International Journal Of Humanities Education And Social Sciences ***(IJHESS)*** *E-ISSN:* **2808-1765**
Volume 3, Number 2, October 2023, *Page. 625 - 639*
Email : editorijhess@gmail.com

Exploring Gender Inequalities and Promoting Equal Opportunities in Ghana's Cocoa Industry Using Harvard Analytical Framework

Enoch Kwame Tham-Agyekum[1*)], Anthony Appiah[2)], Fred Ankuyi[3)], Gifty-Maria Sangber-Dery[4)], Cherita Antwi[5)], Kaakyire Opoku Acheampong[6)], Tania Akolgo[7)], Tetteh Adesah[8)], John-Eudes Andivi Bakang[9)]

[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9)]Department of Agricultural Economics, Agribusiness and Extension, KNUST-Kumasi, Ghana

*Corresponding Author
Email: ektagyekum@knust.edu.gh

Abstract

Using the Harvard Analytical Framework, this study explores the gender inequalities among cocoa farmers in Southern Ghana and also recommends strategies for promoting equal opportunities between the farmers. Specifically, the research identifies and describes the productive, reproductive, and community-based roles within these communities, explores access and control of resources, services, and decision-making processes and ascertains the factors that influence cocoa farmers' gendered opportunities or constraints. We used a cross-sectional survey design approach to select 232 respondents via the multi-stage sampling technique. Data was analysed using mainly descriptive statistics. The study reveals that although men and women cocoa farmers play useful roles in cocoa production, differences exist in their experiences. While men dominate in all the productive roles and some community-based roles, women dominate in the majority of the reproductive roles. Men have more access to and control over resources, services, and decision-making processes. Community norms, political, religious, and social factors serve as gendered opportunities for farmers, while economic factors are gendered opportunities and constraints. The study recommends the promotion of gender-responsive agricultural training that will aim to empower women to engage in productive roles. Policies and interventions that facilitate women's access and control over essential resources such as land, inputs, and finances must be implemented by the Ghana Cocoa Board.

Keywords: Community-Based, Decision-Making, Gender Roles, Productive Roles, Resource Control

INTRODUCTION

Ghana is probably the first nation that comes to mind when discussing cocoa. Similarly, when one thinks about Ghana, one must also consider the country's cocoa industry, which provides jobs for over 700,000 farmers in the southern tropical region (Kolavalli and Vigneri, 2011). Beginning in 2001, the increase in cocoa production became more noticeable, possibly as a result of a combination of record-high global prices, an increase in the share given to farmers, and a series of initiatives implemented by the Ghana Cocoa Board (Cocobod) to enhance farming practises such as mass spraying programmes and high-tech subsidy packages to encourage the adoption of higher and more frequent fertiliser applications (Vigneri and Santos, 2008). With a market share of roughly 20%, Ghana has the second-highest production of cocoa beans in the world and is regarded as the industry leader in terms of bean quality (Roldan et al., 2013; Wongnaa and Babu, 2020). Ghana's cocoa sells for more money than other countries because of its low levels of debris which produce more cocoa butter per pound of bean than beans with higher levels of debris, slightly higher-than-average fat content, and low levels of bean defects which produce the flavour of cocoa liquor that some consumers prefer (Kolavalli and Vigneri, 2011).

Exports of cocoa brought in 2.71 billion USD in 2017, a sizeable portion of the nation's overall foreign exchange profits (Wongnaa and Babu, 2020). Even though the industry only contributes approximately 3% of the country's overall GDP, it accounts for 20 - 25% of all export revenues, providing around two-thirds of the income for cocoa producers and sustaining the

livelihoods of nearly 4 million farmers (Ghana Statistical Service, 2015). Additionally, during the past several years, the production of cocoa has greatly reduced poverty in the nation. For instance, cocoa farmers' poverty incidence decreased from 64% in 1991 to 24% in 2006, whereas food crop producers' poverty incidence decreased from 68 to 46% during the same time (Ghana Statistical Service, 2007; Abbadi et al., 2019).

Roles in cocoa cultivation i.e., clearing of land, cutting of trees, spraying, harvesting, fermenting, bagging, and selling of cocoa beans are strongly skewed towards males since they are seen to possess greater physical prowess, advanced talents, and important decision-making abilities. Women spend a disproportionate amount of time performing unpaid domestic chores, which limits their ability to work in cocoa farming, take part in training, and engage in activities that diversify their sources of income (Bessa et al., 2021). The majority of the cocoa workers in Ghana are women, who frequently assist their husbands on family farms (African Development Bank, 2015; Barrientos and Bobie, 2016). According to Dalberg Global Development Advisors (2012), women work 45% of the time in West Africa's cocoa production. Even though Ghanaian women are actively involved in the production of cocoa, males still control the industry and gender inequity remains endemic. The financial worth of cocoa makes it a "man's crop" (Barrientos, 2013). Women participate in almost all aspects of the production of cocoa, yet their work is often overlooked, underestimated, and underappreciated (Millard et al., 2021). This is brought on by a confluence of toxic gender norms, uneven power relationships, and unequal access to productive resources.

Due to social and economic issues, gender disparities continue in Ghana despite supporting legal and regulatory frameworks. Gender norms and expectations have a significant impact on the community and public life across populations and sectors (Britt et al., 2020). In terms of financial access, economic resource ownership, and resource control, gender disparities exist (African Development Bank, 2019). Even though women make up about 70% of Ghana's entire agricultural value chain, social norms forbid women from owning land and place restrictions on their access to it (African Development Bank, 2019). Women's participation and benefit-sharing in Ghana's cocoa value chain are constrained by social norms and associated beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours. Although women actively perform several tasks in cocoa production, men are typically regarded as farmers and women as supporting roles in the industry. In terms of cocoa production, resources, and revenue, males are free to decide without consulting women, but the opposite is not true (Bessa et al., 2021).

