



# **Differences in agricultural productivity among women and men on small-scale farms in Senegal: Contributions of agricultural innovations**

## **Aboubacry Kane**

*Doctoral student in economics at Cheikh Anta Diop University in Dakar.*

*Associate researcher at Open African Innovation Research (University of Ottawa).*

[Aboubacry1.kane@ucad.edu.sn/aakne055@uottawa.ca](mailto:Aboubacry1.kane@ucad.edu.sn/aakne055@uottawa.ca)

*Tel: (00221)777026645*

## **Mouhamadou Moustapha Aidara**

*Doctoral student in economics at Cheikh Anta Diop University in Dakar.*

[mouhamadoumoustaphaaidara@yahoo.com](mailto:mouhamadoumoustaphaaidara@yahoo.com)

*Tel: (00221)774264583*

### ***Acknowledgements***

This research was financially supported by the 50x2030 initiative through the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). We thank Dr. Travis Reynolds for his review and constructive comments.

## **Abstract**

This study aims to measure gender gaps in agricultural productivity in Senegal and the role those technological innovations play in these gaps, contributing to a growing body of research on gender disparities in agriculture in Africa. We use data from the 2018 Annual Agricultural Survey (AAS) conducted under the FAO's Integrated Agricultural Survey Programme (AGRISurvey). Using the Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition method, we find a 69.6% productivity gap between plots managed by men and those managed by women, with plots managed by women on average *more* productive than those managed by men. There are two main reasons for this unexpected result. First, women on average cultivate much smaller plots of land, with higher production per hectare cultivated. Second, rainfed rice, which is considered a women's crop, is a highly productive crop that is often grown on very small plots, especially in southern Senegal, and has much higher productivity among women than men. 85.5% of the overall productivity gap observed is explained by endowment effects: characteristics of the plot managers and of the plots themselves, and unequal access to resources across women and men. The adoption of certified seeds and the use of chemical fertilizers (NPK, urea and phosphate) were agricultural innovations associated with the gender productivity gap. The use of certified seeds, use of fertilizers, and use of motorized equipment during soil preparation and harvesting are all positively associated with increased agricultural productivity among women and men. Findings suggest increasing women's access to land and to technological innovations could further unleash the productivity potential of Senegalese agriculture.

**Keywords:** *Productivity, Agriculture, Gender, Innovation, Senegal*

**Code JEL :** *D24, J16, Q16*

## 1. Introduction

In Africa, agriculture constitutes the main source of income for much of the population (Ken et al.; 2016). Thus, the development of the agricultural sector occupies an important place both for policy makers and analysts on the continent. In 2014, Senegal adopted the Plan Sénégal Emergent (PSE), whose first axis aims at the structural transformation of the economy. This transformation involves the development of agriculture, fisheries, and the agri-food industry, by developing competitive integrated sectors with high added value and intensified production. Aware that these development objectives of the PSE cannot be achieved without eliminating gender disparities, the Government of Senegal has adopted a national Gender Equity and Equality Strategy (SNEEG), one of the objectives of which is to create an institutional and socio-economic environment conducive to gender equality.

Despite this political will, gender disparities remain in the agricultural sector. Indeed, Senegalese agriculture, which employs more than 60% of the rural population, contributed only 15% of GDP in 2018. Heavily dependent on rainfall, the agricultural sub-sector accounts for 9.4% of GDP and 62.8% of the value added (VA) of the primary sector (ANSD, 2020). This poor performance can be explained in part by the sector's low productivity. Indeed, the use of modern production technologies remains very low for both women and men (FAO, 2015). According to Diagne (2013), Senegalese agriculture is marked by both low and fluctuating growth due to inefficient public resource allocation and low factor productivity. The level of mechanization in agriculture remains very low, with motorized equipment rarely used (3% of plots) and primarily used among men for soil preparation (EAA, 2020).

Agricultural policies, from the Loi d'Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale (LOASP) through the Stratégie Nationale de Sécurité Alimentaire et de Résilience (SNSAR), to the Programme d'Accélération de la Cadence de l'Agriculture Sénégalaise (PRACAS) the Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de Développement de l'Agriculture (LPSDA) and the Programme National d'Investissement Agricole pour la Sécurité Alimentaire et la Nutrition (PNIASAN), all aim to achieve food and nutrition security and reduce poverty, but few policies have integrated gender into their goals and objectives (FAO, 2018). In 2015, 80.7% of plots in Senegal were farmed by men compared to only 19.3% by women in 2015 (EAA, 2020). It is widely accepted that reducing gender inequalities in Africa can significantly improve agricultural production and reduce poverty (FAO, 2011).

The literature on the differences in agricultural productivity between women and men is quite extensive. However, few works focus on the role of innovation in gender gaps in agricultural productivity. According to Njikam et al (2019), differences in endowments across women and men include access to land and agricultural inputs, tenure security and related investments in land,

improved technologies, and access to market and credit (Peterman et al., 2011; Croppenstedt et al., 2013).

Studies assessing differences across women and men in agricultural productivity conduct the analysis either at the household or plot level (Njikam et al., 2019). Previous studies at the household level use a dummy variable with the gender of the household head as a gender indicator (see e.g. Chavas et al., 2005; Horell and Krishnan, 2007). The main limitation of this work is that the use of the head of household as a gender indicator does not indicate who conducts the agricultural activities and who makes the decisions in these activities, but simply indicates the gender of the head of the household. Other works (Kilic et al.; 2015, Oseni et al.; 2013, Arturo et al.; 2014, Njikam et al.; 2019; Nkamuke et al.; 2020) have corrected this limitation by using the gender of the plot manager as a gender indicator. Using the Oaxaca-Blinder (1973) decomposition method, such studies have examined the agricultural productivity gap and some of the sources of this gap in the African context. Most have shown that plots managed by men (Njikam et al.; 2019, Arturo et al.; 2014, Yetna and Mc Gee; 2015) or households headed by men (Horell and Krishnan, 2007, Donald et al.; 2020) are more productive than those headed by women.

