (DC male, interview 3)

“As a farmer I cannot decide that. Once the coffee is out of our hands other people decide that. So we cannot decide when it will be sold.” (DC female, interview 11)

4.2.2.2 Improved Knowledge

As touched upon before, another important aspect of what the mobilization has contributed with is that the gathering of people, where they assist and encourage each other has improved the knowledge and skills of the farmers, and thus made them stronger. The improved knowledge has increased their quality and quantity. They have hence improved their knowledge and skills from being together;

“When we’re mobilized we can achieve more things. When we’re in the group we learn a lot from the trainings and apply those methods. As a group we get educated about farming, for example how to plough and how to apply pesticides and fertilizers and in the right time. We cannot learn these things if we weren’t part of the farmer group. As a group we are doing better than before. This year we are trying to sell the coffee together for the first time.” (DC female, interview 15)

“It is easier through the group, we normally gather together and as a group, we can achieve more things. We have discussions in the group about the right time, in terms of weather conditions, to do things on our farms. It is important that we do things on the farm coherently. If someone is doing something wrong during the year we help each other. All of this under the umbrella of CFAT.” (PO male, interview 5)

Through the mobilization and their improved knowledge and skills, they were hence becoming stronger and more confident;

“I feel that I am stronger in a group compared to when I was on my own. This is because of what I’ve learned from CFAT so I know how to organize my life. At first, people did not trust me but now that I am the Secretary and part of the group, I feel stronger.” (DC male, interview 3)

“Our group is becoming stronger the larger we get. The trainings we get from HRNS has taught us a lot and made us stronger as individuals. We are doing better now when we are together. The prices we’re getting through the group are higher since we know how to grow good quality coffee. This is different from when we were on our own. We didn’t produce high quality coffee and we therefore didn’t get good prices.” (DC female, interview 10)

4.2.3 Summary of 'Political Power'

The result of the improvement in 'political power' is not obvious since patterns in the research indicate the women in the PO female sample category perceived obstacles in their opportunities to engage and influence political matters as well as in the farmer groups and over CFAT. But they too expressed significant improvement when it came to the strengths and achievements of mobilization such as bank loans and credit, marketing channels, improved quality and quantity as well as improved knowledge and strengths.

When looking at the other sample categories and taking the collective result into consideration, it is however possible to distinguish a rather significant improvement in 'political power'. The majority of the farmers, including the DC women, perceived that their opportunities to get involved in and express their opinions in political matters as well as within the farmers groups and CFAT had greatly improved. Most farmers thus perceived that they could not engage so much on higher levels, but this is still considered as a significant improvement since a confident and strong foundation is necessary for higher level political action. Also, all farmers, independently of their position and gender, felt that the mobilization strengthened them individually and collectively, and facilitated opportunities to impact and achieve things that they otherwise would not have accomplished. The mobilization hence enabled them to indirectly control the prices they received since through the unification they could assist each other on farming and thereby increase quality and quantity. All these things enabled them to escape the poverty trap of the middlemen and sell their coffee through professional channels.

One can argue that the whole concept of CFAT is rather political since the mobilization of the farmer groups is similar to workers unions although the trainings it provides do not focus on political engagement- rather leadership to some extent, but the farmers still engaged in official political matters as well as in other social and political forums. This hence suggests that CFAT has led to a triple over effect. The mobilization consequently played a crucial role for the improvement in 'political power' and can even be seen as *the* reason for such a significant improvement. Also the result for 'political power' leans towards a significant improvement but not fully independently of position and gender since PO members and particularly women perceived to be slightly less empowered.

