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ABSTRACT

Gender disparity is a phenomenon that rises above most of the world’s societies, religions, countries and wage gatherings. In many social orders, the distinctions and disparities are show in the obligations each are relegated, in the exercises they embrace, in their entrance to and control over assets and in basic leadership openings. This study examined to gender inequalities in women’s land use in Agricultural Value Chains in Ainabkoi Sub County, Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. The study was guided by Sen’s Entitlement Theory. The study adopted mixed research design. Descriptive research methodology was used to design data collection instruments. The researchers used questionnaire, interview schedule guide, focus group discussion and document analysis to collect data. A sample of 153 was drawn from a population of 1,224 using random and purposive sampling. Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected. Quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Packages of Social Sciences generating descriptive statistics which included percentages, mean and standard deviation. Qualitative data was analyzed by highlighting significant statements and coming up with themes which were used to develop descriptions of the participant experiences and descriptions of the context or settings that influence the experience. These descriptions were unified into structural and textural description giving a unified descriptive account of the quantitative data. The findings showed that gender inequalities were prevalent in land use, financial use and access to extension services among men and women that affect Agricultural Value Chains. The findings of this study will be useful to policy makers in formulating policies that will ensure gender equity in Agricultural Value Chains. The researchers recommend that service providers should foster equitable participation, recognize these gender inequalities as well as activities that meet the needs of both gender with considerations to the customary will. Practitioners should adopt effective communication channels to offer agricultural information. Further studies are required in other counties in this area to determine the inequalities in Agricultural land use and the best way to address them to enable women farmers participate in Agricultural Value Chains.

1.1 Background of the Study

Policymakers and development professionals since the 1990s, have featured the basic significance of gender in the execution, assessment, and adequacy of projects over a scope of social and economic divisions (Peterman et al., 2010). In recent years gender has picked attention never has there been such momentum around the issue of gender parity on the global stage (Schwab and Zahidi, 2010). There is an extending affirmation that ownership, access as well as control over land resources constitute fundamental parts in the confirmation of the well– being of agriculturists. Agriculturist capacity to use improved equipment and technology depends upon their passage to profitable resources. Both genders contribute significantly to rural economies yet, their passageway to these plant resources fluctuate (FAO, 2011). Despite the dedication of women to agriculture, obviously they do not have as much rights and control over land resources. Agricultural sector in developing nations is failing to meet expectations, since women do not have the benefits and openings they require to
accomplish their potential as farmers. In agriculture and the economy, women represent a significant asset through their roles as agriculturists, workers, and merchants, yet they confront various challenges as a result of their sexual orientation that decrease their efficiency and retard advance on more extensive monetary and social improvement objectives (FAO, 2011). Women confront a serious sexual orientation gap with regard to accessing beneficial assets. Women control less land which is regularly of low quality and their residency is insecure than men. Women agriculturalists are more outlandish than men to utilize current information sources, for example, enhanced seeds, manures as well as mechanical instruments, (FAO, 2011). They likewise utilize less credit and don’t regularly control the credit they acquire. Women are also less educated as well have less access to agricultural extension services. This makes it harder for women to access as well utilize a portion of alternate assets, for example, land, credit, and fertilizer. These elements likewise keep women from embracing new innovations as promptly as men do (FAO, 2011)

In Bangladesh, Ecuador, and Pakistan, the disparity in access to land is especially intense, where the land property of men is more than double the measure of those of women. Farming activities in the properties, extending from determination of seed to harvesting and storage, are prevalently overseen by women. Regardless of this ladies’ essential part in agribusiness, the conventional social standards and customary laws joined with the purdah framework deny Bangladeshi women of impartial economic openings and access to assets (Cherry.R., 2011). In Ghana for example, (Doss, 2001), indicated that only 10% of Ghanaian land was held by women. In Kenya the Rift valley province 82% of the women do not own land (NALEP, 2009).

Globally, women farmers are faced with various challenges in credit accessibility which inhibits female agriculturists from accessing the required materials for farming purposes. In situations where ladies access credit, they access small amounts which payment conditions are not exceptionally appropriate. Along these lines, it has been seen by (Mehra, 2008), that ladies can get to just a percentage of the credit in agribusiness. In situations where appropriate devices for women are accessible, the greater part of them is uninformed as well do not hold enough resources to source for them. Therefore diminish their work proficiency and efficiency by using simple strategies (World Bank, 2009). In Bangladesh, financial institutions disburse about five percent of loans to rural women (Gutpa, 1996). In Madagascar nine percent of female-headed households use credit (FAO, 2011). In Nigeria females obtain about five percent of formal credit, while the percentages range from fourteen percent and four percent for males and females, respectively in Kenya (Saito, 1994).

Women farmers are reportedly limited to agricultural extension services in Nepal (FAO, 2011). In Ethiopia women produce 35% less than men due to lower extension services by women (Tiruneh, 2001). In Kenya, extension services are focused to men and large land owners, more than 52% of men have access to extension services (NALEP, 2009). This research sought to determine the gender inequalities in agricultural value chains in Ainabkoi Sub-County, Uasin Gishu County. Despite farmers in Ainabkoi Sub-County having the potential to be drivers of agricultural productivity in Kenya and with the availability of agricultural resources, agricultural productivity is not improving over time (Uasin Gishu County Development Profile, 2013). This is due to these farmers facing gender inequalities (FAO, 2011). According to the national legislation of Kenya (Constitution, 2010), rights to land access for both genders are clearly specified. However, many communities do not honour these women’s rights. This study in Ainabkoi Sub-County, Uasin Gishu County, provides an understanding of gender inequalities in agricultural value chain development. The study determined the position of women in respect to access and control of land, financial services and extension services in agricultural value chains to enhance agricultural productivity.

