University of Gothenburg

Faculty of Social Science

School of Global Studies

UNIVERSITY OF
GOTHENBURG

BACHELOR THESIS IN GLOBAL STUDIES
SPRING 2015

We are Women in Coffee!

– An explanatory case study of Fairtrade's gendered impact on female and male

farmers of a Fairtrade certified Kenyan coffee cooperative

GS1511, BA Thesis in Global Studies, 15,0 higher education credits

Focus/Orientation: Global Development Studies

Major: Global Studies

Spring term 2015

Supervisor: Monica Lindh De Montoya

Student: Fanny Rölander (19900426-0320)

Abstract

Due to globalisation, the world is becoming increasingly intertwined with complex global trade networks linking producers and consumers through largely unequal relationships. Fairtrade addresses this inequality by supporting the vulnerable producers. However, this is often done without disaggregating impact by gender though various scholars have noted that men and women are generally affected differently by interventions. This thesis therefore explores the heterogeneous experiences and perceptions of Fairtrade for female and male farmers of the Kenyan Fairtrade certified cooperative *Kabngetuny Farmers Cooperative Society*, located in a small rural village called Chepkechei in Great Rift Valley. By using gender analysis the gendered impact of Fairtrade is examined in order to answer the main aim of this study: whether Fairtrade can lead to women's empowerment and gender equality. The research was carried out April-May 2015 as a Minor Field Study, employing a qualitative explanatory case study, mainly using participatory observation and focus group interviews. The study revealed that due to different gender roles and highly separated gender divisions of labour female and male farmers are affected differently by Fairtrade. It moreover showed that Fairtrade has positively impacted the income of women, but with marginal alteration of current gender roles. Neither has it challenged women's subordination to a significant degree. Hence, it only partially empowers women and addresses gender inequalities. However, since it is a continuing initiative, its impact has to be investigated anew to assess its actual impact over time. I believe that this study will contribute to the understanding of how gender works as a differentiating and separating mechanism through gender divisions of labour and subsequently assigned gender roles. My study has pointed out the different outcomes men and women experience from Fairtrade, and how these can be addressed for Fairtrade to achieve women's empowerment and gender equality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

Today we are all intertwined in a complex global system of trade and exchange. This most social scientists agree upon, but their opinions diverge remarkably as to the characteristics of the process: some stating it to be an unequal process that thrives on the already marginalised and poor, especially women in the Global South, while others argue that it brings the world together creating a global village of solidarity (Potter, Binns, Elliott & Smith, 2008:133-145). The aspect of global justice is thus an important concept for globalisation and its integral part, world trade systems. Fairtrade is one of the approaches which sees the global trading system as unfair and it tries to address some of the issues by bridging the imbalance between producers and consumers through creating more favourable conditions for producers through a fair price (Chandler, 2006). Fairtrade sees itself as *"an alternative approach to conventional trade"* built on a partnership between producers; Southern farmers, and consumers (Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International, 2011). In addition, two of the main goals of Fairtrade are poverty alleviation and non-discrimination, focusing on gender equality (WFTO, 2013). At the same time another recurrent debate revolving around the relationship between poverty and gender inequality has created a discourse termed 'feminization of poverty' (Mikkelsen, 2005:239); a discourse that also has strong linkages to the Fairtrade prospect since it sets out to both reduce poverty and gender inequality. Therefore scholars have noted that it is not only of value to investigate the linkages between free trade, Fairtrade and justice, but also between free trade, Fairtrade and gender. Still the empirical body of the latter relationship is virtually small and the researchers within this area call for more research (Steinkopf-Rice, 2010; Kasente, 2012 etc.). It is my aim to partially fill this gap with my study, which focuses on gendered effects of Fairtrade.

1.1 Motivation and relevance for global studies

As pointed out above, globalisation is a process that is compressing both time and space while it similarly intertwining the local and the global. This notion guides me and other scholars of global studies who attempt multi- and interdisciplinary analyses of *"the social, political, and economic processes and transformations that affect not only the world as a whole but also individual localities"* (Campbell, MacKinnon & Stevens, 2010:3). There is also an ethical component tied to global studies, as scholars aim to identify ways to improve the development of the world (Campbell et al., 2010:3). Trade is one of the global processes that

scholars of global studies examine, as it links the Global South to the Global North, affecting southern producers vis-á-vis northern consumers in complex and contradictory ways. In this context, Fair Trade has emerged as a global development discourse centred on justice, and it has, as the development discourse, come to notice that it contains important gendered aspects (Chandler, 2006:256 & Jaffee, 2007:694-5). It is important to understand the difference between Fair Trade and Fairtrade. The former, which includes the latter, refers to all efforts towards shaping a trading partnership based on greater equity in international trade mainly through securing better trading conditions for marginalised producers and workers. Fairtrade, as one such effort, includes producer networks, national and market organisations. It also denotes the product certification system, which Fairtrade International (FLO) operates (Fairtrade International, 2011).

1.2 The discourse of development and gender

The view of development has largely moved from solely centring on economic approaches, modernisation, to bottom-up and alternative approaches with highly normative and holistic views of the development process and its subjects (Potter, 2008:68-70). The development approaches have also come to include theories, or policy approaches, regarding women. According to Moser (1993:55) there are five such, largely mirroring shifts in macro-economic development policies, with differing views on women's roles and which needs to focus on. This development and gender discourse started in 1950 with welfare moving on to equity, then to anti-poverty to efficiency and finally to empowerment in 1975. At the beginning of the women and development discourse ruled by the welfare approach women were mainly seen as mothers and as passive beneficiaries of top-down development hand-outs. Last out, the empowerment agenda instead focuses on women's subordination, employing bottom-up strategies to confront it. It recognises the multiple roles that women hold and the importance of relationships between women and men (Moser, 1993:56-7). In sum, this discourse has seen various shifts from, among other, seeing women as beneficiaries to active agents. In these discourses I position myself within bottom-up and alternative approaches, which logically include the last approach in the women and development one. I do so since I explore my research topic with a bottom-up perspective and because I believe that it is necessary to look at gender roles of both men and women, and the relationship between them. Additionally, I see empowerment as one of the bearing concepts of analysis. As noted by Cornwall

(2003:1325), Mosse (1995:573) and Rowlands (1995:106), gender, empowerment and participatory bottom-up methods intersect one another and rightfully should do so in a mindful way.

1.3 Critical scrutiny of recent Fair Trade and gender research

The importance of gender within Fair Trade is evident in the study by Terstappen, Hanson and McLaughlin (2013: 21) mapping the literature on Fair Trade, from 1990 and July 2010, that deals with the social dimensions of gender, health, labour and equality experienced by southern agricultural producers and workers within the Fairtrade chain. It is noteworthy that Terstappen et al. (2013:26) found that *"gender equity and women's involvement in Fairtrade still maintains a very low profile in the research literature"* and that it is seldom the principal focus. This is apparent in the studies of Ruben, Fort and Zúñiga-Arias (2009:777) and Utting-Chamorro (2005:584-8), both of which examined the general impact of Fairtrade on farm-household level in Latin-American countries, especially in economistic terms with gender equity as an additional aspect. I find it very problematic that the researchers choose the family/household level as the unit of analysis, since it is often erroneously considered a joint one and thereby gender inequalities as wells as perspectives and realities of subordinate members are hidden (Moser, 1993:15). This failure of researchers to disaggregate data is noted by Terstappen et al. (2013:34) as very common within existing research on Fairtrade and gender. But in the few cases where data had been disaggregated, the researchers found that labour burdens for women in Fairtrade were high despite remarkably low official participation and that impacts of Fairtrade on producers were often inequitably distributed, with men benefiting disproportionately due to erroneous assumptions of a trickle-down effect of income and benefits from male heads of household and male producers to women. This is supported by Kasente's (2012:117-20) findings from her case study of Uganda where coffee production increases labour burdens for women without giving them space to earn income or take on specialised tasks or higher positions, all of this being dominated by males who did not distribute earnings to their wives who performed unpaid labour on the family-farms. In continuation, men persist to control decision-making (Kasente, 2012:118; Terstappen et al., 2013:21 & Utting-Chamorro 2005:595).

According to Steinkopf-Rice (2010:46) gender equality is not achieved through Fairtrade because, as a part of the trade liberalisation scheme, it does not transform the

structural dimensions creating gender inequality. Terstappen et al. (2013:29) rather find that most researchers link gender roles and gendered divisions of labour to cultural norms that in turn limits women's ability to participate in and benefit from alternative trade. This may well be due to the fact that Steinkopf-Rice (2010:43) reach conclusions about the gendered structures of Fairtrade by using theories and reviewing Fairtrade documents, whilst the review of Terstappen et al. (2013:25-6) included empirical research, where qualitative methods, most often types of semi-structured interviews, were highly overrepresented. It is further noticed that the Fairtrade and gender research often hinges on case studies (McArdle & Thomas, 2012:289). This might make it problematic to generalise the impacts of Fairtrade on gender equality but the primary methodology concern is the fact that, according to Terstappen et al. (2013:26), almost one-third of studies completely left out their methods or did not explain them clearly enough. They also noted that *"a limited descriptive language may be contributing to the silencing of important marginalized voices"* since the dominant language of researchers, even when explicitly examining impacts of Fairtrade on gender, included ''producers'' and ''co-operatives'', thus implying a harmonious homogeneity potentially concealing divert experiences within Fairtrade (Terstappen et al., 2013:35). I have myself identified and sought to address this pitfall by looking at the separate views of female and male farmers. Other researchers within this discourse highlight the heterogeneity in experiences of Fairtrade, and point out the necessity of always contextualising them (Kasente, 2012:114; McArdle & Thomas, 2012:277; Steinkopf-Rice, 2010:42 & Terstappen et al., 2013:35). These studies make use of gender analysis and feminist perspectives, and it is evident that it is useful, especially in the case of Kasente (2012) where it assists her in relating what her research subjects express to a more general and theoretic level, through important concepts such as gender divisions of labour, and gender roles. What is even more noteworthy is that Terstappen et al. (2013:26) found that *"gender equity and the gendered dimensions of fair trade are repeatedly described in the literature as areas in need of further investigation"*. Hence, creating an imperative for more contextualised studies on the gendered impacts of Fairtrade.

1.4 The case

Coffee as one of many Fairtrade certified commodities is also one of the largest traded commodities on the world markets, the majority being produced by smallholder farmers.

Within coffee production female representation is approximately 60-80%, still their labour remains largely undervalued and invisible in terms of no financial gains and exclusion from decision-making (Gall, 2013, 5th of March). Kenya is one of the countries where coffee is considered a key industry, which includes 6 million workers with 75.5% of the coffee being cultivated by cooperatives composed of farmers with small and medium sized landholdings (Bagal, 2013:1-11). One of these is the rurally based coffee farmers' society *Kabngetuny Farmers' Cooperative Society* (hereinafter *Kabngetuny*) located in Chepkechei, the Great Rift Valley of Western Kenya. According to its chairman Samson Koskei (Interview chairman), it was formed in 1985 and was initially made up of approximately 200 male members, whereas spouses and children provided labour but had no say. When the cooperative started the Fairtrade certification process in 2010 the principle of gender sensitization was introduced which 2013, being fully Fairtrade certified, resulted in participation in Fairtrade's *'Growing Women in Coffee'* (hereinafter *GWIC*) programme aimed at *"supporting Kenyan women coffee farmers to grow their livelihoods"* (Fairtrade Africa, 2015). This made Fairtrade Africa (2013) recognise *Kabngetuny* as one of the first cooperatives to incorporate gender mainstreaming within its operations. Koskei (Interview chairman) describes this as a great transformation of the society from membership and wealth exclusively appropriated by the dominant males to incorporating Fairtrade and subsequently gender sensitive strategies, which resulted in the handover of coffee plants to female farmers and the founding of *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee* (hereinafter *Kabngetuny WIC*); a female headed cooperative with 191 members and a target of 300.

1.5 Purpose

I seek to explore whether Fairtrade is a medium through which gender relations, gender roles and gender divisions of labour are transformed. I believe it is necessary to look at women and men farmers as two distinct groups in order to understand heterogeneous perceptions of this and to answer the main aim of my study: whether Fairtrade moreover results in women's empowerment and gender equality. Furthermore, I intent to discern whether Fairtrade employs the mean of gender equity to accomplish this. I seek to do this by means of a qualitative field study, adopting a case study strategy with a bottom-up approach, where *Kabngetuny* serves as the case. To answer the overarching research question: "Can Fairtrade

lead to gender equality and women's empowerment?", I will explore the following sub-questions:

1. Is gender equality a desirable goal for farmers, and if so, how is it described and related to their lives?
2. How do farmers define and relate to empowerment?
3. Is Fairtrade important to farmers in terms of reaching gender equality and empowerment, and if so, how and why?
4. What are the current gender divisions of labour and gender roles, and do farmers express changes in these since entering Fairtrade?

