

Gender Issues in
Farm Restructuring
in Uzbekistan and
Kyrgyzstan:
Implications for the
BASIS Research
Program

June 1998



1625 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 550, Washington, D.C. 20036 USA
Tel.: 202-332-2853 Fax: 202-332-8257 Internet: info@widtech.org

A Women in Development Technical Assistance Project

Development Alternatives, Inc. • International Center for Research on Women • Women, Law and Development International
Academy for Educational Development • Development Associates, Inc.

Gender Issues in Farm Restructuring in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan

Implications for the BASIS Research Program

Jeanne Koopman, Consultant, International Center for Research on Women

June 1998



A Women in Development Technical Assistance Project



Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems

A project funded by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development under contract number FAO-0100-C-00-6005-00. This publication was made possible through support provided by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Contract No. FAO-0100-C-00-6005-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

PREFACE

The USAID-funded Collaborative Research Support Program on Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems (BASIS) in Central Asia is in the early stages of a multi-national, collaborative research project on the impact of farm restructuring on land, labor and financial markets. The initial research will take place in the Ferghana Valley, an irrigated, cotton-growing area shared by Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, countries in which the pace and scope of economic reform has differed considerably. The present report follows up on the participation of a consultant provided by the WIDTECH project in the January 1998 research planning workshop held in Tashkent. It outlines the scope of the economic reforms that have taken place in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, offers an initial analysis of their impact on women and men, and suggests how the BASIS research program can be organized to more readily identify and analyze policy relevant issues stemming from the differing effects of farm restructuring and macro-economic policies on groups that differ by age, gender, and socioeconomic situation.

BASIS is a Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) funded by the US Agency for International Development (USAID) designed to help strengthen both US and host-country research capacity through jointly developed and collaborative programs of research and training on land, water, labor, and financial markets and their interactions in Southeast Asia, Southern Africa, Central America, Central Asia, and the Horn of Africa. It is implemented by the 16-member Consortium for Applied Research on Market Access (CARMA) that includes the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), a private, non-profit organization based in Washington, DC, that conducts policy oriented research and technical assistance on women and development issues. ICRW is also a member of a consortium of five development organizations that implement Women and Development Technical Assistance (WIDTECH), a global technical assistance and training project that is funded by the Office of Women in Development (G/WID), Bureau for Global Programs in USAID. ICRW's involvement with BASIS and WIDTECH projects provided the linkage that resulted in this report on gender issues in farm restructuring in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VII
SECTION ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
THE BASIS RESEARCH PROGRAM	1
PLANNING MISSION AND CONSULTANT'S ROLE	1
SECONDARY SOURCE MATERIALS ON WOMEN	1
STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT	2
SECTION TWO	
INDICATORS OF WOMEN'S STATUS: UZBEKISTAN AND KYRGYZSTAN	3
DEMOGRAPHY, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION	3
EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT	4
SECTION THREE	
THE PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF ECONOMIC REFORMS	7
CHANGES IN REAL GDP AND INFLATION RATES, 1991-1997	7
IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT, WAGES, SURPLUS LABOR, AND MIGRATION	8
IMPACT ON INCOMES, TRANSFERS, STANDARD OF LIVING, AND SOCIAL SERVICES	9
IMPACT ON WOMEN	11
SECTION FOUR	
PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF FARM RESTRUCTURING	13
ACCESS TO LAND	13
THE STRUCTURE OF EMPLOYMENT IN UZBEKISTAN'S AGRICULTURAL SECTOR	16
ACCESS TO CREDIT, INPUTS, AND MARKETS	17
SECTION FIVE	
GENDER ISSUES IN FARM RESTRUCTURING	21
WOMEN'S WORK AND WOMEN'S WAGE EMPLOYMENT	21
GENDER DIFFERENCES IN UNEMPLOYMENT RATES (OFFICIAL AND SELF-DECLARED)	21
GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT MODELS OF FARM RESTRUCTURING	22
GENDER-SPECIFIC EFFECTS OF REDUCTIONS IN SOCIAL SERVICES AND CHILD CARE FACILITIES	22
PRIVATE PLOTS AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME	23
MEN'S AND WOMEN'S LIVESTOCK-REARING ROLES AND OWNERSHIP RIGHTS	23