4.3 'Psychological Power'

4.3.2 Self Confidence, Potency and Opportunities

The increased income and improved life situation, which was a result of the trainings and mobilization through CFAT, has had a significant impact on the farmer's self confidence, sense of potency and how they viewed their opportunities in life. The farmers expressed a certain freedom in their lives and that they themselves were in control;

"As I woman I was dependent on my husband. But even though he has passed away I feel confident. I can go to take a bath, I cook what I need, and I can go to my farm. I'm just independent and I feel better about myself. I don't have to go to someone else to ask for food. I am good just by myself!" (PO female, interview 4)

"I feel ok about myself, I depend on myself." (PO male, interview 1)

"I feel more confident because I don't have to depend on someone else today, I can stand on my own. I've send my children to school but the village people don't do that." (DC female, interview 11)

They furthermore expressed improved opportunities and an eager to achieve things;

I have good opportunities in life. I'm able to go to the hospital and send my children to school. But I am dreaming of having a big business. I don't want to depend on only the farm, I want another business. I want three motorbikes but I can't afford that. I am also planning of buying a grounding machine (...) I think that I have more confidence. I mean I've built a house and I could only do that if I had confidence." (DC male, interview 6)

"At the moment I would like to do more things in my life. I want to do more and more and more so that I can have a rich life (...) Through the farmer group I am able to do more things than when I'm alone. You live and you die, I want more. It is through the group that I can do things. For me, it is through the group that my life can be changed." (DC male, interview 3)

4.3.2.1 Confidence to Express Oneself

All farmers experienced that they were more confident to express themselves today compared to before. They were not as shy today;

“Yes I do feel more confident to express my opinion. I used to feel shy and other people didn’t really listen to me. But now people listen to me and even take time to answer me.” (PO male, interview 14)

“I’m not shy these days. I had a problem to speak in public. I remember how scared I was. What am I going to say? I didn’t want officials to ask me questions because I didn’t know what to answer.” (PO female, interview 9)

The farmer group forum has furthermore functioned as a ‘safe’ starting point to gain self confident in order to express their opinions, which has then been transferred to other forums as well;

“Yes I feel that I can express my opinion in the group. When I wasn’t part of it I had no place to do that, but now I can do that in the group as well as in other places also. I’ve tried to convince people to join our group. If they aren’t joining they’re still listening to farming advices.” (DC male, interview 13)

“I am involved in the farmer group and I can express my opinion there. If someone has a problem we can help each other. Through the farmer groups we can express our opinions (...) I feel more confident to express my opinion today, especially in the group. I am more confident now when I am part of a group. When I am alone I don’t feel as confident.” (PO male, interview 1)

4.3.3 Confidence to Engage in Goals and Activities

All of the farmers set up dreams and goals and most of them could reach some of their goals. The most common goal for the farmers was to purchase better and more tools, such as to improve their household, production and to buy animals;

“Everybody wants to reach a certain point. I do create goals and I’ve reached perhaps 50 percent of those. For example, I’ve built a house, bought a motorcycle and a car although the car is old. I have a plan to buy a push beautiful, big and strong car.” (PO male, interview 5)

“I like to set up goals and I’m reaching them! The tribe that I comes from do not allow women to own things, everything belongs to the husband but I do own things!” (PO female, interview 9)

Another goal and dream that the farmers emphasized on was to acquire an education for their children and for themselves;

“I do set up goal for myself. My husband left me without proper walls and I had to fix this. I wanted to have chickens and I’ve managed to get that. I also plan to get an education for my children.” (DC female, 12)

I don’t really need to engage in more things but just improve my farming. With improved farming I will earn more money and go to school to learn English. (PO male, interview 14)

The majority of the farmers said that they liked to engage in more activities such as to have new animals, try new farming methods and run a business;

“I was planning to have kettles but I was scared. Can I really do this? But then I tried! (...) For six years I’ve been the DC Secretary. I didn’t feel so scared about this position since I started as a group Secretary. For the moment I have experience, if they select me for a higher position I can do that, I have the confidence.” (DC male, interview 3)

“I have the confidence to engage in new activities since being part of CFAT gives me a lot of power and confidence. I have tried new farming methods such as irrigation so we can harvest twice a year.” (PO male, interview 1)

“I have a restaurant. I would like to have a big hotel but also improve the things that I have. I didn’t engage in things before, just worked at the farm. Although I was a politician.” (PO female, interview 16)