**Significance of the Study**
The study was significant in identifying the gaps that needed to be filled to promote gender equity in agricultural value chains among farming households. The findings of the study will inform the different stakeholders within different agricultural value chains of the existing gender inequalities and will emphasize on some of the actions they will take to promote gender equity for improved productivity along the agricultural value chains. The information will be useful for policy makers especially the Ministry of Agriculture and other stakeholders in the extension service delivery, in formulating policies that will ensure gender equity, to make the delivery of agricultural financial services and extension services more rapid and cost effective.
This study will benefit Scholars as a basic literature review in further research. Donor agencies on the other hand will use the information generated to aid in identifying areas which need to be addressed when allocating funds for increased productivity. While for the researcher the study will enable attaining her degree, master in development studies and career development.

Scope of the Study
The study sought to determine gender inequalities and their effects on Agricultural value chains. This study was conducted in Ainakboki sub-county, Uasin Gishu County. Ainakboki sub-county is one of the 6 sub-counties in Uasin Gishu County located in the Rift Valley province of Kenya. It constitutes 23 Sub–Locations; Kapsoya, Tendwo, Lotonyok, Kipsinende, Kongasis, Kileges, Cheptigit, Kapsundei, Songich, Chepkongony, Chesogor, Tilol, Kaplalach, Chepngoror, Koiluget, Kapkeno, Burnt forest, Tingwa, Ndai, Kapsenget, Kapnetuny, Siliboi and Kipkabus. The study covered 22 sub-locations excluding Kapsoya Sub-location because of its urban and peri-urban setup. This study area was selected because of its vibrancy in agricultural activities. The average farm size in Ainakboki Sub-County is 2-10 acres with a wide range of crop and livestock enterprises. The crops of monetary significance incorporate nourishment crops, money/modern harvests and green yields though the domesticated animals’ undertakings incorporate dairy, poultry, sheep, goats, pigs, honey bee keeping and fish cultivating. The crops include maize; wheat, beans, Irish potatoes, tomatoes, kales cabbages, carrots, local vegetables (spider plant, night shade), and passion fruits (Uasin Gishu County, 2013). The study was conducted between March 2014 and February 2015.

Literature Review
The Value Chain Concept
The value chain is referred the sequence of activities that are needed to develop a product and a service from the stage of conception, (Kaplinsky and Morris, 2010). A value chain refers to a progressive order of target-oriented combinations of agricultural production factors to ensure a marketability of the product or service from conception to the final consumption. In a value chain there are many actors who cooperate as the product move from one stage to the other. It is argued that actors who are involved in a value chain sometimes cooperate to bring the product to the final consumer although they may not know how they are linked up with upstream and downstream actors along the chain (Kaplinsky and Morris, 2010).

Value chain can be simple or complex, which imply the number of actors and interactions involved. In general, the value chains of most agribusinesses have the following actors; input suppliers, producers, transporters, processors, wholesale sellers, distributors, retailers and final consumers. It is also common for one actor to be involved in more than one function in the value chain. There are also barriers to entry into some nodes of the value chains which may be more profitable, such barriers to entry may be gender based like the activities that are only done by men, women or children; the barrier may also be due to lack of skill or capital. Hence, it is important to conduct value chain analysis to understand gendered participation into a particular value chain.

Gender Inequalities and Control over Productive Resources
Agricultural production strategies are adopted by many countries across the world including Sub Saharan Africa for economic development. Farming production relies upon: Natural asset resources: land, soil, water and plant hereditary assets; financial resources: credit, capital and pay; Physical resources: innovation, work sparing advancements and Information resources: local learning, formal training, access to data. Sex relations shape access to these advantages which are critical to be a totally powerful and beneficial part in the farming division. Research nulls over exhibit that a basic overall sexual introduction hole exists in asset proprietorship, control and access. On average, men approach a more noteworthy number of sorts and bigger measures of focal points, their rights are more ordinarily formalized, while women are compelled to standard rights which deprive them their rights (Haussmann, 2012). Ladies globally have been on the center of sexual orientation, various studies show that the term sex issues has been used to describe the disservices looked by women agriculturalists regardless of the hypothetical significance of gender as parts of men and females (Okali, 2011).

In farming, women incorporate recognizably as they are acknowledged to convey most of all the food that is delivered, particularly, up to eighty percent in Africa (Mehra, 2008). It has been typical that if wages of ladies are broadened, they may have more access to assets and place resources into their youngsters’ rule, human
organizations and sustenance. Regardless, women are obliged by poor access to assets as well as enduring more opportunities which include new markets, their constrained educational foundation, poor structures and minimization controls. Sexual introduction qualification, rising up out of the fabricated social associations among the two genders clearly affect the movement of agricultural resources utilization and may make various irregularities being produced comes about.

Women in agricultural production play the role of agents to ensure food security and nutrition, relatively men are disadvantaged to the access to production assets therefore women need to participate and be recognized in agricultural value chains. The strategies that are employed demand resources which ensure accessibility as well as control over such resources. Along these lines, beneficial assets that encourage farming quality bind advancement should be accessible to ladies regarding openness and control to build profitability (Kabira, 2012).

In customary country social orders, agricultural production is fundamentally a male obligation. Men get ready land, water, reap yields and transport, advertise and sell their produce (FAO, 2011). Women in the rural areas have the essential obligation regarding keeping up the family unit. They bring up kids, develop and get ready sustenance, oversee family poultry, and gather fuel wood and water. In addition women, play an imperative unpaid role in creating family salary, by giving work to planting, weeding, gathering and sifting products, and preparing produce available for sale (FAO, 2011). Studies cited in Doss (2001) demonstrate that all things considered, land property among the males is nearly three times the ladies’ territory possessions. This traded off land get to drive ladies to settle on imperfect choices in regards to crop decisions and to get bring down yields than would some way or another be conceivable if family unit assets were dispensed proficiently (World Bank, 2011)

Numerous nations still face challenges in making an interpretation of enactment identified with access as well as asset control among women.

