Examining Success Factors for Sustainable Rural Development
through the Integrated Co-operative Model

Section Seven

Annexes One to Twelve

Contents

Annex One: Power Dynamics in Community-Based Research

Dr. Cindy Hanson and Adeyemi Ogundade
University of Regina
Saskatchewan, Canada
March 2016

Introduction

Community-based research (CBR) has emerged as a preferred approach to conducting research that affects disenfranchised groups, because of its egalitarian tenets and its emphasis on building genuine partnerships between the researcher and the community. In this regard, Jacobson and Rugeley (2007) note that CBR engages "marginalized community residents as valued participants in decision-making and community solution-building processes around issues that concern their lives" (22). Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, and Donohue (2003) also characterize CBR as a collaborative enterprise between academic researchers and the community that validates multiple sources of knowledge and has as its goal the pursuit of social action and change to achieve social justice. Over the last decade, a number of requests for proposals have specifically called for CBR research, especially in the field of health research (Blumenthal, 2011; Wallerstein and Duran, 2006). Thus, attempts have been made to better understand the meaning of CBR, the hallmarks of CBR, and the challenges facing CBR partnerships (Israel, Shulz, Parker, Becker 1998; Ochoka and Janzen 2014; Minkler 2005).

Despite the growth of research in CBR, not much is known about how power dynamics influence CBR partnerships. Power dynamics refer to how differences in power among key participants in CBR projects creates tensions and challenges that in turn impact the outcome of research either positively or negatively. This paper will review some of the issues that arise as a result of the interplay of power in two critical CBR partnerships, namely the academic researcher/community partnership and intra- community partnerships. We have chosen to consider the tensions that arise in these partnerships because the literature suggests that the success of any CBR project revolves around trust between academic researchers and the community and solidarity within the community were the issue is being investigated (Isreal et al. 1998; Minkler 2005). Exploring how power differentials influence these relationships will thus go a long way in helping us develop effective CBR partnerships. Second, examining how power impacts partnerships in CBR is also

important because power pervades everything we do, either as researchers or research subjects, and as such, could potentially impact the emancipatory effects of CBR. Power in this sense, is not a discrete entity that is possessed by an individual, but rather is diffuse and can be exercised by multiple actors, within fluid relationships (Foucault 1978).

This paper will draw on a Foucaultian interpretation of power to interpret research in CBR and explore how power differentials among key actors in CBR projects impacts research outcomes. To do this, we will first examine Foucault's notion of power/knowledge and the post-structural idea of discourse, detailing how power only exists relationally. Secondly, we will review literature that highlight the tensions and challenges that arise as a result of power dynamics in key partnerships in CBR projects, showing how Foucault's notion of power/knowledge and the post-structural idea of discourse applies to CBR. Finally, drawing on the literature and our experience in the field, we will suggest a number of adult education facilitation methodologies or tools that have been used to successfully address power differentials in different types of CBR projects. Highlighting tools used to unmask and address power differentials is important because it ensures the CBR project truly addresses issues that concern marginalized communities and not just reinforces existing unequal power structures within communities. Ultimately, we hope to highlight the import of paying special attention to issues of power in CBR, as a means of ensuring CBR programs achieve their objective of combining "research methods and community capacity-building strategies to bridge the gap between knowledge produced through research and translation of this research into interventions and policies" (Viswanathan, et al. 2004, 2).

Foucault's Notion of Power-Knowledge and Post-Structural Discourse

Power has played an important role in defining human relationships and can be defined simply as the ability to influence or impact the actions of others. Numerous scholars have theorized about power, but the thoughts of Michel Foucault stand out because they signal a departure from modernist notions of power (Mansfield 2000). Foucault contrary to modernist thinking posits that power is neither a commodity nor is it solely embodied in a person, institution or structure to be used for organizational or individual purposes (Townley 1993). Townley (1993) notes that Foucault sees power as "relational; it becomes apparent when it is exercised. Because of this relational aspect, power is not associated with a particular institution, but with practices,

techniques, and procedures. Power is employed at all levels, through many dimensions" (520). Thus "he (Foucault) hardly ever uses the word "power" but speaks of "power relations" or "relations of power"" (St. Pierre 2000, 489). It is within the fluid exertions of human relationships that power becomes apparent, constantly shaping and reshaping truth, knowledge, identity and ultimately human relationships themselves. Power is thus constantly at play in human relationships and becomes evident in the truths we acknowledge, the knowledge we hold valid and the social systems we institute to enshrine order in human relations. Foucault in this regard notes that:

> Power must be understood… as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, ….whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies (Foucault 1978, 92).

Thus, for Foucault, the identity and characteristics of individuals in society is produced and reproduced by a relation of power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces (Gordon 1980). Power for Foucault could be seen as not just a negative, coercive force, but it is also a creative force that produces knowledge. Power in this sense is made tangible by the knowledge it creates and Foucault as cited in St. Pierre (2000) notes that "power and knowledge directly imply one another; there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (496). For Foucault, the workings of power and knowledge are so interconnected that it becomes impossible to think of one without the other. This is because "the exercise of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge and accumulates new bodies of information… the exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power" (Gordon 1980, 52). Hall (1989) as cited in Murphy (2012) notes that power "is caught in and constituted by the struggle to prefer among many meanings as the dominant" (4), drawing on established regimes of truth legitimated by existing discourses. Power is thus seen as being "produced in everyday practices of gestures, actions, and discourse" (Murphy 2012, 4).

The post-structural notion of discourse refers to "a way of reasoning (form of logic), with certain truth effects through its impact on practice, anchored in a particular vocabulary that constitutes a particular version of the social world" (Sveningsson and Alvesson 2003, 1171). This depiction of discourse highlights its political nature, by showing that discourses only represent a particular version of reality. The political nature of discourse implies that discourses are always tied to the interests of a particular group of people, who see things in a particular way. Discourses are thus never neutral. But are tied to interests of those in power and generally frame or define the limits of intelligibility in a given situation. This post-structural truism means that discourse and groups, who participate in shaping discourse, wield tremendous power/knowledge in that they can proscribe thought and action. It is in this sense discourses are seen as productive in post-structuralism, in that they work "in a very material way through social institutions to construct realities that control both the actions and bodies of peoples" (St. Pierre 2000, 486). Post-structuralisms avers that discourses produce different subjectivities by creating regimes of truth that frame how people think and act, which in turn constrains what things mean and how people act or perform a specific signifier. In this context, discourses shape the way people perform and "performatives must make sense in order to work; they have to be recognizable, they must continue to be cited" (Youdell 2006, 37). Thus, according to post-structural thinkers like Foucault the individual is "subjectivated- s/he is at once rendered a subject and subjected to relations of power through discourse. That is, the productive power constitutes and constrains, but does not determine, the subject." (Youdell 2006, 37).

When Foucault's conception of power/knowledge and post-structural discourse are applied to CBR, we begin to see that seemingly mundane interactions between the academic researcher and communities are steeped in expressions of power that impact the trajectory of any CBR project. For one, a study by Nation, Bess, Voight, Perkins, and Juarez (2011) suggests that whoever initiates a CBR partnership, whether it is the academic researcher or community members, plays a critical role in framing the discourse, what is intelligible within the project, and ultimately determining what success means for the CBR project. They suggest that whoever initiates the CBR partnership typically has privileged knowledge of the issue to be investigated and is in a better position to dictate research objectives, make administrative decisions, determine data gathering and analysis techniques, and ultimately frame the discourse around such an issue. In

this instance, we begin to see how the power to initiate a CBR partnership is facilitated by the knowledge of problems of import that can be funded and access to information about how to obtain funding to investigate these problems, highlighting the subtle nexus between power and knowledge. Thus, though the goal of CBR is to address the problems facing marginalized communities and hopefully reframe discourse on these issues, the power dynamics between the researcher and community may hamper this goal and lead to exploitative discourses remaining unchallenged.

Nation et al. (2011) indicates that the knowledge and values of the initiator of the CBR project (whether it is the community or the researcher) are typically privileged in the course of the CBR partnership, leading to tensions or discursive frictions that may hamper the research goals of the CBR project. Discursive frictions refer to the "tensions that can arise when various national, social, organizational, and individual cultural differences materialize in our everyday discourse and practices, often privileging, but at times shifting traditional, colonial, and postcolonial power relations" (Murphy 2012, 2). Within the context of CBR partnerships discursive frictions have been shown to occur and the next section will begin to consider two partnerships in which discursive frictions have been shown to arise as a result of the interplay of power.

Power/Knowledge, Academic Researcher/Community Partnership

The relationship between the academic researcher and the community is a key part of CBR and in many regards can be considered the driving force behind its emergence as the preferred approach to dealing with marginalized communities. Ideally in CBR partnerships, research does not just occur in a community as a place or site for gathering data, but rather community members are actively involved in all stages of the research process from determining the issue to be investigated, to the dissemination of results. However, some studies indicate that the relationship between the academy and community is particularly susceptible to the discursive frictions that are a product of power dynamics (Nation et al. 2011; Murphy 2012).

In Nation et al. (2011) the power relationship between the academic researcher and the community is examined to highlight how the method of power sharing plays a central role in determining the kind of engagement that occurs during CBR projects. The study found that in

community-initiated CBR projects, where the community is organized and initiates the partnership with academic researchers on a pre-determined issue, "communities tend to have the most power" (91). They note that this means academic researchers may have to negotiate aspects of the project like the choice of methodology, which changes their role when compared to traditional research and makes the research project more emancipatory for the community, but more problematic for the researcher. Here academic researchers will have to relinquish their privileged position in knowledge production, give up control of the leading role in the research process, and assume more of a pragmatic participant role in the research project, as opposed to being a facilitator of key issues. On the other hand, Nation et al. also note that in situations where academic researchers develop the research agenda and determine the issues before collaborating with the community, the researchers hold most of the power and it becomes difficult to share ownership of the project and engage members of the community meaningfully because the academic researchers have predetermined goals and they may not share the same interests with the community. This could lead to the project being largely researcher driven and issues that concern the community may be ignored in favour of the researcher's academic interests.

A case study of an international CBR partnership between US government sponsored academics (USACAD) and a Kenyan non-governmental organization (KNGO) in Murphy (2012), highlights how power and knowledge are interconnected, diffuse, non-linear and complex, and constantly being exercised by both partners in the CBR relationship "from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations" (Foucault 1978, 94). The study set out to establish a program that helps build the KNGO's capacity to implement family-based curricula on HIV/AIDS. Members of the USACAD team found it difficult to get a timely response from the KNGO team on the items to be included on the agenda for a training workshop. The KNGO team eventually responded to the USACAD team's requests, but the agenda sent to the American team turned out to be radically different from what they expected, with references to anal sex as being a type of sexual act that could lead to the transmission of HIV/AIDS removed from the agenda. This led to discursive frictions between the teams, with the USACAD claiming that their position on anal sex was scientifically backed, while the KNGO team refuted their claim, noting that the supposedly dominant scientific position "promoted homosexuality" and contravened the religious, cultural and political beliefs of the Kenyan people. Thus:

> While the KNGO, as the south partner, is placed positionally as the partner "in need", they continually exercise power based on their cultural knowledge and expertise. In this example, the U.S partners' strategies to use/impose a particular knowledge system and language practice were rerouted to accommodate Kenyan cultural norms. And numerous attempts at negotiating ways to overtly connect certain sexual practices and HIV/AIDS transmission through the USACAD's direct communication style were met with a "respectful" silence *"* (Murphy 2012, 10).

Here we can see how by remaining silent and refusing to compromise on certain language the KNGO group exerts power in the relationship despite the fact that the partnership is being funded by the American team. This case highlights the Foucaultian notion of power being diffuse and continually being (re)negotiated by different partners in a CBR relationship. Thus, though the "USCAD may have the technical knowledge and control the economic power (they secured the U.S. funded grant), however, KNGO has the practical knowledge and controls the local cultural power" (Murphy 2012, 10), which in turn allowed the Kenyan team control the discourse about HIV/AIDS transmission. The fact that power is relational makes it malleable and allows for all participants in such relations to exert some control over others in CBR partnerships.

Power/Knowledge and Intra-Community Partnerships in CBR

During CBR projects discursive frictions occur not only between academic researchers and community partners but also among various community partners (Cullen, Lema, Tucker, Snyder and Duncan, 2013; Nation et al. 2011). Here you find that communities are not monoliths and that there are "several community constituencies who both contribute and (at times) compete to influence the project. Because of this, many of the issues that develop are not tensions between the community partners and the researchers, but instead among community partners" (Nation et al. 2011, 95). Discursive frictions within communities speak to the Foucaultian notion of power being relational and exercised even within supposedly familial community relations. Power pervades communal relations were competing interests and values arise that impact the outcome of a CBR study. For instance, marginalized groups within the community may feel less inclined to participate in the CBR project if they feel the views of certain community partners dominate the research. Academic researchers will find it difficult to navigate a scenario where community partners have opposing interests and may want to influence research outcomes to suit their interest leading to tensions.

In fact, a CBR study of ways to improve natural resource management (NRM) in the highlands of Ethiopia by Cullen et al. (2013) indicates that it is indeed precarious for academic researchers to navigate the power dynamics in a community with different factions and competing interests. The study also indicates that even within innovative community-based partnerships with commonly agreed upon issues to be studied, views of more powerful members of the community tend to dominate thus further marginalizing weaker members of the community. In this case, the views of government partners were being advanced over and above the views of farmers in the community. Even though government representatives and farmers in the community ideally ought to share common interests, the study revealed that government representatives had longer term goals while farmers in the community had goals that addressed more immediate, existential needs. Differences in power between groups within a community at times influences whose knowledge is adopted and shared in the CBR project. In Cullen et al.,

> … initially farmer knowledge was not valued during platform discussions. During early platform meetings, decision-makers frequently complained about farmer ignorance of key issues, their lack of knowledge of NRM, backward or inappropriate farming practices and short-term visions. This did not create a favorable environment for the sharing of farmer knowledge and represented a major barrier to innovation (83).