In Senegal, the literature on agricultural productivity is quite extensive (Diagne et al., 2007; Diagne, 2013; Diop; 2020, Ndiaye and Kabou; 2021, Gueye; 2021). Much of the existing work on the Senegalese agricultural sector focuses on the efficiency of public spending (Diagne 2013), the impact of trade reforms (Diagne et al. 2007), technical efficiency, or the productivity of a particular commodity chain (Gueye, 2021; Ndiaye and Kabou, 2021; Diop 2020). For example, Ndiaye and Kabou, (2021) analyze the impact of the adoption of new rice technologies on the technical efficiency of farmers in Senegal. Diop (2020) examines agri-food innovation in the mango sector in Senegal, but don't control for gender and innovation.

Despite the importance of this work, important gaps remain in understanding the roles of technology in increasing agricultural productivity, as well as gender gaps in technology use and production outcomes. This paper seeks to help fill this gap by responding to the following questions:

- What is the gender gap in agricultural productivity in Senegal?
- What is the contribution of agricultural innovations to the productivity of plots managed by women and men in Senegal?
- What are the explanatory factors associated with agricultural productivity in Senegal by gender?

Through these research questions, this study aims to fill gaps in the literature on agricultural productivity and identify policy levers to increase agricultural productivity and improve decision

making within the framework of the National Agricultural Investment Program for Food Security and Nutrition (PNIASAN) in Senegal. It will provide necessary context to decision makers on the extent of gender disparities in technology adoption and productivity, enabling them to better formulate policies that support farm households. This research addresses gender mainstreaming policies and the focal areas of the PNIASAN, particularly the fourth, which aims to improve the productivity of strategic and promising sectors.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the theoretical background; Section 3 presents the data from the 2018 Annual Agricultural Survey (AAS) and Section 4 introduces the methodology used in the analysis. Results are summarized in Section 5, and Section 6 concludes and provides policy recommendations.

## **2. Background**

The literature on gendered differences in agricultural productivity highlights several key barriers that women face, including barriers in access to land, to agricultural inputs, and to technologies that contribute to productivity gaps. Njikam et al. (2019) find endowment differences explain the productivity gap in Cameroon, including differences in access to land, innovations, credit, and market and agricultural inputs (see notably Petermann et al., 2011; Croppenstedt et al., 2013). In addition, the difference between plot manager characteristics (Aguilar et al. (2015), and plot characteristics (Donald et al., 2020) and locality-specific fixed effects (Njikam et al., 2019) may help explain the gender productivity disparity. This study focuses on the association between innovation and productivity, but also examines the contribution of innovations to productivity gaps.

Innovation can explain gender gaps in agricultural productivity to the extent that there is a difference in the level of access to and adoption of agricultural innovations across women and men. Indeed, access to new technologies is often essential for maintaining and improving agricultural productivity. However, women face gendered barriers in accessing and adopting a range of agricultural assets and technologies, from machinery and tools to fertilizers, pest control measures and management techniques. Several studies show that adoption rates of improved seeds and fertilizers are much lower for female-headed households or plots managed by women (Doss and Morris, 2001; Aguilar et al., 2015; Njikam et al., 2019; Donald et al., 2020). And Oseni et al. (2013) in Nigeria, Kilic et al. (2015) in Malawi, Yetna and McGee (2015) in Niger, Aguilar et al. (2015) in Ethiopia, Njikam et al. (2019) in Cameroon, and Donald et al. (2020) in Cote d'Ivoire all found that men have higher agricultural productivity than women.

However, there is also a body of research that shows that women's productivity may be higher than that of men in some circumstances. Adeleke et al. (2008) found no significant difference in productivity after controlling for input use by comparing the production female and male maize farmers in Nigeria. And Oladeebo and Fajuyigbe (2007) conducted a plot-level analysis of plot productivity across women and men in Nigeria and found that female farmers were technically more efficient than male farmers, with mean technical efficiency indices of 0.904 and 0.897 respectively (though the difference was not significant). One factor contributing to such patterns may be the fact that women cultivate plots that are much smaller compared to men, and a large body of previous scholarship on the “inverse farm size-productivity relationship” suggests size of landholdings is negatively associated with agricultural productivity (Burke & Jayne, 2021; Savastano & Scandizzo, 2017).

### 3. Data

We use data from the 2018 Annual Agricultural Survey (AAS) conducted under the FAO Integrated Agricultural Survey (AGRISurvey) programme. The AGRIS methodology was developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations as part of a global strategy to improve agricultural and rural microdata. The 2018 AAS covers a sample of 6,340 farm households and 16,607 plots across Senegal’s 14 regions. This sample is representative at the national and departmental level. This analysis is conducted at the plot level, so from the total sample we selected 10,181 plots, of which 1,606 are managed by women and 8,375 by men.

Table 1 shows the simple averages of the overall sample, and then of the sample separated by gender of the plot manager. The level of significance of the variables is assessed by t-statistics.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the grouped sample and by gender of the plot manager.**

	<b>Female plot manager</b>	<b>Male plot manager</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Difference Averages</b>	<b>T-statistics</b>
<b>Log productivity (FCFA/ha)</b>	12.376	11.860	11.933	0.518	19.323***
<b>Log production value (FCFA)</b>	11.456	11.858	11.801	-0.374	-12.181***
<b>Characteristics of the parcel manager</b>					
Age	42.218	49.020	48.034	-7.235	-19.502***
Married	0.811	0.924	0.908	-0.107	-13.738***
Nursery/Elementary	0.865	0.800	0.809	0.054	5.035***
Secondary	0.013	0.028	0.026	-0.017	-3.929***
Superior	0.002	0.015	0.013	-0.012	-4.246***
Literacy	0.092	0.184	0.171	-0.087	-8.527***
Agricultural training	0.010	0.033	0.030	-0.022	-4.995***