This is because of a couple of variables that relate particularly to a nonattendance of human capital as well as cash related capital (nonappearance of advantages, decentralization impediments), (IFAD, 2004). This is problematic to women’s especially in regard to the capacity to control and favorable position from provincial age.

Agricultural innovation exchange and limit advancement is one of the prime strategy levers to increment farming efficiency. All the more frequently ladies are not focused on in light of the fact that it is accepted that their spouses will impart the information to them, and regularly they are provided with advances that don't address their issues (FAO, 2011). The crossover that was presented required sledge plants, however just conventional factories were accessible locally. Poor stockpiling attributes of the half and half likewise bargained women’s capacity to ration their rural production, so women came back to developing customary maize assortments (World Bank, 2011). In any case, appropriation of new innovation relies upon a few elements, including the accessibility of expected resources for execute the innovation, how nearby women and men see the apparent advantages, the way data is shared and neighborhood sexual orientation parts and other socio-cultural contemplations (World Bank, 2009).

In non-accessibility of secure land rights, women agriculturalists have next to zero access to credit, which is basic for making interests in enhanced agrarian practices (FAO, 1993). Subsequently, the mechanical advances yielding considerable picks up in horticultural profitability in the course of the most recent couple of decades have frequently circumvent ladies’ ranchers and diminished their efficiency (FAO, 1993).

There is noteworthy disparity globally with regard to the role of women in their support in agricultural value chains and other financial exercises (Cherry, 2011). The female role of farming work extending from 20 to 50 percent. In spite of this heterogeneity, ladies crosswise over districts and settings confront a shockingly comparable arrangement of imperatives which restrain their entrance to gainful assets. While the correct level of sexual orientation disparity in get to varies by resources and area, the basic causes are social, standards, family/regenerative obligations that make time imperatives, and resource complementarities. These sexual orientation imbalances adversely influence the productivity of women in terms costs as far as lost yield, pay and eventually welfare of family units, groups and nations (United Nations, 2011).

In Nepal despite of women engaging in agriculture more than men do, they are devoid of accessibility to control productive resources such as land, forest and water. Agricultural extension services targeted to women farmers are judged to be inappropriate and inadequate (FAO, 2011). Imbalance in the dispersion of assets amongst different genders is associated with production inefficiencies yet intercessions focusing on small scale farmers frequently neglect to address
critical issues affecting women especially with regard to rural economies (Quisumbing, 2009). In Kenya, scarcely do ladies claim arrive, all the more so the standard convictions are against ladies taking part in arrive related issues. This clarifies why Kenyan ladies don't partake in illuminating area question and land dispersion boards of trustees. Like others, Kenyan circumstance likewise displays a similarly sexual orientation discriminative land arrangement change and strategy, Spring/Summer news, 2005. Access and responsibility for is administered by statutory laws, standard laws and religious laws. The conjugal status of ladies is likewise basic to owning or getting to arrive. In the examination did by the ladies and Law in East Africa Research aggregate on Inheritance, Laws and Practices, it was clarified that ladies watched out for claim moveable property or belongings (African Journal of Social Sciences, 2011).

Gender Inequalities in Land use among Women Farmers

Land is a factor limiting the productivity for smallholder farmers, (Allendorf, 2007). Access to land is basic for enhancing agrarian profitability; and when the individuals who chip away at the land advantage, motivators expand yields and give great stewardship to land benefits, horticulture as well as acquire more nonfarm independent work salary than the landless (FAO, 2011)

Lawful separation and social standards confine women’s capacities to utilize and possess land similarly to men. Ladies are frequently limited in their entrance to arrive through associations with men, by marriage or family relationship, and have generally couple of chances to get formal responsibility for either freely or mutually (Rubin, 2009). Women are faced with challenges such as poor financing which inhibit them to contract work widely, therefore rely upon their family units. In this manner, they spend more hours doing the household chores (Rubin 2009). Consequently, the sexual orientation gap in landownership is noteworthy. Reports from nations around the globe propose that women’s landownership rates differ from the vicinity of 2 and 15 percent to 20 and 25 percent just in European nations. Women commonly have less access to land. In Montenegro for instance, 3 percent of property is enrolled in ladies' names (IFC, 2008). 10% of property in rustic Kosovo is enlisted to ladies. In Tanzania, Women have around 19 percent of titled land (Ellis, 2006). In spite of sacred announcements of sexual orientation fairness and numerous laws that advance equivalent open doors for both genders, people do diverse sorts of work at same time have distinctive levels of access to assets and are unequally remunerated for their commitments to the rural framework with ladies regularly having less access and lower salaries (Rubin, 2009).

General laws that are both customary and regular restrict women’s rights to arrive legacy or land buy and oblige ladies from extending agrarian creation. Sex relations inside the family unit additionally delimit zones of duty regarding choices over land utilize and arrive administration, every now and again restricting ladies' utilization rights to specific bits of or kinds of land (Rubin, 2009). According to Allendorf (2007), access to land and control keeps on being a noteworthy mishap for women farmers which constrain their capacity to successfully own feasible farming advancement. The expansion in estimation of land which has come about into showcase situated cultivating has put ladies off guard as men challenge ladies' rights to arrive even in matrilineal social orders (Gray, 2012). Ladies may in some cases loosely get to try to understand what land gives them for sustenance creation (Cornhiel, 1997). Men command in settling on choices about what to develop since inside social orders they are invested with forces to control monetary exercises in the family unit (Squire, 2003).

Women may get a few rights over land, yet the significant test is responsibility for it (Gray, 2012). However as far as land possession, (Walker, 2002) reports that a little first class and expert or ladies with high monetary status have secured rights through responsibility for and can impact choices. Ladies' training level and salary may likewise be utilized as measures of haggling power. In this manner, as recommended by (Patkar, 1995) putting resources into training for ladies would change the nature and powers that minimize ladies as far as control over profitable assets and administrations.