We find here that even within communities, power differences exist and these differences are played out in ways that may hamper the dissemination of knowledge of marginalized groups and thus perpetuate discourses that undermine their interests and advance the interests of community members in positions of power. The link between power and knowledge is made evident in this case as the knowledge of farmers is initially ignored because they lack the education and credentials of government officials and the power and social standing that goes with being educated.

Miltenburg et al. (2013) illustrate Foucault's notion of power/knowledge and its relational dynamic by showing that multiple and competing knowledge structures exist among community partners in a community-based maternal health project in Tanzania. The study shows that partnership between stakeholders in a community especially when it comes to an important issue like maternal health outcomes are "difficult as perception of health are based on diverse knowledge cultures formed by different experiences, forms of enquiry and to some extent even

languages" (163). Further stakeholders within the community are influenced by affiliations to groups with varied histories, structures, and interests. The power hierarchy among community stakeholders has been shown to be an impediment to collective learning which is at the heart of any CBR project (Brown, 2010). In Miltenburg et al., the study highlights a disconnect between the knowledge of women in communities who receive maternal health services and the knowledge of health care providers such as nurses/midwives and clinicians within the healthcare institutions charged with providing services to reduce maternal mortality. Thus, discursive tensions exist between women in the community and community health care providers, with both groups having "markedly different perspectives on causes of delay to reaching appropriate care, based on different knowledge cultures" (175). The authors also note that because health care providers have formal education and biomedical expertise, they are placed in positions where their knowledge is privileged over that of the expecting mother. This sometimes leads to oppressive hierarchical power relations and reluctance among expecting mothers to avail themselves of health services provided. Overall the study indicates that including the local knowledge of mothers and cultivating an atmosphere of trust, respect and inclusiveness are critical principles to achieving successful partnerships within communities. Consequently, using adult education facilitation techniques in CBR projects could serve as a useful tool to resolving the discursive tensions that are bound to arise within communities. The next section will explore some methods that have been used to foster inclusiveness, trust and respect both between academic researchers and communities and within the community in CBR projects.

Addressing Power Dynamics in Community-Based Research

Adult education facilitation methods have been shown to be useful in addressing power differentials in CBR. One approach that has gained prominence is the use of photo-voice as a means of bringing to the fore the voice, experiences, knowledge, and narratives of marginalized groups and helps reshape discourse to address issues that concern these groups (Becker, Reiser, Lambert, and Covello 2014; Casteldon, Garvin, and Huu-ay-aht First Nation 2008). Photo-voice is an advocacy and research technique that sets out to influence systems and policies by using "photographic images taken by persons with little money, power, or status to enhance community needs assessment, empower participants, and induce change by informing policy makers of community assets and deficits" (Strack, Magill, and McDonagh 2004, 49).

Becker et al. (2014) used photo-voice during a CBPR project in mental health to bring to the fore the voice, experiences, and perspectives of community members who use mental health services "in an attempt to engage their expertise on what is working within the mental health system and what needs to be changed" (191). The goal of the study was to address the stigma, prejudice, isolation and discrimination experienced by individuals with mental health needs from the public, mental health and health care professionals and themselves. The photo-voice technique in this study helped create new narratives and knowledge of what it means to be diagnosed with a mental disease and highlighted the stigma associated with individuals diagnosed with mental health issues leading to a push for change in mental health services and policy. This study highlights how photo-voice has been used as a tool to give voice to previously marginalized groups and influence power dynamics by changing our knowledge of issues and shedding light on silenced perspectives. In the context of CBR, photo-voice can be used to shed light on the narratives of marginalized groups within the community and thus helps foster inclusiveness, trust, and social cohesion, factors critical to co-learning necessary for CBR to succeed.

Participatory video is another community engagement facilitation tool that has been shown to be effective in challenging hierarchies in power structures in communities (Cullen et al. 2013). Participatory video is a technique similar to photo-voice but involves the use of videos instead of photographic images to capture the voice and perspectives of marginalized groups. In Cullen et al., it was "used to empower farmers, who were trained to use video to record their problems and their points of view" (81), while the resulting videos were shown to community members in charge of agricultural policy to increase their awareness of farmer issues.

References

Becker, K., Reiser, M., Lambert, S., and Covello, C. (2014). "Photo-voice: Conducting community-based participatory research and advocacy in mental health." *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health* 9 (2): 188–209.

Blumenthal, D.D. (2011). "Is community-based participatory research possible?" *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 40 (3): 386–89.

Brown, V.A. (2010). "Multiple knowledges, multiple languages: Are the limits of my knowledge the limits of my world?" *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* 6 (2): 120–31.

Castleden, H., Garvin, T., and Huu-ay-aht First Nation. (2008). "Modifying photovoice for community-based participatory indigenous research." *Social Science and Medicine* 66 (1): 1393–1405.

Cullen, B., Lema, Z., Tucker, J., Snyder, K., and Duncan, A. (2013). "Navigating power dynamics in innovation platforms: Lessons from the Blue Nile basin, Ethiopia." Proceedings of the International Workshop on Agricultural Innovation Systems in Africa, Nairobi, Kenya, 29–31 May 2013, pp.79–84.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality volume 1: An introduction*. New York: Random House.

Gordon, C., ed. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972–1977,* by Michel Foucault. New York: Pantheon Books.

Israel, B., Schulz, A., Parker, E., and Becker, A. (1998). "Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improving public health." *Annual Review of Public Health* 19 (1): 173–202.

Jacobson, M., and Rugeley, C. (2007). "Community-based participatory research: Group work for social justice and community change." *Social Work with Groups* 30 (4): 21–39. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J009v30n04_03

Mansfield, N. (2000). "Foucault: The subject and power." In *Subjectivity: Theories of the Self from Freud to Haraway*, ed. N. Mansfield. First Ed., pp. 51–65. New York: University Press.

Miltenburg, A., Rijkers, E., Maselle, N., Barass, J., Rossmalen, J., and Bunders, J. (2013). "Reflections on the dynamics of the coexistence of multiple knowledge cultures in a community-based maternal health project in Tanzania." *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* 9 (2): 162–84.

Minkler, M. (2005). "Community-based research partnerships: Challenges and opportunities." *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 82 (2): 3–12. doi:10.1093/jurban/jti034.

Murphy, A.E. (2012). "Discursive frictions: Power, identity, and culture in an international working partnership." *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 6 (1): 1–20.

Nation, M., Bess, K., Voight, A., Perkins, D., and Juarez, P. (2011). "Levels of community engagement in youth violence prevention: The role of power in sustaining successful university-community partnerships." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 48 (1): 89–96.

Ochoka, J., and Janzen, R. (2014). "Breathing life into theory, illustrations of community-based research: Hallmarks, functions and phases." *International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* 7: 18–33.

St. Pierre, E.A. (2000). "Poststructural feminism in education: An overview." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 13 (5): 477–515.

Strack, R.W., Magill, K., and McDonagh, K. (2004). "Engaging youth through photovoice." *Health Promotion Practice* 5 (1): 49–58.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., and Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. San Franscico: Jossey-Bass.

Sveningsson, S., and Alvesson, M. (2003). "Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle." *Human Relations* 56 (10): 1163–93.

Townley, B. (1993). "Foucault, Power/Knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management." *The Academy of Management Review* 18 (3): 518–45.

Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Garlehner, G., Lohr, K.N., Griffith, D., Rhodes, S., Samuel-Hodge, C., Maty, S., Lux, L., Webb, L., Sutton, S.F., Swinson, T., Jackman, A., and Whitener, L. (2004). *Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence.* North Carolina: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Wallerstein, N.B., and Duran, B. (2006). "Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities." *Health Promotion Practice* 7 (3): 312–23. doi:10.1177/1524839906289376.

Youdell, D. (2006). "Diversity, inequality, and a post-structural politics for education." *Discourse: Studies in Cultural Politics of Education* 27 (1): 33–42.

Annex Two: Annotated Bibliography of Research in Community Engagement and Participatory Research in Africa

Annotated Bibliography of Theoretical Expositions in Community Engagement and Community-Based Research

Adeyemi Ogundade
Graduate Student
University of Regina
Saskatchewan, Canada
March 2016

Annotated Bibliography of Research in Community Engagement and Participatory Research in Africa

Bernard, T., and D.J. Spielman. (2009). "Reaching the rural poor through rural producer organizations? A study of agricultural marketing cooperatives in Ethiopia." *Food Policy* 34 (1): 60–69.

This paper explores the concept of inclusiveness (a form of community engagement) in rural producer organizations (RPO) in Ethiopia and its effects on how RPOs meet the goal of marketing agricultural outputs. The authors are of the opinion that being inclusive or engaging the community for rural co-operatives in Ethiopia means: open membership to all individuals, all individuals irrespective of membership benefit from the activities of the organization and the extent to which a participatory decision-making model pervades the organization. The findings of the study indicate that the poorest farmers tend to be excluded from membership in marketing co-operatives in Ethiopia either because of high membership costs, or farmers voluntarily choosing not to participate because of the perceived low returns of membership. The authors identify education and land holding as significant statistical variables that influence household participation in rural marketing co-operatives, highlighting the importance of co-operative adult education programs to increasing community involvement in agricultural co-operatives. This paper offers us unique insight into the factors that influence community engagement in agricultural co-operatives in Ethiopia.

Kamanda, A., L. Embleton, D. Ayuku, L. Atwoli, P. Gisore, S. Ayaya, R. Vreeman, and P. Braitstein. (2013). "Harnessing the power of the grassroots to conduct public health research in sub-Saharan Africa: A case study from western Kenya in the adaptation of community-based participatory research (CBPR) approaches." *BMC Public Health* 13 (91): 1–10. http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/13/91.

This paper illustrates how community-based participatory research approaches and principles where integrated in a longitudinal research study design in sub-Saharan Africa. The study sets out to evaluate the effects of different care environments on the physical and mental health outcomes of orphans and children separated from their families in western Kenya. The study describes how a CBPR framework was used to identify the research problem, plan, implement, evaluate, and disseminate the findings of the research study. The study illustrates how a longitudinal study of this magnitude could not be achieved without the active involvement of the community in all stages of the research process. The study is an example of how community-based participatory research can be used to empower communities and draw on the expertise of the community to identify and solve social problems in Africa. The authors note that the majority of literature on CBPR is from Canada and the United States and they set out to show how adopting a CBPR approach positively impacts research outcomes in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mosavel, M., C. Simon, D. Van Stade, and M. Buchbinder. (2005). "Community-based participatory research (CBPR) in South Africa: Engaging multiple constituents to shape the research question." *Social Science & Medicine* 61 (12): 2577–87. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.041.

This article details the workings of a research project using community-based participatory research in a South African community. The authors show how the act of engaging in genuine dialogue with community members led to a change in the focus of their research project. The authors note that their research question changed from examining the risk factors associated with cervical cancer, to a broader emphasis on cervical health and its relation to the larger context of community health, as a result of dialogue with community members. The article shows that by building relationships rooted in affect and trust, researchers and community stakeholders can begin to make meaning of the world around them and make goals that serve both the communities and the researcher's interests. This article details an instance of genuine "transformational engagement", where the research question and goal is radically altered based on a commitment to genuine dialogue that is the hallmark of the community-based participatory

research model. Overall, this article serves as an exemplar showing how transformational community engagement works in practice in the field of health care research in Africa.

Nelson, F., and A. Agrawal. (2008). "Patronage or participation? Community-based natural resource management reform in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Development and Change* 39 (4): 557–85.

This article takes a look at the institutional impediments to efforts to decentralize control of natural resources to local communities in seven countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. Though community engagement is not highlighted as a key concept in this article, the focus on the political and institutional conditions that either advance or hamper community-based natural resource management speaks to the institutional environment that shapes community engagement activities and determines its success. Overall, this article offers us insight into the legal, political, economic, and administrative conditions that frame community engagement practices in Sub-Saharan Africa relating to natural resource management.

Participants in the community engagement and consent workshops in Kenya. (2011). "Consent and community engagement in diverse research contexts." *Journal on Empirical Research on Human Ethics Research: An International Journal* 8 (4): 1–18.

This paper reviews current thinking about and experience of community engagement and consent in health research in varied contexts. The article carries out a review of the literature examining the meaning of research consent and community engagement and explores the link between these concepts. The authors detail the contested meaning of community engagement and explore issues around what it means for an individual to "represent" a community during engagement activities. The paper highlights the importance of clarifying the scope of community engagement goals and also offers insight into how community engagement is viewed in African countries like Kenya by using case studies.

Rein, M., and L. Stott. (2009). "Working together: Critical perspectives on six cross-sector partnerships in Southern Africa." *Journal of Business Ethics* 90 (Suppl. 1): 79–89. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9915-9

This article carries out an analysis of formal partnerships meant to foster community engagement in Southern African countries. One of the key issues the article raises is that contextual factors like culture, and political conditions, may either enhance or impede the development of

partnerships that foster genuine engagement between non-governmental organizations and the community. The study shows that in partnerships between non-governmental organizations and communities analyzed in Southern Africa, none of the partnership structures had provisions for a collective decision-making apparatus, leading to the absence of teamwork, power-sharing, and consensus building. This state of affairs has led to the community's interests being supplanted by the "development priorities" of project partners and outside organizations. The article indicates that the absence of a continual partnership evaluation process leads to less engagement with the community over time. The article offers insight into the workings of partnerships targeted at fostering community engagement in Southern African countries between 2003 and 2005.