WOMEN'S LAND RIGHTS	24
WOMEN'S OFF-FARM EMPLOYMENT/SELF-EMPLOYMENT	25
SURPLUS LABOR AND GENDER EFFECTS ON EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS WITH PRIVATIZATION	25
GENDER DIFFERENCES IN LABOR TIMES AND ROLES IN THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME	26
SECTION SIX	
GENDER ISSUES IN THE FIRST STAGE OF THE RESEARCH	28
LAND	27
LABOR	28
WATER	28
MECHANIZATION	28
FINANCE	29
RESTRUCTURING	29
SECTION SEVEN	
ISSUES AND QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE RESEARCH	32
PROPOSED RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES	32
LABOR AND INCOMES	34
FINANCE	37
RESTRUCTURING, MECHANIZATION, AND LABOR USE	38
SECTION EIGHT	
GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCE-SENSITIVE RESEARCH METHODS	42
DEALING WITH CULTURALLY SENSITIVE ISSUES	42
A PROPOSED METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	42
SECTION NINE	
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PARTICIPATION OF G/WID ASSISTANCE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BASIS RESEARCH	46
SECTION TEN	
HUMAN AND INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES FOR DOING OR SUPPORTING GENDER-SENSITIVE RESEARCH IN UZBEKISTAN AND KYRGYZSTAN	48
REFERENCES	54

LIST OF TABLESTable

1	Indicators of Women's Status in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, 1995	3
2	Changes in Real GDP and Inflation Rates: Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, 1991-1997	7
3	Structure of Aggregated Incomes of an Average Family in Uzbekistan by Social Group, 1996 (%)	10

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Economic policies to privatize agriculture and industry have progressed much faster in Kyrgyzstan than in Uzbekistan, with the process nearly complete in Kyrgyzstan's agricultural sector, but progressing quite slowly in Uzbekistan. Both countries have serious problems of surplus labor in the rural sector, particularly in the Ferghana valley. Kyrgyzstan's relatively rapid privatization process has also resulted in high levels of overt unemployment. Both countries have suffered increasing poverty as wage levels and social services have declined. Women are acknowledged to have been affected more severely than men by the economic troubles, especially in the area of declining earnings, loss of family allowances and day care, and declining access to education, especially higher education. Women in both Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan accounted for about half the labor force prior to independence in 1991, but during the recent economic crisis, they have been losing jobs more rapidly than men. Unemployment cuts women off from important housing and family benefits and makes them more vulnerable to domestic violence, which is increasing.

Farm restructuring in Uzbekistan has proceeded primarily through the renaming of state farms and experimenting with short-term leases for members of collective farms. Little, however, has changed in the organization of work and decisionmaking. Aside from their 0.1 ha private plot, farm workers have no independent access to land, credit, or markets. The few private farms existing today have been created mainly from the livestock brigades or fruit orchards of collective farms. They have been purchased by managers or specialists who previously ran the collective farms. Even these new "private farmers," however, have little power to decide on crops or markets, since the state still controls both input and product markets.

Kyrgyzstan has recently broken up its large collective farms, but not necessarily into single family farms. Many new farm enterprises are multiple family farms, managed by an elected manager. Current statistics do not reveal the how farm restructuring has changed the balance between men's and women's paid and unpaid work and their respective abilities to make economic decisions. This needs to be studied. Access to credit from banks or savings and credit societies is practically nonexistent in Uzbekistan, but informal "sponsors" sometimes provide large loans to certain privileged private farmers. In Kyrgyzstan, lack of adequate access to credit for agricultural investment is also considered a serious problem.