Gender disparities in productivity have received a lot of attention (Mabundza et al. 2014; Kabeer, 2016; Rola-Rubzen and Paris, 2016; Morgan et al. 2017). According to Kelani et al., (2020), gender differences in productivity are caused by several factors, including credit access, information technology, and agricultural inputs, among others. They further argued that in any agricultural endeavour, it is assumed that women are less financially effective than men. Numerous international organizations have launched gender intervention programmes to bridge the gap between the genders now that it is so widely prevalent in terms of access to productive resources and income inequality. So, it is anticipated that the difference in production would close as the disparity in women's access to and control of resources, services and decision-making shrank. Yet to close the production gap, women must either use resources efficiently or be technically proficient (Danso-Abbeam et al., 2020).

Though several studies (Danso-Abbeam et al., 2020; Alao et al., 2020; Kelani et al., 2020; Abukari et al., 2022; Mabundza et al., 2014; Ankrah et al., 2020; Wahaga, 2018) have been conducted on gender issues among farmers in Ghana, these studies have failed to shed light on the roles of men and women cocoa farmers. It would be appropriate and enlightening to know gender roles while planning programmes aimed at reducing gender inequality. Again, the studies failed to provide empirical evidence on gender-based access to and control of resources, services,

decision-making processes as well as factors influencing farmers' participation in cocoa farming activities. There is therefore the need to explore cocoa farmers' gender differences to offer policymakers opportunities to develop gender-responsive programmes. This setup will allow for the identification of some gender differences between men and women farmers working in cocoa-growing communities. This study looks into gender roles and resource control in Ghanaian cocoa farming communities, with a focus on productive, reproductive, and community roles as well as access and control of resources, services and decision-making processes. Again, it explores factors influencing the opportunities and constraints of farmers and recommends strategies for promoting equal opportunities between men and women with regards to these aspects.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study used a cross-sectional survey research design. The study was conducted in some selected cocoa districts in Southern Ghana, thus, Ashanti Region, Eastern Region, Western North Region and Western South Region. The population for the study comprised all cocoa farmers within the selected areas in the country. Using the Yamane sample size formula, a total of 232 cocoa farmers were selected for the survey. In order to ensure equal representation, 116 males and 116 females were selected. The study employed the multi-stage sampling technique to select the respondents. In the first stage, the simple random sampling technique was used to select four out of the seven cocoa regions in the Country. In every Cocoa region, two districts each were selected using the simple random sampling technique (this was the second stage). In the Eastern Region, the Tafo and Asamankese cocoa districts were selected. In Ashanti Region, Nkawie and Nyinahin cocoa Districts were selected. In Western South and Western North regions, Asankwagua, Tarkwa, Sefwi Boako and Juaboso cocoa districts were selected. In the third stage, one community each was selected from the districts using the simple random sampling technique, making eight (8). In the final stage, about 14 cocoa farmers were selected from each of the communities. The simple random sampling was used throughout the different stages in order to ensure that each member of the population has an equal and independent chance of being selected. This led to a sample that was highly representative of the entire population, reducing the risk of selection bias.

The study utilised two sources of data; primary source and secondary source of data. The primary data for the current study was gathered from our primary respondents (cocoa farmers). Secondary data were obtained from a review of relevant literature. The research instrument that was utilised in the study was a well-structured questionnaire that adapted the Harvard Analytical Framework. The Harvard Analytical Framework is a conceptual framework used in gender policy analysis and decision-making. It helps policymakers and analysts make informed decisions based on evidence and careful consideration of various factors. It encourages transparency, accountability, and adaptability in the policy-making process. The questionnaire covered areas such as gender roles (reproductive, productive and community-based roles), access and control of resources, access and control of services, access and control of decision making processes and influencing factors such as community norms, economic factors, political factors, religious factors and social factors. The generated questionnaire was administered by the researchers in the areas of study. According to Gay et al., (2012), personal interviews allow for more detailed responses. The survey was undertaken between the periods of August to December 2022. The data were analysed with the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Descriptive statistics, mainly frequencies and percentages were the analytical tools used. The

researchers informed the participants of the study's goal. The respondents were informed that confidentiality was assured.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Gender Activity Profile

