



FACTORS THAT INHIBIT GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT AMONG TURKANA PASTORALISTS IN KENYA

Lokia Asunta

Student at Egerton University,

Prof. Josephine P. Ouma

Department of Crops,
Horticulture and Soils,
Egerton University

Prof. Mark I. Okere

Department of Curriculum,
Instruction and Educational Management,
Egerton University

ABSTRACT

Owing to the situation of food insecurity in the Northern part of Kenya, measures such as gender mainstreaming in livestock management should not be taken lightly. Despite Government intervention, challenges remain in the implementation and application of these policies in order to lead to effective change for most women. This study examined the perceptions of Turkana pastoralist on the influence of gender mainstreaming in livestock management on the social economic status. The study specifically looked at the factors that inhibit gender mainstreaming, attitudes towards gender mainstreaming and gender mainstreaming status in Loima district. The focus was all livestock keepers among the Turkana communities, in Loima district from which a total of 106 residents were selected. The study adopted the descriptive survey design. The data was collected by use of a questionnaire, focus group discussions and an interview schedule. They were piloted using a sub-sample of 11 pastoralists in the district. Data collected was then analyzed with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 21.0 computer software for descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages and means). The findings show that the factors that inhibit gender mainstreaming in livestock management include: lack of technical skills among women socio cultural beliefs, distant and risky location for access by women, the tradition governing animal species ownership, unfavorable perception towards control of cash resulting from selling of milk products, and unfavorable perception towards equality participation in livestock production activities. The study also established that Turkana men are considered to play the major role in livestock management in the Turkana community. They are the key decision makers in regard to livestock production activities. The findings show that pastoralists perceptions towards gender roles in livestock production management, men's continuity in dominating the decision making in production activities, animal species ownership, and insecurity issues associated women involvement in production activities were negatively influencing individual household incomes. The findings from this study may help in improving gender mainstreaming in livestock and help the pastoralists to understand how best to cater for their livestock when both men and women participate in livestock activities.

KEY TERMS: Gender Mainstreaming, Gender disparity, Women Participation in Livestock Production Activities, Livestock management

INTRODUCTION

Many pastoralists can be found in Africa; however pastoralism is also practiced in dry and sub-humid lands in the Middle East, South and East Asia, South America and Europe. The role of women in livestock production and the need for gender mainstreaming have been widely documented (FAO, 2011). However, in most countries, especially in the developing countries women have been excluded from the management of livestock. For instance, in India and Syria, grazing is the exception, with men doing an estimated 37 percent of the work (UNDP, 2007). Throughout Africa, women take a leading role in livestock production, yet men dominate livestock management. For instance the Hamar of Ethiopia where young wives are increasingly taking on herding activities, in order to promote the self-sufficiency of nuclear families (Hirut Yibabe 2001), The Heera of the Somali, the Gadaa of the Borana and the Finna of the Afar (Arsano, 2000), and in Egypt (IFAD, 2008)

In Kenya, the importance of livestock keeping to the Kenyan economy cannot be underestimated. An estimated 60% of all households are engaged in farming activities, and 84% of rural households keep livestock (GoK, 2009). In the Turkana community, men dominate all important livestock process ignoring the fact that there are those processes that could be well handled by women considering their proximity and knowledge about the animals. When the rearing of small animals becomes a more important source of family income, ownership, management and control are often turned over to the man (IFAD, 2003). An estimated two-thirds of poor livestock keepers are women (ILRI, 2012). They have important roles in managing dairy cattle, poultry and other small ruminants often being involved in feeding, watering and milking animals reared close to home such as in intensive and mixed systems and in processing and marketing of livestock products (ILRI, 2012). Yet gender mainstreaming in livestock management remains a great challenge. This is because, livestock production livestock productivity is occasioned by recurrent drought (inadequate feeds and water), insecurity, land tenure system, poor breeds and breeding practices, endemic livestock diseases and poor livestock husbandry, which the communities believe can only be handled by men (Schilling, et al. 2012). Given the importance of the sector to the economy, its dismal performance is a concern that needs to be mitigated