The report reviews the gender aspects of farm restructuring under the following topics: changing formal sector employment and unemployment rates; the precarious situation of wives who give up waged jobs to help a husband farm; the reduction in social services and child care facilities with economic reform and the need to study its impact on women's access to employment; the increasing importance of private plots with the decline in real wages and the need to determine gender patterns in access to and control over the output of private plots; changes in livestock rearing and ownership rights; the need to study women's coping strategies as their formal employment declines, including the gender aspects of off-farm employment and self-employment in the informal sector; and changes in men's and women's overall labor times and influence over the allocation of household income. Because people's economic options are critical to the possibilities for improving welfare, the BASIS research needs to differentiate between men and women of different socioeconomic status when studying the impact of changes in economic policies. It must study how people in differing life situations are coping with job losses and reacting to new opportunities, including those in the nascent informal sector. The results of the research are expected to assist

governments in identifying policies that can broaden economic opportunities for a wide variety of groups, including women and youth.

Section six discusses the gender aspects of the statistical data collection exercises and the legal issue reviews that were conducted during the first stage of the research (February-March 1998). Section seven proposes research questions for the second stage of the research, in which field work will be undertaken. The proposed field work questions are grouped under the following topics: land and water; labor and incomes; finance; and restructuring, mechanization, and labor use. Most of the questions elaborate on the research issues identified by the participants in the January workshop, concentrating on the gender and socioeconomic difference aspects preliminarily analyzed in the earlier sections of the report.

Section eight discusses methodological issues, beginning with the cultural sensitivity of gender and socioeconomic difference issues. It proposes that rapid and participatory rural appraisal methods be used in the early stages of the field research in order to identify and analyze issues with gender-specific focus groups comprised of participants of similar ages and socioeconomic situations. It is observed that although rapid rural appraisal/ participatory rural appraisal research results can both improve the relevance of the research to local communities and provide policy-relevant information on the impact of farm restructuring on different groups, for many issues the preliminary findings from the appraisals will need to be followed up with formal surveys to study the frequency distribution and corollary factors associated with the initial rapid rural appraisal/participatory rural appraisal-based findings.

Section nine recommends that the BASIS research project in Central Asia consider seeking the assistance of Central Asian and, if necessary, international gender and women in development experts in the following aspects of the research program: i) participation in the design of the field work; ii) providing training for the research teams in gender and socioeconomic difference-sensitive rapid rural appraisal methods, and iii) participation in the planning of research questionnaires and sample surveys. Section ten provides references to Uzbek and Kyrgyz institutions and individual researchers who could provide this type of assistance and also lists expatriate scholars who have conducted research on rural women in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.

SECTION ONE

INTRODUCTION

THE BASIS RESEARCH PROGRAM

The USAID-funded Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) on Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems (BASIS) in Central Asia is in the initial stage of a research project on land, labor, and financial markets. The research began with a study of farm restructuring in the Ferghana Valley, an irrigated, cotton-growing agricultural area currently encompassing three different countries: Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tadjikistan. The first phase of the research was undertaken in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, two countries in which the pace and scope of post-independence economic reform and farm restructuring have varied considerably. The government of the Kyrgyz republic has privatized state and collective farms and reduced centralized economic management to a far greater extent than neighboring Uzbekistan. Because the Ferghana Valley had essentially the same cultural and agrarian history in the pre-independence period, it offers a unique opportunity to study the impact of these differing reform policies on rural men and women from different socioeconomic groups.

PLANNING MISSION AND CONSULTANT'S ROLE

The Land Tenure Center at the University of Wisconsin, the lead institution for the Central Asian CRSP, requested its BASIS partner, the International Center for Research on Women, to provide a consultant to participate in a January 1998 collaborative research planning workshop in Tashkent and to offer ideas for the integration of gender issues into the research design. The consultant also participated in post-workshop meetings with specialists in specific areas (land, labor, water, etc.) to prepare a short-term research work plan for the February to April 1998 period. This report, which outlines the policy-relevant gender issues and proposes methodologies for addressing them, was written after the consultant returned to the U.S. It will be translated into Russian and distributed to the Uzbek and Kyrgyz research participants.