In Latin America, where private property structures are the standard, inheritance is the most progressive wellspring of trade of obligation regarding land. In light of customs, ladies are considerably less inclined to obtain arrive. Similarly, there is ordinarily male advantage in marriage, and state tasks of land redistribution have tended to be uneven towards men. In Sub Saharan Africa including Kenya, women get rights to arrive through their enrollment in family units particularly through marriage as families. This by and large implies that these rights may be denied in instances of separation or some of the time widowhood as a few relatives depends on snatching land since the
ladies don't possess the land (Gray, 2012). In a perfect world in patrilineal social orders where ladies take after and inhabit the spouses' house should keep making the most of their rights to arrive even on account of their husbands' passing unless they choose to remarry or serious ties with their conjugal land (Gray, 2012).

Legacy of land in many social orders is dictated by whether they are patrilineal or matrilineal. This framework regularly gives kids beneficiaries to the land from their folks. As per Davison, (1993) heritage in patrilineal social requests is through the father's family line while in matrilineal is through the mother's lineage. These structures tend to give more prominent authority to either men or women who by then leave the other sexual introduction exposed. In accordance with sex interest needs, responsibility for is both a functional and key need since arrive gives them control as far as basic leadership over its utilization separated from helping them attempt their ladylike parts (Arun, 2010).

Cultural frameworks also recognize acquisition of property legal rights where land is part of enabling women to participate in the agricultural value chains (March, 1999). In Kenya, 93% of the land is owned by the men, they are the ones to make decisions on how the land is to be utilized, secured and or disposed (NALEP, 2009). Access to and control over land likewise faces additionally challenges notwithstanding changes in value of land. Dull (2012), saw that the advancement in estimation of land has actuated men testing the rights to land to ladies even in the matrilineal frameworks. The illustration has happened into African women supporting for annihilation of such standard land hones. In Uganda for example, as point by point supporting for annihilation of such standard land illustration has happened into African women (Arun, 2010).

Legal Rights to Land
In agriculture, rights to land are basic. Secure property rights make motivators for agrarian venture and yields prompting expanded horticultural profitability (Jacoby, 2002). Standard and statutory law treats land get to in an unexpected way; now and again clashes exist inside statutory law of various sorts. In Botswana, for instance, land laws have not been blended with marriage laws to encourage ladies' landownership (Africa, 2003).

In Kenya, the Kenya Registered Land Act (RLA) takes into account up to five individuals to enroll as proprietors of a plot of land. Plots are normally enrolled exclusively for the sake of the head of family (men). As indicated by the RLA, enactment supersedes standard rights unless they are enrolled. The new Kenyan constitution of 2010 was the first major step in the direction of the unification of several laws. User privileges of land are once in a while noted on the farm; hence, frequently the enlistment gives total title to the enlisted landowner. In different cases, extra lawful prerequisites may compel ladies from enrolling land (FAO, 2000). For instance, in Guatemala, the law enables ladies to claim arrive. In any case, one reason couple of ladies are legitimate landowners is that they frequently need lawful character to enlist land, where the rights are frequently connected to conjugal status, where people's rights in marriage are characterized distinctively under the law (World Bank, 2009).

The Kenyan Law of Succession, which administers legacy rights, ends a dowager's legacy rights on the off chance that when a woman remarries, yet a widow's rights stay in place. In Uganda, albeit legitimate arrangements allow ladies to acquire 15 percent of wedding property upon the passing of her better half, ladies are regularly not counseled about the mien of family arrive upon the demise of the life partner (Ellis, 2006).

Theoretical Framework
The study was informed and guided by Sen’s Entitlement Theory. The entitlement relation as proposed by Sen (1981) is one kind of ownership relation which could be obtained by the following four methods; Production-based entitlements, Own-labour entitlements, Trade-based entitlement, Inheritance and transfer entitlements.

One can exchange for other things that one owns. This exchange can take place either through trading or production or a combination of the two. The entitlement set of a person depends on two parameters; the endowment of a person and the exchange entitlement. Apart from the endowment or ownership factor the key determinant of a person’s welfare is his or her exchange entitlement. However, the key factor is whether he or she can exchange their endowment or exchange entitlement and if so for how long and at what rate. The exchange entitlement varies from person to person based on their economic prospects as well as the modes of production of that economy. One of the main factors in exchange entitlement is the differential gender factor. The gender factor opens a whole array of issues.
With the gender issues prevalent the theory of entitlement, a host of issues come into play when they want to decide the factors in exchange entitlement of women. The issues are widely divergent ranging from property rights, social customs gender empowerment measures for women’s entitlement factors to institutional and academic issues. From this work, Sen, (1981) went ahead to contend that opportunity is the rule means and end of improvement, and the concentration ought to be moved from those with low-pay to those lacking advancement of human capacities.

Tisdell (2003) went on to apply Sen’s theory to women, furthermore, demonstrated that ladies’ status is to be sure reliant on these qualifications, gifts and dealing power. The financial status of ladies in numerous creating nations, and accordingly sex disparity, is clarified by their absence of qualifications, and all privileges are important contemporaneously for strengthening sex value.

This theory suggests that gender inequality as an obstacle to agricultural value chain development might be generally reliant on beginning conditions and the qualifications of people, and that inequality may actually be endogenously reinforcing.

The rules of entitlement in agricultural production are the civil rights and obligations which affect the agricultural production factors including land, Extension services (Skills and Knowledge) and financial services. These factors affect agricultural productivity.

Research Design and Methodology

Research Design

The researcher used descriptive survey research design which determines the gender inequalities that affect agricultural value chains. According to Burns & Groove (2001), descriptive research provides a picture of a situation as it naturally happens and justifies current practice and makes judgment as well as developing theories. In this study descriptive research brought out the gender inequalities in agricultural value chains as they are in Ainabkoi Sub-county.

The research was based on quantitative and qualitative research strategy. According to Babbie, (2010) quantitative studies include gathering of numerical information as well introducing a perspective of the connection amongst hypothesis and research as a deductive and objectivist origination of social reality, with an inclination for a shared science approach.