Tindana, P.O., L. Rozmovits, R.F. Boulanger, S.V. Bandewar, R.A. Aborigo, A.V. Hodgson, and J.V. Lavery. (2011). "Aligning community engagement with traditional authority structures in global health research: A case study from northern Ghana." *American Journal of Public Health* 101 (10): 1857–67. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300203.

This article offers evidence supporting the efficacy of community engagement practices for biomedical researchers in developing countries when aligned with traditional authority structures. The study details how preexisting authority structures of a community in Ghana helped facilitate community engagement and a sense of control of the research process by the community, which in turn fostered increased community involvement in the research project. The paper highlights the importance of aligning research goals and objectives to traditional values, culture and mores and offers some guidance to researchers on how to carryout community engagement practices in Africa in public health research. Using a qualitative interview method of data collection, the authors found that using traditional authority structures familiar to the community helped create buy in and trust, which in turn, fostered community participation and engagement. The study also highlights the limitations of using traditional authority structures to foster community engagement in research in Africa. Limitations identified include the absence of gender equality in some traditional settings and the need to invest vast amounts of time and resources to cultivate relationships within communities.

Tindana, P., J. Singh, C. Tracy, R. Upshur, A. Daar, P. Singer, J. Frohlich, and J. Lavery. (2007). "Grand challenges in global health: Community engagement in research in developing countries." *PLoS Medicine* 4 (9): e273. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040273

The paper sets out to outline how community engagement has been conceived of and used to advance health research in developing countries. The authors show that the concept of community engagement is unsettled by highlighting the contentions in the meaning of community and engagement in research circles. The paper details the goals of community engagement in health research and reviews conceptual models of community engagement prominent in the health research literature. The authors also detail how community engagement approaches have been used in specific contexts, highlighting its practicality.

Annotated Bibliography of Theoretical Expositions in Community Engagement and Community-Based Research

Blumenthal, D.S. (2011). "Is community-based participatory research possible?" *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 40 (3): 386–89. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2010.11.011.

This paper carries out a review of community-based research highlighting the fundamental assumptions underlying the methods used in this approach and detailing the unique challenges facing the CBPR model. The paper identifies two pillars of CBPR, the first being the ethically sensitive attitude the researcher possesses in response to the history of exploitation of communities. The second pillar the author identifies is the pursuit of research practices that engender community empowerment. The author also identifies a number of ongoing challenges to CBPR. Challenges like the need to ensure "equitable community participation in every phase of the research project" (387) are seen as critical to reconfiguring the balance of power between the community and researcher. Overall, the paper offers an abridged overview of the CBPR landscape, detailing challenges facing the model and possible solutions.

Head, B.W. (2007). "Community engagement: Participation on whose terms?" *Australian Journal of Political Science* 42 (3): 441–54. doi:10.1080/10361140701513570.

This article examines the concept of community engagement, highlighting its ambiguous nature and how different interpretations of community engagement have emerged. The authors state

that different interpretations of community engagement in discourse depend on the orientation of the individual or organization promoting community engagement. They distinguish the traditional managerial orientation in community engagement, which relies on hierarchical structures of control, from the critical orientation in community engagement, which espouses wide spread power-sharing and substantive dialogue that leads to change. The paper details different types of community engagement activities and examines reasons why the government, business sector, and community groups get involved in community engagements activities of different types. The paper also highlights six learning challenges facing those who get involved in community engagement activities. The author suggests that there is little evidence the critical orientation to community engagement has taken hold in policy discourse. Overall, this paper offers a detailed review of the community engagement literature that allows the reader better understand the complex terminology that animates discourse.

Israel, B.A., A.J. Schulz, E.A. Parker, and A.B. Becker. (1998). "Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health." *Annual Review of Public Health* 19: 173–202.

This paper carries out a detailed review of the literature in community-based research and other participatory forms of research, with the goal of distilling key characteristics of community-based research. The paper examines the practice of community-based research within the context of different scientific paradigms and notes that different epistemological paradigms inform different practices of community-based research. The authors discuss the rationales used to justify community-based research and explore the challenges faced in conducting effective community-based research. The authors highlight the fact that multiple ways of knowing have informed community-based research, leading to a diversity of methods and conceptions of what community-based research should look like. They note that within the field of public health, the positivist epistemological paradigm dominates research practice and show how the community-based research approach draws from a constructivist and critical theoretical paradigm. The paper also highlights eight key principles that characterize community-based research and discuss different rationales for adopting a community-based research approach.

Minkler, M. (2005). "Community-based research partnerships: Challenges and opportunities." *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 82 (2): 3–12. doi:10.1093/jurban/jti034.

This paper explores the historical roots and core principles of CBPR and illustrates how the CBPR approach adds value to urban health research. Using examples from various international settings like South Africa, the author reviews some of the ethical challenges faced by researchers adopting the CBPR model. The author identifies ethical challenges like identifying a community driven issue, insider-outsider tensions, dilemmas in sharing and releasing findings, and challenges in the action dimension of CBPR, as important challenges to surmount if a CBPR project is to be considered successful. The paper offers insight into the nature and workings of the CBPR process and challenges involved in the practice of CBPR.

Stanton, C.R. (2014). "Crossing methodological borders: Decolonizing community-based participatory research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20 (5), 573–83. doi:10.1177/1077800413505541.

This paper positions CBPR as a tool that facilitates the decolonization of knowledge and a means of fostering empowerment in indigenous communities. The article explores the potential of CBPR to challenge the epistemological assumptions of mainstream research and implement decolonizing theory in indigenous communities. The author notes that different epistemologies underpin different approaches to research and that an epistemology that values partnership and collaborative meaning making embodies the epistemological orientation of both indigenous communities and CBPR researchers. The paper suggests similar epistemological assumptions underpin CBPR and indigenous knowledge systems and consequently positions the CBPR approach as ideal for decolonizing research methodologies when considering issues in indigenous communities. The paper illustrates how the CBPR approach helped the author conduct research that realigned the power differential between the University academy and the indigenous community, and ensured research was respectful, relevant, reciprocal, and responsible. Overall the paper highlights the importance of adopting CBPR approaches in conducting research with disenfranchised and oppressed groups.

Wallerstein, N.B., and B. Duran. (2006). "Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities." *Health Promotion Practice* 7 (3): 312–23. doi:10.1177/1524839906289376.

This article highlights the ethical tensions and challenges that have arisen in the relationship between academic and community partners as a result of the increased use of CBPR. The authors use examples to illustrate the tensions and paradoxes involved in CBPR and recommend transforming the culture within the academy as a means of alleviating these tensions. The authors identify knowledge interests, shifting involvement, community consent, and the challenge of race, racism and discrimination, as a few paradoxes creating tensions in the relationship between the academy and community. The article points to the structural, hierarchical, and instrumental cultures in Universities as a major factor creating tensions between scholars who would like to engage in CBPR and the community. The authors suggest incorporating the values of integrity and humility as the most effective way of alleviating tensions and paradoxes between the academy and community during CBPR.

Annex Three: Annotated Bibliography of the Determinants of Co-operative Success in Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda

Terra Brockett and Dr. JoAnn Jaffe
University of Regina
Saskatchewan, Canada
March 2016

> Bernard, T., M.-H. Collion, A. De Janvry, P. Rondot, and E. Sadoulet. (2008). "Do Village Organizations Make a Difference in African Rural Development? A Study for Senegal and Burkina Faso." *World Development* 36 (11): 2188–2204.

This study examines the performance and benefits of village organizations (producer organizations that are either market-oriented (MO) or community-oriented (CO) organizations). The researchers identify the growing presence of producer organizations in West Africa. They identify that membership within these organizations crosses socio-economic classes and that the returns to investment for the members is consistent and does not reflect elite capture or corruption because of internal controls. Instead they identify limited managerial capacity despite training and clearly defined processes and transparency that leads to limited impacts on communities. Determinants of MO and CO include community size, geographical location, economic environment, and ethnic diversity (higher in MO which does not require the same shared norms). The researchers note potential resistance to MO co-operative formation as it focuses on members increased economic gains that has the potential to challenge traditional forms of authority. They also identify that increased controls of COs improved their potential to meet the needs of a range of socio-economically vulnerable people within the community as they are regulated by egalitarian principles. These same guiding principles and controls are understood to have a negative impact on the efficiency of MOs as equitable sharing of benefits with the larger community through the production of services is framed as a sort of tax on MOs that decreases their efficiency in meeting members' financial needs.

Key words: poverty reduction, co-operative characteristics and goals

Bernard, T., and D.J. Spielman. (2009). "Reaching the rural poor through rural producer organizations? A study of agricultural marketing cooperatives in Ethiopia." *Food Policy* 34 (1): 60–69.

This research examines the limited inclusiveness of rural producer organizations in Ethiopia. Specifically, it identifies the limited membership of the poorest members of *kebeles* (due to low returns to and the high cost of membership), the limited access of poorer members to decision making (through management committees), and minimal benefits to the non-members (such as decline on input costs and information sharing on different educational workshops). It briefly identifies previous government regulation of co-operatives as a potential reason for limited membership. Note: They identify a trade-off between inclusive membership, participatory decision making and market success. (In terms of social cohesion this follows Putnam —where diversity (needs/ goals) breaks down cohesion and in turn limits outcome).

Key words: social inclusion/exclusion (individual and structural); cohesion; poverty reduction

Birchall, J. (2003). *Rediscovering the Co-operative Advantage: Poverty Reduction through Self-help*. Geneva: International Labor Organization.

This report examines the relationship between co-operative formation and poverty reduction in both "developed" and "developing" countries. It outlines the concepts of poverty and co-operative, the history of co-operatives and uses nine case studies to explore the diverse outcomes and determinants of co-operative success. In chapter four it concludes with factors for successful co-operative projects. These factors include: members involvement in the planning process; the initial start of pilot projects at the community or local level; flexibility in the planning process; cost-effective projects with somewhat flexible budgets; projects that are able to address multiple conditions of poverty in order to better sustain themselves (through addressing health and education for example), focus on women; human resource development at management and membership level; and as a result of monitoring and self-evaluation the project should be replicable.

Key words: poverty reduction and co-operative characteristics

Birchall, J., and R. Simmons. (2009). *Co-operatives and Poverty Reduction: Evidence from Sri Lanka and Tanzania.* Manchester: The Co-operative College.

This article outlines how different forms of co-operatives (multipurpose, agricultural, credit, industrial) reduce poverty. It looks at the different forms of poverty and what is termed "poverty traps," which include:

- the need for child labour (decreasing children's access to education)
- uninsurable risk (the risk of investing already minimal resources into income generation)
- debt bondage
- lack of information (long work hours lead to limited access to information about alternative or better jobs)
- poor nutrition and illness
- low skill
- high fertility
- forced subsistence (no market access to sell products)
- farm erosion
- collective action traps (tied to the costs of collective action)
- mental health issues (depression)

The article identifies that co-operatives can deal with these different issues tied to poverty but that there were also factors that limit their success. These factors include:

- limited training
- financing of capital projects
- limited skill development, technical resources, and marketing support and access (there are limits to the amount of income that can be generated from local markets)
- the role of the government (where government involvement and regulation led to less democratically run co-operatives)
- lack of trust due to past dysfunctional management
- lengthy processing of paper work (because of government regulation)

The researchers identify the needs for financial support to diversify and expand, improved training and knowledge for members to increase productivity, and improved infrastructure (roads) to increase access to markets. In terms of government involvement and legislation, they identify the need for an autonomous co-operative sector, minimal government regulation, and support focused on co-operative registration and enabling co-operative movement to reach its full potential.

Key words: determinants of poverty, poverty reduction for multiple forms of poverty, barriers to potential outcomes of co-operatives

Chikaire, J., F.N. Nnadi, C.O. Osuagwu, M.N. Oguegbuchulam, J. Oparaojiaku, A.A. Jamilu, and T. Osigwe. (2011). "Cooperatives — A Vehicle for Rural Development: The Case of Ahiazu Mbaise Area of Imo State, Nigeria." *Nature and Science* 9 (11): 6–11.

This article offered a brief overview of the benefits of and barriers to co-operative membership and development in Imo State, Nigeria. The benefits highlighted included improved community infrastructure, general knowledge of co-operatives, increased access to education, and increased income generation through improved market participation. The barriers included a discussion on government support and co-operative characteristics including management skills and co-operative policy, education and working knowledge of co-operatives for employees and members, and lack of credit and technical support.

Key words: co-operative characteristics and external factors (government and infrastructure)

Develtere, P., I. Pollet, and F. Wanyama. (2008). *Co-operating out of poverty: The renaissance of the African cooperative movement*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

This book starts with a description of the different colonial influences on co-operative formation before market liberalization in the 1980s and '90s. It looks at co-operatives in eleven African countries. Specifically, it starts to locate employment creation, poverty reduction, social protection and visibility, voice and representation within government through strong vertical co-operative structures in each country.

Key words: poverty reduction; external factors (historic role of co-operatives and government); social inclusion/exclusion (through the existence of apex organizations that act as a voice for the co-operatives nationally).

Dorsey, J., and T. Assefa. (2005). *Final Evaluation Report of Agricultural Cooperatives in Ethiopia (ACE) Program Activities*. Washington DC: The Mitchell Group.

This article evaluates ACE guided co-operatives in Ethiopia. It highlights determinants of success such as:

- training in different aspects of co-op development for members/board/staff and managers
- hiring professional staff and managers in place of part-time volunteers
- quick-return dividends to maintain membership and encourage new membership
- vertical integration

Key words: organizational characteristics (structural and technical)

Fischer, E., and M. Qaim. (2012). "Linking Smallholders to Markets: Determinants and Impacts of Farmer Collective Action in Kenya." *World Development* 40 (6): 1255–68.