Women's right in Kenya are supported by law and a number of key policy documents, including article 27 of the constitution. Kenya is also a signatory to various international instruments including CEDAW which guarantees gender equality of treatment in all spheres of life. Nonetheless, challenges

remain in the implementation and application of these policies in order to lead to effective change for most Kenya's women. Turkana women have experienced gender discrimination in the livestock management. Male dominance in decision-making, control and access over resources prevents women from participating and benefiting from livestock activities. While it is evident that women are central contributors to the economic, social and political development as well as environmental management (Turkana Environmental Resources Association (TERA) 2012), of the livestock economy they have received marginal benefits from economic growth and development (Hassan *et al.*, 2007), continue to be outside the decision-making sphere (Wamuyu, 2014) and barely enjoy any human rights (Budlender & Alma, 2011). However, women still face discrimination, exclusion, and marginalization and do not share equally the benefits from production. Could negative perceptions of Turkana pastoralists on the influence of gender mainstreaming in livestock management be one of the factors contributing to low socio economic status of the residents of Loima district? This study examined the perceptions of Turkana pastoralists on the influence of gender mainstreaming in livestock management on the socio-economic status.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study adopted a social feminist theory advocated by Alison Jaggar (1998). The theory focuses mainly on the analysis of historical and socio-economic class factors that relate to the position of women in a capitalist society. Socialist's feminists aim to understand the relationship among different types of class struggles over the control of the means of production in a given capitalist society and the gendered nature of the social relations of production in that society. The theory also seeks to understand how the gendered construction of society under patriarchy interacts with other social forces of domination and subordination under capitalism. Socialist feminism argues that the division of labour based on sex perpetuates patriarchal capitalist values because different types of labour are neither equally valued nor equally compensated. This theory maintains that women in their domestic role have an important place in the maintenance of capitalism, although they are unpaid. This theory is relevant to this study because the study focuses on the perceptions of Turkana pastoralist on gender mainstreaming in livestock management and this will create an environment where gender equity in livestock activities will be incorporated.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Gender Mainstreaming in Livestock Management

According to FAO, (2012a) livestock is considered a key asset for rural households worldwide and a primary livelihood resource for rural communities: about 752 million of the world's poor keep livestock to produce food, generate cash income, manage risks and build up assets (FAO, 2012a). Livestock "widens and sustains three major pathways out of poverty: (1) securing the assets of the poor, (2) improving smallholder and pastoral productivity and (3) increasing market participation by the poor" (International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), 2007). Especially in rural areas, the development of small-scale livestock enterprises must be seen as a key element of any efforts to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger (FAO 2010b).

FAO (2011) noted that rural women perform a reproductive role, encompassing child bearing, child rearing and housework. At the same time, they also fulfill a productive role, engaging in paid labour activities outside the house and/or being in charge of a number of tasks related to household farming activities, including livestock management. In some developing countries, they make on average up to 43 percent of the agricultural labour force and contribute substantially to the livestock management (FAO, 2011).

Women worldwide play important roles in livestock keeping and provision of livestock services. However, a number of challenges face the livestock sector, including ensuring food and feed resources, and livelihood security for poor smallholder producers and processors. It is estimated that women compose around two thirds of the 400 million poor livestock keepers who mainly rely on livestock for their income (FAO, 2011; 2012).

According to WHO (2009), gender disparities can also have negative consequences on women's ability to earn a stable income, and have an adverse impact on overall household income earned at the household level from livestock production. In addition, the nature of the work women and men perform within the livestock sector may expose them to various health and safety related concerns, such as heightened exposure to zoonotic diseases.

The role that women play in the management of dairy cattle differs greatly among communities, countries and regions, although some patterns and tendencies can be identified across most regional contexts. Among both mobile pastoralists and settled agro-pastoralists, women are traditionally responsible for milking animals, processing milk and collecting dairy products (FAO, 2010a). On the same note, a report by FAO (2009) on gender equity in agriculture

and rural development revealed negative impact of gender discrimination on productivity is more obvious in the livestock sector than in most other areas of agriculture. But the potential benefits of gender equality have made the sector a privileged entry point for gender mainstreaming.