1.6 Delimitations

From the critical examination of former research I believe it is clear that my choice of focus has high societal value since it affects important aspects of marginalised people's lives. My study also possess high scientific value in answering the imperative of former researchers by adding to the empirical body of evidence that can be used to find cross-cutting impacts of Fairtrade on gender equality. By disaggregating my research I also increase the information on the heterogeneity in experiences of Fairtrade by women and men. What I will not address is the issue of low generalizability within the research area. By instead examining a specific case, as Kasente (2012), I still believe that I can contribute to the basis from where comparable research can be drawn. There is also an important question raised by Steinkopf-Rice (2010) as to whether Fairtrade, due to its incorporation to the trade liberalization system, is systemically and therefore permanently unable to address the root causes of gender inequality embedded within the same. Due to time constraints this triangulation of analysing my empirical data in relation to the Fairtrade structure from a systemic departure will not be possible although it could have answered both the more general question of Fairtrade's ability to systemically address gender inequality as well as its ability to do so in a specific context. Lastly, I will limit my focus to that of the perspectives of male and female farmers from one cooperative even tough it would have been interesting to compare it to other cases to validate the factors affecting Fairtrade and its gendered aspects.

2. Theoretical framework

I use gender analysis since it proved to be successful in conceptualising gendered experiences of Fairtrade before. In general, gender analysis within development aims to understand the underlying mechanism of development practice and policy in terms of its gender differences. It entails asking the critical questions of whose interpretations and whose voices count. Through gender analysis, women and their important role in development processes as well as the different roles and positions of women and men, ascribing them different needs and interests, are recognised (Mikkelsen, 2005:234-242). I employ two out of the six most noticed analytical frameworks, namely: the Moser Framework and the Social Relations Approach, in order to explain my understanding of the theoretical concepts I use. I complement these frameworks by separately looking at the concepts of doxa and by further problematizing gender, gender equality and equity.

2.1 Moser Framework

Moser develops a gender planning with tools that address some of the core concepts shaping the realities of especially women, but also men. These concepts are above all practical and strategic gender needs and gender roles, but also gender divisions of labour and gender positions because of the interrelated relationship among these. The framework is based on the premise that the major issues to tackle are subordination and inequality, so that women by empowerment achieve the end goal of equality with men in society (Moser, 1993:1-5).

2.1.1 Gender positions, gender divisions of labour and gender roles

Firstly women and men hold different positions within the household and differ in their control over resources, and they play different and changing roles in society that in turn gives them diverse needs (Moser, 1993:15). From this notion Moser (1993:15) criticises Western planning theory for making generalised assumptions about the household as a socio-economic unit characterised by a clear division of labour where men do productive and women reproductive work while sharing equal control over resources and decision-making power. In reality, most households are built on unequal gender divisions of labour where most low-income Third World women have a triple role; reproductive, productive and community managing, while their male counterparts have two: productive and community leadership. These gender roles are performed at household, market and community level.

Women often solely possess *the reproductive role,* which is not limited to childbearing/rearing and domestic work, but also includes socialisation and maintenance of family members. This role is extended to include the community sphere where women have a community-managing role; providing unpaid voluntary work to ensure provision and maintenance of scarce resources, e.g. water and education, for collective consumption. Men on the other hand engage in the community politics through a community leadership role, which is usually paid directly or indirectly through wages or increased status and power. The fact that community managing and reproduction are seen as 'naturally' women's domains creates critical notions of value and recognition where women work more hours than men due to invisibility and non-recognition (Moser, 1993:29-35). This makes it important for me to look at value perceptions of private and public work and also recognised work hours for female and male farmers.

The productive role entails work done by both sexes, but substantial research has shown that permanence of rigid gender divisions of labour have rendered them unequal both vertically, based on a gender hierarchy putting women into lower-paid and lower-skilled jobs; and horizontally with a minority of women in managerial positions (Moser, 1993:29-33). For women in agricultural production this means that they normally engage in work as independent farmers, peasants' wives and wageworkers, but often in a clearly dichotomous way; women ascribed to subsistence food production while men produce cash crops, a gendered labour division which once again creates high invisibility of rural women's work (Moser, 1993:31-3). In my research I will use these more specific roles to analyse the incidence of gendered divisions of labour within *Kabngetuny*.

2.1.2 Gender needs – practical and strategic

I identify Moser's conceptualisations of gender roles reflecting the gender divisions of labour as important concepts from which I can analyse the case of Fairtrade and gender at *Kabngetuny*, especially in terms of answering research questions three and four. But for question four, I also need to move further and understand the gender needs that these gender roles create. Here, an important distinction between two types of gender needs: practical and strategic, exists. Practical gender needs are those that women identify in their socially accepted roles in society, thus not challenging unequal gender divisions of labour or women's subordination, but arising out of them. They originate from the concrete conditions that women experience due to their positions within the gender divisions of labour where they

often carry sole responsibility of the domestic arena. Therefore these needs often revolve around meeting basic needs, e.g. water provision. In opposition, strategic gender needs are those women identify because of their subordinate position to men. They also relate to gender divisions of labour as well as power and control over resources, but with the aim of changing them, and thereby they challenge women's subordination. Therefore, meeting strategic gender needs helps women reach greater gender equality (Moser, 1993:37-41).

Moser's interrelated explanation of gender roles as the outcome of gender divisions of labour, and the underlying principle of separating out and differentiating the work between men and women providing the rationale for the difference in value placed on their work, is a valuable understanding of linkages between the gender division of labour and the subordination of women from which I can theorise my empirical data (Moser, 1993:29).

2.2 Social Relations Approach

Social Relations Analysis, initiated by Nabila Kabeer, provides a less economistic conceptualisation of gender where emphasis rather is placed upon women's empowerment (Razavi, & Miller, 1995:14). This approach, just as Moser's, acknowledges that the redistribution of resources implied in gender equality and women's empowerment efforts is always a zero sum game. Redistributive projects will inevitably lead to conflict since some will gain whereas others will not. This conflict will often take place at the household level, at the dimension of social relations that create differences in the positioning of men and women in social processes, that is gender relations. These gender relations are constituted through the gender division of labour as the form of social connection assigning women and men different responsibilities, activities and spheres, making it essential for them to engage in relationships of co-operation and exchange (Razavi, & Miller, 1995:27-30). I will additionally make use of this understanding of gender relations in order to complement what Moser notes on these aspects for research question four.

2.2.1 Empowerment

Empowerment, as thoroughly outlined by Kabeer (1999 & 2005), is the most important concept in Social Relations Analysis. I employ this to fully understand research subjects' expressions of situations, feelings and thoughts that can be understood as aspects of empowerment or the opposite, thus answering research question three. Kabeer (1999:435 &

2005) defines empowerment as a process of change moving from disempowerment, when women denied the ability to make strategic life choices acquire this ability. The strategic life choices; first-order choices, are those that constitute the possibility for people to live the lives they desire. Examples of these, with relevance to my study, are freedom of movement, choice of livelihood, number of children to have and whether to use family planning. To clarify, empowerment is something that cannot be singled down to economic capacity as is often done. On the contrary it entails a far wider ability to exercise meaningful choice. Hence, empowerment means making active use of one's agency in ways that challenge unequal power relations, but agency; the process, is only one out of three interrelated dimensions that constitute the parameters for change. Resources, as the first parameter, sets the conditions for making use of agency where the distribution of material, social and human resources is as important as the terms on which these are acquired (Kabeer, 2001:19-21). It is therefore not enough to look at *de jure* entitlement; simple access to resources, but one must investigate *de facto* entitlement; actual control over resources – that women have a say regarding the resource in question (Kabeer, 2001:29-31). The third dimension is the outcome; the generated achievements – one's potential to lead the life s/-he wishes, generated through the fusion of the resources and agency dimensions (Kabeer, 2001:19-21).

It is also essential to look at the aspect of agency termed 'power within'; the purpose and meaning individuals bring to their actions, since beliefs and values play significant roles in legitimising inequality (Kabeer, 1999:37-8 & 2005:14-5). According to Kabeer (2001:21), purposive action should be understood as a wide spectrum, including bargaining, negotiation, persuasion, deception, manipulation, subversion and resistance, as I shall attempt in this thesis. However, empowerment can and often does take place not only at the individual level, but also at relational and collective levels. Thus, there are three levels from which empowerment can arise. The collective level of empowerment is crucial since agents work together to achieve a more extensive impact than each could have had on their own (Rowlands, 1995:103). It is not possible for individual women to address structural inequalities. Individual empowerment will therefore prove to be *"a fragile gain if it cannot be mobilized into the interests of collective empowerment"* (Kabeer, 2001:48). It is therefore noted that women's empowerment has to be simultaneously fought in two arenas, with collective action in the public and with individual assertiveness in the private (Kabeer, 2001:48). It informs us that all levels have to be represented to ensure that changes translate into meaningful and sustainable processes of empowerment. A mere change in individuals'

resource attainment without addressing the structures of inequality and discrimination may improve their economic standard, but without empowering them (Kabeer, 2001:27). Palpably, all three levels of power are important to the empowerment conceptualisation, but in my case the collective level might prove to be especially important due to the possible gains that the women of *Kabngetuny WIC* can reach collectively.

To close this section I wish to emphasize that empowerment must be self-generated; the women themselves must take control over their own lives. The process can be aided by a gender-transformative policy, in this case Fairtrade and the *GWIC* programme, which will equip the women with enabling resources, but ultimately these women must themselves decide to use this opportunity to alter their gender relations. It cannot be given to or done for them. Given that the empowerment of women through access to resources entails that those in power, read men, must resign some of its power, it is likely that conflict arises during the process. I therefore acknowledge that it is not certain that women will want to further use newly found resources to re-negotiate their position within the household to reshape current gender relations and roles, due to the conflicts it will spur. Since these conflicts may cause greater vulnerability in some settings due to valuable losses of protection and security.

2.3 Doxa

The concept of empowerment, as seen above, is not easily captured. It becomes even more complex when one seeks to conceptualise it in light of the existing culture since this is often the boundary for what the choices are perceived to be. Bourdieu (1977:164) explains this by the concept of doxa; cultural and traditional aspects that are embedded within people's minds to the extent where they are viewed as natural. A doxic mode exists when these traditions and cultural beliefs stand above discourse and argumentation – they are accepted without argument and scrutiny. In order for these cultural and traditional aspects to shift from being viewed as self-evident to variable there must be a passage to discourse. At discourse level, material and cultural possibilities become available with competing views of ways of being and doing. The cultural "common sense" begins to dissolve, losing its naturalised character, and there is a space for people to conceive of a possibility of choosing differently, to be and to do differently (Bourdieu, 1977:164-70). Doxa will be useful in my research since some aspects of empowerment and gender equality might be brushed aside due to culture and/or

tradition. The concept will thereby facilitate my analysis of which aspects or cultural boundaries that are hindering gendered change since they are viewed as innate.

2.4 Gender

I also outline my understanding of the concept of gender to provide further clarity in my usage of abovementioned theoretical terminologies. I view gender as the socially and culturally produced and reproduced roles that women and men are given through the process of socialisation. This is inherently different from sex; the biologically given 'gender' (Razavi & Miller, 1995:12). Eloquently explained by Simone De Beauvoir (1949), one is not born to be a woman but grows to be one. It is widely known that this socialisation process is gendered, that is, its enunciation differs for boys and girls to such a high extent that they grow up in fundamentally different cultures (Järviluoma, Moisala & Vilkko, 2003:5). Gender, as such, ascribes women and men different roles and positions in society, thus placing different expectations on women and men and different standards for acceptable behaviours resulting in different constraints and possibilities. Gender is thereby the determinant of what is valued in a female contra a male (Bonvillain, 1998:1). Gender is also fluid: changeable throughout time and varying according to context, therefore it constantly has to be reflected upon when carrying out research work, as I also sought to do (Järviluoma et al., 2003:2).

2.5 Gender equality and equity

Gender equality and equity is often used interchangeable although they denote different positions in the gender discourse. UNESCO (2006) clarifies this distinction by stating: *"equity is a means. Equality and equitable outcomes are the result"*. In sum, I, as well as many other scholars, believe that in order to gain gender equality; equal rights and opportunities irrespective of gender, it is essential to adopt the method of gender equity; using different approaches to reach equitable outcomes for women and men due to the fact that they often hold essentially different positions in societies (UN, 2001). In my research this understanding will guide me as I analyse the empirical data regarding research question three.

3. Methodological predispositions

In order to be more transparent as a researcher I hereby outline the epistemological basis in addition to the methods making up methodological assumptions of my research. In accordance with a feminist understanding of the epistemological triad; the knower, the known and the process of knowing, I argue that the focus should be on how these relate to one another (Sprague, 2005:31). I further assume a feminist position in recognising gender as a key organiser of social life (Sprague, 2005:3).

Hermeneutic and standpoint theory are the scientific theories that underlie my research. Hermeneutics, founded on Weber's claim of human beings and human actions as filled with meaning, calls us to make interpretations in order to access knowledge. More specifically I build my research on the double hermeneutic developed in Anthony Giddens' grand theory – the theory of structuration, since I agree that both researcher and research subjects are interpretative in nature, thus researchers engage in a process of interpretation while performing investigation and thereby must reconstruct and re-interpret social actors' interpretations within the language of social science by using theoretical concepts (Gilje & Grimen, 2007:172-178). As Sprague (2005:131) clarifies, each narrative generated in research interaction is a product co-constructed by the researched and the researcher. Hence, I consider knowledge to be socially produced, without falling into the relativist pitfall where no knowledge claims can be validated.