Table 1: Gender Roles

Productive Roles	Men	Boys	Women	Girls
Seeding of cocoa beans in nursery bags	112 (48.3)	29 (12.6)	74 (32.0)	17 (7.4)
Irrigation	165 (71.1)	33 (14.5)	25 (11.5)	8 (3.5)
Preparing of land	152 (65.5)	25 (10.8)	42 (18.1)	13 (5.6)
Planting	104 (44.8)	31 (13.4)	64 (27.6)	33 (14.2)
Application of Fertilizer	153 (65.9)	19 (8.2)	50 (21.6)	10 (4.3)
Application of Pesticide	193 (83.1)	18 (10.5)	16 (9.3)	5 (2.9)
Application of Fungicide	193 (83.1)	18 (10.5)	17 (9.9)	6 (3.5)
Weeding	138 (59.5)	42 (18.3)	36 (15.6)	16 (6.9)
Pruning	198 (85.3)	20 (8.9)	11 (4.9)	3 (1.3)
Harvesting	115 (49.6)	25 (10.8)	73 (31.5)	19 (8.2)
Pod breaking	127 (54.7)	32 (13.8)	56 (24.1)	17 (7.3)
Drying of cocoa beans	111 (47.8)	28 (12.1)	76 (32.8)	17 (7.3)
Fermenting of cocoa beans	138 (59.5)	16 (6.9)	66 (6.9)	12 (5.2)
Bagging of cocoa beans	156 (67.2)	37 (15.9)	31 (13.4)	8 (3.4)
Storage of cocoa beans	176 (75.9)	17 (7.3)	28 (12.1)	11 (4.7)
Selling of cocoa beans	134 (57.8)	34 (14.7)	49 (21.1)	15 (6.5)
Reproductive Roles	Men	Boys	Women	Girls
Ironing	78 (33.6)	48 (20.7)	69 (29.7)	37 (15.9)
Laundry	37 (15.9)	33 (14.2)	90 (38.7)	72 (31.0)
House cleaning	4 (1.7)	8 (3.4)	112 (48.3)	108 (46.6)
House maintenance	100 (43.1)	19 (8.1)	97 (41.8)	16 (6.9)
Waking up family	68 (29.3)	9 (3.9)	145 (62.5)	10 (4.3)
Bathing kids	11 (4.7)	5 (2.2)	186 (80.2)	30 (12.9)
Preparing food	9 (3.9)	8 (3.4)	154 (66.4)	61 (26.3)
Washing dishes	11 (4.7)	9 (3.9)	104 (44.8)	108 (46.5)
Sending children to school	63 (36)	13 (7.4)	77 (44)	22 (12.6)
Paying school fees	184 (71.6)	2 (0.9)	43 (18.5)	3 (1.3)
Healthcare	75 (57.7)	10 (7.7)	39 (30)	6 (4.5)
Housekeeping money	158 (68.1)	12 (5.2)	56 (25.1)	6 (2.5)
Buying of clothes	84 (36.2)	23 (9.9)	104 (44.8)	21 (9.1)
Fetching water	52 (22.4)	58 (25)	52 (22.4)	70 (30.2)
Fetching firewood	47 (20.3)	31 (13.4)	107 (46.1)	47 (20.3)
Paying rent and utilities	176 (75.9)	9 (3.9)	40 (17.2)	7 (3)
Family security	194 (83.6)	6 (2.6)	30 (12.9)	2 (0.9)
Community-Based Roles	Men	Boys	Women	Girls
Participating in weddings	68 (29.3)	32 (13.8)	99 (42.7)	33 (14.2)
Participating in funerals	87 (37.5)	17 (7.3)	111 (47.8)	17 (7.3)
Participating in village meetings	142 (61.2)	5 (2.2)	84 (36.5)	1 (0.4)
Participating in community vigilantism	175 (75.4)	15 (6.5)	35 (15.1)	6 (2.6)
Participating in naming ceremonies	85 (36.6)	14 (6.0)	118 (50.9)	15 (6.5)
Participating in communal labour	120 (51.7)	22 (9.5)	66 (28.4)	24 (10.3)
Participating in farmer group meetings	139 (59.9)	7 (3.0)	85 (36.6)	1 (0.4)
Participating in political meetings	141 (60.8)	9 (3.9)	75 (32.3)	7 (3.0)
Participating in religious meetings	74 (31.9)	30 (13.9)	100 (43.1)	28 (12.1)

Donations to families and friends	104 (44.8)	10 (4.3)	110 (47.4)	8 (3.4)
Self-help Projects	130 (56.0)	11 (4.7)	82 (35.3)	9 (3.9)

Source: Field data, 2022

Table 1 shows the distribution of productive roles among men, women, boys, and girls in cocoa-producing communities. The table shows that men dominate most of the productive roles, with higher percentages in tasks such as irrigation (85.6%), preparing the land (76.3%), application of fertilizer (74.1%), pruning (94.2%), and storage of cocoa beans (83.2%). Men tend to concentrate on market-oriented productive activities such as cocoa, whereas women's engagement in these activities is less common. Boys and girls have lower participation rates in most tasks. This distribution of roles suggests that gender inequality is present in the cocoa farming industry. Men are more likely to hold leadership positions and perform tasks that require physical labour or technical skills, while women are often relegated to tasks that are considered less skilled and less physically demanding. The fact that boys are also involved in some of the roles further reinforces the gendered nature of these tasks, as it perpetuates the idea that certain tasks are "masculine" and others "feminine". Women's limited access to productive resources can result in lower incomes and reduced economic security. It can also lead to poor health outcomes, as women may not have access to adequate healthcare or be able to afford healthy food for themselves and their families (Ankrah et al., 2020). To address this issue, it is essential to create more inclusive and gender-sensitive policies and practices in the cocoa farming industry. This could involve providing training and education to women and girls to enable them to take on more skilled and higher-paying roles, as well as increasing their access to credit and other resources. Additionally, promoting gender equality and challenging gender stereotypes within the industry can help to shift attitudes towards gender roles and promote greater inclusivity and empowerment for all workers.

Table 1 shows the distribution of reproductive roles among men, boys, women, and girls in the studied communities. Reproductive roles refer to tasks related to household and family care, such as cleaning, cooking, childcare, and paying bills. From table 1, it is evident that women and girls are primarily responsible for most household tasks. For example, women and girls are primarily responsible for laundry (69.7%), house cleaning (90.9%), waking up the family (72.2%), bathing kids (96.5%), preparing food (92.7%), washing dishes (91.3%), and buying clothes (53.9%). Armbruster et al. (2019) discovered through a time-use study that women typically allocate 39% of their time to income-generating activities, while the remaining 61% of their time is devoted to domestic tasks such as caring for children, cooking, washing clothes and cleaning. According to Ramos et al., (2019), women are typically expected to handle all household chores because of established gender stereotypes. In contrast, men and boys are primarily responsible for tasks related to house maintenance (49.9%), ironing (54.3%), and paying rent and utilities (79.1%). This distribution of household roles reflects traditional gender roles that have been prevalent in many cultures worldwide. These gender roles are reinforced by social norms and expectations that have been passed down from generation to generation. However, the unequal distribution of household tasks can have negative consequences for women and girls. It can limit their opportunities for education, employment, and personal development. It can also perpetuate gender inequalities in society (Ankrah et al., 2020; Abebe et al., 2020). Therefore, it is essential to challenge traditional gender roles and promote gender equality in households. This can be achieved by promoting shared responsibility for household tasks among family members, regardless of their gender. It can also be achieved by challenging gender stereotypes and promoting positive attitudes towards gender equality. By doing so, households can become more equitable and promote greater opportunities for women and girls.