In Sub Saharan Africa, preventing confiscation of livestock upon the death of a husband is an important social protection mechanism. Heifer Zambia, an NGO, recognized the constraints women faced in owning and inheriting property, including livestock. Heifer worked with households and communities to establish joint ownership of livestock by the husband and the wife. A signed contract also allowed for a woman to inherit the livestock if her spouse died, which provided a form of social protection.

As keepers of local knowledge, women and men contribute to the enhancement of gene flow and domestic animal diversity (FAO, 2002). They also hold knowledge useful in the prevention and treatment of livestock illness. Men, women, boys, and girls will often have differing livestock knowledge and skills depending on their roles and responsibilities in animal husbandry. Women who process wool may have far different criteria for breed selection than men. Men herding cattle may have different knowledge of fodder and disease prevention than others in their household. Men's and women's reasons for keeping livestock may differ, as shown in a study conducted in Bolivia, India, and Kenya (Heffernan, *et al.*, 2001; IFAD, (2004).

Gender mainstreaming which is the independent variable has an influence on socio economic status indicators which includes; better livestock management, levels of education of children, income levels, quantity of milk production and health and welfare of livestock. Intervening variables are education of household head, security, and climate change which affects the entire Turkana community, and the pastoralists' age. Only the pastoralists who were over 30 years participated in the study. Most of these pastoralists have not gone beyond standard 8 level of education. Thus, the household heads have same level of education.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Mutai (2000:120) defines a research design as a specific plan for studying the research problem. It constitutes the blue -print for the collection, measurement and analysis of data. This study used descriptive survey design. This design uses questionnaires and interview schedule to collect data from respondents to determine the influence of the independent variable on dependent variable.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The data was collected by use of a questionnaire, focus group discussions and an interview schedule. They were also piloted using a sub- sample of 11 pastoralists in the district. Data collected was then analyzed with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 21.0 computer software for descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages and means). The results were then presented in the form of charts and tables. The study employed a multi-stage sampling approach, where the respondents were accessed in geographical strata, then clustered to either male or female. The strata included Locher Edome and Namoruputh. Within the strata simple random sampling was used in selecting the respondents. Purposive sampling technique was used in identifying participants for the interview schedule. This is because only those who keep livestock were considered. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003: 50), Purposive sampling is a sampling technique that allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his or her study. Prior to use, the researcher carried out a pilot study in Locher Ekuyen, in Loima Sub County using 11 pastoralists (10% of the sample size). Care was taken so that they do not form part of the sampled pastoralists. The pilot study revealed deficiencies in the design of a proposed research procedure and these were then addressed. The questionnaires were tested for reliability using Cronbach's reliability test and the instruments were considered sufficiently reliable since they yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.704, borrowing from the views fronted by Kathuri and Pals (1993).

Reliability

The results of the pre-test survey helped in restructuring of the questionnaire by incorporating the missing information, omitting irrelevant questions and paraphrasing questions that appear ambiguous to the respondents. The questionnaires were tested for reliability using Cronbach's reliability test and the instruments were considered sufficiently reliable since they yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.704, borrowing from the views fronted by Kathuri and Pals (1993). The questionnaire instrument yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.709, across the 49 items (variables).

Validity

Content validity was established by use of experts to determine if the items are a representative sample of the skills and traits that comprise the area to be measured. The experts provided guidance on the content of the instruments that is, ensuring that all the research objectives had been addressed by the information sought in the instruments. The manner of

construction of the questionnaires was also checked to ensure that the questions were not misinterpreted and only relevant information is obtained. The findings from the pilot study were used to improve on the questionnaire, thus enhancing its validity.