This research identifies determinants of participation in co-operatives for small banana farmers in Kenya. Specifically, the authors compare demographics such as farm size, age, and education of co-operative members and nonmembers in terms of their differentiated economic outcomes. The authors identify a middle-class effect where wealthier farmers did not participate in co-operatives and the returns to the poorest members did not lead to higher financial benefits.

Key words: demographic determinants and poverty reduction

Gray, Thomas. (2007). "Business structure helps producers address power disparity in the market place." *Rural Cooperatives*. Online at www.rurdev.usda.gov/rbs/pub/may07/may07.pdf

This article discusses the necessary role of common belief systems, grievances and identities, participation and leadership during the mobilization of co-operatives. Gray identifies the initial process of co-operative formation starting with a shared grievance among people who discuss and work as a group to construct a shared understanding of their grievance and to plan a resolution. Through leadership that initially facilitates this process and later guides the goals of resolution, co-operatives form as members build a collective identity that is reproduced and deepened through their participation in the co-operative.

Key words: key characteristics of co-operatives during formation

Ihenacho, R.A., J. Chikaire, N. Ejiogu-Okereke, M.N. Oguegbuchulam, C.O. Osuagwu, and K.U. Obi. (2009). "Empowerment Strategies of Cooperative Societies for Poverty Reduction among Members in Aboh Mbaise Area of Imo State, Nigeria." *Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science* 1 (8): 233–39.

This research on the benefits and barriers to co-operatives focuses the Aboh Mbaise area of Imo, Nigeria. The researchers identify what they term empowerment strategies that are fundamental to reducing poverty through co-operative formation. For them, co-operative strategies that work to reduce poverty include:

- creating employment opportunities
- developing marketing services
- giving voice to members

- building financial services
- facilitating bargaining power
- providing educational support and training for members
- increasing women's membership
- building social cohesion
- creating social protection
- exchanging mutual aid and labour

Barriers to poverty reduction through co-operatives include:
- low literacy rates and skills of members
- gender norms and cultural beliefs
- lack of credit and government funding
- the location of members
- ineffective land rights
- poor management and corruption
- lack of prior co-operative training for members and staff.
-

Key words: co-operative characteristics and goals, and poverty reduction

> Nkuranga, T., and K. Wilcox. (2013). *Cooperative Performance Index — Field Results and Analysis of Cooperatives in Rwanda.* Rwanda: USAID, Enabling Market Integration through Rural Group Empowerment (EMIRGE).

This article quantitatively highlights the level of success of eighty-five co-operatives in Rwanda using the co-operative performance index (CPI) created by EMIRGE. It specifically looked at the legal status of co-operatives, co-operative planning and strategies, management structures and accounting systems, production and quality of inputs, market linkages and relationships, and membership and member-retention strategies. The descriptions are brief and mainly presented through graphs. The intention of the CPI is to identify strengths and weaknesses within co-operatives to better support them.

Key words: organizational characteristics

> Majurin, Eva. (2012). *How women fare in East African cooperatives: The case of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.* Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: International Labour Office.

This article explains in detail the barriers to women's access to co-ed co-operatives;
- lack of land holding
- control over finances
- education

- social location within family and community
- limited government funding to support women's participation

The article highlights the changes necessary to allow women to participate more effectively in co-operatives and discusses the determinants for successful women-only co-operatives through identifying best practices.

Key words: poverty reduction, social inclusion/exclusion, reduction in inequality, and organizational characteristics

Jones, Elaine, Sally Smith, and Carol Wills. (2012). "Women producers and the benefits of collective forms of enterprise." *Gender & Development* 20 (1): 13–32.

This article discusses the economic and social benefits of women producer collectives in the informal economy (free trade) in seven countries including Tanzania, Kenya, and Uganda. It examines a range of outcomes such as:

- improved income
- ability to diversify products
- knowledge sharing to improve products and social networks
- expanded markets and marketing
- increased negotiating
- greater economies of scale
- increased access to credit
- training markets and social supports
- improved social status and family stability

It briefly mentions the gendered power dynamics that can mediate the outcomes of participating in collectives, but does not explore them in detail.

Key words: poverty alleviation, reduction in inequality, organizational characteristics and capacity building

Kaganzi, E., S. Ferris, J. Barham, A. Abenakyo, P. Sanginga, and J. Njuki. (2009). "Sustaining linkages to high value markets through collective action in Uganda." *Food Policy* 34 (1): 23–30.

This case study of the Nyabyumba Farmers group in Uganda identifies factors that lead to farmers more effectively participating in and sustaining their position within markets. The researchers identify a need for a multipronged approach that includes human and bridging social capital development, leadership and technological development reflecting the needs of the

members and the market. Key determinants that resulted from long-term support from different agencies included:

- co-operative farming, and especially marketing education
- skills development
- innovation
- the ability to organize and reflect the needs of the farmers
- shared norms and homogenous goals
- consistent quality production
- capacity support and building

This support came in the form of front-line work where the organizations worked regularly with members for five years in these areas as part of a "hands on" approach. For the researchers, key determinants for maintaining market links were strong leadership, quality products, and the goals of the group. There was a strong focus on the need for building bonding and bridging social capital.

Key words: Social capital, cohesion, organizational characteristics, and capacity building

Kyazze, Lawrence. (2010). Cooperatives: *The sleeping economic and social giants in Uganda.* CoopAFRICA, Working Paper No.15 in a series on the status of co-operative development in Africa. ILO, United Republic of Tanzania, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda.

This article provides an overview of co-operative development in Uganda. It describes the historical shaping of the current co-operative system in Uganda and the success of the movement prior to increasing government and political regulation that started in the 1970s with the military government, which, in turn, did not prepare co-operatives for the market liberalization of the 1980s. The article outlines the current structure from primary co-operatives to the Uganda Co-operative Alliance, the apex or umbrella organization that organizes and informs the unions and supports a range of co-operatives through programs and advocacy work. It identifies the need for further support for primary co-operatives in terms of co-operative and technological education (for members and employees at each level), policy development, and financial support (through local credit co-operatives) for each level of the system from primary co-operatives to the apex body (so that it may better support the co-operatives).

Key words: organizational characteristics (three tiered levels), external factors (historical influences and government).

Hussein, Karim. (2001). "Producer Organizations and Technology in West Africa: Institutions that Give Farmers a Voice." *Society for International Development* 44 (4): 61–66. doi:10.1057/palgrave.development.1110294.

This article outlines the potential impact of co-operatives on technological development and improving livelihoods in developing countries. It examines the roles and development of co-operatives in Western Africa and sites a number of determinants for their success, including:

- clear mandate and legislation for the co-operative
- technological, managerial, agricultural, and organizational capacity building
- diverse funding
- enabling government legislation and policies
- effective coordination and mechanisms of coordination for co-operative bodies (primary co-operatives to the apex body).

Key words: external factors (government legislation and decentralization of co-operatives) and organizational characteristics

Mercer, Claire. (2002). "The Discourse of Maendeleo and the Politics of Women's Participation on Mount Kilimanjaro." *Development and Change* 33 (1): 101–27. doi: 10.1111/1467-7660.00242.

This article examines the normative subjectivity of Chagga women on Mount Kilimanjaro that is a product of national and international development discourses. It identifies how participation in women's groups works to reinforce a normative identity that reproduces class-based social exclusion through the inability of poor women to access them. The inability to access women's organizations leads to a reproduction of their bodies being marked as "not progressive or modern, and uneducated" within the larger development discourse that marks women with memberships to the organizations as empowered and progressive. It includes a discussion on poor women's inability to access these organizations "run by elite women" because of their social location and financial and time constraints due to workloads. The researcher identifies the need to adopt a research model that focuses on local cultural norms and constraints as well as the larger social, economic, political, and cultural structures that may lead to differentiated access and benefits for socio-economically vulnerable community members.

Key words: social exclusion, gender, and identity production

Mrema, Herment A., (2008). "Uganda: Starting All Over Again." In *Cooperating Out of Poverty: The Renaissance of the African Cooperative Movement,* ed. P. Develtere, I. Pollet and F. Wanyama. Geneva and Washington: ILO and The World Bank Institute.

This article is an overall description of the co-operative movement within Uganda. It highlights the decline in agricultural co-operatives and increase in financial co-operatives after market liberalization. The decline is identified as the result of the lack of knowledge and skills of co-operative members who suddenly had to manage co-operatives that were previously run and regulated by experts within the government. It identifies the positive support of external donors, the role of the Co-operative College, and the Uganda Co-operative Alliance. It also identifies the potential for reducing poverty through membership, professional employment in the co-operatives, and employment related to co-operative production (i.e., processing agricultural goods) and the social protection through burial and crisis funding.

Key words: poverty reduction, external factors, and organizational characteristics

Münkner, H-H. (2012). "Co-operation as a Remedy in Times of Crisis. Agricultural Co-operatives in the World; Their Roles for Rural Development and Poverty Reduction." Euricse Working Paper No. 41 | 12

This report describes the background of co-operatives. It outlines the history of co-operative development, defines poverty and the cycle of poverty, authentic co-operative formation (ground up, member led, and developed with little external support or intervention and a focus on the benefits to members), the attitude and approach of external support organizations (ILO, World Bank, and UN), and factors for a successful movement. It identifies the differentiated needs for poor populations and absolutely poor populations in terms of approaches to establishing a co-operative (external long-term support, technological training, education, government involvement, etc.).

Key words: poverty reduction, inclusion, external factors, co-operative characteristics

Ndenyele, W.O., and Fathima A. Badurdeen. (2012). "Looking beyond gender in humanitarian interventions: A study of a drought stricken region in Kenya." *Gender and Development* 20 (2): 323–36.

This article examines relationships of power that manifest in differentiated vulnerabilities as a result of gender, tribal affiliations, religions, caste, class, geographical location, or ethnicity within a rural drought stricken area in Kenya. The researchers discuss different struggles of women in the area such as the higher rate of illiteracy among women and the issue of time because of their work load (farming, household work, and water collection). They note that although women do much of the farming on their plots, the husband (the owner of the land) makes the decisions in terms of what crops are produced and how money made from their sale will be spent. In cases where women received food aid, husbands also made the decisions about how the food was used — in some cases it was sold instead of eaten by the family. Women deal with drought-induced poverty through a number of approaches ranging from eating less themselves to generating income or savings through collective action. The researchers concludes by identifying the need for projects to have a gender lens that considers economic and social relationships of power.

Key words: gender inequality/ social inequality

> Nyamwasa, Jean Damascène. (2008). "Jump-starting the Rwandan Cooperative Movement." In *Cooperating Out of Poverty: The Renaissance of the African Cooperative Movement*, ed. P. Develtere, I. Pollet and F. Wanyama. Geneva and Washington: ILO and The World Bank Institute.

This article is an overall description of the co-operative movement in Rwanda after 1994. While it examines the successful cases of tea and rice co-operatives, it highlights the predominantly nonformal/legal nature of collective groups. It identifies the fragmented nature of the movement with few national unions or an apex organization to regulate co-operatives or act as a voice for them (the rice and tea co-operatives, examples of vertical integration, have limited national representation through their own individual apex organizations). It concludes by identifying the limited impact on poverty reduction even within the successful co-operative examples that result from limited government input and support, technical and management skills, and limited financial returns to membership.

Key words: poverty reduction, external/internal factors, organizational charactersistics, vertical integration

Pollet, I. (2009). *Cooperatives in Africa: The Age of Reconstruction: Synthesis of a Survey in Nine African Countries*. Dar es Salaam: International Labour Office.

This report summarizes the state of co-operatives in nine African countries. It is intended to provide a baseline in terms of co-operative development, focusing on the number of active co-operatives in each country, the institutional and structural support (confederation or apex bodies), co-operative education, governmental support (policy, legislation and monitoring) and financial support (through donor agencies or financial collectives). Pollet identifies that there is strong donor support. He also notes that there has been an overall positive shift in government policy and legislation in support of co-operatives in each of these countries and that over 7 percent of the African population has membership in co-operatives. With this he also notes that only two countries have confederations that represent co-operatives and that much-needed co-operative education is focused on student graduates. Although each country has a co-operative college, more short-term education focused on co-operative members in rural areas is needed.

Key words: external factors (government policy and legislation, and donor support), co-operative characteristics (education and structure-apex organizations)

Paumgarten, F., H. Kassa, M. Zida, and M. Moeliono. (2012). "Benefits, Challenges, and Enabling Conditions of Collective Action to Promote Sustainable Production and Marketing of Products from Africa's Dry Forests." *Review of Policy Research* 29 (2): 229–50.

Using case studies from Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, and Zambia, this article examines the motives, benefits, barriers, and enabling conditions for dry forest farmers/producers to participate in collective organizations. Motives and benefits ranged from improved market access, information, and economies of scale (for both input and output markets). Barriers included ineffective external support and government policy and infrastructure (i.e., lack of roads). Additional barriers were tied specifically to the collectives such as previous failures, lack of trained management, lengthy processing times for dividends, lack of transparency, cost of membership, and potential inequalities in terms of benefits that have inhibited the ability to maintain membership or encourage new members to join.

Key words: external factors, organizational characteristics, and social inclusion/exclusion.

Revuga, S., R. Masandika, and W. Heemskerk. (2007). "MVIWATA's in pro-poor service provision in Tanzania." In *Access of the poor to agricultural services: The role of farmers' organizations in social inclusion*, ed. B. Wennink, S. Nederlof, and W. Heemskerk. Bulletin 376. Bulletins of the Royal Tropical Institute. Amsterdam: Kit Publishing.