Table 1 shows the participation of men, women, boys, and girls in various community roles in cocoa-producing communities. Looking at the data, we can see that men and boys participate more in village meetings (63.4%), community vigilantism (81.9%), political meetings (64.7%) and self-help projects (60.7%) while women and girls participate more in weddings (56.9%), funerals (55.1%), religious meetings (55.2%), and naming ceremonies (57.4%). According to Blare and Useche (2014), significant gender disparities still exist in participation, resulting in the exclusion of women from agricultural extension activities. The relatively low participation of women in community roles could be due to reasons such as cultural norms, gender-based discrimination, and lack of opportunities for women and girls to participate. To promote gender equality and ensure that everyone has equal opportunities to participate in community roles, it is important to address these underlying factors and create an inclusive environment. This could involve promoting women's and girls' participation in traditionally male-dominated roles, providing training and resources to support their participation, and challenging gender stereotypes and discrimination.

Access and Control of Resources

Table 2: Access and Control of Resources

Resources	Access to resources			Control of resources		
	Men	Women	Both	Men	Women	Both
Land	94 (40.5)	15 (6.5)	121 (52.2)	191 (82.3)	16 (6.9)	25 (10.8)
Capital	97 (41.8)	20 (8.6)	115 (49.6)	116 (50.0)	24 (10.3)	92 (39.7)
Cutlass	98 (42.2)	31 (13.4)	103 (44.4)	117 (50.4)	3 (14.7)	81 (34.9)
Basket	45 (19.4)	159 (68.5)	28 (12.1)	51 (22.0)	158 (68.1)	63 (27.2)
Drying mat	91 (39.2)	78 (33.6)	63 (27.2)	153 (65.9)	60 (25.9)	19 (8.2)
Pruning saw	191 (82.3)	19 (8.2)	22 (9.5)	192 (82.8)	20 (8.6)	20 (8.6)
Harvesting tool	122 (52.6)	16 (6.9)	94 (40.5)	193 (83.2)	17 (7.3)	21 (9.1)
Wheelbarrow	204 (87.9)	14 (6.0)	14 (6.0)	204 (87.9)	15 (6.5)	13 (5.6)
Spraying machine	202 (87.1)	15 (6.5)	15 (6.5)	206 (88.8)	16 (6.9)	10 (4.3)
Watering can	106 (45.7)	35 (15.1)	91 (39.2)	154 (66.4)	47 (20.3)	31 (13.4)
Pollination forceps	96 (41.4)	54 (23.3)	82 (35.3)	103 (44.39)	48 (20.7)	81 (34.9)

Source: Field Data, 2022

In Table 2, men have notably higher access to land and capital compared to women. This is a critical observation because access to land and capital often serves as a foundation for agricultural activities and economic empowerment. The data shows that while 40.5% of men have access to land, only 6.5% of women do. This is confirmed by Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) that only men have access to land. Similarly, 41.8% of men have access to capital, while only 8.6% of women enjoy similar access. This suggests that men are better positioned to engage in agricultural production and economic activities that require financial resources. On the other hand, women dominate in the access to resources like baskets (68.5%) and drying mats (33.6%). These resources may be associated with specific gender roles and activities. For example, baskets are often used for tasks related to food preparation and storage, while drying mats may be linked to post-harvest activities. The higher access to these resources by women highlights their critical

roles in these aspects of daily life and agriculture. Access to pruning saws, a potentially essential tool for agricultural work, is significantly higher among men (82.3%) compared to women (8.2%). This control over resources can influence decision-making within households and communities and may affect women's ability to engage in certain agricultural activities. Conversely, access to resources like baskets and drying mats is predominantly female-dominated, with 68.5% of women having access to baskets and 33.6% to drying mats. These disparities in resource access have important implications for gender equity and women's empowerment. Unequal access to land, capital, and essential tools can limit women's participation in agriculture, economic activities, and decision-making processes. It may also perpetuate gender-based economic disparities and reinforce traditional gender roles.

Table 2 offers valuable insights into the control of resources among men and women. The data clearly demonstrates that men generally have greater control over various resources. This control extends to key resources such as land, capital, cutlasses, pruning saws, harvesting tools, wheelbarrows, and spraying machines, with control percentages ranging from 50.0% to 88.8%. This suggests that men are more likely to make decisions regarding the allocation and utilisation of these resources, which can significantly impact their economic activities and agricultural productivity. According to LeBaron and Gore (2020), women's ability to access and exercise control over land is frequently contingent upon their connection to husbands or other male relatives, resulting in a significant impediment to their autonomy and the perpetuation of prevailing patriarchal standards. Women also may have limited power when it comes to financial matters related to cocoa farming. According to Tall et al., (2014) and Twyman et al., (2014), women face more significant obstacles than men when it comes to accessing credit. In contrast, women exhibit higher control over access to baskets and drying mats, with control percentages of 68.1% and 25.9%, respectively. This is an important observation as it reflects the roles that women often play in activities related to food processing, storage, and post-harvest management. The higher control over these resources by women signifies their critical contribution to these aspects of daily life and agriculture (Abebe et al., 2020). Interestingly, there are instances where resource control is shared relatively equally between men and women, such as access to pollination forceps. In these cases, both genders have comparable influence over the utilisation of specific resources. This shared control might be influenced by the nature of the resource or its relevance to particular agricultural tasks. The data underscores the importance of addressing gender equity and resource distribution. Gender-based disparities in resource control can have far-reaching consequences, impacting women's economic empowerment, decision-making autonomy, and overall well-being. It also highlights the need for gender-sensitive policies and interventions that aim to promote more equitable resource allocation and control.