The consultancy took place in Tashkent from 17 January to 6 February, 1998. The first week was spent planning the workshop, visiting two farms near Tashkent (one collective and one private), and meeting with representatives of government, NGOs, and international institutions. The workshop took place during the second week, and post-workshop planning meetings with six research groups were held during the third week.

SECONDARY SOURCE MATERIALS ON WOMEN

A review of secondary source materials on women in Central Asia was conducted using the resources of the Harvard Library System in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and the Tashkent offices of the United Nations Development Program, UNICEF, the World Bank, and the Women's Resource

Center, an independent Uzbek NGO. As far as could be determined from this relatively brief search, there are no published studies in English on rural women in Uzbekistan, although three doctoral dissertations are currently being written and three other field studies are in the planning stage. For Kyrgyzstan, I found only a brief summary of one study that interviewed 700 women about their changing employment situation. There is also at least one U.S. doctoral dissertation being written on Kyrgyz rural women.¹

Given the dearth of available studies, I have pieced together from several sources an initial analysis of the impact of farm restructuring and post-independence reform policies on rural women.² The picture is unavoidably sketchy, but it is complete enough to identify critical issues that need to be studied. These are signaled in the body of the report in short, italicized paragraphs on “implications for the BASIS research” and are also summarized in a separate section on research proposals.

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The report begins with a review of indicators of women’s status and an overview of recent macroeconomic reforms. Section four describes the process of farm restructuring, and section five analyzes the implications for women. Sections six and seven make suggestions for the overall research design, first focusing on general issues, then presenting a list of research questions that can help clarify the impact of farm restructuring on men and women from different socioeconomic strata. Section eight sets out methodological proposals for including gender issues in the research; section nine suggests how experts from the International Center for Research on Women might be involved in the research; and section ten lists institutions, researchers and gender experts from Central Asia, the U.S., and Europe who can assist in making the research more gender sensitive.

¹ For references to this work in progress, see section 10 below.

² Among the more important sources used are the 1996 Eckert and Elwert study on land tenure in Uzbekistan, the 1997 Chemonics project report on farm restructuring, the 1993 World Bank country report on Uzbekistan, three UNDP Human Development Reports for Uzbekistan, some very brief UNICEF reports, and a one-hour interview with two women from a “model” collective farm near Tashkent.

SECTION TWO

INDICATORS OF WOMEN'S STATUS: UZBEKISTAN AND KYRGYZSTAN

DEMOGRAPHY, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

Table 1: Indicators of Women's Status in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, 1995

	Uzbekistan	Kyrgyzstan
Population	23 million (1995)	4.7 million (1995)
Per capita income	US\$930 (1995)	US\$1,160 (1994)
Percent population rural	62%	61%
Average rural family size	6.1	
Total fertility rate	3.8	3.6
Infant mortality rate	37.7 per 1000 live births	
Life expectancy: women	72	73
Life expectancy: men	65	64
Literacy: women over 15	100%	96%
Literacy: men over 15	100%	99%
Human Development Index: world ranking	94	89
Religion	88% Muslim 9% Eastern Orthodox	70% Muslim 28% Eastern Orthodox
Women as % of labor force	46% (1993) 43% (1996)	51% (1993)
Women as % of unemployed	66% (1996)	60% (1995)
Women as % of top managers		17.5%

Sources: Uzbekistan 1996, p. 30; Herman et al., 1996, p. 10 for Kyrgyzstan, p. 17 for Uzbekistan; World Bank 1993, p. 98; UNICEF 1994, p. 134, for women's share of employment in Kyrgyzstan; UNDP 1997, p. 91, for women's share in employment and unemployed in Uzbekistan. Herman et al. for women's share of official unemployment in Kyrgyzstan.