This article is about MVIWATA, a national network of farmers' groups in Tanzania that focuses on capacity building and advocating for small-farm producer co-operatives. It works to increase co-operative access to markets, information, training, and credit. In terms of gender, it has focused on training and providing credit to women and women's co-operatives as well as requiring that women make up a third of the leadership roles within mixed co-operatives (a noted barrier to this is the experience that men within the co-operatives may not identify women leaders as legitimate). It also includes a focus on developing bonding, bridging, and linking social capital. The focus on linking social capital builds links between co-operatives and the larger community, including socio-economically vulnerable community members and other organizations that represent their needs.

Key words: gender, social inclusion/ exclusion, social capital, poverty reduction

Tiffen, P., J. MacDonald, H. Maamah, and F. Osei-Opare. (2004). "From Tree-minders to Global Players: Cocoa Farmers in Ghana." In *Chains of Fortune: Linking Women Producers and Workers with Global Market*, ed. Marilyn Carr. Commonwealth Secretariat, United Kingdom.

This case study of the Kuapa Kokoo Co-op in Ghana describes its process of successful growth. The article discusses the positive impact of slight government protection, investment from Twin Trading, and their involvement in Fair Trade. The highlighted reasons for growth are:

- sustained investment in village and education training
- roles for women at each level of development, and co-operative, independently monitored elections
- strict punishment for corruption
- transparency in financial management
- farmer-selected buying clerks from within the community
- decision making bodies consist of members elected by farmers

The authors also highlight the ways in which the co-operative reduces poverty through increases in income, international voice, and community development initiatives including building wells, schools, corn mills, and bridges.

Key words: poverty reduction, external factors, co-operative characteristics, multi-level production

Thorp, R., F. Stewart, and A. Heyer. (2005). "When and how far is group formation a route out of chronic poverty?" *World Development* 33 (6): 907–20.

This article looks at group formation and the ability to reduce poverty and empower the populations living in chronic poverty. The authors note that group formation has one of two functions. The first is to deal with market failures and the second is to increase power or resources. For Thorp et. al., the key factors that limit the access and benefits of co-operatives are lack of assets (land ownership, education, social capital), lack of access to markets and networks, lack of rights, dependence on external intervention, and the co-operative focus on social cohesion (that results only through the exclusion of marginalized community members who may have different goals or needs).

Key words: social exclusion, poverty reduction

Wennink, B., S. Nederlof, and W. Heemskerk. (2007). *Access of the poor to agricultural services: The role of farmers' organizations in social inclusion.* Bulletin 376. Bulletins of the Royal Tropical Institute. Amsterdam: Kit Publishing.

This bulletin looks at the socially exclusive nature of farmers' co-operatives in Africa. It identifies the fact that women, subsistence farmers, the poorest community members (landless, labourers, and HIV/AIDS effected households) have limited access to membership. In addition to this, co-operatives do not focus on the needs of the poorest members as members in leadership positions reflect class and gender divisions. Additionally, the authors identify a difference in service provision for the poorer members of smaller, community-based farmer organizations and larger, commodity-based (supply-chain-oriented) producer organizations. Using case studies from Tanzania, Rwanda, and Benin, this bulletin identifies methods of making co-operatives and their services more inclusive of typically excluded populations. The researchers identify the need to lobby for an inclusive policy (that enables and mandates inclusive membership), to strengthen the capacity of farmers' organizations with an inclusive focus, to develop strong relationships with agricultural service producers, and to focus on building bonding, bridging, and linking social capital.

Key words: social exclusion, poverty reduction, co-operative characteristics

Wanyama, O., P. Develtere, and I. Pollet. (2008). *Encountering the Evidence: Cooperatives and Poverty Reduction in Africa.* Maseno University, Kenya: School of Development and Strategic Studies, Working Papers on Social and Co-operative Entrepreneurship.

This article offers a brief overview of the ways in which co-operatives throughout Africa reduce poverty. The authors discuss direct employment of co-operative and government employees, member income generation and support, and spillover income generation for businesses that work with co-operatives. They also identify social protection through instant loans or insurance for emergencies (death, illness, and poor crops), investment in human capital through health and education services, an increase in food security through community lines of credit, and grain and farm input banks that result from the formation of co-operatives.

Articles to be added:

Binns, Tony, and Etienne Nel. (1999). "Beyond the Development Impasse: The Role of Local Economic Development and Community Self-Reliance in Rural South Africa." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 37 (3): 389–40.

Birchall, J. (2004). *Co-operatives and the Millennium Development Goals*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Jennings, Michael. (2003). "'We Must Run while Others Walk': Popular Participation and Development Crisis in Tanzania, 1961–69." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 41 (2): 163–87.

Annex Four: Household Questionnaire

Questionnaire number: ------------------------ Name of enumerator ----------------------------

Date of interview: ----------------------------- District: ---

Sub-county: ------------------------------------- Parish: --

Village: ---

Section A: Household Demographic Characteristics

Q101. What is your name? ---

Q102. Gender of respondent: (*Circle one*) 1. Male   2. Female

Q103. What is your age? ---------- years.

Q104. Are you the household head or not? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q105. If no, what is your relationship to the household head? (*Circle one*)

      1. Spouse   2. Son/daughter   3. Parent

      4. In-law   5. Sibling   6. Other relation (specify) -------------

Q106. If you are not the household head, what is his or her name? ----------------------------------

Q107. What is the sex of the household head? (*Circle one*)   1. Male   2. Female

Q108. What is the age of the household head? ---------- years.

Q109. What is the religion of the household head? (*Circle one*)

      1. Roman Catholic   2. Protestant   3. Pentecostal/Born Again

      4. Islam   5. Seventh Day Adventist   6. Others (Specify) -----------------------

Q110. What is your tribe? ---------------------------------------

Q111. Which of the following best describes the present marital status of the household head?

      1. Never Married/Single   2. Married Monogamous   3. Married Polygamous

      4. Divorced/Separated   5. Widow/Widower

Q112. If polygamous, how many wives are in the household? ------------

Q113. How many members are currently living in this household in the following age categories?

      1. Female children under five years -----------

      2. Male children under five years -----------

      3. Female children between 5 and 17 years -----------

      4 Male children between 5 and 17 years -----------

      5. Adult females aged between 18–59 years -----------

      6. Adult male aged between 18–59 years -----------

      7. Elders aged above 59 years -----------

Q114. What is the main occupation of the household head? (*Circle one*)

    1. Farming   2. Salaried employment   3. Self-employed off-farm

    4. Farm worker   5. Off-farm worker   6. Casual labour

    7. Housekeeping   8. Other (Specify) ---

Section B: Selected Household Assets

Human

Q201. How many years did the household head and the spouse spent schooling?

    (a) Household head: ----------- years.

    (b) Spouse ----------- years.

Q202. (a) How many members in this household are school going?

    (b) How many:

        (i) Males are in primary school? ---------

        (ii) Females are in primary school? ---------

        (iii) Males are in secondary school? ---------

        (iv) Females are in secondary school? ---------

        (v) Males in vocational schools after S4   ---------

        (vi) Females in vocational school after S4 ---------

        (vii) Males are in tertiary/university? ---------

        (viii) Females are in tertiary/university? ---------

Q203. If primary school going, do they go to a school offering Universal Primary Education (UPE) or not? (*Circle one*)

    1. Go to UPE School.

    2. Do not go to UPE School.

    3. Both.

Q204. If secondary school going, do they go to a school offering Universal Secondary Education (USE) or not? (*Circle one*)

    1. Go to USE school.

    2. Do not go to USE school.

    3. Both.

Q205. (a) Do they pay for school fees, books and uniforms? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

    (b) If yes, about how much do pay for school in a year? ----------------- (Shillings)

    (c) How do you raise the money to pay for school? --

Q206. (a) Are there children below 18 years in the household who are not going to school?
(*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how many of them are:

(i) Males between 5 and 12 years? ----------

(ii) Females between 5 and 12 years? ----------

(iii) Males between 13 and 17 years? ----------

(iv) Females between 13 and 17 years? ----------

Q207. Why are they not going to school? ---

Housing

Q208. What kind of main housing does the household have? (*Observe but ask if not possible*)

(a) Type of walls:

1. Brick walls plastered

2. Brick walls unplastered

3. Mud poles plastered

4. Mud poles unplastered

(b) Type of roof:

1. Iron sheet roof

2. Grass thatched roof

(c) Type of floor:

1. Cement floor

2. Rammed earth floor

(d) How many rooms? ---------

(e) Is the kitchen inside the house or outside? (*Circle one*)   1. Inside   2. Outside

(f) Are animals being kept inside the house? (*Circle one*)   1. Inside   2. Outside

(g) Is there a latrine? *(Circle one)*   1. Yes   2. No

Q209. What kind of housing would you like to have?

(a) Type of roof: -------------------------------------

(b) Type of wall: -------------------------------------

(c) Type of floor: -------------------------------------

(d) Number of rooms: ---------------------------------

Water Supply and Sanitation

Q210. Where does your household mainly collect water for drinking?

1. Protected well

2. Unprotected well
3. Borehole
4. River
5. Lake
6. Dam
7. Tap water
8. Rain water
9. Other (Specify) -------------------------------

Q211. Where does your household mainly collect water for other domestic uses?

1. Protected well
2. Unprotected well
3. Borehole
4. River
5. Lake
6. Dam
7. Tap water
8. Rain water
9. Other (Specify) ---

Q212. How long does it take (minutes) to get to your main water source? --------------minutes.

Q213. Who collects the water? ---

Q214. How often does this person have to go get water per day? ------------------------------------

Q215. Does lack of water keep you from doing what you need or want to do?
(**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

Q216. What would you be able to do if you had enough water? --

Tools and Equipment

Q217. How many of the following *Agricultural Implements* does your household possess?

Item	Hoe	Panga	Rake	Spade	Axe	Slasher	Sickle	Wheelbarrow	Ox-Plough
Number									

Q218. How many of the following *Home Items* does your household possess?

Item	Radio	Watch	Clock	Bicycle	Mobile Phone	TV	Motorcycle	Motor Vehicle	Sofa sets	Lanterns
Number										

Social

Participation in Co-ops

Q219. Do you and/or any other adult in this household *belong to a rural producer group (RPO)?*
1. Yes   2. No (**Go to Q225**)

Q220. If yes, which household member and which RPO?

Who? _____ Name of co-op _____Since when? _____

Who? _____ Name of co-op _____Since when? _____

Q221. (a) Have you made any changes in farming or running your household as a result of being a member of a co-op? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, what are these changes? --

Q222. As a result of any change(s) that you have made in farming or in your household as a member a co-op, do you have *more* people you consider as *close friends* now? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

Q223. (a) If so, have you ever asked any new close friend for help in solving a problem? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, what type of problem? ---

Q224. (a) If so, have you ever been asked by any new close friend for help in solving a problem? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, what type of problem? ---

Q225. If you experienced a major problem (for example, failure or loss of your most important crop), to whom would you first turn for help? --

Access to Land

Q226. In total, how much land (in acres) does this household (*all members*) own? --------- acres.

Q. In total, how much land does this household (all members) have access to use? --------- acres.

Q227. Of the above land, how much is currently under use? --------acres.

Q228. (a) If you needed more land to farm, could you get access to more? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how? --

Q229. (a) Is your household farming more land than it did 5 years ago? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how much more? --------------------acres

(c) Who is the owner of the land? --

(d) How did you get this land? ---

Q230. (a) Did belonging to a co-op group help you in any way in acquiring more land?

1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how? --

Q231. (a) Is your household farming less land than it did 5 years ago? (**Circle one**)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how much less? ------------acres.

(c) Who was the owner of the land? ---

(d) What happened to this land? --

Q232. (a) Is belonging to a co-op group in any way responsible for having less land than you had before?

1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how? ---

Q233. (a) Is belonging to a SACCO in any way responsible for having less land than you had before?

    1. Yes   2. No

    (b) If yes, how? ---

Access to Labour

Q234. (a) Do you use hired labour? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

    (b) For what tasks? ---.

    (c) On average, how much do pay them per day? -------------------- shillings.

Q235. (a) Do you participate in a labour exchange group?   1. Yes   2. No

    (b) What is it for? --

    (c) What do you do/ What do you have to do to participate? -------------------------------------

    (d) How many days a month/year? ----------------------------------

Q236. (a) Do men in this household work on someone else's land?   1. Yes   2. No

    (b) How many days? -----------days.

    (c) For what tasks? --.

    (d) What are they paid? ----------------------

Q237. (a) Do women in this household work on someone else's land? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

    (b) How many days? -----------days.

    (c) For what tasks? --.

    (d) What are they paid? --------------------------------------

Section C: Crop Production

Q301. Name, in order of importance, *four* major crops grown in your household last year (2013)

Crop	(a) Season one			(b)Season two		
	Acreage	Average output (kg)	Main purpose	Acreage	Average output (kg)	Main purpose
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						

Main purpose- *Codes*: (1) Food (2) Cash (3) Both food and cash (4) Others

Q302. (a) Of the major crops mentioned above, are there any crops that you grow because of the influence or support of the RPO/ACE where you or member(s) of your household belongs?

    1.Yes   2. No

    (b) If yes, what type of influence or support? --

Q303. (a) Of the major crops mentioned above, are there any crops that you grow because of the influence or support of the SACCO where you or member of your household belongs?

    1.Yes   2. No

    (b) If yes, what type of influence or support? --

Q304. Did you experience any <u>severe</u> constraints in producing crops in the last year?

    1. Yes   2. No (*If no, go to Q306*)

Q305. If yes, what were the main production constraints your household faced?