There were also some farmers who currently felt that they had enough things going on and did therefore not want to engage in more activities;

“I would like to try new things and I’m admiring my neighbors that have such a nice house. If I tried new things maybe I could get a better life faster. But I don’t really have the time to think about trying new things.” (PO female, interview 7)

“No I don’t plan to engage in more things because what I’m engaged in already is enough, I just need to finish what I have. Need to keep working on my farm.” (DC male, interview 8)

“Sure but right now my chickens take a lot of time.” (DC female, interview 12)

4.3.4 Knowledge Boost Confidence

Many farmers thus emphasized on that their improved self confidence and ability to express themselves was a result of the education they got through CFAT;

“HRNS has been so good to us, I can’t even explain how good they’ve been. The education has really boosted my confidence. I was definitely more shy and scared before. The skills I’ve gained have given me more confidence.” (PO female, interview 16)

“I think I have the confidence to express my opinion. I think I’ve gained confidence from CFAT, it has boosted my confidence. The knowledge and education that we have got from CFAT has improved this confidence.” (PO male, interview 5)

“Today I feel free to express my opinion. HRNS has helped us to become stronger. Our education through the trainings increases our confidence and makes us keener to speak.” (DC female, interview 10)

4.3.5 Financial Obstacles Lowers Confidence

One can distinguish a link between financial struggle and low self confidence. The few farmers that expressed having lower opportunities in life and lower possibilities to reach their goals were those who struggled economically. This was evident for most sample categories, although a few more farmers from the PO female sample category;

“I’m not doing so good in my life. I am alone and it’s hard. I don’t have much money but I have many children to feed. Life is hard. I’m going through a difficult time (...) I want my children to go to better schools but I can’t afford that because my income isn’t good enough. I also want a better house. If I get money I will definitely buy that. No, I don’t have many goals that I’ve achieved. I wanted a bicycle for example but I can’t get that.” (PO female, interview 7)

“I would like to try new farming methods but I don’t have the resources to buy more fertilizers.” (PO female, interview 4)

“I feel better, I’m able to do more things now compared to before. Things have changed since I’ve tried new farming methods and it has improved my production. Although, not much has changed financially, but I’m at least able to send my children to school, which has improved my confidence a bit.” (PO male, interview 14)

4.3.6 Summary of ‘Psychological Power’

The result suggests that there is also a significant improvement in ‘psychological power’. Most of the farmers perceived that they were more self confident in general. Thus, they felt better about themselves and that they had control over their lives- they perceived a sense of potency. The farmers furthermore expressed positive views on their opportunities to achieve things in life. Importantly is also that the farmers were more confident to express their opinions and that the farmer group functioned as a springboard to other forums as well. The farmers were able to set up goals for themselves and engage in new activities, often to purchase more tools or animals, to acquire an education, try new farming methods or start a business. The farmer groups and the trainings was the main factor for improving their self confidence.

But those who experienced financial obstacles did however not feel as confident, which was slightly more evident for the PO female sample category than the other categories. Not many women did however perceive insecurity and it did not have major impacts on their lives. It is therefore possible to draw the conclusion that there was an overall significant improvement in ‘psychological power, but not entirely independently of position and gender due to the minor difference between the PO women and the other farmers.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Answering the Research Questions

The result from the analysis suggest that Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments' development policy, *in general* has contributed to a perceived improvement in 'social', 'political' and 'psychological' power. According to the unified perception of the farmers, the fundamental reason for this improvement was the mobilization of the farmer group structure. This structure is highly political since it is similar to traditional workers unions in that it mobilizes workers and this collective strength enabled them to improve their work and life situation- it has facilitated opportunities to achieve and impact things that they otherwise would not have accomplished, as presented below.