The study also used qualitative research because it explores explanations and descriptions as well as narratives (Fidel 2008). The qualitative research method gives participants an opportunity to present their thoughts, interpretations as well as understanding by describing and explaining the situation in their environment.

This study was undertaken in Ainabkoi Sub-County of Uasin Gishu County. Located in the expansive Great Rift Valley that extends from Egypt to Mozambique, 324 kilometers Northwest of Nairobi the Capital City of Kenya. Ainabkoi Sub-County is one of the 6 sub-counties in Uasin Gishu County that were created after the promulgation of the new Kenyan constitution in August 2010. The sub-county constitutes 23 sub-locations. The sub-county population is approximately 149,029 and covers an area of 3,341 square kilometers (Uasin Gishu County, 2013). (Appendix 5).

The study was carried out in 22 sub-locations of Ainabkoi Sub-County Uasin Gishu County. The area was chosen because the researcher anticipated that she was to get all the necessary information on the study given that the main economic activity in the area is farming. The selection was also based on ease of accessibility and homogeneity of the population.

Population is referred to as the individuals from whom study samples are taken for measurement. It is the larger group from which the study sample is picked from. Capturing variability in population gives room for more reliability (Tromp, 2006). The study comprised of 1,210 smallholder farmers, 10 group officials who are also smallholder farmers and 4 service providers.

A sample is a small part of the general population selected using a systematic procedure as a representation of the whole target population. Emphasis on the dangers of a small sample is in its inability to reproduce the salient characteristics of the target population to an acceptable level (Tromp, 2006).

This study used the stratified random sampling technique in determining the sample. The population in the 22 sub-locations was subdivided into homogeneous subgroups of small-scale farmers (10 farmer groups) and then a simple random sample was taken from each subgroup to ensure that both men and women are equally represented. Purposive sampling was used to identify key informants who enabled the researcher to obtain more information on the issue under study. Purposive sampling technique in this case was preferred because it allowed for the use of cases that have vital information and thus allowed the researcher to obtain in-depth information. The researcher interviewed ten (10) key informants who had information on gender
inequalities in agricultural value chains. This method reduced standard error by providing control over variance and was used to achieve greater statistical significance in a smaller sample. In this study Taro Yamane’s formula was used to determine the total sample size. The formula is assumed to have normal data distribution and was in this manner considered reasonable for deciding a suitable sample from the whole study populace in light of the fact that the investigation included diverse classes of individuals. Hussey (1997) states that an error of less than 10% with a confidence levels higher than 90% in the study sample was acceptable; the study therefore was guided by a sampling error of eight percent to determine the minimum sample size.

Taro Yamane’s (1967) Formulae is shown below:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \]

Where: 
- \( n \) = sample size 
- \( N \) = population size 
- \( e \) = level of precision/sampling error at 0.08

\[ n = \frac{1,210}{1+1,210 (0.08)^2} = 137.9 \]

Therefore 138 respondents were the lowest acceptable number of respondents to maintain a 95% confidence level and 8% sampling error.

**Questionnaire**
The main data collection instrument was the questionnaire. The questionnaires were administered to 150 smallholder farmers (Men and Women) in Ainabkoi Sub-county with the assistance of two research assistants. The farmers were allowed a two weeks period to complete the questionnaires which were then collected for data analysis.

**Interview Schedule Guide**
An interview is an oral administration of questions. They are person-to-person verbal communication where one person asks the other questions intended to illicit information or opinions (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The researcher conducted interviews with 4 service providers and 10 smallholder farmer group officials (Men and Women). The interviews were used to obtain in-depth information and to meet specific objectives of the study. The questions were formal and conversational. The researcher informed the respondents in advance concerning the interview to get their consent and permission. The responses were recorded manually in a notebook and with the use of a voice recorder. The audio responses were then transcribed to facilitate thematic data analysis.

**Focus Group Discussions**
The researcher conducted two Focus Group Discussions of five and six members each drawn from the smallholder farmers. The purpose of focus group discussions was to gain knowledge by discussing with group of people directly affected by the gender inequalities and exploring the depth and nuances of opinions and different perspectives regarding the issue and understanding the factors influencing their opinions. The discussions were guided by Focus Group Discussion questions. During the focus group discussions, the researcher took control of the discussion while the research assistant took notes from the discussions.

**Document Analysis**
The researcher used existing records and documents related to the study. This involved a critical examination of records containing information on the problem under study. Records regarding participation in the smallholder farmer groups and their productivity were analyzed. The records included the group training attendance forms and the productivity forms. Individual farmer records were also assessed. Documents which were analyzed were service provider progress reports (monthly, quarterly and annual) available at the service providers’ libraries. These study reports were audited then analysis and conclusions deduced.

**Research Findings and Discussions**

**Background Information**
The researcher sought to establish the background information of the farmers who participated in the study. From the study, 46.7% of the respondents were male and 53.3% were female (mean=1.53, SD=0.516). The study also reveals that 66.7% of the respondents were aged between 15 and 35 years and 33.3% were aged between 36 and 55 years. 0% was of the age above 56 years. These results are spread over a mean of 1.33 and a standard deviation of 0.488.
Table 1: Background Information of the research respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO FORMAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEYOND SECONDARY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDOWED</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATED/DIVORCED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYED</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMING</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: F- Frequency   %-percentage   S.D-Standard deviation

The study revealed that 40% of the respondents had a certificate of Secondary education, 33% had no formal education, 27% had certificate of primary education, and 4% had certificate level of education and no respondent with education beyond secondary level. These results are spread over a mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 0.884. The findings are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 1: Respondents’ Education Level

Source: Field data 2014
Generally, respondents in the study had attained some formal education. They can be able to read and write. Information is a piece of individuals’ close to home and social capital. The abundance of created nations in exact examinations have discovered that an expansion in ladies’ instruction builds their wage, and these profits to training for ladies are oftentimes more noteworthy than for men. Experimental confirmation additionally demonstrates that a mother’s training positively affects kid survival, instruction and wholesome status (Hubbard and Murphy, 2009). However, overall, women make up most of the small share of adult illiterates in developing countries (UNESCO, 2012). Despite progress in adult women literacy, women still way low below average in literacy rates (World Bank, 2014).