Constraint	Did you experience this constraint?	Did the group where you or member of hhold belongs assist in coping with the constraint?		Did the SACCO where you or member of hhold belongs assist in coping with the constraint	
	1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	If yes, how?	1. Yes 2. No	If yes, how?
1. Low soil fertility					
2. Pests					
3. Diseases					
4. Weeds					
5. Vermin/rodents					
6. Lack of improved varieties					
7. Lack of access to inputs					
8. Extreme weather changes					
9. Small land holding					
10. Lack of labour					
11. Other					

Q306. What are the major types of livestock kept in this household?

Livestock	Type	Number
Chickens	Local	
	Crossbreed/Exotic	
Pigs	Local	
	Crossbreed/Exotic	
Goats	Local	
	Crossbreed/Exotic	

Cows	Local	
	Crossbreed/Exotic	
Fish	Local	
	Crossbreed/Exotic	
Sheep	Local	
	Crossbreed/Exotic	
Bees		

Q307. Are some of the animals housed in your house? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q308. Where do you graze your animals? (*Circle all that apply*)

(a) Own land   (b) Land belonging to fellow farmers

(c) Communal land   (d) Land belonging to my co-op/famer group

(e) Other (Specify) ---

Section D: Crop Marketing

Q401. Did you sell any crops in the last 12 months? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q402. Who mostly sells the crops? (*Circle one*)   1. Man   2. Woman.   3. Both

Q403. (a) Do you sell all your produce through the co-operative where you are a member?

1. Yes   2. No

(b) If no, what proportion of the produce do you sell through the co-operative? -------------%

Q404. What benefits do you enjoy by selling the produce through the co-operative?

(a) Quantity/volume-related benefits---

(b) Quality-related benefits--

(c) Marketing cost-related benefits--

(d) Storage-related benefits--

(e) Market search-related benefits--

(f) Price-related benefits--

(g) Payment terms-related benefits--

(h) Others --

Q405. What challenges do you face by selling the produce through the co-operative?

(a) Quantity/volume-related challenges--

(b) Quality-related challenges ---

(c) Marketing cost-related challenges --

(d) Storage-related challenges ---

(e) Market search-related challenges --

(f) Price-related challenges --

(g) Payment terms-related challenges --

(h) Others ---

Q406. Where did you mostly sell your crops not sold through the co-ops? (*Circle one*)

    1. Farm gate/home   2. Rural market   3. Urban market   4. Other (Specify)

Q407. Who usually buys your produce? (*Circle all that apply*)

    1. Others in the village for local consumption

    2. Retailers

    3. Agents of wholesalers or retailers

    4. Wholesalers

    5. Processers

    6. Others (Specify) --------------------------------------

Q408. (a) How far (km) is the nearest rural and urban market? (b) How do you commonly transport your produce to the market? (c) How much time in hours do you take to reach the nearest rural and urban market?

	(a) Distance (Km)	(b) Means of transport	(c) Time taken to travel (hours)
Rural market			
Urban market			

Q409. Does your producer group belong to an Area Co-op Enterprise (ACE)? (*Circle one*) 1. Yes 2. No

Q410. If yes, what services do members receive from the ACE?

    (a) In procuring farm inputs--

    (b) In accessing extension services --

    (c) In accessing loans ---

    (d) In accessing storage facilities--

    (e) In accessing transport services---

    (f) In accessing markets for farm produce---

    (g) In collective marketing--

    (h) Others ---

Q411. When was the last time you participated in collective marketing?

    1. Less than 5 months ago

    2. 6 months to 1 year

    3. 1 year to 2 years

    4. Over 2 years

Q412. Do you access market information from ACE? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q413. If yes, how often do you access this information?

1. Weekly
2. Twice a month
3. Monthly
4. In more than one month
5. When ACE staff visits
6. Others Specify

Q414 Apart from Market Information from ACE, from what other sources do you access market information? (*Circle all that apply*)

1. Radios
2. Mobile phone messages
3. Newspapers
4. Neighbors
5. Markets
6. Others (specify)-------------------------------

Q415. Did you experience any serious problems in marketing your crops?

1. Yes   2. No (*If no, go to Q501*)

Q416. If yes, what were the main marketing constraints your household faced in marketing?

Constraint	Did you experience this constraint?	Did the group where you or member of your hhold belongs assist in coping with the constraint?		Did the SACCO where you or member of your hhold belongs assist in coping with the constraint	
	1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	If yes, how?	1. Yes 2. No	If yes, how?
1. Poor roads					
2. High transport costs					
3. Low prices					
4. Low demand					
5. Poor storage facilities					
6. Lack of markets					
7. Lack of market information					
8. High post-harvest losses					
9. High local taxes (market dues, loading fees)					
10. Unorganized farmers					
11. Others (specify)					

Section E: Access to Financial Services

Q501. (a) Do you or anybody in your in your household save with a VSLA? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If yes, how much do you save in a week in your VSLA? ---------------------shillings

(c) How much do you hope to get from the VSLA at the end of the current cycle? --------------Shs

Q502. Does the VSLA you belong to have an account with a SACCO? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q503. Does the RPO you belong have an account with a SACCO? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q504. Do you or anybody in the household have an account with a SACCO?
(*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q505. If some other person, is the person male or female? (*Circle one*)

1. Male   2. Female

Q506. Did you or any member in your household *borrow* MONEY last year (2013)? (*Circle one*)

1. Yes   2. No (*If no, go to Q507*).

Q507. If yes, please provide the following details:

Source (*Circle all that apply*)	(a) Have you ever borrowed? 1.=Yes 2.=No	(b) Amount borrowed)	(c) Purpose for borrowing (*codes below the table*)	(d) Interest rate (*in percentage*)	(e) Period of repayment
1. VSLA					
2. SACCOs					
3. Relatives and friends					
4. Microfinance					
5. Commercial bank					
6. Money lender					
7. Other…………….					

Codes for (c): Purpose for borrowing:

1. Purchase food
2. Purchase household assets
3. School fees
4. Buy crop inputs
5. Buy livestock inputs
6. Invest in business
7. Others

Codes for (e): Repayment period

1. After one month
2. After three months
3. After one year

Q508. If you or any member in your household ever borrowed MONEY from more than one source, which source was the easiest and hardest to borrow from? (*Rank: 1= Easiest*)

Source (*Circle all that apply*)	Rank	Reason for the rank
VSLA		
SACCOs		
Relatives and friends		

Microfinance		
Commercial bank		
Money lender		
Other…………….		

Q509. (a) If you or any member in your household borrowed money from a SACCO, would it have been equally easy if you never belonged to the group?   1. Yes   2. No

(b) If No, why would it have been difficult? --

Section F: Household Income, Nutrition and Food Security

Q601. Now I would like to ask you about the income you and other members of the household earned any time of the year, big or small amounts of income. (*Ask one at a time and if the household does not get income from that source, move to the next*)

Income source	(a) Did you get income from this source? 1. Yes 2. No	(b) What did the household head do with the money from this source? **See codes**	(c) Who was this for?	(d) Estimate amount from this source in the past 12 months	(e) What is the contribution of this source to total household income 1. Very low 2. Low 3. High 4. Very high
1. Crop sales					
2. Livestock and poultry sales					
3. Sale of other products (firewood/charcoal/crafts)					
4. Casual employment (agricultural related)					
5. Casual employment (non-agricultural related)					
6. Running own business					
7. Remittances					
8. Rentals					
9. Other …………………					

Codes for (c): What was done with the money:
1. Purchase food
2. Purchase household assets
3. School fees
4. Buy crop inputs
5. Buy livestock inputs
6. Invest in business
7. Drinking alcohol
8. Others

Codes for (e): Who was this for?
1. Men
2. Women
3. Children
4. All household members
5. Relatives and friends

Q602. What proportion of income is generated from crop sales? _____

Q603. In the past 12 months, were there months in which you **did not have enough** food to meet your household's needs? (***Circle one***)   1. Yes   2. No

Q604. If yes, in which month(s) did the household **not have enough** food to eat? (***Circle all that apply***)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec

Q605. On average, how many meals does your household consume in a day during the season of plenty? (***Circle one***)   1. One   2. Two   3. At least three meals

Q606. On average, how many meals does your household consume in a day during the season of scarcity? (***Circle one***)   1. One   2. Two   3. At least three meals

Q607. Which type of food reserves does your household have? (***Circle all that apply***)

    1. None

    2. Food in store

    3. Granary

    4. House

    5. Food in the garden

    6. Others (specify) --------------------

Q608. What proportion of the foods consumed in your household comes from the following sources?

    1. The market   ----------------

    2. Own garden   ----------------

    3. Relatives, neighbours--------------

    4. Others (specify)----------------

Coping Strategies

I am going to ask you several statements about food eaten in your household in the past 2 weeks, and whether you were able to have or afford the food the household needed. *(Response categories for the first questions: 1. Yes 2. No). (Response categories for subsequent questions: 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often).*

Q609a	In the past 2 weeks, did you worry that your household would not have enough food?	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q610a	In the past 2 weeks, were you or any household member not able to eat the kinds of foods you preferred because of a lack of resources? Who? ---------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q611a	In the past 2 weeks, did you or any household member have to eat a limited variety of foods due to a lack of resources? Who? ----------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	

Q612a	In the past 2 weeks, did you or any household member have to eat some foods that you really did not want to eat because of a lack of resources to obtain other types of food? Who? ------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q613a	In the past 2 weeks, did you or any household member have to eat a smaller meal than you felt you needed because there was not enough food? Who? -------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q614a	In the past 2 weeks, did you or any household member have to eat fewer meals in a day because there was not enough food? Who? -------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q615a	In the past 2 weeks, was there ever no food to eat of any kind in your household because of lack of resources to get food? Who? ---------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q616a	In the past 2 weeks, did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food? Who? ------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	
Q6187a	In the past 2 weeks, did you or any household member go a whole day and night without eating anything because there was not enough food? Who? ---------------------	
b	How often did this occur? 0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Always	

Q618. Compared to the rest of the people in this village, do you consider yourself: (*Circle one*)

     1. Poorer than others?   2. The same level with others?   3. Richer than most others?

Q619. Do you consider your household to be? (*Circle one*)

     1. Always food insecure (Not having enough to eat for more than **six** months)?

     2. Sometimes food insecure (Not having enough to eat for at least one month but less than **six** months)?

     3. Food secure (Having enough to eat throughout the year)

Section G: Community Aspirations

Q701. Do you think your children will be farming your land or live in this region when they grow up? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

Q702. How do you see yourself in 5 years?

Q703. How do you see your community in 10 years?

Q704. (a) Have you seen any good changes in farming in general in the last five years? (*Circle one*)   1. Yes   2. No

    (b) What is the change?

    (c) How did it help you or your community?

Q705. (a) Have you seen any bad changes in farming in the last five years ago?
(***Circle one***)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) What is the change?

(c) How has it hurt you or your community?

Q706. Does your household eat foods this year that you did not eat five years ago?
(***Circle one***)   1. Yes   2. No

Q708. Did your household eat foods five years ago that you do not eat any more?
(***Circle one***)   1. Yes   2. No

Q709. (a) Have you seen other big changes in your community compared to five years ago?
(***Circle one***)   1. Yes   2. No

(b) What is the main change?

(c) Who is the change good for?

(d) Why is it good for those people?

(e) Who is the change bad for?

(f) Why is it bad for those people?

Q710. (a) What changes would you like to see to make life easier in your community?

(b) Which of those is the main change you would like to see?

(c) Who would benefit from it?

(d) Who would not benefit from it?

Thank You for Your Participation

Annex Five: Guidelines for Further Analysis of Household Survey

1. Accumulation Cycle

The following looks at where the household is in terms of its "accumulation cycle" and labour availability. This can help to interpret why a household may follow a certain strategy with its enterprise, such as aggressively pursuing possibilities to enlarge or make more money or, on the contrary, why it may not. It can also help us understand and interpret some issues in relation to well-being.

1.1 Child Dependency Ratio — Classical Measure

= # of children 0–14 / # of adults 15–64

1.2 Total Dependency Ratio — Classical Measure

= # of children 0–14 + # 65+/ # of adults 15–64

We can come up with a better kind of dependency analysis that looks at real consumption demands versus productive availability to let us know where the household is in its accumulation cycle. The particulars for each country will need to be discussed, but one approach would be the one below:

- Baby-toddler: 0–4 years (not contributing to household) → counted as 0

- Working child: 5–9 years (helping with livestock, watching younger children and doing house chores, carrying water, etc.) → counted as .3

- Adult helper: 10–14 years (helping with livestock, in the field, kitchen, more substantially than younger children) → counted as .6

- Adult: 15–64 (or when unable to carry full load, so transition to elderly could be younger or older) → counted as 1

- Elderly 65+ (or when unable to carry full load) → counted as .5

- Permanently disabled or sick for more than 3 months → counted as 0

1.3 Child Dependency Ratio

= # of children 0–14/ sum of productive members' values

1.4 Total Dependency Ratio

= # of children 0–14 + # 65+/ sum of productive members' values

1.5 Males vs. Females

A suggested grouping to understand family needs and the demands on and availability of particular kinds of labour according to ages above.

2. Wealth Indicators (to be turned into index or clusters)

- Farmland owned in local measure or in hectares

- Farmland cultivated in local measure or in hectares

- Security of tenure based upon dominant kind of land tenure of cultivated land.

  This could be indicated using simple coarse-grained estimates of:

  - 0 (little or no security — the household sharecrops or rents almost all the land they farm)

  - .5 (medium security — the household owns about half the land they farm)

  - 1 (very secure — the hhd is cultivating their own land)

- Livestock

  These indicators can be computed with and without livestock, since in many places in Africa livestock are a significant source of wealth, but one that does not necessarily correlate with land wealth.