The mobilization of farmer groups, where they acquired trainings and assisted each other has led to improved knowledge and skills regarding farming and entrepreneurial activities that has contributed to higher coffee quality and quantity. It has furthermore strengthened the farmers individually and collectively, which facilitated opportunities to use better market channels, and so, avoid poverty traps that middlemen and other untrustworthy channels led to. The improved knowledge and market channels has thus increased the income of the farmers, which has enabled them to buy more and better food, send their children to school as well as upscale their household and improve their tools for the household and work activities.

These farmer groups have functioned as forums and springboards for the farmers to acquire a higher self confidence that made them believe in themselves and their opportunities, to express their opinions and gain control over their lives. It has furthermore strengthened them to set up goals and engage in more activities. Such self confidence has then tripled over to other forums as well. The mobilization of the farmer groups, where they were only trained on farming, entrepreneurial and leadership skills, and not particularly encouraged to political engagement, still had a triple over effect to surrounding societal and political matters. The farmers became hence much more engaged in, and voiced their opinions on political matters in their village as well as in other matters and forums. Some are even politically engaged on higher levels, and other farmers believe that they could potentially.

The result consequently indicated that there has been a general or an overall improvement in empowerment among the farmers. Even though the combined result shows this positive effect, there are also patterns in the research which imply less empowerment for some people. The result hence indicated that Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments' development policy, did not *fully* facilitate empowerment independently of poor people's position and gender since patterns show that people with lower social positions perceived to be slightly less empowered- PO members did not perceive to be as empowered as DC people. Part of the previous presented theory and empirics suggest that local contextual inequalities, where social hierarchies in the community and the subordinate position of women, lowered the opportunity for empowerment of people with lower social status. The result from this research hence suggests that this assumption can both be supported and rejected. A rejection of such theory can first of all spring from the result which indicated that most women who had a higher and influential DC position felt that they had been empowered in most aspects, but also that there were women and men with lower social positions who perceived to be significantly empowered, which will be further discussed.

But what supported such theory, which makes empowerment to some extent independently of peoples' position and gender, is that there has been a pattern throughout the research, which suggests that PO members, who have a less influential position, and particularly PO women, did not perceive to be as empowered as the people holding more influential DC positions. This pattern showed that PO men perceived more obstacles in 'social power', such as to acquire bank loans and credit and to upscale their household and production tools. The PO women mostly experienced difficulties in 'political power' where they specifically felt that they were either not interested, had a possibility to impact, or were simply too shy to engage in and impact political matters, the farmer groups and CFAT. If they felt a slight opportunity to impact, it was mostly through the farmer group. This lower 'political power' was interconnected with having a lower self confidence and thus 'psychological power' since the reason that these PO women did not engage and impact political and social occurrences as much as other sample categories was that they, to some extent, felt an inability based on self-esteem. Such lower 'psychological power', where they also perceived to have limited opportunities, was often a result of financial struggle.

Other patterns showed that the majority of the farmers that felt significantly empowered hold DC positions. Those who had been appointed higher and more influential positions did not necessarily improve their financial situation more than others, but they seemed to have

had significantly improved their self confidence, which enabled them to engage more in surrounding societal and political matters. One can furthermore imagine that women without any positions were unconsciously affected by their subordinate position, which made them sustain in their reserved role. Such result suggests that the acquired position and thus improved status in the community, greatly defines and facilitates empowerment, but gender still plays an important role.

5.2 Implications for the Broader Context

The aim of the research is to increase the understanding of whether and how Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments' development policy, can serve to facilitate empowerment of poor people. The result suggests that the ability of these kinds of partnerships to impact empowerment of poor people leans toward being quite positive- there was an overall empowerment among the farmers. This modest and difficult suggestion is on the one hand attributed to the result which indicates that most of the farmers were actually improving their life situations quite significantly in many aspect compared to when they were not part of CFAT and also able to climb the social ladder, but the result on the other hand show that PPPs were not as successful to fully empower people independently of their position and gender since PO members with lower social positions, and particularly women in their 'political' and 'psychological' power, did not perceive to be as empowered as DC people who have higher influential positions.