The high literacy rates for women in both countries, as well as their high labor force participation rates, are the direct result of 70 years of Soviet policy. That policy has had an important impact on how women view themselves as economic and social actors. Most women now want higher education for their daughters and paid employment for themselves (personal communication with Elizabeth Constantine, Central Asian Program, University of Iowa, March 2, 1998).

Uzbekistan

In 1994, nearly half of all students in primary and secondary schools were female, but women accounted for only 39 percent of those in higher education. Women's enrollment in universities has declined significantly since the 1980s, when they represented 47-51 percent of graduates. By 1994 only 25 percent of post-graduate students and 12 percent of Ph.D. candidates were women (UNDP 1995). Gender discrimination in higher education is becoming a serious problem. In 1995, an elite private university in Tashkent stopped accepting women altogether in the fields of international relations and international law (Herman et al. 1996, p. 20).

Implication for BASIS Research: Since women's (and men's) access to secondary, higher, and graduate education will affect the gender composition of employment and income structures, gender-differentiated data on enrollment and graduation rates at all educational levels should be collected for Kyrgyzstan and for the regions to be studied in the Ferghana Valley. Men's and women's assessment of the economic impact of the decline in women's access to higher education should be investigated.

Kyrgyzstan

The data available for Kyrgyzstan reflect dramatic changes in the availability of preschool education and after-school programs that provide child care services for working mothers. Between 1990 and 1995, the number of preschools declined by 73 percent, from 1696 to 456. After-school programs were all but eliminated, falling from 1225 to 12. These changes followed the introduction of fees. The impact will be felt by women in two ways: a reduction in women's employment as teachers and child care workers, and a decline in state-provided child care for all women employees.

Implication for BASIS Research: Data should be collected on changes in the availability of day care and after-school programs in Uzbekistan and in the Ferghana Valley. The research should investigate the effects of farm restructuring on child care.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Kyrgyzstan

Women's participation rates in the paid labor force are high. In 1993, women represented 51 percent of the employed population (UNICEF 1994, p. 134). Since that time, however, women have been losing their jobs at a rapid pace. A 1996 government report states that:

Resulting from the liquidation of work places, the number of unemployed women is growing. Of the officially registered unemployed people, about 60 percent are women. Particularly critical is the deficit of work places in the regions, where substantial release is primarily caused by reformation of the kolkhoz (the former collective farms) and closing of social-cultural institutions (such as the preschools and after-school programs mentioned above) (Kyrgyz Republic, quoted in Herman et al. 1996, p. 14).

A recent study of more than 600 Kyrgyz women found that even though 83 percent of all women had been in paid employment in 1989, by 1993, 77 percent of the women interviewed were unemployed, most having been laid off from the jobs in the previous year (Kuehnast 1993, cited in UNICEF 1994, pp. 131-2). More than half had not applied for unemployment benefits and therefore did not appear in the official unemployment statistics.

Uzbekistan

Women's participation in the labor force in Uzbekistan was also very high in the past, but has also been falling recently. Women were 47 percent of the labor force in 1992 and 43 percent in 1996 (UNDP 1997, p. 91). This decline in women's share is consistent with widespread anecdotal evidence that women have been losing their jobs in larger numbers than men.

SECTION THREE

THE PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF ECONOMIC REFORMS

CHANGES IN REAL GDP AND INFLATION RATES, 1991-1997

Uzbekistan has not suffered the drastic decline in real GDP experienced in Kyrgyzstan (or in other former Soviet Union countries). The government attributes this to the moderate pace with which it has pursued free market reforms. Be that as it may, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan have both suffered hyperinflation, which has only recently been brought under some degree of control.

Table 2: Changes in Real GDP and Inflation Rates: Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, 1991-1997

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Real GDP (%change)						
Kyrgyzstan		-12%	-15%	-20%	-6%	
Uzbekistan	-0.5%	-11%	-2.4%	-5.2%	-0.9%	1.6%
Inflation Rate						
Kyrgyzstan	150%	900%	1250%	450%	250%	
Uzbekistan	106%	719%	1042%	1457%	250%	85%

Sources: **Gross Domestic Product:** Kyrgyzstan: UNICEF 1997, p. 7. Uzbekistan 1993-96: UNDP 1997, p. 96. **Inflation:** Kyrgyzstan: UNICEF, 1997, p. 7 (figures are taken from a graph; the 1995 figure is an estimate). Uzbekistan: UNDP 1997, p. 34.