<b>Plot characteristics</b>					
Size	0.702	1.368	1.271	-0.694	-20.912***
Water shortage constraint	0.147	0.051	0.065	0.105	15.914***
Phytosanitary problem	0.036	0.067	0.063	-0.025	-4.153***
Presence of dyke/dike	0.220	0.052	0.076	0.185	27.212***
Presence of cordon/stone	0.008	0.006	0.006	0.001	0.315
<b>Agricultural innovations</b>					
Certified seed	0.164	0.198	0.191	-0.053	-3.884***
Chemical fertilizers	0.263	0.279	0.277	-0.004	-0.296
Soil preparation with motorized equipment	0.033	0.022	0.023	0.008	2.156**
Harvesting with motorized equipment	0.002	0.004	0.004	-0.005	-2.333**
<b>Inputs</b>					
Phytosanitary product	0.332	0.328	0.328	0.034	2.631***
Quantity of seed per ha	81.859	37.833	44.203	46.157	23.201***
Seed purchased on the local market	0.267	0.337	0.327	-0.100	-7.352***
Natural fertilizers	0.182	0.368	0.341	-0.164	-12.994***
Non-certified seed	0.726	0.763	0.756	-0.007	-0.500
<b>Sample</b>	<b>1606</b>	<b>8575</b>	<b>10181</b>	<b>10181</b>	

Overall, we find that plots managed by women have higher agricultural productivity (measured by the logarithm of the value of output per hectare) than plots managed by men. This advantage is significant at all thresholds considered. This result can be explained in part by the fact that male-headed households farm greater areas of land, and plot size (area in hectares) is negatively correlated with productivity. Another factor that accentuates the observed productivity gap in favor of women is rainfed rice cultivation, which is a self-sufficiency activity generally practiced by women on very small plots, particularly in the Ziguinchor and Sédhiou regions. Traditional rainfed rice cultivation is on average much more productive among women as opposed to men plot managers.

The descriptive statistics also reveal that men on average adopt more agricultural innovations than women. Male plot managers' report greater use of innovations related to the use of certified seeds, the use of chemical fertilizers, and the use of motorized equipment during the harvesting phase than their female counterparts. The only innovation that more women have adopted than men is the use of motorized equipment during soil preparation.

Regarding the other variables related to the characteristics of the farm plot manager, we note that men in the sample on average are older than women (49 vs. 42 years). Compared to plots managed by married men, plots managed by married women are less productive. Women plot managers on

average are less educated (including literacy and training) than their male counterparts. We note that a greater incidence of phytosanitary problems in plots managed by women. Also, we observe a larger number of stone cordons and dikes, which protect crops against rainwater damage, in Female-managed plots.

With respect to access to inputs, we observe that male-managed plots on average use a greater number of seed per hectare than Female-managed plots. This is mainly due to the size of the plots cultivated, which is larger for men. Women plot managers use more seed from personal reserves, while their male counterparts are more likely to use seed purchased from the local market.

#### 4. Methodology

The typical method for examining differences in agricultural productivity between women and men is to estimate a yield function that models the value of output per hectare as a function of a set of factors that influence production as well as an indicator of the gender of the household head or plot manager (Quisumbing, 1996). This approach can be used to determine whether differences in production observed on plots managed by women and men can be explained by factors other than gender. Following the work of Kilic et al. (2013), Oseni et al. (2013), Aguilar et al. (2015), Njikam et al. (2019), and Nkamuke et al. (2020), we use the Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder (KOB) decomposition method to assess the effect of innovation on agricultural productivity and other explanatory factors of the gender productivity gap. We begin by estimating a production function that models agricultural productivity at the plot level as a function of the gender of the plot manager and other factors that may contribute to productivity. The model is estimated as follows:

$$(1) \ln P_{ij} = A + \alpha G_{ij} + \gamma Z_{ij} + \beta X_{ij} + \delta_j + \mu_{ij}$$

$\ln P_{ij}$  is the natural logarithm of the production per hectare on plot  $i$  of manager  $j$ .  $A$  is the constant.  $G_{ij}$  is the dummy variable representing the gender of the manager of plot  $j$ .  $\delta_j$  is a fixed effect capturing time-invariant characteristics related to manager  $j$ .  $Z_{ij}$  is a vector of variables capturing the adoption of different innovations by manager  $j$  in plot  $i$  (e.g., use of motorized equipment, use of certified seed and fertilizer).  $X_{ij}$  is a set of explanatory variables for productivity. It includes the characteristics of the plot manager (age, education, training, marital status), the characteristics of the plot (size, types of constraints, presence of dikes, rocky ridges) and the set of inputs used on the plot (pesticides, herbicides, manure, compost, seeds, equipment).  $\mu_{ij}$  is the error term. Accounting for the gender of the head of the household, the specification is as follows:

$$(2) \ln P_{ijM} = A + \alpha G_{ijM} + \gamma Z_{ijM} + \beta X_{ijM} + \delta_{jM} + \mu_{ijM}$$



$$(3) \ln P_{ijF} = A + \alpha G_{ijF} + \gamma Z_{ijF} + \beta X_{ijF} + \delta_{jF} + \mu_{ijF}$$

F and M characterize the gender of the manager of plot j.