- Presence or absence of irrigation. Yes/No 1, 0

2.1 Livestock Index

Listed are TLUs for each kind of animal found in hhd and then add them together: Cattle =.7; heifer =.5; calf =.2; ox =1.1; horse =.8; mule =.8; donkey =.4; pigs =.2; goats =.1; sheep =.1

2.2 Well-Being Index or Cluster

Oxen

- Yes or no (0/1)

Capital goods (tools)

- Capital goods could be assigned number (make simple count and then categorize) or dollar value

Consumer goods

- Consumer goods could be assigned a dollar value, summed, and categories assigned (0–4 or 5)

Housing quality

- Housing quality: floor (0–1), walls (0–3), roof (0–1), # rooms (0–3), latrine (0–1): sum

Education

- Education also should be divided into categories (0–5, with 0 = no schooling; 1 = 3 or fewer years; 2 = 6; 3 =9; 4 =12; 5 = >12).

Health

- (If there is data)

3. Livelihood Diversification Index

Count each as one and sum.

3.1.1 Crop self-subsistence

3.1.2 Crop sales

3.1.3 Livestock self-subsistence

3.1.4 Livestock and poultry sales

3.1.5 Fish sales

3.1.6 Bees

3.1.7 Other (firewood, charcoal, crafts)

3.1.8 Casual employment (non-ag)

3.1.9 Casual employment (ag)

3.1.10 Running own business

3.1.11 Rental of land

3.1.12 Share of land

3.1.13 Share of livestock

3.1.14 Other

4. Basic Needs Cluster

Does the household have the minimum that it needs to survive?

4.1.1 Quality of access to water and sufficient access to water

4.1.2 Food security index: # of meals during hungry season, duration of hungry season, others if added

4.1.3 Housing quality: floor (0–1), walls (0–3), roof (0–1), # rooms (0–3), latrine (0–1): sum

4.1.4 Purchase of basics (if have the data)

4.1.5 Coping strategies (this section will need to be explored)

5. Labour Capacity Cluster

5.1.1 Presence of adult male labour (yes/no)

5.1.2 Access to paid non-household labour (yes/no)

5.1.3 Access to reciprocal labour, male (yes/no)

5.1.4 Access to reciprocal labour, female (yes/no)

5.1.5 Working on other's farm (yes/no)

5.1.6 Adult male migrating (yes/no)

5.1.7 Oxen, yes or no (1/0).

6. Social Participation

How many social institutions does the household participate in?

6.1.1 Funeral group

6.1.2 Savings group

6.1.3 Religious group (this is not belonging to a church, but participating in a volunteer or prayer group)

6.1.4 Reciprocal or labour exchange

6.1.5 Restive labour exchange

However, we may only have data on labour exchange and/or savings group.

7. Subjective Solidarity

7.1.1 Subjective evaluation of people's wealth as compared to their actual wealth and their tendency to be in co-ops and what kind of co-ops.

8. Financial Capacity

8.1.1 Access to credit yes/no 1/0

8.1.2 Access to remittances yes/no 1/0

9. Technology Adoption

9.1.1 Radio

9.1.2 Mobile phone

9.1.3 "Cross-bred breeds"

9.1.4 "Improved seeds"

9.1.5 "Ag inputs"

10. Influence of Co-op on Enterprise

10.1.1 Have you made any changes as a result of being a member of co-op?

Could include or correlate with satisfaction.

10.1.2 What benefits has participating in a co-op brought to your enterprise?

These might be rather included in category 11.

10.1.3 What challenges has participating in a co-op posed for your enterprise?

These might be rather included in category 11.

10.1.4 How do you compare yourself to members and nonmembers of co-ops?

11. What Is the Co-op Member Experience?

11.1.1 What are the perceived costs and benefits of membership, etc.? (Tz: Section D)

Many of these questions can be aggregated to describe the varieties of member and nonmember response, but some selected questions should be used to contrast members (full and partial) versus nonmembers and by wealth/farm size and gender.

Costs and benefits should be coded as individual items.

11.1.2 Difference in terms of member experience in terms of how hhds view their community, its future, etc.

12. How Has Enterprise/Community Changed?

12.1.1 Is your household farming more land than it did 5 years ago?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.2 Did belonging to a co-op group help you in acquiring more land?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.3 Is your household farming less land than it did 5 years ago?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.4 Are you eating any foods today that you didn't 5 years ago?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.5 What food? (Will need to be evaluated in context, but meat, dairy, etc. indicates more well-being)

12.1.6 Are there foods that you ate 5 years ago that you don't eat today?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.7 What food? (Will need to be evaluated in context, but meat, dairy, etc., indicates less well-being)

12.1.8 Do you see any good changes in your community?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.9 What? (Evaluate in context)

12.1.10 Do you see any bad changes?   yes/no, 1/0

12.1.11 What? (Evaluate in context)

13. Social Class

13.1.1 Uses moneylender

13.1.2 Employs paid non-household labour (yes/no)

13.1.3 Works on other's farm (yes/no)

13.1.4 Adult male migrating (yes/no)

14. Gender Equity/Women's Empowerment

14.1.1 # of years adult female education

14.1.2 Are there males or females 5–12 not in school?

14.1.3 Are there males or females 13–17 not in school?

14.1.4 # of children

14.1.5 Who mostly sells the crops?

14.1.6 Who goes for water?

14.1.7 See if "who benefits from this income source" ends up being answered in a way that allows us to see it break out in a gendered way.

15. Resilience (will also need to play around with as above)

15.1.1 Do you consider your household to be food secure? (3-part scale)

15.1.2 If you experienced a major problem (for example, failure or loss of your most important crop), to whom would you first turn for help? yes/no. If they answer no-one, look and see if there's a direction or if they answer more than one (family, extended family, neighbour, extension agent, fellow co-op member).

15.1.3 If you needed more land to farm, could you get access to more? yes/no

15.1.4 Did you experience any <u>severe</u> constraints in producing crops in the last year? yes/no

15.1.5 (Further, decide if you want to add this to the item: What are they? Grouped as environmental constraints, agronomic constraints, land-holding constraints, labour constraints — could be handled with count or individually).

15.1.6 Did you experience any serious problems in marketing your crops? yes/no

Annex Six: Analysis Domains

The Analysis Domains are extensive Excel spreadsheets not suitable for PDF or image formats and hence not available online. They can be accessed by contacting the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives at 306.966.8509.

Annex Seven: Checklists for Key Informant Interviews

(a) Checklist for Relevant Policymakers and Development Actors

1. What role do you play in the development of co-ops?

2. How was the Integrated Co-operative Model (ICM) established?

3. Do you believe ICM can lead to the achievement of particular (specified) rural development goals or not? Explain.

4. Under what conditions does the ICM lead to the achievement of rural development goals?

5. Does the model contribute to both expected co-op outcomes and rural development goals?

6. What are some of the achievements of ICM so far?

7. What have been some of the unexpected outcomes of the ICM?

8. What challenges have been faced in establishing and implementing ICM, and how have these been addressed?

9. What features (including political and business environment) of Uganda's history allowed the model to evolve, and what factors help it to function?

10. What do you think are the perceptions by government on the ICM, and what can government learn that can shape policy?

(b) Checklist for Co-op Leaders and Members

1. For how long have you been a co-op member/leader?

2. What leadership role do you play in the co-operative(s) in which you are a member?

3. What is the total membership of your co-op now?

4. When was it established?

5. Whose idea was it to establish this co-op, and who established it?

6. What is the goal of the co-op?

7. What services does the co-op offer members?

8. How was Integrated Co-operative Model established? Were there challenges? If yes, how were the challenges overcome?

9. Do you believe ICM can lead to the achievement of particular (specified) rural development goals or not? Explain.

10. Under what conditions does the ICM lead to the achievement of rural development goals?

11. Does the model contribute to both expected co-op outcomes and rural development goals?

12. What are some of the achievements of your co-op as result of being part of ICM?

13. What have been some of the unexpected outcomes of the ICM?

14. What challenges has your co-op faced in being part of ICM, and how have these been addressed?

15. What features of Uganda's history (including political and business environment) allowed the model to evolve, and what factors help it to function?

16. What do you think are the perceptions by government on the ICM, and what can government learn that can shape policy?

Annex Eight: Guidelines for Analysis and Reporting on Focus Group Discussions

General Comments

Analysis of the focus group discussion (FGD) data is determined by the overall research question and the purpose for which the data was collected.

The general focus groups were intended to add information to the community profiles/case studies, as well as to assist with interpretation of the household survey results and fill in any gaps left by the surveys.

It may be helpful to review the original proposal to refresh your memory regarding the research questions that the FGDs were intended to address. The policy-focused FGDs were specific to the questions identified in the research proposal regarding policy.

Please note: We feel that there is no need to type out all the data, nor to translate into English, as this will consume precious time that can be used for analyzing the data.

Categories of Information That Might Be Identified in the Findings from the FGD

1. Basic data about co-op, types, members interviewed, etc.
2. Gender (& youth) — Roles and responsibilities — what opportunities do men and women and youth have and what are the actual outcomes? What are the leadership and decision-making roles. For example, there may be policies or positions benefiting women but in practice this may not be occurring. Are there particular reasons that youth and women are not represented? For example, age and rules regarding inheritance of lands.
3. Education and training — What kind of training is being offered, by whom, and who is receiving the training — e.g., are there differences in access and types of training provided to men and women? Leaders and boards? General membership? Is the training on co-operative leadership, agriculture extension, and if so, how is it received and by whom?
4. #4 and #5 address the SWOT questions from the FGD — Strengths and Opportunities — Group by theme, e.g., food security, access to resources, leadership, etc. In what ways does

the integrated model benefit the community? Are there preferences for integrated structures? Weaknesses of integrated structures?

5. Visions/future aspirations for the co-operative.

6. Individual/community benefits from the integrated model.

7. Access to financial services from other sources besides credit unions — what are the other ways that finance is available to farmers? They may be operating in an integrated system (finance-ag support-marketing) although it is not all co-operative-based.

8. Policy development — this part would be specific to the questions for policy-makers and leaders.

9. Membership in a single or two co-ops — perceived advantages and disadvantages.

10. System structures — horizontal and vertical — perceived advantages or disadvantages.

Below are some detailed suggestions for how to analyse the focus group data.

Suggested Procedure for Analyzing the Focus Group Discussions

1. Read over all the data from each site. Listen if there is a recording. There is no need to type out all the data as this will consume time that can be used for analyzing the data. The first step is to go through the notes (transcript, if something *was* transcribed) carefully (reading closely) and identify those sections that are relevant to the research questions.

2. Based on this initial reading, you will identify common ideas or topics that are repeated and significant to the research questions. Use a highlighter or coloured sticky notes and colour to mark the different topics. The more thoroughly you read over the data, the better you will get at "listening" for ideas that are repeated. Many of these *ideas* will lead to themes. The amount of material coded for any one topic depends on the importance of that topic to the overall research question and the amount of variation in the discussion. The coded material may be only words, phrases, or exchanges between individual respondents. Some literature suggests this is like a cut-and-paste or scissor-and-sort phase of analysis, as you are selecting pieces of the data that respond to the research questions and then you are "pasting" them into clusters because they express similar thoughts or ideas.

   This coding exercise may require that you read through the notes several times, and each time you do, you will gain greater insights into the discussion. Read through all the

answers to a question (from all the focus group notes/transcripts for a single study site), looking for patterns and similarities.

3. Group the answers into key points, keeping a list as you go. Think about how many times a response was similar, how specific the response was and what emotions were expressed about this point. Each of these clusters of points potentially becomes a theme. Sometimes a few clusters can be grouped together. Usually finding 5–6 key themes should be sufficient to address the research questions. Note that the information included in the SWOT-type questions asked during the FGD may fit into the existing themes or perhaps categories of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats/risks will be themes on their own.

4. Write up the findings that fit into these 5–6 key themes. While doing this, select a few quotes from the notes to illustrate and provide insights for your summary.

In summary: Read notes/transcripts carefully. Mark relevant parts of text that respond clearly to research questions; look for key words or topics and construct categories/clusters or themes. Reduce clusters of ideas into 5–6 themes. Find quotes that illustrate each of the themes.

After analyzing the FGD data itself, review the information and compare it to the household survey results. Is there contradictory information? If so, these *contradictions* may be useful for the reflection/validation meetings. Use these meetings to ask additional questions to try to understand or interpret the contradictions.

Writing the FGD Results into the Individual Study Site Report

1. Provide an introduction to the philosophy and ideas behind conducting a focus group discussion in this particular context. Mention limitations (e.g., limited resources). Canadian researchers will be available to help with preparing some of this section.

2. Refer to the study site information already included in the report. Then identify
   a. the organizational positions held by those consulted
   b. representation (gender — number of men/women, youth, breakdown of who was a co-op member, nonmember)

3. Provide the key questions asked (the list of questions will also be an appendix, but key questions should be provided here too). Did you ask all the questions? Was it question and

answer with answers randomly expressed by the study group participants, or did each member provide a response to each question? In other words, for this section you are explaining the methodology you used to gather the focus group data.

4. Write down the findings from the FGD analysis. This should correspond to #4 in the last section of these guidelines.

5. After analyzing the FGD, report on the shortcomings in the data gathered. For example, the fact that FGDs were not all recorded and transcribed verbatim is a shortcoming as the accuracy may be reduced. Assuming that there were unexpected findings or outcomes from the FGD, ensure that they get reported.