Kyrgyzstan

In Kyrgyzstan, an economic privatization program was initiated soon after independence in 1991. By 1995, about half the former state and collective farms had been broken up and transformed into single family or (more commonly) multiple family private farms (Bloch et al. 1996). A national currency was introduced in 1993. Until at least 1995, however, the economy reacted very poorly to the reforms (see table below.)

Uzbekistan

Even though Uzbekistan also introduced its own currency in 1993, the government has taken a much slower path toward economic reform. In fact, many of the privatization policies have been more cosmetic than real. This is especially true in the agricultural sector, where the reorganization of state farms into cooperatives and the minor changes effected on collective farms have had little impact on their highly centralized, state-controlled management structures. By 1995, real private farms (called dekhkan farms) accounted for only 6 percent of all arable land. (Uzbekistan 1996, pp. 40-41). (Farm restructuring is discussed in more detail in section four below.)

IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT, WAGES, SURPLUS LABOR, AND MIGRATION

Uzbekistan

Although Uzbekistan's 1991-1995 decline in real GDP was not accompanied by a serious increase in open unemployment (UNDP, 1997, p. 53), from 1990 to 1993 real wages fell by 70 percent (World Bank 1993, p. 99). There was also a serious problem of underemployment, i.e., too many workers with too little to do. In 1993, the World Bank predicted that privatization would reduce underemployment and bring about a sharp increase in unemployment. Job loss, however, was expected to be "cushioned" by women's "voluntary withdrawal" into the household (see more on this problematic assumption in section three, "Impact on Women").

Massive unemployment has not occurred in Uzbekistan, mainly because the state is reluctant to induce it by fully privatizing state-controlled enterprises. In 1995, the official unemployment rate was less than one percent (Uzbekistan, 1996, p. 32). Even though this does not give a accurate picture of actual unemployment (because the official rate is calculated only from the number of people who register as unemployed), most sources agree that underemployment, not open unemployment, is currently the most serious problem. Underemployment is especially prevalent in rural areas, above all in the densely populated Ferghana Valley. The cotton sector alone is estimated to have nearly half a million excess workers (UNDP, 1996, p. 41).

We have little information on the related topic of migration. The 1997 migration study by the United National High Commissioner for Refugees traced mainly the nationality of external immigrants and emigrants (including their regions of origin and destination). There is no breakdown by gender. On rural/urban migration patterns, the study offers only the following: total net migration during 1989-1996 shows a net loss in urban areas of 143,676 persons, and a net inflow into rural areas of 187,200 persons. Breaking this down into inter-province and intra-province net migration, the same pattern is repeated, with three quarters of the change accounted for by intra-province shifts from urban to rural areas (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 1997, p. 27). These data confirm anecdotal evidence that people are returning to farms upon losing urban jobs, but the net change is relatively small for a population of more than 13 million.

Kyrgyzstan

Except for evidence of potentially serious female unemployment from a 1993 survey of 600 women (in which 73 percent of those interviewed reported themselves unemployed), I have no information on overall unemployment or trends in wages. Given the extremely high rates of inflation of the early 1990s, however, real wages are likely to have fallen significantly.

As in Uzbekistan, there is evidence of underemployment in the rural sector. A 1995 survey of the heads of rural committees indicated that prior to restructuring, state and collective farm enterprises had problems with excess labor. Nearly half of the heads of rural committees (many of whom had been directors of state and collective farms) said that their work forces exceeded the actual need for laborers (Roth et al. 1996, p. 88)³.

³ The survey was conducted among 47 rural committee heads in all six of Kyrgyzstan's provinces (*oblasts*).