The gender of the plot manager is the variable of interest. In our initial multivariate examination, we use a stepwise approach (including additional control variables to the model at each step) to try to explain the gender difference in productivity (Oseni et al.; 2013, Njikam et al.; 2019). The logic of this approach is to identify how each set of factors influences the conditional gender gap. The initial step (step zero) considers the plot manager's gender as the only variable regressed against the value of the plot harvest, with no location fixed effects or control variables. The first stage adds the variables capturing innovation. The second step includes further variables related to the characteristics of the plot manager and farm management without fixed effects. The third step includes Region fixed effects, capturing differences in cropping practices across geographies.

$$(4) E(\ln P_{ij}) = \alpha_g + E(X_g)' \beta_g$$

Where  $g$  is used as a subscript to denote male (M) or female (F) plot manager. The intercept term is  $\alpha$ .  $\beta$  is a vector of parameters (coefficients) corresponding to each explanatory variable in equation (1). The difference in average outcome between male and female plot managers can now be expressed as the difference between the expected harvest values per plot for each gender. The difference (i.e., the difference in productivity between women and men) is :

$$(5) \text{Gap} = E(\ln P_{ijM}) - E(\ln P_{ijtM}) = \alpha_M + E(X_M)' \beta_M - \alpha_F - E(X_F)' \beta_F$$

The harvest value per expected parcel pooled ( $P_{ij}$ ) is then :

$$(6) E(\ln P_{ij}) = \alpha + \gamma g + E(X)' \beta^*$$

Where  $\beta^*$  is the vector of non-discriminant coefficients. This is the methodology favored by Jann (2008) to obtain the non-discriminative coefficients. By including this result in the variance equation, it is possible to obtain the dual decomposition:

$$(7) \text{Gap} = Q + U$$

Where  $Q$  refers to the portion explained by group differences in the explanatory variables (Jann, 2008). Fortin et al. (2011) call it the composition effect and is equal to:

$$(8) Q = [E(X_M)' - E(X_F)'] \beta^*$$

According to Jann (2008), the remaining part (U) is the unexplained part and is attributed to discrimination (or performance differences).

$$(9) U = (\alpha_M - \alpha) + [E(X_M)'(\beta_M - \beta)] + (\alpha - \alpha_F) + [E(X_F)'(\beta^* - (\beta_F))]$$

This equation can be broken down into two distinct parts. One part quantifies the discrimination in favor of one group (or structural advantage), in this case presumed to be men:

$$U_m = (\alpha_M - \alpha) + [E(X_M)'(\beta_M - \beta)]$$

The other part, which quantifies discrimination against (or structural disadvantage to) the other group, in this case women:

$$U_f = (\alpha - \alpha_F) + [E(X_F)'(\beta^* - (\beta_F))]$$

This method then makes it possible to discern the part of the gap that may be due to differences in inputs or characteristics, and the differences due to the structural effect. The structural effect allows the disaggregation of a possible advantage for men and a possible disadvantage for women. Thus, the method estimates an output structure that is not necessarily identical to that of either group (Oaxaca, 2007).

The estimation of (2) and (3) identifies the factors that explain the difference in productivity on male and female managed plots, but does not isolate the relative importance of different factors. To better understand the importance of these factors, including innovation, we follow Uzoamaka et al. (2019), Kilic et al. (2013) and decompose the yield gap using the Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition method as described in Kitagawa (1955), Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973). This model allows us to quantify the contributions of the explanatory variables to the productivity differential of plots managed by women and men.

## 5. Results

We first present the factors associated with differences in productivity before commenting on the results of the estimates of its decomposition.

### 5.1 Factors associated with gender gaps in agricultural productivity

We performed a simple ordinary least squares (OLS) regression of agricultural productivity (log value of production per hectare) on Female-managed and male-managed plots. The results are presented in Table 2. Column 1 presents the estimation results where the only regressed variable is the gender of the plot manager. Column 2 includes variables related to agricultural innovation in addition to the gender of the plot manager variable. Column 3 includes control variables such as household and plot characteristics and inputs, without controlling for fixed effects. The fourth column controls for fixed effects.

**Table 2: OLS regression of household agricultural productivity (FCFA/ha) by gender of plot manager.**

Dependent var : Log_productivity (FCFA/ha)				
	1	2	3	4
<b>Female-managed plot</b>	<b>0.518***</b>	<b>0.699***</b>	<b>0.241***</b>	<b>0.102**</b>
	(0.027)	(0.047)	(0.057)	(0.048)
<b>Agricultural innovations</b>				
Certified seed		0.257***	0.223***	0.100**
		(0.041)	(0.047)	(0.047)
Chemical fertilizers		0.362***	0.356***	0.305***
		(0.030)	(0.025)	(0.024)
Soil preparation with motorized equipment		0.777***	0.626***	0.450***
		(0.093)	(0.119)	(0.122)
Harvesting with motorized equipment		0.694***	0.003	0.108
		(0.222)	(0.312)	(0.318)
<b>Characteristics of the plot manager</b>				
Age			-0.000	0.002*
			(0.001)	(0.001)
Married			-0.098**	-0.143***
			(0.039)	(0.045)
Nursery/Elementary			-0.045	-0.018
			(0.032)	(0.031)
Secondary			-0.025	0.057
			(0.061)	(0.053)
Higher education			-0.015	0.006
			(0.098)	(0.087)
Literacy			-0.109***	-0.066*
			(0.035)	(0.033)
Agricultural training			0.133	0.105
			(0.083)	(0.082)
<b>Plot characteristics</b>				
Plot size			-0.111***	-0.088***
			(0.015)	(0.014)
Water shortage constraint			0.350***	0.321***
			(0.060)	(0.058)
Phytosanitary problem			0.096	0.166**
			(0.070)	(0.065)
Presence of dyke/dike			0.157**	0.206***
			(0.067)	(0.060)
Presence of a stone cordon			0.007	0.101
			(0.154)	(0.190)
Phytosanitary product			-0.178***	-0.208***
			(0.024)	(0.029)
<b>Inputs</b>				
Quantity of seed			0.003***	0.003***
			(0.001)	(0.001)