DATA ANALYSIS

The researcher filled the questionnaires, coded data, edited and analyzed them, after the data has been collected. Data collected was computed for descriptive statistics (frequencies, means and percentages) using statistical package for social scientists (SPSS) computer software and results presented as frequencies and percentages.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The study was able to get a response rate of 102 respondents out of the targeted 106, which is 96% of the target response. Almost all the respondents (82.4%) were aged above 35 years. This shows that most of persons involved in livestock management were aged above 35 years, that is to say there was less involvement of the youth in management of livestock keeping. The study was able to reach 73.5% male and 26.5% female. This was due to the availability and willingness to participate in the study by males compared to females. It is also an indication that more males than male were involved in livestock management. However, the study is able to capture useful information from both gender represented in the study. It was established that 81% of the livestock keepers interviewed were married, while 19% were widows. This implied that livestock keeping was a household practice, that even upon the death of a spouse the widows were allowed to keep and own livestock. It was found that unmarried persons in the area did not own livestock, given that owners in the area were either married or widows. The findings show that whereas 62.7% indicated that their highest level of education attained was primary level, 37.3% indicated that they had never gone to school. This implied that the highest level attained by most livestock keepers was primary school level.

FACTORS THAT INHIBIT GENDER

Mainstreaming in Livestock Management among the Turkana Pastoralists

Using select number of livestock production activities, the respondents were asked to indicate the ones carried out by men and women in this community, as was the usual practice as well as indicate the major difficulties which limited women participation in those activities. The response was as provided in Table 2. For example: One of the key factors which inhibit gender mainstreaming among the Turkana pastoralists of Kenya are....[the community belief on gender roles with respect to livestock production activities. The findings show that the main livestock production activities carried out by men

included Selling milk and milk product (82.4%); grazing animals (81.4%); taking animal in and out of shed (72.5%); and watering the animal (63.7%). on the other hand the main livestock production activities carried by women included: cleaning of shed (91.2%); milking (91.2%); care of sick animal (81.4%); offering food to animal (72.5%); making ghee (72.5%); and storage of milk (82.4%); and. (see Table 2). This finding collaborates with Bern (2000), who reported that in many societies women are responsible for small stock as goats, sheep and poultry, as well as for young and sick animals kept at the homestead. They are mostly involved in milk production, although not all women control the sale of milk and its products.

According to the focus group discussion, traditionally, there is a division between the roles of men in Turkana's pastoral societies and those of women. Women take care of animals; carry out domestic duties such as cooking, childcare, and water and firewood collection; and are involved in farming. Men are involved in herding and marketing animals, farming, and digging water wells, though fetching water remains a woman's role. The findings in this section are in line with a study by Amuguni (2001) who established that women mainly care for young stock of all species, care for sick animals and treat them with traditional medicines, have full responsibility for milking and milk distribution, water the stock, and also herd, particularly when there is a shortage of boys or men.

The proximity to the main source of drinking water is another factor which affects gender mainstreaming among the Turkana of Kenya. The results of this study shows that the main sources of drinking water for both household and livestock use

Government Involvement in Trainings: The findings show that those respondents who had received training received training from NGOs (17.6%) and Church Organizations (8.8%). This implied that there were no governmental organized trainings and thus policy implementation in respect to gender mainstreaming was almost impossible. The findings further revealed that this form of training is only available to the residents when a problem arises. Training activity is mainly supported by NGOs. This finding appears not to totally agree with a report by UNDP (2014) showing that UNDP through the drought response programme funds interventions as a medium term measure to support urgent recovery of communities affected by the drought and to strengthen institutions responsible for recovery and disaster risk reduction work. However, according to the UNDP, there is some form of partnership with the Government of Kenya to ensure women training in business management skills.

include Kospir river (52.9%) and boreholes (47.1%). According to the focus group discussions, most water sources were distant location and it was risk for women access them. Gender mainstreaming therefore, becomes tricky considering the fact that in most cases water sources are distant location and risky areas that may not favour women participation. This report is in agreement with a study by Human Rights Watch (2014) which established that the reduced water levels in Lake Turkana have a devastating impact on the environment and people of Turkana County. Women and girls often walk extremely long distances to dig for water in dry riverbeds. Many children become sick because their families are unable to provide them with sufficient food and clean water.