Implication for BASIS Research: *It will be important for the research on farm restructuring not only to investigate the employment, unemployment, and emigration/immigration situation by both sex and age, but also to try to understand the underlying factors contributing to age, sex, socioeconomic and occupational differences in the distribution of the labor force between the formal and informal sectors. We also need to ask, what are people who are underemployed in the formal sector doing to contribute to family income and consumption from outside the formal sector? This requires serious attention to the informal sector, attention which has apparently not, thus far, been forthcoming from either government or academic research institutions. The BASIS research needs to study all activities of people who have been affected by farm restructuring and loss of jobs in the formal sector — migration, informal sector activities, changes in self-provisioning on private plots, and so forth.*

IMPACT ON INCOMES, TRANSFERS, STANDARD OF LIVING, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Kyrgyzstan

Despite progress in 1994 and 1995 in achieving macroeconomic stability, the standard of living in Kyrgyzstan has fallen dramatically (Herman et al. 1996, p. 11). Elimination of subsidies from Moscow for day care, after-school programs, and pensions has had an especially heavy impact on women.

Uzbekistan

Despite the fact that the incidence of poverty was already relatively high in Uzbekistan before independence, the situation has worsened considerably in the 1990s. In 1989, 44 percent of the population (including nearly all collective farmers) lived below a poverty line defined as the income required to purchase a minimum needs consumption basket (World Bank 1993, p. 98). By 1991 as much as three quarters of the population had slipped below the poverty line (UNDP 1997, p. 45). Over the next five years this poverty deepened drastically (by 1994 real disposable income was less than half its 1991 level) and probably also widened to encompass more households as well (UNDP 1997, pp. 47-49).

Recent field research indicates that the severe poverty of the post-independence period has prevented many rural families from building new houses for newly married sons, thereby precluding their access to the separate household plots young men are normally granted when they marry (Eckert and Elwert 1996, pp. 30-1). Failure to obtain an additional private plot for adult children reduces the extended family's resources. If married sons live with their parents and unmarried siblings in one house, the family is considered seriously impoverished. This phenomenon can be used in the BASIS research as a means of rapidly identifying the poorest families.

The structure of aggregate incomes also changed significantly during the 1991-95 period. The share of wages declined from 57 percent in 1991 to 44 percent in 1995, as did the share of monetary and in-kind transfers from the state (from 25 percent of aggregate income to 17 percent) (UNDP 1997, pp. 46-7). These trends accelerated in 1996 (see table below). In response to falling

wages and state transfers, people turned to entrepreneurial activities (which provided only 2 percent of money income in 1993, but 13 percent in 1995) and to the production of marketable food on their private plots or urban yards. The sale of food from private gardens accounted for less than 10 percent of household monetary income in 1991, but more than 19 percent in 1995 (UNDP 1997, pp. 46-7).

The following table illustrates the effect of changes in the structure of aggregate incomes by the end of 1996.

Table 3: Structure of Aggregated Incomes of an Average Family in Uzbekistan by Social Group, 1996 (%)

	Aggregate income	In-kind income from private plots	Money income	Money income from private plots	Wages	Enterprise income	Transfers	Other income
Total	100	8	92	18	28	25	12	9
Industrial workers	100	5	95	5	58	4	14	14
Collective farm workers	100	19	81	27	27	1	17	9
Entrepreneurs	100	6	94	26	10	45	6	7

Source: Adapted from UNDP 1997, p. 57. (The original source was not cited by UNDP; the BASIS research should seek access to the original study and consider conducting a similar study in the Ferghana Valley.)

Among the more striking aspects of this table is the great importance of private plots to household income. This is true not only among collective farm workers, where private plots account for nearly half of total income (far more than the wages paid to farm laborers), but also among households headed by an entrepreneur, where private plots provide a third of household income. These data may be signaling a change in women's economic activity. Employment data indicate that (at least in the 1990s) only one adult in collective farm households was employed full time on the farm (World Bank 1993, p. 286). It is probably the women in farm households who are currently allocating more labor to private plots.