Seed purchased on the local market			0.037	-0.046*
			(0.026)	(0.028)
Natural fertilizers			-0.256***	-0.226***
			(0.029)	(0.030)
Non-certified seed			-0.051	-0.005
			(0.043)	(0.043)
Constant	11.856***	11.841***	12.170***	11.088***
	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.102)	(1.008)
<b>Gap (%)</b>	<b>67.86</b>	<b>101.17</b>	<b>27.25</b>	<b>10.73</b>
<b>Fixed effects</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Sample</b>	<b>9908</b>	<b>4773</b>	4619	4619
<b>R-squared</b>	<b>0.036</b>	<b>0.161</b>	0.315	0.477
<b>Adjusted R-squared</b>	<b>0.036</b>	<b>0.160</b>	0.312	0.473

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level respectively

We find a productivity gap of 67.86%, without the control variables, in favor of the Female-managed plots (column 1). This gap increases by 33.31 percentage points, to 101.17% (Column 2) when we introduce the variables capturing innovation, measured by the use of certified seed, fertilizer (NPK, urea and phosphate) and the use of motorized equipment during the different phases of the agricultural season. The variables related to agricultural innovation are all significantly associated with agricultural productivity. This reflects the important role of innovation adoption by farmers contributes to the improvement of agricultural productivity. Agricultural innovations enable farmers to increase yields, manage inputs more efficiently, adopt new crops and production systems, improve the quality of their products, and adapt to climatic disturbances.

Furthermore, when innovation, household and plot characteristics are introduced, without fixed effects (Column 3), Female-managed plots have a productivity difference of +27.25% compared to their male counterparts. Controlling for region fixed effects (Column 4), the difference in productivity is still 10.73% in favor of plots managed by women. These productivity differences are all statistically significant, though the estimated agricultural productivity gap decreases substantially if fixed effects are controlled for in addition to the other variables. This is explained by the fact that male plot managers in our sample have more access to agricultural inputs, land, seeds, and other agricultural technologies, and the region fixed effects account for substantial differences in crops cultivated by women (especially rainfed rice) across regions.

## 5.2 Decomposition of the difference in agricultural productivity by Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder method

To measure the contributions of different factors to the observed gender gaps in productivity, we perform a Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition analysis. The result is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Decomposition of the gender gap in agricultural productivity by Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder method**

Dependent variable : log_productivity (FCFA/ha)		
	Coefficients	Standard deviation
Female-managed plot	12.739***	(0.065)
Male-managed plot	12.045***	(0.013)
Difference	0.693***	(0.065)
Explained	0.591***	(0.055)
Unexplained	0.102**	(0.044)
<b>Explained</b>		
<b>Characteristics of the plot manager</b>		
Age	-0.008***	(0.003)
Married	0.014*	(0.007)
Nursery/Elementary	0.003	(0.004)
Secondary	-0.001*	(0.001)
Superior	0.000	(0.001)
Literacy	0.008	(0.006)
Agricultural training	-0.001	(0.002)
<b>Plot characteristics</b>		
Size	0.075***	(0.014)
Water shortage constraint	0.037***	(0.013)
Phytosanitary problem	-0.005*	(0.002)
Presence of dikes	0.034**	(0.015)
Presence of a stone cordon	0.000	(0.000)
<b>Agricultural innovations</b>		
Certified seed	-0.005	(0.005)
Chemical fertilizers	-0.004	(0.003)
Soil preparation with motorized equipment	0.001	(0.001)
Harvesting with motorized equipment	-0.000	(0.000)
<b>Inputs</b>		
Phytosanitary product	0.005	(0.008)
Quantity of seed per ha	0.120**	(0.049)
Purchase of seeds on the local market	-0.021***	(0.005)
Natural fertilizers	-0.005	(0.007)
Non-certified seed	0.000	(0.001)
<b>Unexplained</b>		
<b>Characteristics of the plot manager</b>		

Age	0.244***	(0.083)
Married	0.066	(0.071)
Nursery/Elementary	0.072	(0.082)
Secondary	-0.003	(0.002)
Superior	-0.003	(0.002)
Literacy	0.016**	(0.007)
Agricultural training	0.000	(0.001)
<b>Plot characteristics</b>		
Size	-0.193***	(0.046)
Water shortage constraint	0.026***	(0.009)
Phytosanitary problem	0.001	(0.005)
Presence of dyke/dike	-0.044*	(0.023)
Presence of a stone cordon	0.005*	(0.003)
<b>Agricultural innovations</b>		
Certified seed	0.054***	(0.009)
Chemical fertilizers	-0.039**	(0.017)
Soil preparation with motorized equipment	-0.015	(0.019)
Harvesting with motorized equipment	0.002	(0.002)
<b>Inputs</b>		
Phytosanitary product	-0.034**	(0.017)
Quantity of seed per ha	0.186**	(0.084)
Purchase of seeds on the local market	0.029**	(0.014)
Natural fertilizers	0.009	(0.021)
Non-certified seed	0.056	(0.044)
Constant	2.488***	(0.131)
<b>Sample</b>	<b>4619</b>	

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level respectively

We find that the logged average productivity is 12.74 for female-managed plots and 12.04 for male-managed plots.<sup>1</sup> This differential is decomposed into two components: the explained component, which is the part of the gender gap due to the level of observable attributes, and the unexplained component, which is the part of the gap attributable to differences across women and men's plots in how productivity responds to various inputs and other covariates. 85.9% of the overall gap (0.599/0.697) in productivity is explained by endowment effects: plot manager characteristics, plot characteristics and unequal access to resources. Since it is the female-managed plots that have a

<sup>1</sup> Productivity is expressed as a logarithm, following Jann (2008), to obtain the percentage differences we pose:  $(\text{Exp}(\text{coefficients})-1) * 100$ .

baseline productivity advantage, positive coefficients in the explained portion of Table 3 correspond to a larger gap and negative coefficients to a smaller gap. A difference of 10.18% in productivity across women's and men's plots remains unexplained.