Literacy limitations in this hinders women’s active participation in trainings (Hassan et al, 2014). Various examinations have recommended that absence of instruction openings and preparing can contrarily impact ladies’ self-assurance, and consequently, their cooperation in horticultural esteem chains. This is on the grounds that they may expect that their perspectives won’t be genuinely considered (Coleman and Mwangi, 2012).

Figure 3: Marital status of the respondents

Source: Field data 2014

A proportion of 53% of the respondents revealed that they were married (monogamy), 40% were Single, 7% were widowed and the study indicate that there were no respondents separated or divorced. These results are spread over a mean of 1.73 and a standard deviation of 0.799.

Figure 3 indicates that majority of the respondents were married with no separations or divorcees. A study found that women heads of households are more likely to actively participate in agricultural value chains compared to women in men headed households (Manfre and Rubin, 2012).

Marital status impacts women participation in agricultural value chains as the social norms play a great role. Married women are under the husband’s guide in decision making, owning of property, control of finances and attending to agricultural trainings, (FAO 2014). According to Jagero (2011) unmarried ladies are in a change organize and keeping in mind that there are no legitimate hindrances to the responsibility for,
they don’t possess real types of property in their right,

**Figure 4: Main Occupation of the research respondents**  
*Source: Field data, 2014*

The study reveals that 60% of the respondents were farmers, 20% of the respondents were employed and 20% of the respondents were Business men. These results are spread over a mean of 2.000 and a standard deviation of 0.655. The main occupation of the respondents as shown in Figure 4 is farming. Farmers grow different crops ranging from cereal crop (maize, wheat), horticultural crops (Passion fruits, tomatoes, Irish potatoes) and vegetables (indigenous vegetables, cabbage, and carrots), livestock keeping of dairy cows, sheep and local poultry. The researcher targeted farmers (men and women) who were able to read the questionnaires and respond. Differences in women’s age, marital status, education level, and the type of economic activities in which they engage influences their participation in agricultural value chains.

**Gender Relations in Agricultural Activities**  
The researcher also sought to find out who does agricultural activities regarding gender. The findings are as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural activities in the value chain</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Preparation</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeding</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and Pest Control</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storing</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Source: Field data 2014)*
From the findings in Table 3, 86.7% of the respondents indicate that land preparation is done by male and 13.3% done by female (mean=1.13, SD=0.352). The study also reveals that 60% of the respondents indicate that planting is done by men and 40% by women. The results are spread over a mean of 1.4 and standard deviation of 0.507. 93.3% of the farmers indicated that weeding is done by women. 6.7% of the respondents indicated that weeding is done by men. These results spread over a mean of 1.93 and a standard deviation of 0.28. However, 100% of the farmers revealed that disease and pest control is done by men (mean =1, SD=0). 73.3% of the respondents indicated that harvesting was done by women. However, 26.7% indicated that harvesting was done by men (Mean =1.73, SD =0.458). 53.3% of the respondent revealed that storing is done by men and 46.7% indicate that storing was done by women. These results spread over the mean of 1.47 and standard deviation of 0.516. 60% of the respondent indicated that processing is done by men and 40% indicate that processing is done by women (Mean =3.4 SD = 0.507).

The study indicates that 93.3% of the respondent indicated that Transport of the farm produce is done by men and 6.7% believed that transport is done by women. These results spread over the mean of 1.07 and standard deviation of 0.258.

Sex relations inside the family additionally delimit regions of duty regarding choices over land utilize and arrive administration, oftentimes constraining ladies’ utilization rights to parts of or kinds of land.

**Discussions on Gender Relations in Agricultural Activities**

From the study, land preparation, planting, disease and pest control, storing and transportation to the market are mostly men’s activities while women do the weeding and harvesting as shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6.

![LAND PREPARATION,WEEDING AND PLANTING](image)

**Figure 5: Farming activities done by men and women**

(Source: Field Data, 2014)

Land preparation and planting are mechanically done and some use oxen. The part played by women in this is usually manual as one of the participants pointed out;

“We women do not own mechanical implements (tractors) and they are usually driven by men and when it comes to planting women and children are involved in the hardest manual work.”

Weeding and harvesting are considered women’s activities and are low paying. To emphasize this the respondents during a focus group discussion pointed out that:
“Women being observant and keen the activities of weeding and harvesting fit them because of the care required during weeding and the keenness during harvesting to avoid wastage. The payments are usually low or in-kind example a few two kilogram tin of maize or unga. Women are not selective on work. They do any kind of work as long as it is paying.” Said a male respondent.

“We motivate ourselves to weeding a large field in shortest time possible. Therefore most women lose weight” Said a female respondent.

“We really overwork ourselves when we are weeding.” Said another female respondent.

“Without weeding there is no harvest. The back has to ache to overcome the weeds!” Said a female respondent.

“Goodness, weeding is the most exhausting activity, individuals need to twist down and work painstakingly not to harm the yield, haul out the weeds. In the meantime, you need to complete the activity before the weeds exceed the harvest.” Said a female respondent

“It is weeding that almost kills women!” Said a male participant.

Diseases and Pests are handled by men as shown in figure 6 above. Pesticides are used in the control of diseases and pests. Pesticides are dangerous, and they are defined to execute, lessen or repulse bugs, weeds, rodents, parasites or different life forms that can undermine general wellbeing and the economy. Their method of activity is by focusing on frameworks or compounds in the vermin which might be indistinguishable or fundamentally the same as frameworks or proteins in individuals and along these lines, they posture dangers to human wellbeing and the earth (WHO, 2008).