Connected to this restraint, a limitation in this research is however that the farmers might have had slightly different backgrounds and social positions in their communities that could have impacted their potential for empowerment. People that start from a lower social situation, for instance women, might have faced more obstacles in their empowerment process, and they might also have had less strength to aspire higher positions compared to more socially fortunate people. But as indicated in the previous section, women who were extremely poor prior to CFAT, still managed to acquire higher influential positions in the farmer group structure and become significantly empowered. Accordingly, some people that were very poor with a low social position could still climb the social ladder, whereas others were not as lucky. The joint result therefore suggests that there might not have been a *clear* causal relation between social status and empowerment, but many other factors also impact this. An interesting topic for further research could therefore be to look into what were the

mechanisms and factors that enable some people but not other, to climb the social ladder and acquire higher influential positions in their communities, which thus facilitates empowerment.

This PPP consequently has a 'lead organization structure' run by a private partner. This could have had obstacles since it could have hindered other partners, farmers and stakeholders to impact. One can speculate in if there had been a democratic assembly with legal authority that represented all partners, representatives of the farmer group structure and stakeholders, that this could have had improved the situation of the farmers even more, but also strengthened them to keep engaging in surrounding societal and political matters. But all farmers actually felt that they had possibilities to impact CFAT. Perhaps this lack of various decision makers was effective since the program was quite successful- too many decision makers, where some might not possess the necessary knowledge, could have had negative effects on the farmers. HRNS seemed to have had the accurate knowledge for their work, which partially facilitated the success. What furthermore enabled empowerment was that the program adopted a holistic and bottom-up approach that intend to strengthen capacity building and thereby empowerment and ownership of the farmers. Also the fact that most of the employees were local people reinforces such bottom-up approach. But the fundamental element that facilitated empowerment was the mobilization as described above, so Public-Private Partnerships impact on empowerment might be dependent on such mobilization.

One can argue that since this PPP was quite successful in empowering the farmers despite having a top-down structure and partly being a 'least likely case', Public-Private Partnerships might have opportunities to empower poor people in many other cases, both through HRNS in Tanzania and internationally, as well as through other Public-Private Partnerships that are contextually similar to this partnership e.g. the PPP emphasize on mobilization and bottom-up capacity building. The result from this research therefore conclude that if Public-Private Partnerships, which function as a means of external governments' development policy, can adopt a holistic and bottom-up approach that indent to strengthen capacity building and thereby empowerment and ownership of the people, it is possible that PPPs can empower poor people.

References

- Arora, S & Romijn, H, *The empty rhetoric of poverty reduction at the base of the pyramid*, SAGE Organization, 19(4) 481-505, 2011
- Banerjee, S, *Corporate Social Responsibility: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly*, Critical Sociology 34, (1), 51-79, 2008
- Bergström, G & Boréus, K, *Textens mening och makt*, Lund, Studentlitteratur, 2005
- Bexell, M, *Global Governance, Gains and Gender*, International Feminist Journal of Politics, 14 (3) p. 389-407, 2012
- Billing, A, Forslind, M & Metell Cueva, K, *Swedish Development Cooperation and the Private Sector, The role of business in poverty alleviation and the role of donors in promoting private sector contributions to development*, Perspectives No. 22, 2012
- Bovaird, T, *Public-private partnerships: from contested concepts to prevalent practice*, International Review of Administrative Science, Vol 70, (2), 199-215, 2005
- Buse, K, Walt, G, *Global public-private partnerships: part I- a new development in health?* Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 74 (4), 2000
- Cruz, C & Marquez, R, *Infrastructure Public-Private Partnerships, Decisions, Managements and Development*, 2013
- Denscombe, M, *Forskningshandboken, för småskaliga forskningsprojekt inom samhällsvetenskapen*, Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2009
- Esaiasson, P, Gilljam, M, Oscarsson, H & Wängnerud, L, *Metodpraktikan, Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*, Vällingby: Norstedts Juridik, 2012
- Ferroni, M & Castle, P, *Public-Private Partnerships and Sustainable Agricultural Development*, Sustainability 3, 1064-1073, 2011
- Friedmann, J, *Empowerment, The politics of Alternative Development*, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1992
- Hill, M, *Development as empowerment*, Feminist Economics, 9, (2-3), 117-135, 2003
- E.D.E Consulting, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT, Executive Summary*, 2010-09