Within the endowments (the "explained" component), we find that cultivation of a smaller total area of land is the main factor contributing to the productivity advantage of female-headed plots. This reinforces the observation from the descriptive statistics that women manage much smaller plots, which tend to be more productive. If the endowments of female-managed plots were adjusted to the same level as those of male-managed plots, women's productivity would decline – or inversely if the endowments of male-managed plots were adjusted to the same level as those of female-managed plots, we would observe a higher average productivity on male-managed plots.

Concerning the variables related to agricultural innovation, we found in the descriptive statistics that men adopt, on average, more agricultural innovations (use of certified seed, use of NPK, urea, phosphate and use of motorized equipment during harvesting) than women and that these innovations are positively associated with agricultural productivity. By decomposing the productivity difference, we see that if women and men had the same level of adoption of certified seeds and chemical fertilizers (NPK, Urea and Phosphate), for example, then the overall productivity gap would increase by about 0.5% and 0.4% respectively (though these variables have no significant association with the explained component of the overall productivity gap across women and men). Innovations are also significantly associated with the unexplained component (potentially reflecting differences in returns to these inputs across women and men). These results show that the fact that men have an advantage in the adoption of agricultural innovations narrowing the productivity gap between women and men in the sample, further underscoring the importance of innovations in agricultural productivity.

In addition, the difference in the quantity of corrected seed per hectare used by women and men and the fact that they use dikes or bunds in the plots significantly explain the gap in agricultural productivity in favor of women plot managers. On the other hand, being married, having a low level of education, having phytosanitary problems, and buying seeds on the local market significantly affect the productivity gap to the disadvantage of women.

### **5.3 Robustness tests**

One of the assumptions of the decomposition method is that omitted variable bias is not a concern – however it is possible that some unobservable characteristics jointly determine agricultural productivity and other covariates associated with the gender of the plot manager. Given the limitations of cross-sectional data and the unavailability of a suitable instrumental variable, we follow Altonji et

al. (2005) and d'Oseni et al (2013), to assess the possibility of omitted variable bias by adding other variables to the model, including fixed effects. It is expected that if the coefficients of the variables in our baseline model, including the dummy variable for gender, are unaffected, it is unlikely that unobservable characteristics not included in the model will affect our main results. Table 3 shows the results of the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition estimates of agricultural productivity with fixed effects. Overall, we find that the estimates are consistent in terms of significance and sign across models, suggesting the robustness of our main results.

## **6. Conclusion and policy implications**

In this research, we rely on the 2018 Annual Agricultural Survey (AAS) in Senegal. Focusing on the agricultural productivity of female- and male-managed plots, we use the Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition method to assess the contributions of agricultural innovations. Agricultural innovations were measured by the adoption of certified seeds, the use of chemical fertilizers (NPK, urea and phosphate) and the use of motorized equipment during soil preparation and harvesting. We also examine the factors associated with agricultural productivity in Senegal by gender and the gender gap in agricultural productivity.

We find that female-managed plots on average have higher agricultural productivity (measured by the log of the value of output per hectare) than male-managed plots. Cultivating a smaller total area of land is the main factor explaining the productivity advantage of female-managed plots: in our sample, men cultivate plots measuring on average 1.4 hectares, while women manage plots measuring an average of barely half that. Thus, consistent with the large literature on the inverse relationship between plot size and productivity (Kimhi 2006; Larson et al. 2014), we find that women who manage small plots are more productive per hectare than men managing larger plots. In addition to the size of the plot, the way in which women grow rainfed rice widens this productivity gap. Indeed, rainfed rice cultivation, which is a self-sufficiency activity, is generally practiced by women in very small plots, especially in the Ziguinchor and Sédhiou regions. Although it is traditional, rainfed rice cultivation has a higher productivity among women than among men.

We also find that plots managed by men more often use agricultural innovations than those managed by women. This implies that women are at a disadvantage when it comes to accessing innovations, which is an important factor that can boost their agricultural productivity. The challenge is therefore to identify the factors that promote access to agricultural innovations among women farmers. For some authors, the adoption of agricultural innovations by farmers depends on their perceptions of the technology, their experiences, their knowledge, their needs, the information available, and their socio-economic status (Kouboura et al., 2019). In addition, given that the cost of access to motorized



equipment, seeds and good quality fertilizers are high, women's lower incomes and more limited access to finance and credit make them less likely to use these innovations. Socio-economic status is a key prohibitive factor to the adoption of innovations among women in Senegal.

Our results show that the variables capturing innovation, measured by the use of certified seed, fertilizers (NPK, urea and phosphate), and the use of motorized equipment during the different phases of the agricultural season, are all significantly associated with agricultural productivity. This reflects the important role of the adoption of innovations and innovative methods in improving agricultural productivity. Agricultural innovations are therefore an essential lever enabling farmers to increase their productivity.

Through the Kitagawa-Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition method, we find that the average productivity (logged) is 12.74 per hectare for women and 12.04 for men, a gap of 0.70. Decomposing this gap, we find that 85.9% of the overall productivity gap is explained by the difference in endowment effects: plot manager characteristics, plot characteristics, and unequal access to resources. As we have pointed out, we find that cultivation of a smaller total area of land is the main factor contributing to this productivity gap.

An interesting result we found concerns the contribution of agricultural innovations to the productivity gap by gender of the plot manager. Indeed, our results show that because men have an advantage in the adoption of agricultural innovations, this contributed to mitigating the productivity gap between men and women. This implies that if women and men had the same level of adoption of certified seeds and chemical fertilizers (NPK, Urea and Phosphate), then the overall productivity gap will decrease by 0.5% and 0.4% respectively. This result further illustrates that innovation is a source of productivity growth.

Our analysis is based on the gender of the plot manager, thus contributing valuable nuance to a body of literature that mostly focuses on the gender of the household head (who often does not decide on the management of the plot). Given that research on the same topic (agricultural productivity) in Senegal focuses more on technical efficiency and adoption of innovations, this research also contributed to the discussion on the role of innovation in improving agricultural productivity by gender.