By further positioning myself as a critical researcher I wish to identify the processes and aspects of the social context that are systemically reproducing difference. I therefore use standpoint theory where knowledge is viewed as being *"constructed in a specific matrix of physical location, history, culture and interests, these matrices change in configuration from one location to another: are context specific"* (Sprague, 2005:41). Working from a feminist epistemic I put privilege on gender as a standpoint, but I seek to not only work from the standpoint of the disadvantaged, in the case of gender – women; but also to develop knowledge that can empower them, by including men (Sprague, 2005:195). To clarify, I assume no position of objectivity as a researcher but seek to be both self-aware of my own and others standpoints and how these affect the research.

4. Research design

In this chapter I describe and discuss my methods and the considerations I have taken throughout my research. Aiming to explore the complexity of gendered effects of an intervention in a specific setting, with a focus on interpretation, heterogeneity and power asymmetries, I chose a qualitative research design. A valid choice, because qualitative research deals with constructing the social world via an active researcher using qualitative methods, which are well suited for interpretive and critical research (Mikkelsen, 2005:139-142). With my research questions centred on 'how' and 'why', I decided to do an explanatory case study since it is optimal for answering 'how' or 'why' a programme has worked or not. It is thereby suited for complex real-life interventions since it provides in-depth and holistic explanations by making observations of events and interviews with persons involved in them (Yin, 2003:1-7).

4.1 The data and methods for data collection

My primary concern is to obtain insight into the coffee farmers' lives and perspectives to understand gendered impact of Fairtrade on their lives. I therefore commenced with field observation, mainly participatory field visits, to achieve contextual understanding of my case. These were also carried out to contextualise and operationalize my theoretical concepts so that I could design a focus group interview guide that participants would understand, and subsequently generate the information required to answer my research questions. By using the field and case study strategy I did not assume a highly deterministic course of action. However, I systemically organised the work by making sure that both field visits and focus group interviews generated information regarding my research topic while I still left room for unexpected changes, answers and interactions. As Mikkelsen (2005:48) clarifies, field studies are largely a learning process and throughout my stay in Chepkechei I adopted it as such by being open to new ways to explore my research questions.

4.1.1 Participatory observations

Entering the field of study, the hilly village called Chepkechei made up of six different zones I met with the female board representatives of *Kabngetuny WIC* who outlined the organisation for me. In discussion with them I decided to start with field visits at different farmers' homes in order to get familiar with the area and to let farmers get familiar with my research and me. I

also decided to reside in the village, since the accessibility from the nearest town is limited due to mud roads and heavy rains, but also since it would give me greater possibilities to use participatory observation. As explained by Bernard (2006:342), participant observation basically involves *"getting close to people and making them feel comfortable enough with your presence so that you can observe and record information about their lives"*. By living with a family in the village I felt that I received a better understanding of farmers' daily lives and that it was easier for me to be accepted by the farmers and thereby interact with them during field visits and the focus groups.

I fulfilled my aim to make home visits in all the six zones that makes up *Kabngetuny WIC*. This meant that I managed to visit 58 homes and to meet and interact with about 78 female members. At most home visits I met only the women and not their spouses, a majority of which are members of *Kabngetuny*, since they were either working on the farm or away from home. At the field visits I saw the women's coffee farms, and got the chance to ask them about their experiences of working with coffee and being part of *Kabngetuny WIC*. I did not follow an interview guide but tried to get a feel for their lives and especially their perceptions of this particular aspect of their lives, how Fairtrade has affected them and why they joined *Kabngetuny WIC*. Without participant observation, through field visits and living in Chepkechei, I believe that it would have been difficult to fully understand the lives of my research subjects and to analyse my empirical data. Participant observation certainly gave me the ability to validate statements and to feel confident about my findings (Bernard, 2006:342-4). In order to make the participant observations useful I wrote up field notes, often on a daily basis, where I described conversations, environments and situations. I additionally reflected upon data collection techniques as well as the community's organising mechanisms and culture. That is, I foremost wrote descriptive notes, but I also made methodological and analytical notes, thus making use of all three kinds of field notes (Bernard, 2006:395-8).

4.1.2 Focus groups

Observations greatly assisted me in formulating the semi-structured interview guides and background information sheets for my focus groups (see appendices 1-4) and I strongly believe that they provided me with the necessary information to create questions according to the research subjects' understandings. I also decided to use both direct observations and focus groups because some of the most fruitful studies have come about by combining focus groups with other methods (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson and Wängnerud, 2007:363-7). Esaiasson

et. al (2007:363) point out that focus groups are limiting in the aspect that derived results do not create validation to make general statements. Evidently my aim is to discern farmers' *subjective* experiences of Fairtrade, thus perfect validity is not even theoretically attainable and of less concern (Mikkelsen, 2005:196). I chose focus group since its dynamic traits open up for unexpected questions, just as it enables the study of social interaction as researcher exerts minimum guidance (Esaiasson et. al, 2007:361-2 & Mikkelsen, 2005:172-173). I believe that this proved to be true for my case, and that it moreover revealed systems of thought and deeply rooted values that were of interest for my research. The topics of my research may well be sensitive, which further justified the use of focus groups, which are identified as especially well suited for studying sensitive topics since participants can find support in one another and feel a greater ease in opening up than they would in a one-on-one situation with an interviewer (Esaiasson et. al, 2007:362). To clarify, I do not believe that I completely bypassed the interviewer effect; the notion that people respond differently depending on how they perceive the interviewer formulated especially by age, sex and ethnic origin (Mikkelsen, 2005:177), since I view it as an intrinsic concern of interviews, but I felt that it was minimised. By my choice of focus group interviews I also aimed to avoid mainstream interviewing practices which have been criticised for their masculine emphasis on detachment and control, a situation where the researcher controls and dominates the outcome, thus creating a "pseudo-conversation" excluding the crucial aspects of interactions (Sprague, 2005:126-7). I felt that this was largely achieved since both male and female participants often opened up to me and showed curiosity during discussions by asking questions about how I see things and how they are done in Sweden.

As Mikkelsen (2005:173), I argue that an interview conducted in the local language is always preferable. Therefore my focus groups were in the native tongue, one that I do not speak myself, thus demanding the use of an interpreter. I here made the choice to use a female interpreter for the group of women and a male for the group of men. I believe that this was a good choice since my field visits had shown that the women found it easier to open up and talk about these subjects when there were no men present. Lastly, I finish this section, from my point of view as a critical researcher, with one of the strongest pro-argument for focus groups: it has an empowering ability (Sprague, 2005:160) – which I hade the privilege to witness myself during some of the discussions.

4.1.3 Informant interviews

I collected further empirical data by conducting informant interviews with representatives from *Kabngetuny* and Fairtrade Africa. I did this to gain insights about the history of the cooperative and the *Women in Coffee* initiative as well as the more technical details about how it is organised and the role of Fairtrade and the *GWIC* project. This helped me to understand the broader picture and processes that affect the situation of the farmers. These informant interviews were short and semi-structured with a focus on the history, challenges and objectives of the organisations (see appendices 5&6).

4.1.4 Sampling

Undoubtedly a researcher holds a position of power in determining what type of interviewees to select based on preconceived conceptual categories in a process of sampling. By employing standard selection strategies you easily reproduce systematic biases, creating biased samples and consequently distorted findings (Sprague, 2005:127-9). This highlights the importance of reflecting on my sampling methods and their implications.

Due to the high number of members I quickly realized that I did not have time to make field visit to all of their farms. I therefore asked the representatives of the cooperative to assist me with arranging for a number of farmers at each zone to receive me. The only requirement that I communicated to them was that it had to be active members that had time and willingness to receive a visit from me. During the course of time I felt that they arranged my field visits to give me the opportunity to meet members with different characteristics, which was helpful. I acknowledge the possibility that I was only arranged to visit the most positive or successful members, but according to my observations I did not see this to be true.

The sample for focus groups was drawn from two poles since I conducted female and male focus groups separately. To recruit participants I did not make use of the common practice of letters and advertising by systematic sampling (Esaiasson et. al 2007:366). Instead I used what Sprague (2005:127) refers to as group-specific strategies to reach "correct" sampling. This entails finding alternative modes of recruiting, in my case it entailed participatory observation through field visits from where I found potential participants. This was done in combination with using the knowledge and expertise from representatives of the cooperative, as well as my interpreter to get a diverse sample and also to make sure that the participants in the group were those that actually had time to attend discussions. This sampling strategy felt viable since I also recognised the problem that many

of the research subjects come from economically constrained conditions, making it a dilemma for them to participate. They might want to cooperate but are not able to because of having to deal with more pressing issues (Sprague, 2005:129). Therefore, I also decided to provide participants with lunch and money as to cover the transportation fee from their home to the location of the discussion.

Esaiasson et. al (2007:367) describes the standard set-up of a focus group as one where the individuals do not know each other beforehand, since this might affect the interview due to beforehand fixed roles and norms. I strived for this ideal, but quickly realized that it was not possible due to the tightly knit social structure of the community. The prime attribute of my research is sex, being biologically female or male, and therefore this was the homogenous attribute of participants in each group since I believed this would facilitate the discussion (Sprague, 2005:160). Other determinants, for both women and men, turned out to be the ones I had anticipated, namely: marital status, age, number of children, years of schooling and main occupation (for more information about participants see appendices 7-10). My goal was to have six participants per group, comprised of three from each of two different zones that I had previously visited, but this was not possible on all occasions. It therefore turned out that the number of participants ranged from four to six, still creating a sufficient number for carrying out a discussion and all the same having representatives from both zones. I did not determine the number of focus groups that I would carry out beforehand. But I did not see this as a problem because the standard practice of this qualitative method is to conduct as many as necessary to reach theoretical saturation, the point where no new findings are generated regarding the central phenomenon of the study (Mikkelsen, 2005:193 & Esaiasson et. al, 2007:366). In the end I conducted four focus groups, two with women and two with men, drawn from the first four zones I visited.

4.2 Methods for data analysis

As pointed out by Mikkelsen (2005:159) data is seldom readily present in the form that is suited for further analysis and interpretation, which calls researchers to 'construct' data. Here it is important to make a distinction between two typical roles a researcher can assume in the process of data analysis. It could either be that of the data analyst, searching for the interpretation most consistent with the data, letting the data tell the story, or that of the data miner who has predetermined what to look for and searches until it has been found

(Mikkelsen, 2005:160). That is, working inductively or deductively where I position myself as the data analyst working inductively. I aimed to do so by using the analysis method of coding qualitative data, which is considered a useful tool in organising qualitative material for analysis. This method of analysis is attributed to an approach called grounded theory. It includes a number of tools assisting the researcher to find categories and concepts from texts, and secondly, to correlate these into theories or hypothesis. I worked inductively by using 'open' coding; allowing the data to speak to me through a close scrutiny of texts: field notes and transcriptions. While reading these texts I concurrently did *in vivo* coding and memoing. *In vivo* coding involves highlighting of words and paragraphs, which is highly recommended for inductive research in order to find themes. I then used memoing to detect relations among themes. I did this by recurrently scribbling down ideas emerging from the reading, a form of field notes producing information from where theory can emerge (Bernard, 2006:493-9). More specifically, I followed the procedure outlined by Bernard (2006:492):

(1) Create interview transcripts and read through a small section of text.
(2) Highlight hypothetical analytic categories to become potential themes.
(3) As categories arise, compare all data from those categories.
(4) Contemplate linkages between categories.
(5) Shape theoretical models by using the linkages among categories.
(6) Lastly, illustrate results of analysis by using quotes from interviews that explain and support your theory.

By presenting direct quotes from respondents it is immediately and straightforwardly made clear to the reader what I have found out after repeatedly going through and examining my material (Bernard, 2006:503). This is not equivalent to surrendering the analysis in the hands of the research subjects. It is still my theories and ideas that are presented in the result section, they are merely illustrated by carefully selected quotations from my respondents.

My coding process was at all stages guided by the research questions and the theoretical framework, but I was aware that these may well have not been exhaustive, and thus I opened up to the possibility of generating new themes when this was needed (Mikkelsen, 2005:181-2). I sought to be critical when I analysed the empirical data, as not to see things that were not there or to hide/bypass what was there. This is very important since

the coding process where the grounded theory researcher focuses on the data and tries to find the patterns within these can easily and mistakably be perceived as objective, thus the researcher looses the awareness of her or his standpoint (Sprague, 2005:130). For other material I used text analysis in its broad and simple form.

4.3 Methodical problems and ethical considerations

4.3.1 Language and interpreters

Using an interpreter, as I did, always calls for certain issues to be addressed. One obvious issue is that the interpreter becomes yet another filter of interpretation, thus creating a longer chain of information transmission. To constructively confront this possible problem I had initially planned to give a comprehensive explanation of my research and to exchange worldviews and standpoints with my interpreter. I was confronted with the impossibility of this since the interpreter available, a 21-year old man studying business management, was unfamiliar with my methods and theories. Albeit these constraints I made a short explanation of what I needed him to help me with and I continually instructed him along the way so that I could attain the information that I needed. Having a male interpreter also posed some challenges during field visits since the women were more likely to open-up to me when there were no males around. When the husbands were around I experienced that they would dominate and the women would silently stand back. I therefore used a female interpreter for the female focus groups discussions, and I believe that if I had not done so I would not have gotten the women to speak as freely as they did. I therefore believe that it would have been optimal to use a female interpreter during field visits, but since I could not find one that could orient the area as my male interpreter could, I argue that it was better to undertake these with a male interpreter than to not make them. The young age of the interpreter was however an advantage, since I found that most of the women I visited would relate to him as a son rather than as a grown male, which might have made them see him as hierarchically above them. During focus group discussions I generally felt that I could probe and ask for explanations from both interpreters and the English-speaking respondents to the extent where I was sure that I had understood their statements. In line with ethical recommendations I assured my respondents anonymity and gained informed consent through stressing voluntary participation (Vetenskapsrådet, n.d.).