Identification and treatment of livestock diseases: The findings revealed that that 74% of the respondents indicated that they had not received training on how to treat and identify livestock disease, while only 26% had received such training. This implied that majority of the respondents did not have knowledge on how to treat and identify livestock disease. The focus group discussion findings revealed that women and other members of the community lack technical knowledge of livestock issues. This actually could have limited effective gender mainstreaming in livestock management among the Turkana Pastoralists. These findings are in line with an analysis of the SNV/CAPE Community-Based Animal Health Project (CBAHP) which revealed that women are not generally involved in the initial planning meetings and hence have a low level of awareness and understanding of the aims and activities of the project. The staff in general are not gender aware and have not received any training to help them to overcome this.

Adequate of pasture: The findings show that 90% of the respondents indicated that they experienced the problem of inadequate pasture, while 10% did not see this as a challenge facing livestock production. This implied that indeed inadequate pasture presented as a great challenge facing livestock production in the area. This finding is in line with the study by Miller (2011) who in addition noted decisions about moving animals to pastures or water sources, as well as selling or gifting livestock are usually made by men. If women are to equally participate in livestock management as men do, then they also need to participate in making decisions on pasture source.

Water and Drought Challenge in Livestock Management:

The findings show that 73% of the respondents cited water as a great challenge facing livestock production in the area, and 55% cited drought as a key problem. The rest of the respondents, 27% and 45% felt that water and drought, respectively did not pose as serious challenges. It implies that these challenges

did exist but respondents' perception was based on personal experience. Water resource is very important and thus, equal participation of both gender is vital. A publication by Cultural and Survival (2015) shows that in Turkana five species of livestock are kept: camels, cattle, goats, sheep and donkeys. Each species has different food and water requirements. Camels are browsers; sheep, cattle and donkeys are grazers; and goats can be classified as either. Browsers must include a large amount of leafy vegetation in their diet, while grazers favor grasses. The majority of the people and most of the milking animals live in the major homestead which remains in the plains throughout the year but moves frequently as forage and water resources are depleted.

Diseases facing Livestock Production: The findings show that majority of the respondents (82.4%) indicated that disease was an impediment to successful livestock production, while 17.6% did not see this as a problem. This implied that disease was an aspect that needed to be tackled by all stakeholders considering the fact that most of the respondents saw it as a problem. Gender mainstreaming therefore needed to acknowledge this aspect and women could also have a positive input considering their role in livestock keeping. Mochabo *et al.* (2005) and Eregae (2003) described the main diseases that affect livestock in Turkana South District. The diseases identified as being important include: *trypanosomosis*, mange, tick infestation, haemorrhagic septicaemia and non-specific diarrhoea in camels; anthrax, contagious bovine pleuropneumonia and rabies in cattle; anthrax, contagious caprine pleuropneumonia, pox in sheep and goats and anthrax, black quarter, trypanosomosis and impaction in donkeys.

Security in Livestock Production: The results show that majority of the respondents (91.2%) indicated that insecurity was a problem facing livestock production among Turkana pastoralists, while 8.8% did not view this as a challenge. This implied that insecurity was a key problem in the area. According to Wawire (2001), security is an issue which cannot be handled by anyone. It is the responsibility of men to provide security for their family members and livestock. Providing security to the animals and household members. This is because the area is prone to cattle raiding and bandit attacks from neighbouring ethnic communities. Wawire noted that if women are not protect in the course of livestock management, they may be attacked by bandits or rapists on their way. To counteract this, women walk in groups. Transporting the water for long distances is also a problem because the women have to carry the water on their heads, making many trips. They have to carry the water in heavy traditional wooden troughs (*ng'ageterin*) that were originally meant to be carried by donkeys, before the drought killed them.