We emphasize that our results evaluate the contribution of innovation to agricultural productivity, and other research on the subject could evaluate the impact of these innovations. Other research could also look at the dynamics of productivity with panel data. This will require, to the extent possible, greater harmonization of agricultural surveys at the household and plot levels across years.

In terms of economic policy implications, we suggest levers that could further stimulate agricultural productivity growth and reduce endowment access gaps between male and female farmers in Senegal. As this research shows, women's limited access to land leads them to farm on small areas. Consequently, improving land tenure systems and legislation in terms of access to land is essential to unlock women's productivity potential. This implies the popularization of land management tools integrating gender in agricultural sectoral policies and sensitizing religious and customary leaders for better access to land for women. In order to achieve a wide adoption of agricultural innovations among women, it is important to guarantee the availability of innovations and to increase the capacity of women to bear the cost of innovations. In this regard, the Government of Senegal can ensure availability of credit for women, flexibility in repayment of credit, encourage diversification of women's income, promote the sale of certified seeds during marketing seasons, increase fertilizer distribution points by encouraging competition. The Government could also consider subsidizing motorized equipment for women.

## 8. References

- Adeleke, O A, O I Adesiyun, O A Olaniyi, K O Adelalu, and H M Matanmi. (2008). Gender Differentials in the Productivity of Cereal Crop Farmers: A Case Study of Maize Farmers in Oluyole Local Government Area of Oyo State. *Agricultural Journal* 3 (3): 193-98.
- Altonji, J., Elder, T., & Taber, C., (2005). Selection on observed and unobserved variables: Assessing the effectiveness of Catholic schools. *Journal of Political Economy*. 113, 151-184
- Aguilar, A., Carranza, E., Golstein, M., Kilic, T., and Oseni, G., (2015). Decomposition of gender differentials in agricultural productivity in Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics* 46, 311-334.
- Annual Agricultural Survey (AAS, 2020) Annual agricultural survey report of 2017-2018, 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 conducted by Directorate of Agricultural Forecasting Analysis and Statistics (DASPA)..
- Blinder, A., (1973). Wage discrimination: reduced form and structural estimates. *Journal of Human Resources* 8, 436-455.
- Burke, W. J., & Jayne, T. S. (2021). Disparate access to quality land and fertilizers explain Malawi's gender yield gap. *Food Policy*, 100, 102002.
- Croppenstedt, A., Goldstein, M., & Rosas, N., (2013). Gender and Agriculture: Inefficiencies, Segregation and Low Productivity Traps. *The World Bank Research Observer*. 28, 79-109
- DIAGNE. Abdoulaye (2013). Public expenditure efficiency, productivity and growth in Senegalese agriculture. *CRES research paper. Series 2013/49*.

- DIOP. Maty Ndiaye (2020) l'importance de l'innovation agroalimentaire en Afrique : cas de la mangue au Sénégal. *Université du Québec à Chicoutimi*. Quebec-Canada.
- Donald, A., Lawin, G & Rouanet, L. (2020) Gender Differences in Agricultural Productivity in Côte d'Ivoire: Changes in Determinants and Distributional Composition over the Past Decade. World Bank, Policy research, working paper 9113.
- Doss C.R, M.L. Morris I (2001). Appear to be gender-linked differences in technology adoption rates. *Agricultural Economics* 25 27-39 14 pages.
- FAO and ECOWAS Commission. (2018). National Gender Profile of the Agriculture and Rural Development Sectors - Senegal. Gender Country Assessment Series, Dakar. 108 pp.
- FAO (2011) The State of Food and Agriculture. The role of women in agriculture: closing the gender gap to support development. Rome 2011.  
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>.
- Gueye, F., (2021). Analysis of the Determinants of Rice and Maize Productivity in the Southern Zone of Senegal. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension Economics & Sociology - March 2021*. DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2021/v39i130514
- Jann, B., (2008). The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition for linear regression models. *The Stata Journal* 8(4), 453-479.
- Ken B. JOHM., OJUKWU. C (2016). Feeding Africa: a strategy for agricultural transformation in Africa for the period 2016-2025. Working paper, African Development Bank (AfDB). May 2016.
- Kilic, Talip, Amparo Palacios-Lopez, Markus Goldstein. (2013) "Caught in a Productivity Trap: A Distributional Perspective on Gender Differences in Malawian Agriculture," *Policy Research Working Paper 6381, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2013*.
- Kitagawa, Evelyn M. (1955). "Components of a Difference Between Two Rates". *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 50 (272): 1168–1194.
- Kouboura, A., Djinadou, A., Acacha, V.H. , (2019). Perception of innovations by gender. The case of cowpea production in Benin. *Economie rurale*, 2019/4, No 370, p 61-80.
- Ndiaye, B. , Kabou, A.B, (2021) Adoption of new rice technologies on technical efficiency in Senegal.
- Njikam, O. Elomo, T.Z., Mbengono, C.P., Abossolo. I. (2019). The Gender Gap in Smallholder Agricultural Productivity: The Case of Cameroon. *WP Partnership for Economic Policy (PEP), No PMMA 20386*.
- Nuama E., (2010) The Technical Efficiency of Rice Producers in Côte d'Ivoire: Extension Services in Question", *Rural Economy*, Volume 316, Issue 2, pp. 36-47, 2010.