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania – CFAT*, URL: file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Moa/Mina%20dokument/Downloads/1011%20ICP%20Tanzania,%20CFAT%20-%20Project%20Proposal_EN%20(2).pdf, retrieved 2015-03-13

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Public Private Partnership Business for Development (B4D)*, “*Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania (CFAT)*”, 1st Progress report, 2014-03-31

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Tanzania – The Country Program*

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Application Form – Public Private Partnership, Business for Development (B4D)*

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung, *Toward a level playing field*, URL: <http://www.hrnstiftung.org/home-en.html>, retrieved 2014-12-17

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Africa, Blaga Zlateva Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator, retrieved 2015-03-02

Hodge, G & Greve, C, *Public-Private Partnerships: An International Performance Review*, Public Administration Review, May/June, 2007

International Coffee Partners, *Project Title: Building Coffee Farmers Alliances in Tanzania (CFAT)*, URL: file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Moa/Mina%20dokument/Downloads/1105%20ICP%20Tanzania,%20CFAT%20-%20Project%20Description_EN%20(1).pdf, retrieved 2015-03-13

Kabeer, N, *Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women’s Empowerment*, Development as Change Vol. 30, 435-464, 1999

Lawson, V, (Review) Friedmann, J, *Empowerment. The politics of an alternative development*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992

Levy, J, *Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logic of Inference*, Conflict Management and Peace Science, 25, (1), 2008

Mahoney, J, *Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics*, Comparative Political Studies, 40, (122), 2007

Marin, P, *Public-Private Partnerships for Urban Water Utilities, A review of Experiences in Developing Countries*, The World Bank, 2009

Mohan, G & Stokke, K, *Participatory development and empowerment: the dangers of localism*, Third World Quarterly Vol 21, (2), pp 247-268, 2000

Mukhopadhyay, C, *Are Private Investments Serving the Poor in India?*, *Journal of Infrastructure Development*, 3, 39-63, 2011

Prugl & True, *Equality means business? Governing gender through transnational public-private partnerships*, Review of International Political Economy, Vol.21, (6), pp 1137-1169, 2014

Seawright, J & Gerring, J, *Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options*, Political Research Quarterly, Vol. 61, (2), 2008

Sen, A, *Development as freedom*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999

Sen, G, *Empowerment as an approach to poverty*, Working Paper Series Number 97.07, 1997

Sida, Public Private Development Partnerships, Collaboration with the private sector, URL: <http://www.sida.se/globalassets/global/about-sida/private-sector---collected-info.pdf>, retrieved 2015-04-07

Silverman, D, *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2011

Stadtler, L, *Designing public-private partnerships for development*, Vol. 15 2012/1

The World Bank, Narayan, D, *Empowerment and poverty reduction, A Sourcebook*, 2002

The World Bank, Hallward-Driemeier, M & Hasan, T, *Empowering Women, Legal Rights and Economic Opportunities in Africa*, 2013

OECD, Penny Davies, *The Role of the Private Sector in the Context of Aid Effectiveness*, Consultant Findings Document Final Report, 2011-02-02

Osmani, S.R, *Participatory governance, people's empowerment and poverty reduction*, SEPED Conference Paper Series #7, 2000

United Nations Global Compact, *Overview of the UN Global Compact*, URL: <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/index.html>, retrieved 2015-02-03

UNDP, *UNDP and the private sector*, URL: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/partners/private_sector.html, retrieved 2015-02-10

UNDP, URL: <http://www.undp.org/>, retrieved 2015-02-07

Wettenhall, Roger, *The Rhetoric and Reality of Public-Private Partnerships*, Public Organization Review: A Global Journal, 3: 77-107, 2003