4.3.2 My role as a researcher

I was afraid that the farmers would see me as part of Fairtrade and therefore paint a picture that would satisfy Fairtrade, which would distort my research findings and compromise the research. Therefore I overtly explained that I was a student conducting research due to my interest in coffee and Fairtrade and that I had no other linkages to Fairtrade. When the farmers had been informed about this I felt that majority of them understood and that their answers and interaction with me was not compromised due to a wish to satisfy the management of Fairtrade. Still, I encountered difficult situations where many research subjects asked me to support them so that they could receive a higher coffee price, to link them to a direct buyer, assist them to conduct other projects and so forth. In these situations my instinct was to say yes to help them since they were offering me their assistance to conduct my research. I had to bypass this instinctive wish to help and tell them I was not in a position to do this. Instead I promised them to forward their concerns to the management of Fairtrade when I met with them. This turned out to be a good middle way where I could do something for them as appreciation for their participation without them seeing me as something I was not.

I also faced challenging situations due to being white. This was mostly in the encounter with elder villagers who had worked for white settlers and would refer to these as my grandfathers since I was white like them. Being attributed the title of grandchild of former white Italian colonisers was certainly something that I felt utterly uncomfortable with. I therefore tried to rid myself of it by explaining my Swedish origin and my strongly held dislike for the dominance and maltreatment these colonial masters had exercised against the indigenous population. Despite my attempts to not be seen as a part of that history I had to accept that my skin colour in some cases made this impossible. I also met other assumptions and expectations that came with being white, where people would see me as someone of both wealth and higher status and therefore with an ability to ensure funding for various projects. It was at times uncomfortable having to explain my position as a student of middle-class without any such connections and no capacity to do what these people hoped. But, this was the only way I could avoid to make empty promises that would compromise my research and also give a negative image of anyone else seeking to do research in this area.

5. Results and analysis

In this section I present the empirical data and the analysis of the same since the qualitative methods I have adopted are well suited for fusing presentation and analysis. To begin with I present the background and objectives of the cooperatives, mainly focusing on the women's cooperative. From there I proceed to present the primary empirical data, namely, the views and observations of farmers. At first I look at farmers' perceptions of gender equality as to subsequently situate it in relation to my theoretical understanding of the concept to investigate the correspondence between the two. Secondly, I do the same for the empowerment concept to thirdly investigate if farmers believe that Fairtrade plays an important role in reaching these two. As was outlined in the theoretical framework it is through the assigned gender roles that the gender needs and gender divisions of labour are shaped, to then translate into the context from which gender equality and empowerment can be advocated for and created. I therefore explore how farmers perceive existing gender roles. This is followed by a discussion of whether farmers express a change of the same, and if these are attributed to Fairtrade and the creation of *Kabngetuny WIC*. By closing the result chapter with this discussion I hope to return to the initial and main question of my research: Fairtrade's role in instigating women's empowerment and gender equality.

5.1 *Kabngetuny Farmers Cooperative Society*

Formed in 1985, with 200 male members, *Kabngetuny* sought to give the farmers a common place from where they could jointly market and sell their coffee since this would not be possible individually. The society was also formed to serve as a place from which information and training regarding good agricultural practices would be disseminated to farmers. Since that time great changes have been seen and today active membership stands at approximately 800; about 500 males, 200 females and 100 youths (Kabngetuny, 2015). The factory has been restored and upgraded with electricity instead of hydropower. Machines have been replaced, reducing processing work hours. Another substantial change is that of the complete computerisation of processes, meaning that from the weighing of coffee to the payment of the farmers, processes have moved from being manually to digitally handled and stored. The society has also undergone UTZ and FLO certification, as well as implemented a SACCO (Savings And Credit Co-Operative) so that farmers no longer have to queue long hours for payment, but easily receive their earnings in their respective accounts where they can also

save money. All in all, the achievements have been increased knowledge, efficiency and accuracy as well as reduced risk in terms of cash payment and manual errors (Interview management).

5.2 *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee*

According to Koskei (Interview chairman) he has also seen another achievement, namely the tackling of the situation of women. An incident during coffee peak season at the coffee factory became the ignition that finally sparked the brainstorming of how to recognise the coffee work done by women. This case, where a husband lied and told his wife and children that his money had been taken by the management, was not an extraordinary one, but something that was rather endemic in coffee production, where women and children provided most of the labour without receiving any recognition or payment for their work. At the end of the day it was always the male members who came and collected the proceeds and all the wife and children could do was to hope that he would use it for the family, which was not necessarily the case. Often the children were therefore out of school and seeking employment instead. The women were likewise struggling to find ways to meet the basic needs of their families. It was having seen these issues for a long time, and also being exposed to training and information from Fairtrade, that unleashed a brainstorming that resulted in the establishment of *Kabngetuny WIC*. The idea was to, by convincing male members to surrender a minimum of 50 coffee bushes to their wives, ensure that women's work would be recognised and that they also got legitimate access to at least a small portion of the family's coffee earnings. When the idea was launched at a meeting in 2009 all male members rejected it. Another meeting was held three months later with largely the same outcome. But the following year, 2010, responses were more positive, so a female representative from Fairtrade was invited to speak to the farmers. After this, yet another meeting was held where some farmers aired the fear that this suggestion would disinherit them and that the women would kick them out when they started earning their own money and become independent. The board tried to explain that this was an effort to help the whole family, not to break them, and that it was not going against their culture. That they should not think that the women will leave with the money, but that everything would still remain under the control of the men. So a few months later, in 2010, there were numerous men who passed a signed resolution;

committing themselves to give their women a minimum of 50 coffee bushes without altering the landownership, which still remained in the hands of the men (Interview chairman).

Eventually, in July 2012, *Kabngetuny WIC* was established with 162 female members, while membership today stands at 191 women. Its mission is *"to empower women by improving their living standard with emphasis on environmental conservation"* whereas the vision is *"poverty eradication through joint effort"*. The organisation further explains that it was formed with the main objective of *"improving and sustaining the living standards of various families through women"*. Other objectives are to close gender marginalisation gaps and to lower the dependency rate (Kabngetuny Women in Coffee, 2015). So far, the group has managed to increase their incomes due to coffee payments. They have furthermore bought a plot for a maize mill and are launching a biogas project in May 2015. These two projects are donor funded and proposals to receive funding have been undertaken in cooperation with Fairtrade Africa (Interview chairman). The former can be seen to relate more to poverty eradication goals, whereas the latter addresses the issue of environmental conservation. As explained by Koskei (Interview chairman) the coming of the biogas would both reduce women's workload – no longer having to fetch firewood – and sustain the environment: less trees being cut down.

The biogas initiative is at heart of the Fairtrade project *GWIC:* running from 2015-2018 and funded by Big Lottery Fund (UK), with an overall goal of empowering female coffee farmers and their households. Fairtrade's project manager Marion Nganga (Interview Fairtrade Africa) emphasised that this is the first project of its kind where Fairtrade Africa has committed itself to explicitly work with the issue of gender. She further explained that Fairtrade never used to have a gender focus and that women are not generally cooperative members, thus they do not receive training although they do most of the work on the coffee farms. But with this piloting project Fairtrade is hoping to upscale it so that the effort to address gender inequalities within Fairtrade certified cooperatives reaches whole East Africa (Interview Fairtrade Africa). The pilot project now includes three beneficiaries – *Kabngetuny*, *Kipkiyai Multi-Purpose Cooperative Society* and *Kipkelion Union* – with different objectives and targets attached to them, but aligned to the overarching goal. For *Kabngetuny* these are: *"Good Agricultural Practice trainings to improve coffee yield and quality [for 300 women]"* and *"supporting the construction of biogas units which will reduce the burden on women of collecting firewood each day, while conserving the environment"* (Fairtrade Africa, 2015). Within *Kipkelion Union,* which encompasses the both *Kipkiyai* and *Kabngetuny*, Faitrade

Africa aims to develop and market a combined women's coffee from the two cooperatives to be sold at local, regional and international markets (Fairtrade Africa, 2015).

5.3 Farmers' perception of gender equality

All focus groups participants considered gender equality to be something positive which involves men and women. Thus, if I had taken this statement literally, the conclusion would simply have been that both women and men viewed it as a desirable goal. The picture is far more complex than that, which became clear to me when this topic was dissected as I continued to probe for explanations of their statements. To begin with, equality was generally described as a situation whereby there is balance, 50/50, and a sharing of duties and responsibilities. At the discussions with women this subject spurred more debate and interest, where participants told me *"equality is something which we have discussed a lot. How can we reach to that far end [...], how are we going to convince them [men] until they accept to do some of the work [done by women]"* (Focus group W1). They moreover uttered that it was important for them to look at it in both private and public spaces, as men also oppressed women at the workplaces where they would not let qualifications determine who gets the top position, because men would never allow a woman to lead them. I found support for this statement during Focus group M1 where the men answered the inquiry of what gender equality is to them with: *"all of [us] are the heads of the family – it is important"*. The fact that this is what first came to mind manifests the importance for to reinforce and emphasize their superior position to women. Another comment given was that equality is also somehow negative and when asked why so, the men said: *"because we are not the same in working and deciding"* (Focus group M2). These issues of equal share in decision-making and sharing of earnings were ones I had included in the discussion as to further assess the support for gender equality. In both these areas men disagreed, to varying extents, with equal sharing as men from Focus group M1 told me: *"the man should be higher [and] it is good to give the rules [and then] no one will go beyond that or go against [it]"*. In this statement you can also detect the superior position of men where there is no room to contest the 'rule' given by a man. As the women of Focus group W2 explained to me: *"decisions should be made by both parties [and] if possible [the income of the household] should be shared equally. But it is not [today] because ladies are viewed as lower in the society"*. In line with this the other women also expressed a desire for equality but were critical regarding its achievability by saying

"you must rely on him, he's the owner [and] you know I share my salary but his you cannot see" (Focus group W1).

As seen in the theorisation of gender and gender equality, it is viewed differently for men and women, due to their different positions. For the women this question had far greater importance, undoubtedly due to their subordinate position as expressed by both themselves and the men. In continuation it could be seen that the men were not in favour of gender equality when it was broken down, whereas the women supported it throughout without masking any constraints towards its achievement. To further dismantle whether gender equality was actually supported and wanted I turned to ask them if a woman is equally important as a man. Interesting enough the men uttered comments like *"she is also important. In our culture if you don't have a wife you are not supposed to [...] even decide what to be done. You must have a wife"* (Focus group M1). The other men similarly said she is important. But, the comments that followed shed new light on those statements, leading me to think that it is rather so that the woman is important to validate the manliness of men, and is seen as an accessory a man must have to be counted as a man, in contrast to viewing her as an equal to themselves. Women exclaimed that women are just as important as men but continued to tell me that men do not believe this, instead *"they view women as children, in fact they call us children"* (Focus group W2). It was further explained by Focus group W1 that the man expects the woman to be in the house because if she is not he will say that nobody is there, but *"when you are there they take you as a child, not even one of them"*. That women are viewed as children was a recurrent issue raised during my interactions with female farmers at field visits. As the quotes palpably manifest, the women did not believe that men see women as equally important and I agree with them. Referring to someone as a child is unquestionably a way of putting that person in a lower and dependant position to yourself, stating it to be in need of guidance and protection, not an equal. Although the men did not express these words to me there are other statements like the importance for them to give guidance and set rules, which can be viewed as support for this view of women. By adding this information I gained further support for my theory that men would often support general statements of equality, but as soon as I dug deeper under the immediate surface it was revealed that they were actually not promoting it, not wanting women to have the same rights and opportunities as men.

5.4 Farmers' perception of empowerment

As was painstakingly captured in the theoretical framework, empowerment is not easily defined, which was also evident when farmers discussed it. The keywords that they mentioned were opportunities, help, freedom that was given, mainly, in the aspects of work and financial resources. The important aspect of it as a process of change was also captured by Focus group M1 where the men said: *"you might see changes after being empowered [...], living standard being improved"*. In line with this women from Focus group W1 told me that empowerment is also about training and education of women, which will increase their knowledge so that *"they can think of improving their life standards"*. For the women it was precisely women who were concerned when one talks about empowerment, *"[it is for] women and children because men can survive on their own"* (Focus group W2). Men, on the other hand, usually related to empowerment as something often revolving around women, but said that it should be for the family. Once again there was a difference in how men and women related to the question. While women recognised their subordinate position to men and therefore saw that this process of change called empowerment should be appropriated for them, the men did not find it necessary to acknowledge this imbalance. Notwithstanding all groups viewed empowerment as solely positive.