Limited drugs for animals and inadequate skills on how to treat the animals on livestock production:

The study findings show that 44.1% of the pastoralists indicated that limited drugs for animals affected livestock production, 55.9% did not experience this challenge. This implied that that limited drugs for animals, though a problem seems not to have been experienced by most of the pastoralists. They preferred to treat their own animals using traditional means and this was mostly treated as men's preserve. This is in line with a study by Bett, Jost and Mariner (2008) in Kenya which revealed that most herders opt to treat their own animals due to limited access to animal health services. The distribution of community animal health workers (CAHWs) is poor while some of them are no longer active.

Marketing of livestock products among the Turkana pastoralists:

The study established that 52.9% of the pastoralists experienced limited marketing. Access to marketing information was a tricky issue and this was a serious impediment to gender mainstreaming in the area. During all the four FGD sessions the respondents were asked whether information on market opportunities for livestock products was shared to both male and female livestock owners. The women indicated that they did not get it in time and in fact went ahead to say, that the information came from men.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

Following the study findings, the study concludes the as follows.

Turkana community members believe that it is not socially alright to send women on risky ventures such as getting water for animals or food at distant location. The rivers mentioned in this study are streams which in most cases are located far away from the community settlements. The belief system also places the man in a position of not only heading the household but controlling and owning all forms of livestock. However, where fairness is applied, men own large animals, while women own small animals. The small animals owned by women include sheep, goats and poultry. The big animals owned by men include cattle and camel. This form of segregation inhibits women participation in the management of big animals. There is the unfavorable perception towards control of cash resulting from selling of milk products, yet the study shows that women do the selling. Generally, the finding reveals the unfavorable perception towards equality participation in livestock production activities. Women lack technical knowledge of livestock issues and thus involving them in core livestock management areas is considered not prudent. These factors will continue inhibiting gender mainstreaming in livestock management unless checked.

RECOMMENDATION

After drawing the conclusions, the researcher recommended that the Government of Kenya and stakeholders should consider mobilizing resources to train the community and create awareness to the Turkana community on the advantages of gender mainstreaming in livestock management. Specific workshops themed and targeted workshops need to be organized for men pastoralists, with an aim of promoting their support for gender mainstreaming in livestock management.