- Oaxaca, R. L., (1973) Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets. *International Economic Review*. 14, 693–709.
- Oladeebo, J. O., & Fajuyigbe, A. A., (2007). Technical Efficiency of Men and Women Upland Rice Farmers in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*. 22(2), 93-100.
- Oseni, Gbemisola; Corral, Paul; Goldstein, Markus; Winters, Paul. 2013. Explaining Gender Differentials in Agricultural Production in Nigeria. *Africa Region Gender Practice Policy Brief; No. 7. World Bank*.
- Peterman, A., Quisumbing, A., Behrman, J., & Nkonya, E., (2011). Understanding the complexities surrounding gender differences in agricultural productivity in Nigeria and Uganda. *Journal of Development Studies*. 47(10), 1482-1509.
- Quisumbing, A.R. , (1996). Male-female differences in agricultural productivity: methodological issues and empirical evidence. *World Development*. 24(10), 1597–1595.
- Savastano, S. & Scandizzo, P.L. (2017). Farm Size and Productivity: A "Direct-Inverse-Direct" Relationship. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 8127, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3006201>
- Uzoamaka Joe-Nkamuke, Kehinde Oluseyi Olagunju, Esther Njuguna-Mungai, Kai Mausch (2020). Is there any gender gap in the production of legumes in Malawi? Evidence from the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition model. *Review of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Studies, Springer, 2019, 100 (1-4), pp.69-92*
- Yetna, P. B., Mc Gee, K. (2015) *Gender Differentials and Agricultural Productivity in Niger*. World Bank, Policy research, working paper 7199.

## 9. Appendixes

**Table 4: Description of variables**

Variables	Types of variables	Description of the variables and measurement
<b><i>Dependent variable</i></b>		
Productivity	Digital	Quantity harvested in FCFA/ ha
<b><i>Gender indicator</i></b>		
	Dummy	Gender of the plot manager 1= Male, Female= 0
<b><i>Agricultural technological innovation</i></b>		
Use of chemical fertilizers	Dummy	1= if using NPK, or Urea or Phosphate 0 = No
Use of motorized equipment for soil preparation	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Use of motorized harvesting equipment	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Use of certified seed	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
<b><i>Characteristics of the plot manager</i></b>		
Age	Digital	Average age of the plot manager in years
Married	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Agricultural training	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Kindergarten/Elementary	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Secondary	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Superior	Dummy	1= Yes 0 = No
Literacy	Dummy	1= If he/she can read or write in the local language 0 = No
<b><i>Plot characteristics</i></b>		
Plot size	Digital	Area in ha
Phytosanitary problem	Dummy	1= Yes 2= No
Water shortage constraint	Dummy	1= Yes 2= No
Presence of dyke/dike	Dummy	1= Yes 2= No
Presence of a stone cordon	Dummy	1= Yes 2= No
<b><i>Agricultural inputs</i></b>		
Quantity of seed per ha	Digital	Quantity in seed
Seed purchased on the local market	Dummy	1 = Yes 0 = No
Use of natural fertilizers	Dummy	1 = if using manure, or compost or fertilizer 0 = No
Use of plant protection products	Dummy	1= Yes if herbicide, or fungicide, or insecticide used 0 = No
Non-certified seed	Dummy	1 = Yes 0 = No
<b><i>Fixed Effects</i></b>		
Regions	dummy	For each region

**Table 5: Distribution of productivity (FCFA/ha) by gender and crops**

```
. tab culture_principale if sexe==1, sum( productivite )
```

culture_principale	Summary of productivite		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Arachide	11.990494	.74585371	3,492
Fonio	11.378725	.17068462	2
Mais	11.894367	.759893	938
Mil	11.681832	.84091124	2,519
Niébé	11.420684	1.2088188	823
Pastèque	13.325306	2.0321214	69
Riz irrigué	13.757889	.55720485	81
Riz pluvial	12.78105	1.8840076	40
Sorgho	11.774083	.78297119	324
Sésame	12.135609	.85948295	82
Total	11.855584	.91121483	8,370

```
. tab culture_principale if sexe==0, sum( productivite )
```

culture_principale	Summary of productivite		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Arachide	12.033564	.73380488	631
Fonio	12.620203	.79549261	3
Mais	11.772193	.91425639	84
Mil	11.641105	.80611899	146
Niébé	11.522747	1.089163	160
Pastèque	12.944195	2.4206066	4
Riz irrigué	13.97031	.62050031	22
Riz pluvial	13.496676	1.1896722	439
Sorgho	11.794681	.94609766	35
Sésame	12.188842	1.0530979	14
Total	12.373711	1.2243854	1,538

**Table 6: Distribution of production value (FCFA) by gender and crops**


```
. tab culture_principale if sexe==1, sum( ln_valeurproduction )
```

culture_principale	Summary of ln_valeurproduction		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Arachide	12.280866	.93816104	3,492
Fonio	10.986225	.38439409	2
Mais	11.342106	.97931842	938
Mil	11.920535	.96431785	2,519
Niébé	10.79025	1.3209106	823
Pastèque	12.951404	2.1126559	69
Riz irrigué	12.581775	.5706149	81
Riz pluvial	11.174231	1.5813297	40
Sorgho	11.508657	.93347584	324
Sésame	11.603571	.89096262	82
Total	11.886965	1.1214429	8,370

```
. tab culture_principale if sexe==0, sum( ln_valeurproduction )
```


culture_principale	Summary of ln_valeurproduction		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.
Arachide	11.838961	.79588376	631
Fonio	11.351008	.29491969	3
Mais	11.003718	.95959731	84
Mil	11.80394	.98362329	146
Niébé	10.414451	1.1908971	160
Pastèque	11.937631	2.4664099	4
Riz irrigué	12.594521	.63915731	22
Riz pluvial	11.398251	.95104147	439
Sorgho	11.262472	.93412399	35
Sésame	11.794614	.60959456	14
Total	11.512621	1.0294436	1,538

**Figure 1: Distribution of plot operators by gender**




Source: EAA 2018

**Figure 3: Distribution of mean of productivity (FCFA/ha) by gender and crops**



Authors

**Figure 2: Productivity distributions (FCFA/ha) by gender of the plot manager**



**Source: Authors**