It was problematic for me to get information about which aspects of their lives that they related to empowerment, but at least in the case of the women it was expressed that it included both aspects from the private and the public spheres. I therefore asked the women of Focus group W1 if empowerment also relates to freedom of movement. But, the women still focused on its economic side by looking at gains that could be achieved if they were able to sell products at the marketplace with the best price. This I found in all focus groups: empowerment was largely viewed as economic improvement. It was therefore difficult to apply the multifaceted empowerment I had at the back of my head as outlined in the theoretical framework. Having anticipated this on beforehand I had added questions about who decides about certain aspects deemed important in regard to ability to exercise strategic life choices, thus empowerment. These were, among others, buying and selling of land, if the wife can work outside the home, the number of children to have and whether to use family planning or not. Men stated that land purchase and sale is a family matter whereas women said that the man alone decides.

Regarding a woman's freedom to work outside the home, participants from Focus group W2 told me that it has changed somewhat, to being discussed, unlike in the past

when men used to decide alone, but as this was further debated they told me *"but if [men] don't agree you have no other choice, you stay [at home]"*. Which can only lead to the conclusion that the change is minimal since the man still possesses the final say regarding a woman's choice of livelihood. The reasons for this were described by Focus group W1, supporting that men decide, *"he cannot allow you to go far away from home. You are reporting at home daily even if [your workplace] is far"*. They continued, *"so when you report to your home, if you are late, they [men] will start asking questions: where were you, where have you been?"*. Most men similarly said *"the husband gives the rules if she can go or not"* (Focus group M1) whereas others said *"we both agree"* (Focus group M2). To understand this last diverging view one can look at how these participants answered the open question of 'who decides': *"It used to be decided by the head only [husband], but now we discuss [and] disagreement is very minimal"*. They then continued by saying *"if you want to buy […] the best thing for the family you are not supposed to consult"* (Focus group M2).

This impression of minimal disagreement is problematized when one looks at how women answered the same question. In Focus group W2 the women told me *"the husband […] decides. They decide for their own and mostly they don't even tell us they have some money"* and what they do as women is to maybe give suggestions but *"it is for him to decide whether he will take your decision or not"*. The other women gave me similar stories; *"as women we suggest, [but he is] the one to give clearance that he has accepted your suggestion, to give approval"* (Focus group W1). The perception men have of minimal disagreement seems to be a delusion in a situation where women have accepted letting men's opinions go first and only giving suggestions in case of differing ideas, and to then wait and hope for their ideas to be appreciated and implemented.

This hypothesis was substantiated by the women's story of what would happen if they went against their husband: *"if you say no you can be beaten or sent home"* (Focus group W2). Women also said: *"[men] believe that they cannot do a mistake, he's the boss, […] and if we see they have done any mistake we just hide, you cannot correct him"* (Focus group W1). It is tangible that the actual situation is one where women have accepted allowing men to take a superior position, not questioning their decisions nor correcting their mistakes, and not one where there is equality. This is a conscious choice on the part of women so as to protect themselves against violence. In light of this, the issue of women's ability to work outside the home – where it is men who decide, it might be so that women do not air this option if they anticipate that it will not be well received, or put them at risk of not fulfilling

their expected duties in the home. To summarise, women's agency; or ability to exercise strategic life choices, seems very limited – especially since their freedom of movement is highly restricted, but still not non-existent. When it comes to resources, however, this was seen as having improved, as will be further discussed in the following section since it was attributed to Fairtrade.

5.5 Fairtrade's role in terms of achieving gender equality and empowerment for farmers

The questions regarding Fairtrade were the last ones during discussions. This was a deliberate choice due to the fact that I wanted to see if Fairtrade was mentioned during the other questions before I straightforwardly asked about its effects and whether it was paving the way for empowerment and gender equality. As seen in the previous sections the norm was not gender equality, women were still oppressed and overruled by the men as well as possessing limited ability to make strategic life choices, but an area where women saw that Fairtrade had assisted them was that of resource access. Women from Focus group W2 explained to me that they joined *Kabngetuny WIC "so that we could also have a share in the money from coffee"* and further explained: *"we are now able to get money of our own, we can't borrow [from men] – we are now independent"*. These newly gained coffee bushes, and earning their own money from it, because of Fairtrade was viewed by all women as aspects that would uplift their status and ability to be independent, thus assisting them to both reach gender equality with men and to become empowered. During field visit this was also mentioned in combination with the fact that many of these women had acquired their first bank account, something that opened-up new possibilities to save and place their money. During observations I further learnt that the husbands still owned the land where women had their coffee bushes so I raised this issue of land ownership at discussions. The women then told me *"of course we cannot gain ownership, [but] it is not a problem […] so long as I have been given my coffee bushes we believe that we don't own land, it is owned by men"*. Here I was encountered with a doxa, it was not even up for discussion that women would own land, which I would view as preferable in terms of empowerment since it would mean not only having access to the land, but actually having control over it.

It was also seen that Fairtrade was creating empowerment because it is *"not only stressing on coffee, even how to stay at home"* (Focus group W1). Women also stated,

during discussions and observations, that the maize mill and the biogas project were reasons to why they joined. Another objective for joining, often expressed during observations, was that they received training and could as women come together and help one another in this group as well as it could be a platform from where they could advocate for their interests and build more projects to help them and their communities. This I could relate to my theorization of empowerment as being important and occurring at, not only, the individual and relational levels, but also through their joint effort at the collective level.

The men largely supported the statements made by the women. There is less dependency; women earn their own money, can buy their own clothes and have gained insights after coming together as a group. Hence, men also believed that Fairtrade was a way for women to become empowered and reach equality with men. As clarified by men from Focus group M2 it was believed that Fairtrade empower the women by both bringing them together and competing among themselves. Noticeable is that the clear separation between men and women was maintained; women competing among themselves but not with the other men engaged in coffee farming. Men and women also commented on the changed attitudes of men. Women said men have positively changed; *"they have agreed to sit with their wives and decide about the money"* (Focus group W1) while men said: *"the men now know that even women can do better [...] they can earn something for the family unlike in the past"* (Focus group M1). This acknowledgement of women is surely important and as expressed by the women themselves: *"[Fairtrade has] tried to see that a woman is seen"* (Focus group W1). The changes might not be great, but there is a definite change as the women feel that they are now seen as well as possessing greater ability to carry out their current roles; but regarding the role of men, there seems to be little or no changes. This issue was highlighted by the women who were sceptical about the possibility of reaching gender equality because: *"[men] believe that we cannot be equal [and] even some duties are not equal"* (Focus group W1). This will be further examined in the subsequent section, which focuses on gender divisions of labour and gender roles.

5.6 Gender divisions of labour and gender roles

When I asked the men in my focus groups what the role of the man in the household is, they all agreed that it is to *"be the head of the family"*. They explained this role of theirs as being the one to give guidance, set rules and to distribute the duties among family members (Focus

group M1 & M2). The women largely affirmed these statements by uttering: *"he gives orders [...], guard[s] the family"* (Focus group W1). In addition to this, the women said that men should look for food and do farming and slashing[1] around the compound but that actually *"he mostly does not work, his work is only to supervise us"* (Focus group W2). Women from both focus groups told me that after the men have dispensed the work of the day, to be carried out by the women and other family members, he often disappears, maybe strolling around. Hence, the gender role of the men is to do productive work; bring food and do farming, and to provide direction; setting rules and allotting duties. This affirmed my theoretical understanding of commonly dichotomous gender division of labour where the male gender is ascribed productive and community leadership roles. It was never mentioned that a man should carry out any reproductive responsibilities such as feeding children, nor was it mentioned that they should ensure water provision or firewood for cooking; to take a community managing role. When, on the other hand, the role of the woman was discussed men quickly mentioned taking care of children, cooking, washing, cleaning, fetching water and collecting firewood (Focus groups M1 & M2). As described by the men in Focus group M2: *"she is our adviser [and] undertakes indoor chores [... and] she participates in the [farm]"*. This statement manifests both the woman's confinement to the private sphere as well as her gender position where she is viewed as a participant and an adviser to the man, but not on the same level as he is. The women likewise said that they are responsible for all above-mentioned household chores as well as care for other family members. Once again the theoretical framework was confirmed as it was seen that the women are carrying out three different roles: reproductive, community managing and productive. It was further confirmed that these gender roles and divisions of labour were strongly separated and differentiated, assigning them different spheres: men mainly ascribed to the public and women to the private. By this I mean that during observations I would only see men assembling in public spaces and it was only men who held community leaderships posts – community chiefs, thus taking on a community leadership role.

The women were well aware of this clear divide between men and women. As laughingly expressed by women from Focus group W1: *"the man he orders, but the whole work [in the home] is for the woman"*. This quote also materialises the issue of work hours carried out by men and women, where most participants stated that women work the most, which was supported by the background information I gathered from focus group participants

---

[1] Using an axe or machete to cut weeds or crops.

where majority of men uniformly uttered that they would shower and relax upon returning home from work, while all women stated that they did various household chores (see appendices 7-10). Still, men in Focus group M2 believed that men work more than women. They said it was so because *"he brings stability to the family"*. To understand this utterance I asked them to describe what they considered to be 'work'. They then told me that work is *"the work outside the house"*. They continued to explain that: *"we normally work the outside work [not] the inside because most of the household work is for the woman [...], those are petty work for woman"* (Focus group M2). This statement not only confirms the spatial division between men and women, but also informs about the value perceptions regarding work done outside the house vis-à-vis private; household work. Unmistakably, remunerated work outside the house; especially public employment but also cash crop farming, is valued higher and it is almost as if household work in the private sphere is seen as unworthy, 'petty'. This reinforces the low recognition and value placed on this work that is almost solely carried out by women. Still, the other male focus group, as well as the female ones recognised the work of women and therefore said that women do work more than men. When asked why, the men gave me factual recapitulations of what a woman does during the day without touching on its unequal allocation, showing that for them a woman working more hours was seen as a natural state. Women rather expressed it as a result of men's lack of care for the home, as well as superiority over women who would be quarrelled or even worse beaten if they had not done what the man had told them (Focus group W2).

5.6.1 Room and desire for change

Confronted with this strong affirmation of my theoretical understanding of clearly separated gender roles and gender divisions of labour, I was curious to see whether the farmers were content with this situation or wished for change. I also wanted to explore whether change was perceived to be possible or if it was a situation of doxa. So farmers were asked if a woman can do what a man can, and vice versa. Answers given by the men were along these lines *"what men do women can do, but there are some limits – she cannot become the head"* (Focus groups M2, 2015). In continuation *"in general we [men] cannot do the household work [...] not cooking and cleaning due to our culture"* (Focus group M1). I probed for further explanations, and the men then confirmed that it was not physically impossible for them, but culturally, to carry out these duties assigned to women: albeit noting that it might be different for urban families. Women on the other hand did not mention the constraint that

women cannot become heads, but saw women as able to do that which men do. Regarding the men, some women said that a man could do the work of a woman if the wife has passed away, whereas others said that they could not. Not because they really cannot, but because: *"they don't want to do it because they believe that they are men and they cannot do what the ladies do"* (Focus group W2). Thereby they confirmed the men's statements. Women once again recognised that this meant that women do a lot more work than men, and expressed a desire to share the work and duties so then *"at least everybody is going to get time to rest"* (Focus group W1). The other group of women replied to this question of will to change with a lot of scepticism: *"[we] are emphasising that [we] have accepted to do that [which] men can't cause after all if we don't do [it] nobody will do it for us. Nothing can be changed because the men can't change"* (Focus group W2). This view is indirectly supported by the men's comments stating that change has been seen because *"women used to not work [...], but currently we can share the duties [...] there is still room for improvement by allocating some duties like hatcheries for a woman"* (Focus group M2). The change they mention and room for improvement centres on the women, the women shouldering greater productive responsibilities to further reduce the men's burdens by sharing this duty. The men did not mention that change was needed on their part, and did not seem to recognise that hatcheries would put more pressure on women who already work more hours. My conclusion was therefore that the men viewed current gender roles and gender divisions of labour as natural, self-evident and not up for discussion due to their culture. Hence, a doxic mode where the culture is setting strict boundaries for what a man and woman can perform rendering women to largely accept a heavier workload.

5.6.2 Impact of Fairtrade

Considering the abovementioned perceived cultural boundaries inhibiting changes in strongly separated gender divisions of labour and gender roles it was difficult for me to believe that Fairtrade had changed these to a great extent. But when I asked the farmers about it during discussions, all groups told me that they have seen changes, some seeing great and others slight ones. The men said that the change was seen in the women who were now responsible for some coffee bushes, thereby assisting the men to pay school fees and reducing the burden on men. The women similarly told me that with them taking up the responsibility of coffee bushes, they *"have relieved [men] from stress – school fee stress"* (Focus group W1). It was also acknowledged by the women that there had been changes in the men who now *"can even*

feed the children when the mothers are not there" (Focus group W2). This contrasts with former statements, and also my observations during which I never saw a man cooking or collecting firewood and very seldom caring for young children. Altogether these aspects made me question this statement, so I asked the women if this happened in their families. They then laughed and told me that it was very rare for it to happen. My conclusion was therefore that the changes are mainly seen regarding the women, who now shoulder a greater responsibility in their productive role while all their other duties and responsibilities in their reproductive and community managing roles largely remain intact. Consequently the women have assumed a vaster responsibility and workload while there are no visible alterations for the men. The women confirmed this by telling me that Fairtrade had motivated them to work more but that the work hours of their men had remained constant (Focus group W1 & W2). Thus, even though most women saw this as positive it was also problematic since men were not assuming larger responsibilities at home. As for the men they did not express similar concerns.