Access and Control of Services

Table 3: Access and control of services

Services	Access to services			Control of services		
	Men	Women	Both	Men	Women	Both
Hired labour	162 (69.8)	19 (8.2)	48 (20.7)	184 (79.3)	19 (8.2)	28 (12.1)
Communal labour	164 (70.7)	19 (8.2)	48 (20.7)	179 (77.2)	20 (8.6)	32 (13.8)
Family labour	71 (30.6)	37 (15.9)	124 (53.4)	146 (62.9)	37 (15.9)	49 (21.1)
Paid work	108 (46.6)	19 (8.2)	104 (44.8)	126 (54.3)	20 (8.6)	85 (36.6)
Cocoa seedlings	95 (40.9)	20 (8.6)	116 (50.0)	115 (49.6)	22 (9.5)	94 (40.5)
Fertilizer	91 (39.2)	20 (8.6)	120 (51.7)	109 (47.0)	21 (9.1)	101 (43.5)
Fungicide	104 (44.8)	19 (8.2)	109(47.0)	137 (59.1)	20 (8.6)	75 (32.3)
Pesticide	98 (42.2)	19 (8.2)	115 (49.6)	160 (69.0)	20 (8.6)	52 (22.4)

Source: Field Data, 2022

The findings from table 3 suggest that there are significant gender disparities when it comes to access and control over various services in cocoa farming activities. Men have more access and control over hired and communal labour compared to women. This is particularly concerning given that hired and communal labour are critical inputs in cocoa farming activities. Women, on the other hand, have limited control over family labour, which may impact their ability to balance their farming responsibilities with their household duties. Men also have more access and control over paid labour, which suggests that women may have limited opportunities to earn income from their cocoa farming activities. The findings are in line with Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) that men have access to labour compared to women. This finding is particularly concerning given that women often face greater economic vulnerability than men in many rural communities. Men also have more control over the distribution of cocoa seedlings, fungicides, and pesticides, which may affect the quality and quantity of cocoa production by women. Both genders have access to fertilizers but men slightly have control over it. This implies that access to fertilizers is not limited by gender. However, traditional gender roles and cultural norms in many societies often assign men the primary responsibility for agricultural production, including the application of fertilizers. This means that men are often the ones making decisions about the use of fertilizers, including the type, amount, and timing of application. This is contradicting Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) that only men have access to fertilizers. Overall, the findings suggest that there is a need to address gender disparities in access and control over resources and services in cocoa farming activities. This can be achieved through the implementation of gender-sensitive policies and programmes that promote women's participation in decision-making processes, provide access to resources and services, and ensure equitable distribution of benefits from cocoa farming activities.

Access and Control of Decision Making

Table 4: Access control of decision making

Decision Making	Access to decision making			Control of decision making		
	Men	Women	Both	Men	Women	Both
Land	99 (42.7)	20 (8.6)	113 (48.7)	166 (71.6)	20 (8.6)	46 (19.8)
Capital	102 (44.0)	20 (8.6)	110 (47.4)	178 (76.7)	21 (9.1)	33 (14.2)
Labour	95 (40.9)	20 (8.6)	117 (50.4)	172 (74.1)	26 (11.2)	34 (14.7)
Water	56 (24.1)	67 (28.9)	109 (47.0)	56 (24.1)	119 (51.3)	57 (24.6)
Family planning	41 (17.7)	112 (48.3)	79 (34.1)	47 (20.3)	12 (53)	62 (26.7)
Child education	58 (25.0)	52 (22.4)	122 (52.6)	116 (50.0)	64 (27.6)	52 (22.4)
Healthcare	57 (24.6)	59 (25.4)	116 (50.0)	58 (25.0)	71 (30.6)	103 (44.4)
Daily food	42 (18.1)	67 (28.9)	123 (53.0)	50 (21.6)	123 (53.0)	59 (25.4)
Farming inputs	92 (39.7)	28 (12.1)	112 (48.3)	167 (72.0)	26 (11.2)	39 (16.8)
Buying clothes	55 (23.7)	53 (22.8)	124 (53.4)	67 (28.9)	70 (30.2)	95 (40.9)
Accommodation	85 (36.6)	30 (12.9)	117 (50.4)	149 (64.2)	35 (15.1)	48 (20.7)
Attending training programmes	87 (7.5)	27 (11.6)	118 (50.9)	93 (40.1)	30 (12.9)	109 (47.0)
Child occupation	143 (61.6)	29 (12.5)	60 (25.9)	135 (58.2)	39 (16.8)	58 (25.0)

Marriage of children	137 (59.1)	34 (14.7)	61 (26.3)	135 (58.2)	43 (18.5)	54 (23.3)
Family vacation	99 (42.7)	53 (22.8)	80 (34.5)	82 (35.3)	62 (26.7)	68 (29.3)
Farmer group meetings	84 (36.2)	26 (11.2)	122 (52.8)	112 (48.3)	32 (13.8)	88 (37.9)
Family security	172 (74.1)	19 (8.2)	41 (17.7)	176 (75.9)	23 (9.9)	33 (14.2)
Housekeeping money	170 (73.3)	23 (9.9)	39 (16.8)	160 (69.0)	41 (17.7)	31 (13.4)
Political party preference	120 (51.7)	24 (10.3)	88 (37.9)	137 (59.1)	24 (10.3)	71 (30.6)
Religious preference	67 (28.9)	33 (14.2)	132 (56.9)	78 (33.6)	95 (40.9)	59 (25.4)

Source: Field Data, 2022

Table 4 shows the access and control of decision-making on various resources and services by both men and women. The results indicate that there is gender-based disparities in access and control in decision-making over resources. In terms of access to land, capital, and labour, both men and women have access, but men have control. This indicates that even though women have access to these resources, they do not have the power to make decisions about their use. This could be due to cultural norms and practices that give men greater authority in decision-making. Traditional gender norms, according to Ramos et al., (2019), limit women's ability to influence decisions on land use and output. Sarpong (2006) contends that the marginalisation of women from land-related decision-making has led to their unequal access to land. In terms of water, women have control despite both genders having access. This could be because women are primarily responsible for household chores, including fetching water and therefore have a greater understanding of the water needs of the household. This is in line with Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) that both men and women have access to water.