Annex 1

		
<p>James Siame, Translator</p>	<p>Kristina Jackson, DC Rep. in Bondelasongwe DC, Mbeya Rural</p>	<p>Bahati Nkanyanya, DC Secretary in Utengule DC, Mbeya Rural</p>
		
<p>Witinesi Rameki, PO member in Idugumbi PO, Mbeya Rural</p>	<p>Ndele Sawanga, PO member in Idugumbi PO, Mbeya Rural</p>	<p>Wiliadi Kameme, PO member in Nkuyu PO, Mbeya Rural</p>
		
<p>Jimmy Kalonga, DC Lead Farmer Promoter in Igale DC, Mbeya Rural</p>	<p>Lilian Mwashigala, PO member in Izumbwe PO, Mbeya Rural</p>	<p>Daudi Mwasabwite, DC Secretary in Igale DC, Mbeya Rural</p>

		
<p>Sofia Mwazembe, DC Rep. in Bara DC, Mbozi</p>	<p>Christopher Mzumbwe, PO member in Isansa PO, Mbozi</p>	<p>Evelina Philimoni, PO member in Isansa PO, Mbozi</p>
		
<p>Rafael Mwampulo, PO member in Ibembwa Amcos, Mbozi</p>	<p>Annacreta Alfred, DC Secretary in Isansa DC, Mbozi</p>	<p>Innocenti Msukwa, DC Lead Farmer Promoter in Nyimbili DC, Mbozi</p>
		
<p>Edina Richadi Simfukwe, PO member in Garani PO, Mbozi</p>	<p>Agnes Kibona, DC Lead Farmer in Nyimbili DC, Mbozi</p>	<p>The staff at Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung Africa, Mbeya and the Researcher</p>

Annex 2

Interview Scheme

Details

- Name?
- PO/DC and village?
- Position within the PO/DC?
- Grows?
- What does the main income come from?

Introduction Question

- How do you like working with coffee? Has it helped you?

'Social Power'

1. Do you have more and better tools for your household today compared to when you were not part of CFAT? Please give example. (For example things for the kitchen, for the bathroom, clothes, electricity)
2. Do you have more and better tools for farming and other work activities today? Please give examples. (For example fertilizers, hand hoe, boots, bicycles, garments, sewing machine)
3. Do you have better opportunities for input suppliers, such as bank loans and credit, but also credit for fertilizers and pesticides today compared to before?
4. How is your income level today? Are you living a better life today compared to when you were not part of CFAT? Please explain.
5. How is your health, and are you practically and financially able to see a doctor when necessary?
6. Do you own your property and how did you receive it? Have you been able to extend your territory?
7. Do you have time to spend on other activities besides life surviving activities for example work, travel to work, collecting and preparing food?
8. What have you learned from CFAT, and what has been the most useful?

'Political Power'

9. Are you able to impact/influence local and national political matters? Do these politicians listen to you? Has this changed today compared to when you were not part of CFAT?
10. Are you able to impact/influence activities and decisions in the farmer groups?
11. Can you impact/influence the activities of CFAT? Do they listen to you?
12. When you are mobilized in a farmer group, is the group stronger and can it impact/influence more compared to when you were on your own? If so, what can the farmer group achieve that individual farmers cannot?
13. How are you selling your coffee today and how did you sell it before you were part of a farmer group?
14. Are you getting higher coffee prices when you are selling through the farmer group?
15. Can the farmer groups decide when the coffee will be auctioned?

'Psychological Power'

16. How do you feel about yourself and your opportunities in life? Do you feel more confident today compared to when you were not part of CFAT?
17. Do you feel more confidence to express your opinion today compared to before?
18. Do you like to create goals for yourself, and do you have the confidence to try to reach those goals? Has the enrollment in CFAT improved this?
19. Do you have the confidence to try new things and engage in new activities today?
(For example:
 - a. try new farming methods?
 - b. be more involved in the farmer groups?
 - c. be more involved in local and national political matters?)