REFERENCES

1. Andrea, L. (2007). *Agri-Business for Development. A Social Economic Analysis of the Milk Market Chain in the IFAD- Financed Western Sudan Resource Management Program Area*. IFAD, Sudan
2. Baumann, B. (2000). *Gender and livestock: Capitalization of Experiences on Livestock Projects and Gender*. Swiss Agency for Development on Cooperation, Bern.
3. Bravo-Baumann (2000). *Livestock and Gender: A Winning Pair - Capitalization of Experiences on the Contribution of Livestock Projects to Gender Issues*. Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Bern.
4. Bett, B. Jost, C. and Mariner, J. (2008). *Participatory Investigation of Important Animal Health Problems amongst the Turkana Pastoralists: Relative Incidence, Impact on Livelihoods and Suggested Interventions*. Discussion Paper No. 15. Targeting and Innovation. ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), Nairobi, Kenya.
5. Budlender, D. and Alma E. (2011). *In focus. Women and land. Securing rights for better lives*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
6. Christensen, H. (2011). *Mainstreaming Gender, Diversity and Citizenship: Concepts and Methodologies*. Working Paper No. 4, University of Copenhagen
7. *Combined County Livestock Development Plan for Turkana, West Pokot, Samburu and Baringo 2013-2017*.
8. *Cultural and Survival (2015). Food and the Turkana in Kenya*. Retrieved on 4th February 2016. Available at <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/kenya/food-and-turkana-kenya>
9. Drost, E. (2011). *Validity and Reliability in Social Science Research*. Educational Research and Perspectives. Vol 38 (1) 105- 123
10. Eddis, J. (2016). *Emerging Interconnections between Food Security, Gender and Pastoralism*. Available at <http://www.penhannetwork.org/blog/2013/03/28/merging-interconnections-between-food-security-gender-and-pastoralism>.
11. *Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2012). Invisible Guardians; Women manage livestock diversity*. *FAO Animal Production and Health*, 174.
12. *Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2012a), Livestock Sector Development for Poverty Reduction: An Economic and Policy Perspective - Livestock's Many Virtues*
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2744e/i2744e00.pdf>
13. *Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2012b), Children's work in the livestock sector: Herding and beyond*
http://www.fao-ilo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/fao_ilo/pdf/Children_s_Work_LivestockP_V.pdf
14. *Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2009). Gender Equity in Agriculture and Rural Development: A Quick Guide to Gender Mainstreaming in FAO's New Strategic Framework*. 2009. FAO
15. *Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2005). Livestock Sector Brief- Kenya*. Nairobi.
16. Frank. E. (1999). *Gender, agricultural development and food security in Amhara, Ethiopia: The contested identity of women farmers in Ethiopia*. USAID, Ethiopia.
17. GoK (2012). *An overview of the agricultural sector performance 2002-2011: Achievements and challenges*. Ministry of Agriculture, Nairobi.
18. GoK, (2007). *Kenya's introductory statement during the presentation of the 5th and 6th combined report on the convention of all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW) to the 39th session of the United Nations Committee on CEDAW*.
19. Hassan, Y. Z. M. Ali, T. and Ahmed, M. (2007). *Gender Contribution in Livestock Management. A Case Study of Rural Punjab, Pakistan*. *African Crop Science Proceedings Vol 8, 1473 – 1477*.
20. Horenstein, R. N. (1989). *Women and Food Security in Kenya*. The World Bank.
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/Y2647E/y2647e08.htm#TopOfPage>
21. *International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2008). Gender in Agriculture*. GIZ. Available at <http://www.gender-in-german-development.net>.
22. *International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) (2012). Strategy and Plan of Action to Mainstreaming Gender*. ILRI Policy Brief 6. Nairobi
23. *Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, (2009). Population and Housing Census Results*. Government press, Nairobi
24. Khazan, O. (2016). *The Scourge of the Female Chore Burden*. The Atlantic. Available at <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/02/the-scourge-of-the-female-time-crunch/470379/>
25. Kindervatter, S. (2001). *Stories of Equitable Development: Innovative Practices from Africa. An Interaction Publication*. Available at www.sdp.undp.org/lstarch/www-natmatch/msg00023.html
26. Kipuri, N. and Rigdewel, A. (2008). *A Double Blind: The exclusion of pastoralists' women in the East and Horn of Africa*. Minority Rights Group International, Nairobi.
27. Knop, K. (2006). *Gender and Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
28. Kratli, S. (2001). *Educating Nomadic Herders out Of Poverty? Culture, Education and Pastoral Livelihood in Turkana and Karamoja*.
29. Kumar K. S. (1994). *Adoption of Hybrid Maize in Zambia: Effects of Gender Roles, Food Consumption,*