In terms of family planning, women have both access and control, which is positive as it indicates that women are empowered to make decisions about their reproductive health. When it comes to decision-making on daily food, women have control despite both genders having access. This could be because women are primarily responsible for cooking and meal planning in the household. In terms of farming inputs, men have control despite both genders having access. This indicates that men have greater decision-making power when it comes to agricultural activities, which could be because men are traditionally seen as the primary farmers. According to the findings of Armbruster et al., (2019), women have limited influence in the decision-making processes related to the sale and procurement of agricultural products and farm equipment. Men have more control over decisions regarding child occupation, child marriage, family vacation, attending farmer group meetings, family security, housekeeping money, and political party preference. On the other hand, women have more control over decisions related to religious preference. This decision-making power can have significant implications for the well-being and agency of women in the household. For example, if women have limited decision-making power over issues such as child marriage or family security, they may be more vulnerable to harm or abuse. Furthermore, if women have limited access to decision-making power related to economic resources, such as housekeeping money, they may be less able to control their economic well-being.

Factors Influencing Cocoa Farmers' Opportunities or Constraints

Table 5: Factors Influencing Cocoa Farmers' Opportunities or Constraints

Community Norms	Constraint	Opportunity
Taboo day	83 (35.8)	149 (64.2)
No goats allowed	150 (64.7)	82 (35.3)
No cursing allowed	-	232 (100)
Respect for authorities	-	232 (100)
Participation in group activities	-	232 (100)
Respect for the rights and beliefs of others	-	232 (100)
Honour killing	-	232 (100)
Revenge	-	232 (100)
Economic factors	**Constraint**	**Opportunity**
Wages and salaries	63 (2.2)	169 (72.8)
Home-ownership	49 (21.1)	183 (78.9)
Occupation	46 (19.8)	186 (80.2)
Place of residence	32 (13.8)	200 (86.2)
Poverty level	206 (88.8)	26 (11.2)
Inflation rate	195 (84.1)	37 (15.6)
Employment	97 (41.8)	135 (58.2)
Expenditure	180 (77.6)	52 (22.4)
Market prices	186 (80.2)	46 (19.8)
Mortgage	122 (52.6)	110 (47.41)
Political factors	**Constraint**	**Opportunity**
Political party preference	104 (46.1)	125 (53.9)
Elections	80 (34.5)	152 (65.5)
Unit committees	66 (28.4)	166 (71.6)
Assemblyman	55 (23.7)	177 (76.3)
District chief executive	63 (27.2)	169 (72.8)
Chieftaincy	78 (33.6)	154 (66.4)
Political rallies	93 (40.1)	139 (59.9)
Religious factors	**Constraint**	**Opportunity**
Religious preference	69 (2.7)	163 (70.3)
Religious activities	47 (20.3)	185 (79.7)
Religious beliefs	84 (36.2)	148(63.8)
Religious contribution	43 (18.5)	189 (81.5)
Social factors	**Constraint**	**Opportunity**
Educational level	42 (18.1)	190 (81.9)
Health status	40 (17.2)	192 (82.8)
Marital status	38 (16.4)	194 (83.6)
Sports	33 (14.2)	199 (85.8)
Gender	33 (14.2)	188 (81.0)
Entertainment	36 (15.5)	196 (84.5)
General media	41 (17.7)	191 (82.3)
Indigenous media	44 (19.0)	188 (81.0)
Tribe	67 (28.9)	165 (71.1)

Source: Field data, 2022

The findings presented in Table 5 suggest that certain norms within different communities may be perceived as opportunities or constraints to individuals within those communities. Specifically, the norm of "taboo day" appears to be a significant opportunity for respondents, with 64.2% indicating that it serves as such. This suggests that the celebration of this particular day may hold particular cultural significance and importance within the

community. They may also help to regulate life and property (Brempong, 2006). The norm of "no cursing allowed" is also perceived as an opportunity by all respondents, indicating that individuals are free to express themselves without resorting to profanity. Similarly, the norms of "respect for authorities", "Participation in group activities", and "Respect for the rights and beliefs of others" are all perceived as opportunities by all respondents, suggesting that these norms are valued and upheld within these communities. On the other hand, the norm of "No goats allowed" is perceived as a constraint by 64.7% of respondents. This suggests that this norm may be limited in some way, perhaps restricting access to a particular resource or activity that involves goats. Finally, the norms of "honour killing" and "revenge" are both perceived as opportunities by all respondents. This is concerning, as these norms are not only morally reprehensible but also illegal in many jurisdictions. It is important for individuals and communities to actively reject and challenge such norms to promote a more just and equitable society for all. Overall, these findings suggest that different norms may have different impacts on individuals within a community and that some may be perceived as more limiting or empowering than others. It is important to consider the cultural context and values that underlie these norms to fully understand their impact on individuals and communities. Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) noted that the influence of community values and norms affects farmers' access and control of resources.

The results presented in Table 5 suggest that economic factors play a significant role in the opportunities and constraints experienced by respondents within their communities of operation. Specifically, wages and salaries, home ownership, occupation, place of residence, and employment are all perceived as opportunities by a majority of respondents. This suggests that individuals within these community's value economic stability and security and that these factors may contribute to a sense of empowerment and agency. On the other hand, respondents indicated that poverty level, inflation rate, expenditure, market prices, and mortgages serve as constraints that negatively impact their activities within their communities. This suggests that economic insecurity and instability can have a significant impact on individuals' ability to fully participate and thrive within their communities. Overall, these results suggest that addressing economic constraints and promoting economic opportunities is critical for promoting social and economic well-being within communities. By investing in economic development and addressing poverty and inequality, communities can create more equitable and inclusive environments that support the well-being and agency of all individuals. Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) identified low family income, insufficient funds and high cost of agricultural resources as factors affecting farmers' access to and control of resources.

The findings presented in Table 5 suggest that political factors play a significant role in shaping the opportunities experienced by respondents within their communities. Specifically, political party preference, elections, unit committee, assemblyman, district chief executive, chieftaincy, and political rallies are all perceived as opportunities by a majority of respondents. This implies that individuals within these communities also value political participation and engagement and that these factors may contribute to a sense of empowerment and agency. Political party preference, for example, may give individuals a sense of belonging and identity within their community, while elections and political rallies may provide opportunities for individuals to voice their opinions and participate in the democratic process. Similarly, unit committee, assemblyman, district chief executive, and chieftaincy are all political positions that can provide individuals with opportunities for leadership and influence within their communities. Overall, these findings suggest that political factors are important in shaping the opportunities and experiences of individuals within their communities. By promoting political engagement and participation, communities can create more inclusive and democratic environments that support the well-being and agency of all individuals. However, it is important to note that not all

communities may have equal access to these political opportunities and that political structures and power dynamics can often be exclusionary and unequal. Policymakers and community leaders need to work towards creating more inclusive and democratic political systems that ensure equal access to political opportunities for all individuals.