Annex Nine: Policy Interview Guide Instrument

1. The policy and governance interview instruments will be directed to three groups of respondents: Top government policy makers (ministers, permanent secretaries and planning directors of ministries of trade and industry, agriculture, finance and planning, irrigation, fisheries, minerals and natural resources, and tourism). These ministries are directly linked to the integrated model of rural development and also related to co-operative development. Sectorally, these are ministries where co-operatives can be formed and regulated.

2. Regional and district officers of the same ministries where policy and legislation are interpreted and implemented, and where interaction takes place between policy makers and the community.

3. Co-operative movement leadership at the national level. When policy and legislation are formulated, the national co-operative leaders are involved in a participatory formulation process, interpretation and implementation.

A. Key Issues for Top Policy Makers

Rural Development Policy

1. Is there a policy focusing on rural development in your country?

2. If there is one, what are the main features of the policy?

3. If there is no policy for rural development, do you have any policy substitute as a framework?

4. Which ministry co-ordinates the implementation of rural development in your country?

5. What is your opinion on integrated rural development in your country?

B. Ministry Responsible for Co-operative Development

1. Do existing sectoral policies in agriculture, industry and trade, minerals, fisheries, finance and planning support co-operative development in your country? If so, how?

2. What relationships exists between rural development and co-operative development policies?

3. To what extent does current co-operative development policy support:

   a) Local networking among primary societies?

   b) Local networking between lower- and upper-level co-operative organization

  c) Does local networking expand towards joint agro-processing and value addition?

4. From the point of view of the government, what do you think is the current experience level of member satisfaction and perceived benefits of co-operatives in your country?

5. Based on knowledge from Uganda, if the integrated co-operative model were to be applied in Rwanda, what would this look like?

6. What features of your country's history have affected the approach to co-operative development and what is the current policy context like?

7. What are the current perceptions of the government towards co-operatives and what can government learn from its experience and history that will shape policy and legislation in your country?

8. How does the ministry support and promote good governance in co-operatives in your country?

C. Issues for Other Ministries Supporting Co-operative Development (finance and planning, fisheries, minerals and energy, agriculture, trade and industry, irrigation, housing and human settlements)

1. To what extent does your ministry perceive the need for co-operatives in rural development in your country?

2. Do you have co-operative institutions in your sector and how does the ministry support such organizational initiatives?

3. How do your ministerial policies support cooperatives and rural development in your country?

D. Issues for Regional and District Government Staff: Ministry Responsible for Co-operative Development

1. What processes and mechanisms used by the ministry in promoting co-operative development and registration are in your area?

2. When co-operatives have been formed, what mechanisms and processes do you use to initiate the implementation of co-operative policy and legislation?

3. What methods do you use to identify local capacities and ability for organizational development in local communities in your area?

4. How do you interpret and link local economic development efforts with delivery systems of the central government in co-operative development?

5. How do you link existence of resources in local co-operatives with higher level policy response and recognition?

6. What instruments and tools are used by the government to audit the status governance in local co-operatives and what have been the outcomes in shaping governance in local co-operative development?

7. Do you see the emergence of horizontal co-operative integration with local co-operatives? If so what are the areas and co-operative institutions where integration is possible?

8. If co-operative integration at the local level is possible, what are the main issues that should be addressed for the development of a successful integrated co-operative development in your country?

9. If co-operative integration is possible at the local primary society levels, what do you think will be the main tools for effecting successful integration?

10. Co-operative integration is the implementation of principle number six of the co-operative identity. How can the same logic be carried out by co-operatives nationally, regionally, and internationally?

E. Issues for Interview with National Co-operative Leaders

1. 70-80 percent of the population in your country are rural and depend on agriculture. What initiatives are taken by your federation to link farmers to existing or new co-operatives in the country?

2. Co-operatives usually operate under policies which shape the operational environment. Which sectoral policies do you think support co-operative development in all sectors and why?

3. Which policies do you think constrain co-operative development in all sectors?

4. Which policies are neutral to co-operative development in your country?

5. Based on knowledge of the integrated co-operative model in Uganda and its success outcomes, do you think the model can be replicated with primary co-operatives in your country? If so, what are the existing opportunities? If not, what are the existing constraints?

6. The integrated co-operative model operating in Uganda has been successful because of upholding the culture of joint planning, entrepreneurship, and mobilization for effective negotiation in business. Do you think such motivation for integration is possible in your country? If so, what should be the national strategy for co-operative integration in the country?

7. If co-operative integration is possible for Uganda, what are the tools which can bind co-operatives to run a successful integrated co-operative business model in your country?

Thank You for Your Participation

Annex Ten: Guidelines for Case Studies / Community Profiles

The following components would be ideal to include in the Case Study / Community Profile, using information gathered throughout your research (both qualitative and quantitative) as well as from desk review and existing official sources. However, if your team does not have this information and it cannot be obtained from existing sources, you are not expected to do substantial additional research, as there aren't any additional funds in the project for this!

Please note that throughout the profile, it will be important to refer to the source of information for each (published source, own research, etc.). Please also include, throughout the profile, *quotations (from the FGDs and interviews) to represent the diversity of opinions of participants.*

Case Study / Community Profile

1. Community name
2. Location in the country (describe + map)
3. Size
4. Residents
   a. Age breakdown
   b. Family size
   c. Educational attainment of adults by co-op membership type and gender
   d. School attendance of children by class and gender. What do people need to do in this community to send their children to school?
   e. Wealth/poverty/socio-economic status and class (include official data if available, as well as what is available from HH survey) / income levels/inequality (distribution). Illustrative questions:
      i. What is the source of wealth in this area?
      ii. What are the causes of poverty and inequality?
      iii. Who is well-off? Who is poor?
      iv. Are there any particular social characteristics that can be identified to describe these people?
      v. How does poverty affect people in this area?
      vi. Is there any formal or informal "safety net" that you can identify?
      vii. What does wealth allow people to do or to be in this community?

f. Gender. Illustrative questions:

    i. What is the gender division of labour here?

    ii. What about gender issues in ownership, inheritance, decision making, etc.

    iii. What are some particular issues faced by women and men in their work and in the household?

5. Characteristics

    a. Languages or cultures (where relevant), religion, ethnicity; relative percentages.

        i. Is one dominant, do they mix with each other, etc.?

        ii. What are the implications of this for the co-op, as well as for community solidarity?

    b. Relevant geographic features, if any.

    c. Economic activity in the area — illustrative questions:

        i. Any industries or business; what is in competition with the co-op?

        ii. Are there any businesses that might provide synergies?

        iii. Is this a community that is visited by other members of other communities for economic or social reasons, and for what?

        iv. Is there land-grabbing in the area?

        v. What is the national and transnational business presence in the area, if any? Are they "pushing" any crops, activities, or techniques?

    d. Access to finance

        i. How do people get access to credit? What are they using it for?

        ii. Presence of banks, SACCOs, VSLAs, etc., in the area. Distance from area, if not right there?

    e. Employment (draw on HH survey data)

        i. Percentage of farmers in community (% of people who say farming is their main business).

        ii. Average land size for farmers, inequality in land size and animals.

        iii. Employment by class and gender; number/percent female, single-headed households.

    f. Farming systems: major crops, minor crops, animals, use of resources on-farm, are people purchasing their inputs, etc? Major problems faced and how they are dealt with at present.

    g. Informal and (other) formal co-operation: What is there and how do they affect (or how are they likely to affect) the co-op? (and how is the co-op likely to affect them?).

    h. Proximity to rural and urban markets; what are they selling and where? What are they most likely to buy?

    i. Availability of infrastructure (roads, rail, water processing, etc., — whatever is relevant).

6. Historical/political context

    a. Conflicts? How has this affected the solidarity of the local community?

    b. Previous political involvement with co-ops in the area?

    c. Any social movement history, local or otherwise?

7. Any other relevant information

8. Description of the co-op or co-ops in the community

Uganda	Tanzania	Rwanda
RPO	AMCOS	Rice Co-op
SACCO (if present)	SACCOS (if present)	SACCO
ACE (if present)	Co-op Bank (if involved)	Union/Federation
	Dynamic or other union (if involved)	

Information to Share in Describing Each Co-op

1	Name	
2	Year founded	
3	# of women members	
4	# of men members	
5	# of youth members (also counted above)	
6	Any special efforts being made to involve youth and/or women members in co-op activities or leadership?	
7	Any notes on the board of directors and/or other co-op leadership	
8	Opportunities offered for learning and training about co-ops	
9	"Class" breakdown of membership	
10	Mission	
11	Lines of business	
12	Other activities (training, education, links to government extension, involvement in development projects, links with apex organizations, etc.) (This could be a big section — feel free to create separate sections if there is a lot of information.)	
13	Volume of business (whatever measures are relevant)	
14	Other business statistics (whatever is relevant)	
15	Links between the co-ops — describe. Are they formalized with MOUs, etc.?	
16	Any information on any overlap of members with other co-ops	
17	Nonmembers: why do they not join? (Too expensive? Not relevant?) Who are they, socially speaking?	
18	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and limitations	

Annex Eleven: Member Profiles Guidelines

Interviews to Develop a Profile of a "Typical Member"

a) **Purpose of the additional interviews —** We do not have longitudinal data, hence the purpose is to gather brief member profiles to address, as much as possible, the issue of bias that might be due to a certain type of person having a predisposition to become a co-op member.

b) **Criteria for selecting a person for the additional interview —** What we are trying to do is profile the average co-op member. Whoever this person is will be specific to the co-op itself, so the people to interview are those who are most representative of an average single co-op member and an average integrated co-op member.

The demographics to consider are gender, marital status, farm size (livestock holdings) or other measures of wealth, level of education, level of involvement in the co-op (perhaps someone who holds a leadership position).

You should also look for some variability — so if you interview a single woman farmer in one area, then you should interview a married woman farmer in another area.

c) **Two or three profiles per co-op** — not overly long, two to three pages at most

d) **The type of information we need is demographic** as listed in point b) above, but in addition to this, **is also contextual:**

    a. Why did the person join the co-op?

    b. How long have they been a member?

    c. What was their circumstance prior to joining the co-op (measured in ways appropriate to the region)?

    d. Do they attribute the changes in their lives (good or bad) to membership in the co-op? If not, to what?

    e. Why do they feel membership in the co-op is a positive or negative thing?

Annex Twelve: Guidelines for Validation Workshops

Validating the results of the research findings is an important part of community-based research. The validations are used to ensure that the community agrees with what the research team has interpreted or understood about the community's input and the data collected/analyzed. Sometimes it also means that the researcher needs to give more ownership of the results to the community as there may be disagreement between what the researchers understood and what the study participants actually meant. Keep in mind, however, that there are always multiple perspectives in the community as well.

Working with the community to validate and discuss knowledge sharing and transfer is an important part of community-based research. It also helps to distribute power over the research results. To achieve effective knowledge transfer and implementation, it is important to develop processes that assist the co-operatives and communities to adapt research findings to the local circumstances.

So, How Can This Be Done?

There are multiple ways to check for validity with a community, but two seem particularly relevant here:

> 1) Member checks
> 2) Community feedback groups

1. Member Checks

Member checks are done by sharing the findings with *select* study participants after the data analysis is complete. This allows participants to critically analyze the findings and comment on them. The participants either affirm that the summaries reflect their views, feelings, and experiences, or the interpretations require additional information. If the participants affirm the accuracy and completeness, then the study is said to have credibility. These member checks are not without fault, but serve to decrease the incidence of incorrect data and the incorrect interpretation of data. The overall goal of this process is to provide findings that are reliable.

Member checks are sometimes called informant feedback. This can be accomplished by having several study participants (volunteers) check the accuracy of and comment on the

preliminary research findings. Their comments serve as a check on the validity of the interpretation. The relationship between the researcher and the study participant (member agreeing to the member check) should be one that encourages honesty and openness in this process. The process for achieving member checks is to get a few study participants to agree to read over the study findings and make comments and suggestions for changes, additions, deletions, and so on. In the sites where we have conducted data collection, this will likely include leaders of the co-operative organizations and perhaps a couple of community members with high literacy skills. Another way to do this would be for the researcher to go through the analysis with these individuals and solicit feedback. Member checks can get more depth on particular findings. The problem with member checks, however, is that they often don't reach the breadth of experiences represented in our study and that is why they should be completed with community feedback groups.

2. Community Feedback Groups

This group should be made up of a cross-section of stakeholders involved in the data collection sample — e.g., several members from the study's focus group discussions, members of the different co-op associations involved, non–co-op members (this might also serve to recruit new members), youth involved in the study, etc. Efforts at achieving gender equal representation should be considered. The group should be brought together for a workshop-style meeting.

At this meeting, the researchers should present the results to the group in a simple and understandable way (not using complicated graphs, tables, or study questions). Complicated tables and graphs may not assist the study participants in feeling that this is the information they provided. Caution should be taken in deciding what is important for the community people to know and what will be confusing for them to know. We want the community to be part of the process, not alienated from it. The presentation of the findings from the researchers should invite feedback from the community feedback group. If the community feedback group is larger than 10 people, they should be divided into small groups to give feedback; otherwise several people may dominate and others will have less of a chance to speak. Good facilitation in the community feedback group is important to ensure that multiple voices are recognized and heard.

It is important to have a good note-taker/recorder during the community feedback group (more than one if you are dividing into groups) because additional data and clarifications may emerge. Snacks should be provided.

What Is Important for People in the Field?

In addition to validating the data already collected, the research team could invite a conversation about how the co-op might use this data. For this process, the community feedback group could again divide into smaller groups and look at how the data might be used. This kind of discussion can validate the findings and also encourage community-driven knowledge dissemination. In all likelihood, if the community is involved in making decisions about the research, they will be more likely to implement it.