- and Nutrition. *International food policy research institute, Washington, D.C*
30. Mathooko, M. J. Mathooko, M. F. and Mathooko M. P. (2007). *Academic Proposal Writing: A Guide to Preparing Proposals for Academic Research (1st edition)*. Amu press, Nairobi.
 31. Müller A. Beth (2011). *The Gender and Social Dimensions to Livestock Keeping in Africa: Implications for Animal Health Interventions*. GALVmed
http://vetvac.org/galvmed/docRep/docs/6_GALVmed_African_Gender_Report_Web.pdf
 32. Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) (2009). *The agricultural outlook January-June 2009*. MoA, Nairobi.
 33. Mochabo, M. Kitala, M. Gathura, P. Ogara, W. Erage, E. Kaitho, T. and Catley, A. (2006). *The socio-economic impact of important camel diseases as perceived by a pastoralist community in Kenya*. Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research 73(4):269–274.
 34. Moser, C. O (1993). *Gender Planning and Development: Theory Practice and Training*. London: Routledge.
 35. Mugenda. O. and Mugenda, G. A. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: African Centre for Technology Studies Press, Nairobi.
 36. Mutai K. B (2000). *How to Write Quality Research Proposal: A Complete and Simplified Recipe*. New York: Thelley publications.
 37. Niamir- Fuller, M. (1994). *Women Livestock Managers in the Third -World. A Focus On Technical Issues Related to Gender Roles in Livestock Production*. IFAD, Working Staff Paper 18.
 38. Njiuki, J. and Distefano, F. (2011). *Report on the FAO-ILRI Training Workshop' understanding and integrating gender in livestock projects and programs 22-25 November 2011*. Addis Abba, Ethiopia.
 39. Omolo, N. (2010). *Gender and Climate Change-Induced Conflict in Pastoral Communities: Case Study of Turkana in North-Western Kenya*. AJCR, 10(2), 81-102.
 40. Parry, M.L. Canziani, O.F. Palutikof, J.P. van der Linden P.J. and Hanson, C.E. (2007). *Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,* 2007, Human health," in "Climate Change <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-chapter8.pdf> (accessed November 6, 2015), 391-431.
 41. Punch, F. K. (2009). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches (2nd edition)*. Los Angeles: Sage publications.
 42. Quisumbing, Meinzen-Dick. R. and Bassett. (2008). *International Food Policy Research Institute, policy brief 7 October, 2008*.
 43. Reeves, H. and Baden, S. (2000). *Gender and Development: Concepts and Definition*. Prepared for the Department for International Development (DFID) for its gender mainstreaming intranet resource. Institute of Development Studies, BRIDGE report Number 55, Brighton.
 44. Republic of Kenya. Ministry of Livestock and Development. *Session Paper No. 2 of 2008 on National Livestock Policy November 2008*.
 45. Sikod F. (2007). *Gender Division of Labor and Women's Decision Making Power in Rural households in Cameroon*. Africa development 2007 32 3 58–71.
 46. Silale, J. and Nyambegera, S. (2014). *The Influence of Socio-Economic Factors in the Transformation of Rural Economies*. International Journal of Business and Social Research (IJBSR), (4), No. 1, 109-120
 47. Taylor, V. (1999). *Reference Manual for Gender mainstreaming in Development Planning: A Government and Other Stakeholders*. Available at <http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=XF2015037362>
 48. Tegegne A. (2004). *Urban Livestock Production and Gender in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*. Available at <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/29819>
 49. Turkana Environmental Resources Association (TERA) (2012), *Background Report*. Retrieved on 20th December, 2015. Available at <https://www.google.com/#q=turkana+sources+of+income+filetype:doc>
 50. *The Kenya National Gender and Development Policy, 2000*
 51. Ministry of Agriculture (2005). *The official journal of the MoA vol.1 No 2, August, 2005*. MoA, Nairobi.
 52. *Turkana county livestock development plan-2013-2017*
 53. *Turkana District Vision and Strategy 2005-2015*. Pricewaterhousecooper. July, 2005.
 54. UNESCO (2006). *Gender Inequalities in Kenya*. Nairobi
 55. Upton, M. (2004). *Role of Livestock in Economic Development and Poverty Reduction*.
 56. UN Women, (2015). *The Effect of Gender Equality Programming on Humanitarian Outcomes*. Retrieved on 20th April, 2016. Available at <http://www.unwomen.org/~media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2015/unw%20effects%20of%20gender%20equality%20on%20humanitarian%20outcomesinglepgsweb.pdf>
 57. Wallace, T. and March, C. (1991). *The Involvement of Agro-pastoralist Women in Livestock Programmes*. Oxfam, Ottawa
 58. Waters-Bayer, A. and B. Letty (2008). *Promoting gender equality and empowering women through livestock*. http://www.prolinova.net/~prolin/sites/default/files/wcap_promoting_gender_equality_nov08.pdf
 59. World Bank, (2009). *Agriculture and rural development: gender and governance in rural services. Insights from India, Ghana and Ethiopia*. (The World Bank).
 60. World Bank, (1999). *Gender in agriculture sourcebook*. The World Bank.