The results presented in Table 5 suggest that religious factors are important in shaping the opportunities and experiences of individuals within their communities. Specifically, religious preference, religious activities, religious beliefs, and religious contribution are all perceived as opportunities by a majority of respondents. Religious preference may provide individuals with a sense of belonging and identity within their community, while religious activities, such as attending religious services or participating in religious events, may provide opportunities for socialisation and community building. Religious beliefs may also influence an individual's worldview and values, which in turn can shape their behaviour and interactions with others in their community. Finally, religious contributions, such as giving to religious organizations or participating in religious outreach programmes, may provide opportunities for individuals to give back to their community and make a positive impact. These findings suggest that religious factors are important in shaping the opportunities and experiences of individuals within their communities. By promoting religious engagement and participation, communities can create more inclusive and supportive environments that support the well-being and agency of all individuals.

The results presented in Table 5 highlight the significance of social factors in shaping the opportunities and experiences of individuals within their communities. Educational level, health status, marital status, sports, gender, entertainment, general media, indigenous media, and tribe were all perceived as opportunities by a majority of respondents. The educational level can provide individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to pursue better employment opportunities and improve their socioeconomic status. Health status can also impact an individual's ability to work and participate in community activities, while marital status may provide social support and networking opportunities. Sports and entertainment can provide opportunities for socialization and community building, while gender and tribe may provide a sense of identity and belong within one's community. General and indigenous media can also provide access to information and resources that may be important for community development and decision-making. These findings suggest that social factors play an important role in shaping the opportunities and experiences of individuals within their communities. By promoting access to education, healthcare, and social support networks, communities can create more inclusive and supportive environments that promote individual agency and well-being. Koyenikan and Ikharea (2014) noted that a low level of education/illiteracy affects farmers' access to and control of resources.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that productive roles associated with cocoa production in various communities are performed by men, women, boys and girls. However, men dominate all these productive roles as compared to women. In terms of reproductive roles, men, women, boys and girls participate fully in all the roles, however, women dominate most of the reproductive roles in these cocoa-producing communities as compared to men, boys and girls. In terms of community roles, the results indicate that men, women, boys and girls participate in the various roles but men in most cases dominate in these roles. Society assigns most of the roles to men than women. It also shows that there is gender inequality in cocoa-producing communities. In terms of access and control of the various resources, services and decision-making processes,

both men and women have access to resources, services and decision-making. However, men continue to have access and more control over resources, services and decision-making processes. In terms of the factors shaping farmers' gendered opportunities and constraints, the study concludes that community norms, political, religious and social factors serve as opportunities while economic factors offer both opportunities and constraints to the farmers.

The study recommends the promotion of gender-responsive agricultural training that will aim to empower women, girls, men, and boys with the knowledge and skills necessary for productive roles in cocoa production. These programmes should be accessible to all community members and should challenge traditional gender stereotypes by encouraging women and girls to actively participate in productive roles. Inclusive decision-making processes within cocoa-producing communities must be encouraged by stakeholders. This can be achieved by promoting community-level discussions and initiatives that involve both men and women in key decisions related to cocoa farming, resource allocation, and community development. Women's voices must be heard and valued in these processes. Policies and interventions that aim to address resource inequities must be implemented. This may involve initiatives to provide women with better access to land, capital, and agricultural tools. Additionally, women must be assisted by Corporate and Lending Institutions by facilitating their ownership and management of assets critical for cocoa production. The COCOBOD needs to work with community leaders, local institutions, and civil society organizations to challenge and transform societal norms that reinforce gender inequalities. They must raise awareness about the benefits of gender equality and encourage a shift in attitudes and practices that limit women's participation and control over resources. The Government must improve access to essential services such as healthcare, education, and extension services for both men and women in the community

REFERENCES

Abbadi, S., Senadza, B., Lieuw-Kie-Song, M., Abebe, H. (2019). Assessing the Employment Effects of Processing Cocoa in Ghana. International Labour Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

Abebe, M. T., Synnevåg, G., & Aune, J. B. (2020). Gendered constraints for adopting climate-smart agriculture amongst smallholder Ethiopian women farmers. Scientific African, Volume 7

Abukari, A.B.T., Zakaria, A. and Azumah, S. B. (2022). Gender-based participation in income generating activities in cocoa growing communities. The role of youth training programs. Heliyon, 8(2), p.e08880.

African Development Bank (2015) Economic Empowerment of African Women through Equitable Participation in Agricultural Value Chains. Available at https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/Economic_Empowerment_of_African_Women_through_Equitable_Participation_in_Agricultural_Value_Chains.pdf

African Development Bank (2019). Republic of Ghana country strategy paper (CSP) 2019-2023, (June), 82. https://www.afdb.org/

Alao, T. B., Bamire, A. S. and Kehinde, A. D. (2020). Gender analysis of agricultural financing in cocoa-based farming system in Oyo and Osun States of South Western Nigeria. Ghana Journal of Agricultural Science, 55(1), pp.34-42.

Ankrah, D.A., Freeman, C.Y. and Afful, A. (2020). Gendered access to productive resources–evidence from small holder farmers in Awutu Senya West District of Ghana. Scientific African, 10, p.e00604.

Armbruster, S., Solomon, J., Blare, T. and Donovan, J. (2019). Women's time use and implications for participation in cacao value chains: evidence from VRAEM, Peru. Development in Practice, 29(7), pp.827-843.