Disease and pest control involves money, given that men are the ones in control of the household finances they buy the pesticides and hire fellow men to do the spraying or do it by themselves.

Harvesting and storage are done manually. According to FAO, (2010), Ladies play out numerous parts in horticulture and assume a noteworthy part in the process of giving birth concentrated and manual exercises. Men are regularly in charge of farming work that is motorized or connected with more noteworthy pay producing potential. Social conventions and sex stereotyping truly restrain the degree of help.
men give in manual farming work, collecting (FAO, 2010). Storing, processing and transportation are mechanically done. Figure 7 indicates that these activities are carried out mostly by men because produce is seen as cash. To emphasize the respondents during research interview pointed out that;

“Income belongs to men. A harvest implies pay. For a lady, a harvest implies nourishment for the family.”

“At whatever point money is included, men additionally end up included. Men sit tight for the final products [of our work] – that is food at the table!”

![Figure 7: Gender relations in processing and transport in agricultural value chains](image)

Source: Field data, 2014

Women do activities men do but they are invisible, because many activities are either carried outside the home compound or their activities are sometimes not discussed if they go against the Socio-cultural norms of what women should be doing. Field Service provider said;

“Men don’t generally value all the work done by women, notwithstanding when it is increasing constantly. It is ordinary, conventional, and expected, much the same as a dog is relied upon to bark and isn’t valued any more on the off chance that it barks more! Men wed marry spouses to expand the quantity of workers on the farm.”

“Among themselves, men will regularly praise their women and their work, however no man will straightforwardly laud his woman. Men feel that doing as such would ruin their spouses and this will debilitate men’s situation of power in the family.”

“Women do the work; men are in charge!”

In the past, there was an unmistakable qualification between sexual orientation in horticulture. In many countries of the world, men dealt with clearing or working the land before planting, utilizing bull control when they had it. With availability of mechanical cultivator, the men would in like manner grasp that action, by and large the women and children would do the planting by hand. Starting there, all the weeding and harvesting assignments were by and large done by the women. Today, these errands have wound up being obscured. Different men have left the land to work in the towns or neighboring nations. The wonder is so predominant in a few zones that, as per reports accessible in Burkina Faso, ladies here and there speak to as much as at least 80% of the grown-up country populace. In these conditions, ladies have been compelled to go up against assignments that were customarily taken care of by men, far beyond their own particular obligations of hand-planting, weeding and reaping (FAO, 2011).

Notwithstanding when they invest the greater part of their energy working around the local area, men are as yet thought to be the fundamental leaders about cultivating. This
confirms report by FAO, (2011) which says that women, despite their hard work they are not recognized nor are they rewarded. However, women do not necessarily automatically control the income they make from their participation in agricultural value chains. The gendered roles that women play in households reinforced by these social norms affect their ability to interact with other commercial actors in value chains, Kabeer, (2009). Gender limits the nature of economic activities women engage in as well as how they operate them. Many of the current business practices of women may not translate well into the types of demands required to participate in new commercial relationships, Kabeer (2009).

Table 3: Gender inequalities in land use in Ainabkoi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women do not acquire land through inheritance</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not acquire land through leasing</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.330</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not acquire land through buying</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.470</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not have user rights over the land</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land is under the name of the female member of the family</td>
<td>F 20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>1.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 13.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not own land</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The society has no influence on how land is allocated in your family</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 6.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your family household there are separate male plots and female plots</td>
<td>F 60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.070</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 40</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women access to land will not lead to improved agricultural productivity</td>
<td>F 50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.130</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 33.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women decision making over land will not lead to improved agricultural productivity</td>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.070</td>
<td>3.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 26.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: F-frequency %-percentage S.D-Standard deviation SD-Strongly Disagree D- Disagree U- Undecided  A- Agree SA- Strongly Agree

Source: Field data 2014

The study shows that women do not acquire land (60% of the respondents) through inheritance for their agricultural activities (mean=2.00, SD=1.464). However, 86.6% agreed that women do not acquire land through leasing (mean=4.330, SD= 0.976). 89.4% of the respondent also agreed that women do not acquire land through buying for their agricultural activities (mean=4.470, SD=1.06). 80% agreed that women do not have user rights over the land.
for their agricultural activities (mean=4.0, SD=1.41), 69.4% of the farmers however disagreed that the land is under the name of the woman member of the family (mean=3.47, SD=1.598). 80% of the respondent agreed that women do not own land for their agricultural activities (mean=0.378, SD=1.464). 60% also disagreed that the society has no influence on how land is allocated in their family for their agricultural activities (mean=0.364, SD=1.414). 81.4% of the farmers however disagreed that in the family household there are separate male plots and women plots (mean=4.07, SD=1.335). 82.6% also disagreed that women access to land will not lead to improved agricultural productivity (mean=4.13, SD=1.125). 81.4% of the farmers however disagreed that Women decision making over land will not lead to improved agricultural productivity (mean=4.07, SD=1.163).

Table 4: Kurtosis and Skewness land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>S.E. S</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>S.E. K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women do not acquire land through inheritance</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not acquire land through leasing</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not acquire land through buying</td>
<td>2.805</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>8.884</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not have user rights over the land</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land is under the name of the female member of the family</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>-1.253</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not own land</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The society has no influence on land allocation in your family</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your family household there are separate male plots and female plots</td>
<td>-1.803</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women access to land will not lead to improved agricultural productivity</td>
<td>-1.684</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women decision making over land will not lead to improved agricultural productivity</td>
<td>-1.404</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SES-standard error of skewness, SEK-standard error of kurtosis

Source: Field data 2014

The kurtosis results show that the farmers had varied opinions on Women and land use in Ainabkoi Sub-County.