6. Discussion

In this chapter I highlight my key conclusions, based on the analysis of the research results provided in the previous chapter, in order to answer the overarching research question. I also discuss the contextual factors of my case, which may have affected the generalizability of my results. I do so to relate my specific findings to the wider picture. Lastly, I outline areas of future research and the value of my findings.

6.1 Key conclusions

It was quickly obvious that the main changes brought about by the Fairtrade initiative was an increased income, but also, burden for women. Since the introduction of *Kabngetuny WIC* they were taking on greater responsibility and work hours as their productive role had expanded and been legitimised, while they were continuously doing all that was previously done in their community management and reproductive roles. Comparing this to the case of Uganda, presented by Kasente (2012), shows that Fairtrade in both cases increased labour burdens for women and it seems that giving women explicit membership was necessary for it to also translate into attaining training, higher positions and income as it did in my case, but not the Ugandan one. Marginal change has been recorded in the area of decision-making, which is, in both cases, still dominated by men but opening-up slightly, with some reports of more room for discussion and information sharing. From the women's perspective, the view of women in Chepkechei had at least altered slightly; from being a dependant family member to a productive contributor to family income, but on the part of men recorded change was marginal or non-existent.

From my analysis it became clear to me that Fairtrade, by installing biogas, is focusing on enhancing women's ability to cook, thus assisting women to carry out their assigned gender role rather than questioning it. Hence they are focusing on practical rather than strategic gender needs, and cannot fully achieve women's empowerment or a state of gender equality. For this to happen I believe that they must work meticulously on the attitudes and cultural beliefs of mainly men, who today will not touch the 'work duties of a woman'. Otherwise, the workload for women will unceasingly increase as that of men either remains constant or decreases – this, just like the issue of power, is a zero-sum game. Still I wish to emphasize that to be sustainable, the process of women's empowerment and gender equality requires attitudinal change of mainly men, but also on the part of women. It might not be

feasible to set out strategies that challenge the current gender order at the moment, due to cultural constraints, as there is seemingly a doxa attached to current gender roles and as women face risk of violence if the contest the men's decisions and superior position. A focus on strategic gender needs, advocating for the status of women and acquiring land ownership for them so they can gain control over this resource and their coffee bushes, could challenge this male dominance and his entitlement as the sole owner by.

Nevertheless it is crucial to continuously assess the room for change, as this constantly alters and hopefully expands with the current projects. Eventually one may find that there is an opening to address the core issue of women's subordination, and to reach gender equality and women's empowerment. In sum, women have partially been empowered by improved income, greater resource access, and recognition in the productive sphere, which also means that gender inequality has also decreased. Hence, neither gender equality nor women's empowerment have been fully accomplished, but since it is a process and Fairtrade is currently working active with it I argue that not all of the effects have been seen yet and that it has to be investigated further in the future. Additionally, majority of farmers believed that Fairtrade does play an important role in this process and I likewise argue that it appears to be one of the factors that, in the time to come, will create considerable change.

6.2 Contextual factors affecting findings

When reading my findings one must recall that most other Fairtrade certified cooperatives have not acknowledged women to this extent, since they are generally not members and do not receive training (Interview Fairtrade Africa), as was seen in the case of Uganda. It is also noteworthy that the women I spoke with believed that their culture was partially responsible for the slowing incidence of change. When comparing communities they said: *"[with] kikujos [another tribe in this area] it is that equality. A woman is free – she can go and work even outside the country. [But] our Kalenji [...] up to now they have not accepted their wives to have business. They will not allow them to go to places where there are many people"* (Focus group W1). I had no possibility of investigating these claims but it seemed like this other tribe had more gender equal norms and less cultural constraints towards achieving gender equality as compared with their own, which may lead to other findings if the same study is carried out in a cooperative made up of Kikujos.

6.3 Scientific and societal value

I believe that the findings of my research have added to the existing material on gendered effects of Fairtrade for its producers. It has highlighted the differences in female and male farmers' experiences, which is an important aspect to consider when one sets out to address the issue of gender inequality, whether through Fairtrade or other actors. The research has further validated the ways that gender differentiates and assigns women and men different roles and positions within the household and the society at large, thus confirming the necessity of including gender as a key variable when one undertakes research at large, as well as in the case of Fairtrade. Future scholars can use my research to investigate whether the same holds true in other localities, continuing to build a body of evidence from which more generalizable conclusions of Fairtrade's gendered effects can be drawn.

However, this study not only provides value for further research. It also has direct value for Fairtrade in terms of being useful as baseline data from where their *GWIC* project, to be launched May 2015, can be evaluated and assessed at various stages of implementation as well as in an end-term evaluation or audit. For Fairtrade this can be used to evaluate the impact its project has had on farmers' gender roles, positions, division of labour and the gender equitable norms held by farmers of both genders.

6.4 Areas of further research

During my research both farmers and cooperative management constantly depicted the issue of coffee marketing as the main factor restraining their ability to earn the income they deserved. Many farmers also asked me to assist them to get an increased share of the price paid for coffee by eliminating middlemen and acquiring a direct buyer. I believe that this topic is important to explore, but it was not within the scope of my research. Another area of research could be that of the impact of computerization on cooperative operations, since considerable changes were attributed to this transformation.

It became clear to me that there was some covariance between number of coffee bushes and occupation: the women working as teachers having more than those who were peasant-/housewives (see appendices 7&8). Time allowing, I would have investigated this further, but instead I identify it as an interesting area for future research. Another such area would be comparing the views of female and male farmers who are part of the initiative with those who are not. I sensed and heard comments indicating that the women who had not been

given coffee bushes were struggling more to make ends meet, so it would be interesting to study how coffee income is spent in the household. Furthermore, it would be interesting to do a longitudinal study and investigate how gender topics and questions are discussed in a few years' time, to see how farmers show behavioural and attitudinal change and what triggers such change.

7. Concluding remarks

A wise man called Carl Ljung once said *"Great innovations never come from above; they come invariably from below, just as trees never grow from the sky downward, but upward from the earth"*. I witnessed this myself during my research. It is the women and men working with coffee that are the owners of this research, the changes that are underway, and the change to come. They hold the answers and without their involvement in the process, neither Fairtrade nor the cooperative management will achieve their intended results. So far, positive change has been recorded and generally Fairtrade and the cooperative receive appreciation from farmers. But, as manifested in this statement, made in a quite condescending tone, from a male farmer during one of my field visits: *"now everybody should learn [the different procedures of coffee farming], so our neighbours [pointing to the women] are also taught"*, there is a long way to go. Yet, it was reassuring to hear the women proudly retort: *"We are Women in Coffee"*, not allowing the man to devalue their worth. The power in those words should not be underestimated, at least this recognition of being someone, being seen, has been gained, although the current prospect for gender equality may look remote. With this short story; painstakingly materializing the value of both working and researching these issues from below, I wish to leave you.

References

Bagal, M. (2013). *Study on the potential of marketing of Kenyan Coffee as Geographical Indication (AGRI-2012-EVAL-05)*. European Commision.

Bernard, H. R. (2006). Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches – fourth edition. Oxford: AltaMira Press. ISBN: 0-7591-0868-4.

Bonvillain, N. (1998). Women and men: cultural constructs of gender –second edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice (Cambridge studies in social anthropology; 16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 0 521 29164 X.

Campbell, P. J., MacKinnon, A., & Stevens, C. R. (2010). *An Introduction to Global Studies*. Chichester, East Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN: 978-1-4051-8736-7.

Chandler, P. (2006). Fair Trade and Global Justice. *Globalizations, 3*(2), 255-257.

Cornwall, A. (2003). Whose Voices? Whose Choices? Reflections on Gender and Participatory Development. *World Development, 31*(8), 1325-1342. DOI: 10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00086-X

De Beauvoir, S. (1949). The Second Sex. New York: Vinatge Books.

Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H., & Wängnerud, L. (2007). *Metodpraktikan*. Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik AB. ISBN: 978-91-39-10865-8

Gall, S. (2013, 5th of March). Empowering women in coffee production. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 2015-01-18, from http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/fairtrade-partner-zone/empowering-women-coffee-production

Gilje, N., & Grimen, H. (2007). *Samhällsvetenskapernas förutsättingar*. Gothenburg: Daidlos AB. ISBN: 978-91-7173-260-6.

Fairtrade Africa. (2015). *Empowering African producers through trade: Growing Women In Coffee Project* [Brochure]. Fairtrade Africa.

Fairtrade Africa. (2013). *COFFEE COOPERATIVE EMPOWERS WOMEN FARMERS?*. Retrieved 2014-10-06, from http://www.fairtrade.net/what-is-fairtrade.html

Fairtrade International. (2011). *Fair Trade Glossary* [Brochure]. Fairtrade International. Retrieved from http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2009/about_fairtrade/2011-06-28_fair-trade-glossary_WFTO-FLO-FLOCERT.pdf

Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International. (2011). *What is Fairtrade?*. Retrieved 2014-10-05, from http://www.fairtradeafrica.net/news/coffee-cooperative-empowers-women-farmers/

Hutchens, A. (2010). Empowering Women through Fair Trade? Lessons from Asia. *Third World Quarterly, 31*(3), 449-467. DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2010.488477

Jaffee, D. (2007). Book review on Fair Trade: The Challenges of Transforming Globalization. *Rural Sociology*, 73(4), 694-697.

Järviluoma, H., Moisala, P., Vilkko, A. (2003), *Gender and Qualitative Methods*, London: SAGE Publications, Ltd. ISBN: 9780761965855.

Kabeer, N. (2005). Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: A Critical Analysis of the Third Millennium Development Goal. *Gender and Development, 13*(1), 13-24.

Kabeer, N. (2001). Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. (Sida studies no. 3). Stockholm: Sida. ISBN: 91-586-8957-5. ISSN: 1404-9562

Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment. *Development and Change, 30*, 435-464.

Kabngetuny. (2015). *Society profile*.

Kabngetuny Women in Coffee. (2013). *Business plan*.

Kasente, D. (2012). Fair Trade and organic certification in value chains: lessons from a gender analysis from coffee exporting in Uganda. *Gender and Development, 20*(1), 111-127. DOI: 10-1080/13552074.2012.663627

McArdle, L. & Thomas, P. (2012). Fair Enough? Women and Fair Trade. *Critical perspectives on international business, 8*(4), 329-348. DOI 10.1108/17422041211274165

Mikkelsen, B. (2005). Methods for Development Work and Research – A New Guide for *Practitioners*. Second Edition. London: SAGE Publication. ISBN: 10: 0-7619-3327-1 (Hb).

Moser, C. O. N. (1993). *Gender planning and development – Theory, practice and training*. London: Routledge. ISBN: 0-415-05621-7 (pbk).

Mosse, D. (1995). Authority, Gender and Knowledge: Theoretical Reflections on Participatory Rural Appraisal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, March Edition.

Potter, R. B. (2008). Theories, strategies and ideologies of development. In V. Desai (Ed.) & R. B. Potter (Ed.), *The Companion to Development Studies* (p. 67-70). Second Edition. London: Hodder Education.

Potter, R. B., Binns, T., Elliott, J. A., & Smith, D. (2008). *GEOGRAPHIES OF DEVELOPMENT. AN INTRODUCTION TO DEVELOPMENT STUDIES. THIRD EDITION*. Pearson Education Limited: Essex. ISBN: 978-0-13-22823-7.

Razavi, S., & Miller, C. (1995). *From WID to GAD: Conceptual Shifts in the Women and Development Discourse*. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). ISSN: 1020-3354

Rowlands, J. (1995). Empowerment Examined. *Development in Practice*, 5(2), 101-107. DOI: 0961-4524/95/020101-07

Ruben, R., Fort, R., & Zúñiga-Arias, G. (2009). Measuring the Impact of Fair Trade on Development. *Development in Practice, 19*(6), 777-788. DOI: 10.1080/09614520903027049

Sprague, J. (2005). *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers – Bridging Differences*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press. ISBN: 978-0-7591-0903-2.

Steinkopf-Rice, J. (2010). Free Trade, Fair Trade and Gender Inequality in Less Developed Countries. *Sustainable Development, 18*, 42-50. DOI: 10.1002/sd.407

Terstappen, V., Hanson, L., & McLaughlin, D. (2013). Gender, health, labour, and inequalities: a review of the fair and alternative trade literature. Agric Hum Values, 30, 21-39. DOI: 10.1007/s10460-012-9377-7

UN. (2001). *Factsheet 2: Important Concepts Underlying Gender Mainstreaming*. Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and the Advancement of Women, United Nations.

UNESCO. (2006). *A Toolkit for Promoting Gender Equality in Education*. Retrieved 2015-04-22, from http://unesco.org.pk/education/life/nfer_library/Reports/4-109.pdf

Utting-Chamorro, K. (2005). Does Fair Trade Make a Difference? The Case of Small Coffee Producers in Nicaragua. *Development in Practice, 15*(3/4), 584-599.