Barrientos, S. (2013). Gender production networks: Sustaining cocoa-chocolate sourcing from Ghana and India. *Brooks World Poverty Institute, 186*. https://www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/gender-production-networks-sustaining-cocoachocolate-sourcing-from-ghana-and-india(ab32ef05-c352-41ad-b8e5-e2c8fc8e8e71).html

Barrientos, S. and Bobie, A.O. (2016). Promoting Gender Equality in the Cocoa-Chocolate Value Chain: Opportunities and Challenges in Ghana. Global Development Institute Working Paper Series 2016-006 October 2016. University of Manchester. Global Development Institute. Available at http://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/institutes/gdi/publications/workingpapers/GDI/GDI_WP2016006_Barrientos_Bobie.pdf.

Bessa, T., Mesfin, Z., & Tobbin O. M. (2021). *Women's land rights and economic empowerment in cocoa communities in Ghana: Gender assessment*. Washington, DC: USAID Integrated Land and Resource Governance Task Order under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights II (STARR II) IDIQ.

Blare, T. and Useche, P. (2014). What Does it Mean to be Socially Responsible? Case study on the impact of the producerplus-program on communities, women, and the environment in Ecuador. MEAS Estudio de caso, (11).

Brempong, O. (2006). Chieftaincy and Traditional Taboos. In: Odotei, Irene – Awedoba, Albert K. (eds.): Chieftaincy In Ghana. Culture, Governance and Development. Sub-Saharan Publishers, Legon.

Britt, C., Ivankovich, M., Essah, S., Fiscian, V. (2020). USAID/Ghana gender analysis report, (April), 1–114. https://banyanglobal.com/

Dalberg Global Development Advisors (2012). Analysis of IFPRI (2002) 'Empowering Women and Fighting Poverty: Cocoa and Land Rights in West Africa', Dalberg Global Development Advisors Internal Document.

Danso-Abbeam, G., Baiyegunhi, L.J. and Ojo, T. O. (2020). Gender differentials in technical efficiency of Ghanaian cocoa farms. Heliyon, 6(5), p.e04012.

Gay, L., Mills, G. and Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. 10th Edition, Pearson, Toronto.

Ghana Statistical Service (2007). Pattern and trends of poverty in Ghana: 1991-2006, Ghana living standards survey round five (GLSS5), Accra, https://www2.statsghana.gov.gh/ (Ghana Statistical Service, 2015 'Annual gross domestic product', https://www.statsghana.gov.gh/

Kabeer, N. (2016). Gender equality, economic growth, and women's agency: the "endless variety" and "monotonous similarity" of patriarchal constraints. Feminist Economics, 22(1), pp.295-321.

Kelani, G., Alimi, T., Amujoyegbe, B.J., Bamire, A.S., Onwuemele, A. and Kehinde, A.D., (2020). Gender Differentials and Optimal Combination of Crop Enterprises under Limited Resource Conditions in South Western Nigeria: A Case Study of Cocoa-based Farming Systems. Asian Research Journal of Agriculture, 12(2), pp.27-38.

Kolavalli, S. and Vigneri, M. (2011). Cocoa in Ghana: Shaping the success of an economy. *Yes, Africa can: success stories from a dynamic continent*, *201*, pp.258643-1271798012256.

Koyenikan, M.J. and Ikharea, V. E. (2014). Gender Access to and Control of Agricultural Resources in South Zone of Edo State, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, 1(7), pp.138-145.

LeBaron, G. and Gore, E. (2020). Gender and forced labour: Understanding the links in global cocoa supply chains. The journal of development studies, 56(6), pp.1095-1117.

Mabundza, R., Dlamini, C. S. and Nkambule, B. (2014). Gender mainstreaming in smallholder agriculture development: A global and African overview with emerging issues from Swaziland. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 9(42), pp.3164-3170.

Millard, E., Oduro, M. and Fadika, S. (2021). Strategies for integrating gender equity in cocoa smallholder support programs.

Morgan, M., Terry, G., Rajaratnam, S. and Pant, J. (2017). Socio-cultural dynamics shaping the potential of aquaculture to deliver development outcomes. Reviews in Aquaculture, 9(4), pp.317-325.

Ramos, C. P., Valencia, A. M., Blare, T. (2019). Gender Perspectives on Cocoa Production in Ecuador and Peru: Insights for Inclusive and Sustainable Intensification. Policy brief No 44. Nairobi: World Agroforestry. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336591430_Gender_Perspectives_on_Cocoa_Production_in_Ecuador_and_Peru_Key_messages [accessed Mar 15 2023].

Rola-Rubzen, M. F. and Paris, T. R. (2016). Enhancing women's capacities in agricultural research and development in Asia and Africa. In Human Development and Capacity Building (pp. 29-49). Routledge.

Roldan, M. B., Fromm, I., Aidoo, R. (2013). From producers to export markets: the case of the cocoa value chain in Ghana. J. Afr. Dev. 15, 121–138.

Sarpong, G. A. (2006). Improving tenure security for the rural poor. Ghana–Country case study. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization.

Tall, A., Hansen, J., Jay, A., Campbell, B. M., Kinyangi, J., Aggarwal, P. K. and Zougmoré, R. B. (2014). Scaling up climate services for farmers: Mission Possible. Learning from good practice in Africa and South Asia. CCAFS Report.

Twyman, J., Green, M., Bernier, Q., Kristjanson, P.M., Russo, S., Tall, A., Ampaire, E.L., Nyasimi, M., Mango, J., McKune, S. and Mwongera, C. (2014). Adaptation actions in Africa: evidence that gender matters. CCAFS Working Paper.

Vigneri M., and Santos. P. (2008). "What Does Liberalization without Price Competition Achieve? The Case of Cocoa Marketing in Rural Ghana." IFPRI-GSSP Background Paper 14. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC.

Wahaga, E. (2018). The gendered nature of productive and reproductive roles in the Agricultural sector.

Wongnaa, C. A., Babu, S. (2020). Building resilience to shocks of climate change in Ghana's cocoa production and its effect on productivity and incomes. Technol. Soc. 62, 101288. doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101288