Discussion on Gender inequalities in land use in Ainabkoi Sub-County
The study depicts that women do not acquire land through inheritance for their agricultural activities nor do they acquire land through leasing. In addition, women do not acquire land through buying for their agricultural activities. Women do not have user rights over the land for their agricultural activities in which the finding also indicated that the land is under the name of the male member of the family and agreed that women do not own land for their agricultural activities. This agrees with findings by World Bank, (2011) which announced that women increased (auxiliary) get to rights to their spouses' territory through marriage yet lost (essential) get to rights to their own particular heredity arrive in the meantime. Ladies' failures to hold control over their own genealogy arrive
after marriages were industriously observed as a wellspring of weakness to ladies. It was along these lines prescribed that ladies needed to endeavor to keep up access to their heredity arrive, for instance, by leasing the land out or by planting money crops. Thusly, ladies would not need to “re-apply” for arrive upon come back to their own particular genealogy on account of widowhood or separation. Respondents agreed that the society has influence on how land is allocated in their family for their agricultural activities. Rubin, (2009) says that women access and control of land is restricted to customary and statutory laws and their opportunities to obtain formal ownership is minimal resulting in a significant gender gap in land ownership. To illustrate this male participant said:

“As men we inherit land from our fathers and pass it on to our sons. Women are related to us through marriage which can be revoked in case of divorce or widowhood if the woman decides to re-marry and so does not entitle them to land ownership. Men are not supposed to sell pieces of land to women but to their fellow men. We are to make decisions on land use and management as owners of the land, which does what and when because we control the economic activities in the household.”

“Women are seen as foreigners in their husband’s family.”

In Kenya, 93% of the land is owned by the men, they are the ones to make decisions on how the land is to be utilized, secured and or disposed (NALEP, 2009). Notwithstanding, one reason couple of ladies are lawful landowners is that they regularly need lawful character cards, which are required to enroll land. Lawful rights to land are frequently connected to conjugal status, where people’s rights in marriage are characterized contrastingly under the law (World Bank, 2009). These land reforms have caused gender inequalities because of the traditionally deprived socio-economic position of rural girls. This has conjointly semiconductor diode to inflated vulnerability and unequal access to opportunities and benefits (UN Women, 2012). Normally, there is a family plot of land, controlled by the pioneer of the family, on which every last one of the general population from the family contribute their work. Besides, ladies reliably have littler individual plots appropriated to them by their buddies on whom they make for home use and plan. They may in like way have negligible vegetable yard nurseries for year-round trimming when water is accessible. Now and again, it is the male pioneer of the family who makes sense of what the women create on their plots. The whole family should offer need to tackling the family plot, and if there is another male individual from the family, for instance, an adult youngster, his plot is second in line; and it is just in the wake of completing of work on these plots that women's plots may get thought. Amid the gathering dialog the accompanying were stressed:
Women having user rights to agricultural land will influence their participation in the agricultural value chain as they will fully participate in agricultural activities leading to increased production thus increased incomes and improved food security (Rubin, 2009). Women are disadvantaged compared to men regarding land ownership, documentation of ownership, operations management and decision making. Women have less land and of lower value as compared to the men (Doss et al., 2015).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusion
Despite women playing a great role in the agricultural sector in Kenya, they still experience several challenges; one of which is lack of access and control to agricultural land. While women have common and political rights and can appreciate them, meet rights in marriage and family matters are an alternate inquiry. Men’s dominance in land ownership and decision-making related to agricultural activities, hinder women’s ability to contribute to increased agricultural productivity however they are unpaid and act as farm laborers. Women’s reserved place in the society carries with it numerous related issues which are particularly essential to formal access to land rights; they do a large portion of the work, yet they are fundamentally unpaid farm workers on the land allocated to their spouses. Women’s absence of access and control to land, and the way that the majority of their work isn’t compensated, gives them exceptionally constrained wage or potential outcomes for getting credit. What’s more, they are only sometimes part of basic leadership forms in the family unit, and even choices with respect to credit use on the farm appear to be taken for the most part by the men. With agribusiness fundamentally at the subsistence level and with low money livelihoods, credit is a significant issue for enhancing agricultural productivity. There appears to be ample opportunity to improve agricultural productivity both through increased yields and increased income from agricultural activities. However, such increases will not accrue to women until and unless they have greater access same accessibility and control of land as men. According to FAO (2011), reducing the Gender inequalities could raise yields by 20-30% of the total agricultural output. On the other hand, if we fail to reduce the inequalities as well as the increasing proportion women agriculturalist, agricultural productivity would be low restraining growth and output and indirectly hindering performance of the Agricultural Value Chains.

Recommendations
The recommendations are summarized according to the specific objectives. The recommendations are as follows:
The beneficiaries, men and women smallholder farmers should adopt farming as a family business. Men and women in the household should plan and manage family land for agricultural maximization. The government should strengthen and reform legal and rights-based frameworks along with customary practices, through adequate political will on land issues. Women and men must participate in this process and appropriate resources. Men should be included in finding out the gender difference problem as well sourcing for the solution. Service providers should include both genders to identifying the sex orientation issues in financial services that limit the production and income used to expand agricultural activities. The extension service specialist ought to guarantee and ensure that agricultural programs and services are participatory. It must include the both genders as well offer services at helpful circumstances and areas with the goal that information offered to those most occupied with the agricultural value chains. Extension service specialized organizations should utilize demonstrated correspondence methodologies and suitable correspondence channels to achieve women and additionally men with agricultural data like, holding showings on agricultural fields, making data accessible for free. The legislature should complete a sexual orientation investigation of strategies and methodology to see how people are differentially
influenced by the lawful and administrative situations in the rural agricultural chains.

**Suggestion for Further Research**

i. There is need to carry out similar studies in other counties and establish the level of inequalities in agricultural value chains and devise mechanisms that will reduce the gender inequalities.

ii. There is need to carry out a study on how best women should be involved and motivated to participate in extension services sustainably because their involvement has been identified as critical to the success of any agricultural value chain work.
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