Vetenskapsrådet. (n.d.). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

WFTO. (2013). *10 Principles of Fair Trade*. Retrieved 2015-05-13, from http://wfto.com/fair-trade/10-principles-fair-trade

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. (Third Edition). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Empirical data – interviews

Focus group interview with male farmers at Kabngetuny Farmers' Cooperative Society, *focus group M1*, 2015-04-15

Focus group interview with female farmers at Kabngetuny Women in Coffee, *focus group W1*, 2015-04-15

Focus group interview with male farmers at Kabngetuny Farmers' Cooperative Society, *focus group M2*, 2015-04-22

Focus group interview with female farmers at Kabngetuny Women in Coffee, *focus group W2*, 2015-04-22

Informant interview: Bett, K. P. & Korir, G. *Interview with Kabngetuny management*, 2015-04-29

Informant interview: Koskei, S. *Interview with Kabngetuny chairman*, 2015-05-02

Informant interview: Nganga, M. *Interview with Fairtrade Africa project manager*, 2015-05-14

Appendices 1 – 10

Appendix 1

Date of interview:
Conducted by:
Interpreter:
No. of participants:
Focus group no.
Recorded: Yes ☐ No ☐

Semi-Structured interview guide for women's focus groups: W1 & W2

Introduction of the study and me as a researcher:

My name is Fanny Rölander. I am a student from Sweden. I am here in Kenya and in Chepkechei to do research for my studies in Sweden. My interest is to learn about how you as farmers are affected by the introduction of Fairtrade and the *Growing Women in Coffee* project. In my study I want to know how you feel about Fairtrade and *Growing Women in Coffee*: if it has brought any changes and how you feel about these. I will not write your names in may report but I will use the material I get from this discussion to write the report. I want to thank you very much for your participation. This discussion will take about one and a half hour and please feel free to express yourself freely. I want to hear your opinions about these questions that I will ask.

- **All participants should be noted individually on a background information sheet**

Interview topics

A. Daily life: daily activities, chores and responsibilities
(gender roles & gender divisions of labour)

1. What does a typical day look like for you? How and when does it start and end? (*To warm up*)

2. What is your responsibility in the house (as a wife and mother)? What is the woman of the house supposed to do?

3. On the other hand, what is the role of the man? *(Let them talk freely)*
   (If no answers are given, start giving examples as a last resort)
   3.1. Cleaning; cooking; washing clothes; taking care of children (feeding, bathing); providing for the family; putting food on the table; working (farm, cattle or other); collecting firewood
   3.2. Has this changed? When? Why? ? Has it changed after you joined WIC? *(First let them talk freely, then lead them in on FT)*
   3.3. Can a woman do what a man can do? Can a man do what a woman can do?

4. What do you think about this situation, your responsibilities in the house? *(Let them talk freely; try to see positive and negative aspects)*
   If no answers are given or to complement
   4.1. If you can change something what would that be?

   B. Decision-making within the household
   (gender equality, empowerment, gender positions & gender needs)

5. Can each person tell me about the last major purchase you made; *(get stories to find out who decides and what money is spent on)*
   5.1. What was it? Why did you buy it? Who decided? Where did the money come from?

6. And what about if you need something for yourself? *(Let them talk freely, try to find out if you are free to decide; if it is a joint decision or if you have no say)*

7. How do you decide what to spend money on? *(try to find out how they negotiate or don't negotiate within the household)*
   7.1. Decide together; I decide (if it is my money); I decide; He decides (if it is his money); He decides (for all money). If you disagree, who has the final say? How do you solve this?

8. Who decides about:
   8.1. Number of children & family planning, household/major purchases, buy & sell land, if wife can work outside, whether/where to send children to school, etc.

8.2. (Extra questions, maybe not applicable, depend on the answers above)

9. What do you think that you should use the money for? *(Let them talk freely)*

C. Gender equality and empowerment

10. How do you think that decisions should be done in the family and marriage? *(Let them talk freely)*

    10.1.   Do you think that a man and a woman should have equal share in decision-making?

    10.2.   Should a woman and a man share equally what is earned in the household?

    10.3.   Is that how it is done today? Why or why not?

11. Is a woman equally important as a man (in the family and in the society)? *(Try to find value perceptions, why or why not?)*

    11.1.   Who works the most each day, the man or the woman? Why?

12. What is equality? *(Let them talk freely)*

    12.1.   Is it a positive or a negative word? Whom does it include and whom does it exclude?

    12.2.   Is it important to you?

13. What is empowerment? *(Let them talk freely, try to look out for expressions of change – the view of it as a process and if it is ascribed to FT)*

    13.1.   Is it a positive or a negative word?

    13.2.   Whom and what does it include? What aspects of life?

    13.3.   Is this important to you? How does this relate to your life?

        13.3.1.   Freedom of movement; earning an income; share in decision-making; choice of livelihood & friends; human capital; ownership (land)

D. Impact of Fairtrade

(extra attention to: gender equality and empowerment)

14. Why did you decide to register for Women in Coffee? *(Let them talk freely, try to find out the motives, and also the advantages and disadvantages of Fairtrade)*

14.1.   Did/does your husband support that you are part of Women in Coffee (earn your own income)? *(Try to find out if it was a struggle, if yes, how did their husbands come to accept it, persuasion, negotiation, deception, agreement…)*

15. How has it affected you? *(Let them talk freely, probe with a lot of uh-um and can you explain that, try to see both positive and negative effects)*
If no answers are given or to complement
    15.1.   What is negative (disadvantage) and what is positive (advantage)
    15.2.   Work hours; income; relationship to your spouse; standard of living; food security; the wider family & the children etc.
16. Is Fairtrade a way for you to reach equality with men?
    16.1.   Why or why not?
17. Is Fairtrade a way for you as women to become empowered?
    17.1.   If yes, how and why? If not, why?

    E. What is your hope/dream for the future? What do you want to see? *(Try to find out if gender equality and empowerment is desirable or if it is not… but let participants talk freely)*

    F. Check if all topics have been covered if not, go back and try to get answers

    G. Do you have any questions or anything you would like to add?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

Appendix 2

Semi-structured interview guide for men's focus groups: M1 & M2

Introduction of the study and me as a researcher:

My name is Fanny Rölander. I am a student from Sweden. I am here in Kenya and in Chepkechei to do research for my studies in Sweden. My interest is to learn about how you as farmers are affected by the introduction of Fairtrade and the *Growing Women in Coffee* project. In my study I want to know how you feel about Fairtrade and *Growing Women in Coffee*: if it has brought any changes and how you feel about these. I will not write your names in may report but I will use the material I get from this discussion to write the report. I want to thank you very much for your participation. This discussion will take about one and a half hour and please feel free to express yourself freely. I want to hear your opinions about these questions that I will ask.

- **All participants should be noted individually on a background information sheet**

Interview topics

A. Daily life: daily activities, chores and responsibilities
(gender roles & gender divisions of labour)

1. What does a typical day look like for you? How and when does it start and end? (*To warm up)*

2. What is your responsibility in the house (as husband and father)? What is the man of the house supposed to do?

3. On the other hand, what is the role of the woman? *(Let them talk freely)*

   (If no answers are given, start giving examples as a last resort)

   3.1. Cleaning; cooking; washing clothes; taking care of children (feeding, bathing); providing for the family; putting food on the table; working (farm, cattle or other); collecting firewood

   3.2. Has this changed? When? Why? Has it changed after you joined the cooperative? After your wife joined WIC? *(First let them talk freely, then lead them in on FT)*

   3.3. Can a woman do what a man can do? Can a man do what a woman can do?

4. What do you think about this situation, your responsibilities in the house? *(Let them talk freely; try to see positive and negative aspects)*

   If no answers are given or to complement

   4.1. If you can change something what would that be?

   B. Decision-making within the household

   (gender equality, empowerment, gender positions & gender needs)

5. Can each person tell me about the last major purchase you made; *(get stories to find out who decides and what money is spent on)*

   5.1. What was it? Why did you buy it? Who decided? Where did the money come from?

6. And what about if you need something for yourself? *(Let them talk freely, try to find out if you are free to decide; if it is a joint decision or if you have no say)*

7. How do you decide what to spend money on? *(try to find out how they negotiate or don't negotiate within the household)*

   7.1. Decide together; I decide (if it is my money); I decide; she decides (if it is her money); She decides (for all money). If you disagree, who has the final say? How do you solve this?

8. Who decides about:

   8.1. Number of children & family planning, household/major purchases, buy & sell land, if wife can work outside, whether/where to send children to school, etc.

   (Extra questions, maybe not applicable, depend on the answers above)

9. What do you think that you should use the money for? *(Let them talk freely)*

C. Gender equality and empowerment

10. How do you think that decisions should be done in the family and marriage? *(Let them talk freely)*

   10.1. Do you think that a man and a woman should have equal share in decision-making?

   10.2. Should a woman and a man share equally what is earned in the household?

   10.3. Is that how it is done today? Why or why not?

11. Is a woman equally important as a man (in the family and in the society)? *(Try to find value perceptions, why or why not?)*

   11.1. Who works the most each day, the man or the woman? Why?

12. What is equality? *(Let them talk freely)*

   12.1. Is it a positive or a negative word? Whom does it include and whom does it exclude?

   12.2. Is it important to you?

13. What is empowerment? *(Let them talk freely, try to look out for expressions of change – the view of it as a process and if it is ascribed to FT)*

   13.1. Is it a positive or a negative word?

   13.2. Whom and what does it include? What aspects of life?

   13.3. Is this important to you? How does this relate to your life?

      13.3.1. *Freedom of movement; earning an income; share in decision-making; choice of livelihood & friends; human capital; ownership (land)*

D. Impact of Fairtrade

(extra attention to: gender equality and empowerment)

14. When did your wives register for Women in Coffee?

   14.1. Did she need your permission? Did you want her to register for Women in Coffee? *(Let them talk freely, try to find out the motives, and also the advantages and disadvantages of Fairtrade)*

   14.2. Did/do you support that your wife is a part of Women in Coffee (that she earns her own income)? *(Try to find out if it was a struggle, if yes, how did they as husbands come to accept it, persuasion, negotiation, deception, agreement…)*

15. How has it affected you? *(Let them talk freely, probe with a lot of uh-um and can you explain that, try to see both positive and negative effects)*

15.1.　　What is negative (disadvantage) and what is positive (advantage)

15.2.　　Work hours; income; relationship to your spouse; standard of living; food security; the wider family & the children etc.

15.3.　　Has it changed your view of your wife?

16. Is Fairtrade a way for your wife to reach equality with men?

16.1.　　Why or why not? Is it good?

17. Is Fairtrade a way for your wife to become empowered?

17.1.　　If yes, how and why? If not, why?

E. What is your hope/dream for the future? What do you want to see? *(Try to find out if gender equality and empowerment is desirable or if it is not… but let participants talk freely)*

F. Check if all topics have been covered if not, go back and try to get answers

G. Do you have any questions or anything you would like to add?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

Appendix 3

Background information sheet for participants in women's focus groups

- CODE: _____
- Location: _____
- Date: _____
- Name: _____
- Age: _____
- No. of children:_____
- Years of schooling: _____
- Farm diversification (mixed farming):   yes   no
- Civil/marital status: widow   married   other
- Duration in Women in Coffee (time of registration):_____
- Has a spouse in the cooperative: _____
- Number of coffee bushes registered in your name (WIC): _____
- Total time working with coffee (both in Kabngetuny & WIC):_____
- Main profession (farmer, employed):_____
- Source(s) of income:_____

1. Daily life assessment

(gender roles & gender divisions of labour)

- What time do you get up and what is the first thing you do in the morning?

- What have you done before you go to work (on your farm)?

- What kind of farming do you mostly do (food or cash crops)?

- Do you leave the farm during the day? If yes, when and why?

- When do you go home for the day (from your work or your farm)?

- What do you do when you come home (from work/farm)?

Comments:

Appendix 4

Background information sheet for participants in men's focus group

- CODE: _____
- Location: _____
- Date: _____
- Name:_____
- Age:_____
- No. of children:_____
- Years of schooling: _____
- Farm diversification (mixed farming):   yes   no
- Civil/marital status: widower   married   other
- Duration in *Kabngetuny* (time of registration):_____
- Have a spouse in Women in Coffee:_____
- Number of coffee bushes: _____
- Total time working with coffee:_____
- Main profession (farmer, employed):_____
- Source(s) of income:_____

2. Daily life: daily activities, chores and responsibilities

(gender roles & gender divisions of labour)

- What time do you get up and what is the first thing you do in the morning?

- What have you done before you go to work (on your farm)?

- What kind of farming do you mostly do (food or cash crops)?

- Do you leave the farm during the day? If yes, when and why?

- When do you go home for the day (from your work or your farm)?

- What do you do when you come home (from work/farm)?

Comments:

Appendix 5

Semi-structured interview guide for informant interview with representative of *Kabngetuny Farmers Cooperative Society* (also handling *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee*)

<u>**Introduction of the study and me as a researcher:**</u>

My name is Fanny Rölander. I am a student from Sweden. I am here in Kenya to do research for my studies in Sweden. My main aim is to learn about how your farmers are affected by the introduction of Fairtrade and the *Growing Women in Coffee* project. In this interview I see you as an informant of mainly *Kabngetuny Farmers Cooperative Society*, but also partly for the *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee*. In this interview I will ask questions regarding the background, the aim, the achievements and the problems of *Kabngetuny*. Since you are a representative of the Society I may cite you and use the material I get from this interview to write my report. I want to thank you very much for your participation. This interview will take about thirty to forty-five minutes.

i. Background information:

- Name:_____
- Position in *Kabngetuny*:_____
- Main profession:_____
- Work description (main work tasks and responsibilities):

Interview topics

1. **Can you explain the background of *Kabngetuny?***
   a. When started
   b. How many members (active and inactive)
   c. The objectives and the main aim
   d. Changes throughout time: introduction of Fairtrade

2. **Can you describe the coffee chain from farmer to consumer in the case of Kabngetuny?**

3. **Which achievements have you seen as a result of *Kabngetuny?***
   a. Changes in the environment
      i. More sustainable farming practices etc.
   b. Changes in the recipients: the farmers (male and female)
      i. Living standard, self-esteem, health, human capital, etc.

4. **When and why was *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee* introduced? How was it received?**

5. **Which achievements have you seen as a result of *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee?***
   a. Changes in the environment
      i. More sustainable farming practices etc.
   b. Changes in the recipients: the farmers (male and female)
      i. Living standard, self-esteem, health, human capital, etc.

6. **What are the problems/challenges you have faced/are facing with *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee?***
   a. Sustainability, resistance from farmers (male and female); attitudes; norms; behaviours, cultural and traditional beliefs/practices, physical availability, etc.

7. **Do you think that the *Kabngetuny Women in Coffee* project can be improved? If yes, how and what is needed to fulfil this?**
   a. Funds, training, sensitization, attitude change, etc.

8. *Check if all topics have been covered if not, go back and try to get answers*

9. **Do you have any questions or anything you would like to add?**

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

Appendix 6

Semi-structured interview guide for informant interview with Project Officer for Fairtrade Africa's project *Growing Women in Coffee*

Introduction of the study and me as a researcher:

My name is Fanny Rölander. I am a student from Sweden. I am here in Kenya to do research for my studies in Sweden. My main aim is to learn about how your farmers are affected by the introduction of Fairtrade and the *Growing Women in Coffee* project. In this interview I see you as an informant of *Growing Women in Coffee* and I will ask questions regarding the background, the aim, the achievements and the problems of *Growing Women in Coffee*. Since you are a representative of the *Growing Women in Coffee* I may cite you and use the material I get from this interview to write my report. I want to thank you very much for your participation. This interview will take about thirty to forty-five minutes.

i. Background information:
  - Name:_____
  - Position at Fairtrade Africa (*Growing Women in Coffee)*:_____
  - Duration at Fairtrade Africa & *Growing Women in Coffee*:_____

  - Work description (main work tasks and responsibilities in relation to WIC):

Interview topics

1. **Can you explain the background of Fairtrade Africa's project: *Growing Women in Coffee?***
   a. When started
   b. Target group/beneficiaries

c. The objectives and the main aim

2. **Which achievements have you seen as a result of (*Kabngetuny*) *Growing Women in Coffee?***
   a. Changes in the environment
      i. More sustainable farming practices etc.
   b. Changes in the recipients: the farmers (male and female)
      i. Living standard, self-esteem, health, human capital, etc.

3. **What are the problems/challenges you have faced with *Growing Women in Coffee?***
   a. Sustainability, funding, resistance from farmers (male and female), cultural and traditional beliefs, physical availability, etc.

4. **Do you think that the (*Kabngetuny*) *Growing Women in Coffee* project can be improved? If yes, how and what is needed to fulfil this?**
   a. Funds, training, sensitization, attitude change, etc.

5. From my interaction with mainly female, but also male, farmers they have expressed a lot of gratitude to Fairtrade for the *Growing Women in Coffee* project. There is still one thing that they have expressed that they feel that Fairtrade has promised them which has not been fulfilled; that is branding of the Women in Coffee in order to sell it separately and to get a buyer who will pay a higher price due to the sustainable practices used. What is your view on this? Is it true? A question of time?

6. *Check if all topics have been covered if not, go back and try to get answers*

7. **Do you have any questions or anything you would like to add?**

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

Appendix 7

Background information for participants in women's focus group 1 (W1)

Background information sheet for participants in women's focus groups							
Background information	Focus group no.	W1					
	Location	Chepkechei - Kaptuiya & Ndubusat					
	Date	2015-04-15					
	CODE	AW1	BW1	CW1	DW1	EW1	FW1
	Zone	Kaptuiya	Kaptuiya	Ndubusat	Ndubusat	Ndubusat	Kaptuiya
	Age	45	38	34	46	43	54
	No. of children	8	6	6	7	7	9
	Years of schooling	9	8	8	16	16	2
	Farm diversification (mixed farming):	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Civil/marital status	widow	married	married	married	married	widow
	Duration in Women in Coffee (time of registration):	2012	2011	2011	2011	2011	2011
	Has a spouse in the cooperative:	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no
	Number of coffee bushes registered in your name (WIC):	50	50	50	2000	500	50
	Total time [years] working with coffee (both in Kabngetuny & WIC)	4	17	5	4	4	4
	Main profession (farmer, employed):	farmer	farmer and shop assistant	farmer	employed as a primary teacher	employed as a primary teacher	farmer
	Source(s) of income:	farming; tea and coffee	farming and business (small shop)	farming	Salary from teaching & farming	Salary from teaching plus money from business & farming	farming
Daily life assessment	What time do you get up and what is the first thing you do in the morning?	wake up at four, light fire, milk the cows and then prepare tea	wake up at six; does household chores	At five to do household chores	At five to prepare breakfast	At five to prepare breakfast	At six to clean the house
	What have you done before you go to work (on your farm)?	milk cows, prepare tea and do house chores	household chores; prepare tea, clean the house, feed cows	Do all household chores and feed cows	Clean and organise compound	Do household chores	Prepared tea and household chores
	What kind of farming do you mostly do (food or cash crops)?	cash crops	cash crops	Food crops	cash crops	Cash crops	Food crops
	Do you leave the farm during the day? If yes, when and why?	At one to prepare lunch or at four when the work is heavy	At one to prepare lunch	At one to prepare lunch	N/A	N/A	At one to prepare lunch
	When do you go home for the day (from your work or your farm)?	At five	at four	At four if the work load is heavy	At five from the primary school	At five from the primary school	at one
	What do you do when you come home (from work/farm)?	milk cows and prepare supper	wash clothes, clean house, milk and feed cows	Cleaning around the house and compound	Does household chores	Prepare supper and finish household chores	Take a shower & make supper

Appendix 8

Background information for participants in women's focus group 2 (W2)

		Background information sheet for participants in women's focus groups					
Background information	Focus group no.	W2					
	Location	Chepkechei - Korosyot & Kipteres					
	Date	2015-04-22					
	CODE	AW2	BW2	CW2	DW2	EW2	FW2
	Zone	Korosyot	Kipteres	Kipteres	Kipteres	Korosyot	Korosyot
	Age	50	48	43	33	23	36
	No. of children	6	8	4	5	3	4
	Years of schooling	7	8	19	16	10	11
	Farm diversification (mixed farming):	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Civil/marital status	married	married	widow	married	married	married
	Duration in Women in Coffee (time of registration):	2011	2011	2011	2012	2013	2011
	Has a spouse in the cooperative:	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
	Number of coffee bushes registered in your name (WIC):	400	500	600	500	83	50
	Total time [years] working with coffee (both in Kabngetuny & WIC)	29	4	4	4	6	10
	Main profession (farmer, employed):	farmer	farmer & business woman	Teacher	Teacher	Farmer	Farmer
	Source(s) of income:	farming	farming and business	Teaching and farming	Teaching and farming	Farming	farming
Daily life assessment	What time do you get up and what is the first thing you do in the morning?	At six to light the fire and then prepare breakfast	At five to light the fire	At five then go into a moment of prayer	at six am	At six to make breakfast	At six to milk cows
	What have you done before you go to work (on your farm)?	Washed the dishes and fed the cows	Prepare breakfast and milk cows	Fed animals (cows)	Does house chores	Does household chores	Prepare breakfast and then do other household chores
	What kind of farming do you mostly do (food or cash crops)?	Cash crops	Mostly cash crop, but also some in food crops	Cash crop planting	Cash crops (tea and coffee)	Food crops	Food cropping mainly and a little of cash cropping
	Do you leave the farm during the day? If yes, when and why?	At eleven to cows and to light fire	At eleven to light fire	N/A	N/A	No	No
	When do you go home for the day (from your work or your farm)?	At one	At twelve	From farm at one and from work at five	At 2 or 3 pm	At one	At one
	What do you do when you come home (from work/farm)?	Make lunch	Take a shower and then take lunch	Does household chores and feeds cows	Comes from teaching, then goes farming 1-2 hours	Does some cleaning and then goes to fetch firewood	Makes lunch and then does household chores

Appendix 9

Background information for participants in men's focus group 1 (M1)

Background information sheet for participants in men's focus groups							
Background information	Focus group no.	M1					
	Location	Chepkechei - Kaptuiya & Ndubusat					
	Date	2015-04-15					
	CODE	AM1	BM1	CM1	DM1	EM1	FM1
	Zone	Kaptuiya	Kaptuiya	Ndubusat	Kaptuiya	Ndubusat	Ndubusat
	Age	39	79	62	43	65	52
	No. of children	8	7	8	6	15	9
	Years of schooling	9	16	16	9	16	16
	Farm diversification (mixed farming):	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Civil/marital status	married	married	married	married	married	married
	Duration in Kabngetuny (time of registration):	2006	1985	1985	1994	1985	2009
	Has a spouse in Women in Coffee:	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Number of coffee bushes:	200	800	540	500	570	400
	Total time (years) working with coffee:	10	64	38	21	38	6
	Main profession (farmer, employed):	farmer	farmer	farmer	farmer	farmer	Businessman
	Source(s) of income:	farming	farming	farming	farming	farming	business and farming
Daily life assessment	What time do you get up and what is the first thing you do in the morning?	Wakes up at 6 and takes tea	At 6, takes tea	at 6, takes tea	At 6 am, takes breakfast	At 6 am, takes breakfast	At 6 am, takes tea
	What have you done before you go to work (on your farm)?	Taken tea	taken tea	taken tea	Taken breakfast	Taken breakfast	Taken tea
	What kind of farming do you mostly do (food or cash crops)?	A little on cash crops and a little on food crops	Both food and cash crops but spends more time on food crops	Puts more effort on cash crop, but also a little on food crops	Spends most time on cash crops and a little on food crops	Spends most time on cash crops and a little on food crops	N/A
	Do you leave the farm during the day? If yes, when and why?	At one for taking lunch	At 10.50 am for taking tea and to rest	At 1.00 pm for lunch	At 1.00 pm for lunch	At 1.00 pm for lunch	N/A
	When do you go home for the day (from your work or your farm)?	at four	See above	at four pm	At 4.00 pm	At 4.00 pm	At 6.00 pm
	What do you do when you come home (from work/farm)?	takes a shower and relaxes	Taking a shower and looking after the cows around the compound	Takes a shower and relaxes	Takes a shower and relaxes	Takes a shower and relaxes	Takes a shower

Appendix 10

Background information for participants in men's focus group 2 (M2)

Background information sheet for participants in men's focus groups					
Background information	Focus group no.	M2			
	Location	Chepkechei - Korosyot & Kipteres			
	Date	2015-04-22			
	CODE	AM2	BM2	CM2	DM2
	Zone	Kipteres	Korosyot	Korosyot	Kipteres
	Age	35	62	36	59
	No. of children	3	6	6	4
	Years of schooling	7	16	16	13
	Farm diversification (mixed farming):	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Civil/marital status	married	married	married	married
	Duration in Kabngetuny (time of registration):	2012	1985	2006	1985
	Has a spouse in Women in Coffee:	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Number of coffee bushes:	182	5000	973	2010
	Total time (years) working with coffee:	5	30	16	30
	Main profession (farmer, employed):	farmer	Businessman and farmer	employed as factory manager & farmer	farmer
	Source(s) of income:	farming	business and farming	coffee, salary, tea, maize etc.	farming
Daily life assessment	What time do you get up and what is the first thing you do in the morning?	At 6 am, feeds the cows	At 6.00 am to open the shop	At 5.30, takes a bath & visits cattle shed	At 6.00 am, feeding cows
	What have you done before you go to work (on your farm)?	Taken tea	Taken tea	Collected farmyard manure for fertilizer application	Taken breakfast
	What kind of farming do you mostly do (food or cash crops)?	Spends about equally much time in food and cash crops	Cash crops	Both food and cash crops	Both food and cash crops
	Do you leave the farm during the day? If yes, when and why?	At 1.00 pm for lunch	At 1.00 pm for lunch	N/A	At 1.00 pm for lunch
	When do you go home for the day (from your work or your farm)?	At 5.00 pm	At 8.00 pm	At 6.00 pm	Around 4.00 pm
	What do you do when you come home (from work/farm)?	Relaxes	Takes dinner and sleeps	Takes bath a rest and then supper before going to bed	Rests and takes tea