Implication for BASIS Research: *The data on the increasing contribution of private plots to aggregate household income may indicate that an informal private sector is developing based in part on women's production from private plots. With job loss in the formal sector skewed against women, female unemployment may be pushing women into the informal sector at a faster rate than men.*

The gender, age, and socioeconomic characteristics of entrants into the informal sector need to be investigated at the field level, as do the form and level of informal sector remuneration for groups with different characteristics. The scope and impact of changes in labor allocation over the course of the reforms should also be investigated by tracing changes in household labor allocation between formal and informal sectors and between monetary and in-kind income generation.

IMPACT ON WOMEN

In 1996, the government of the Kyrgyz Republic issued a report on women stating that 70 percent of women surveyed that year felt that “the consequences of the economic transformation” have made women’s situation worse (Kyrgyz Republic 1996)⁴. Despite considerable evidence to support this conclusion for both Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, the causes of the disproportionately negative impact of privatization on women have not been identified or addressed by either the governments or the major donors that influence policy. This is dangerous for women’s welfare since it fosters an environment in which naïve assumptions and sex discrimination can easily prevail. A World Bank study on Uzbekistan, for example, suggested that the dual problems underemployment and unemployment could be eased if women would “voluntarily” withdraw from the labor force:

Labor-force participation among women is high by international standards. Some women may voluntarily retreat into the domestic sphere; others may opt for part-time employment. This will ease the problem of job creation (World Bank 1993, p. 100).

I would argue that it is dangerous to assume that women’s unemployment or “voluntary” withdrawal from the labor force is unlikely to have serious negative consequences both for families and for women. Women themselves are making the same argument. As a case in point, a 1993 study in Kyrgyzstan (Kuehnast 1993)⁵ found that although 83 percent of adult women had been in the labor force at independence, by 1993 over three quarters of the 600 women interviewed were unemployed, most having lost their jobs in the previous year. Only a few had “voluntarily” left the labor force for reasons such as pregnancy or illness. Nearly all were highly distressed to have lost their jobs since job loss meant the loss of access to many important socioeconomic benefits associated with paid employment: family benefits, child care support, access to housing, and in-kind contributions of food and fuel. Some women even suggested that the physical and psychological isolation of unemployment was leading to an increasing incidence of female alcoholism (UNICEF 1994, p. 132).

In both Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, reports on human rights suggest that rising unemployment is associated with increasing rates of alcoholism, rape, and domestic violence (U.S. Department of State 1997a, 1997b; Herman et al. 1996, p. 15). Currently there are no shelters for abused women or programs to combat problems of domestic violence. Under these conditions, female-biased job loss and anti-women discrimination in hiring has the potential to lock a significant segment of the female population into situations of poverty and/or abuse, even though the women affected have considerable human capital in terms of education and work experience as well as considerable motivation to find paid work.

Privatization has clearly been problematic for women. Many rural women in the 1993 Kyrgyzstan study (Kuehnast 1993) pointed out that work in pastoral societies has always been based on collective principles and organization. Soviet collectivization was thus to a certain degree a compatible way of life. The women interviewed said that they had worked hard for the collective farm, and, in return, many of their daily concerns (child care, education, health) had been taken care of. They did not understand why everyone does not have a job under the new system, and expressed their preference for a collective model over one in which only a few can find work and the owners no

⁴This source was not available for the present report.

⁵This source was not consulted directly.

longer care about their workers. These opinions reflect the study's findings that both nomadic women and women on privatized rural farms are extremely vulnerable to significantly worsening poverty. Many are suffering shortages of clothing, medicine, fuel, and even food (UNICEF 1994, p. 132).

Implication for BASIS Research: *The research on the effects of farm restructuring in the Ferghana Valley must assess the impact of increasing female unemployment on women's and children's welfare in terms of access to subsidies, day care and other services, etc., as well as on changes in monetary income. It should also assess the effects of restructuring on marketed and nonmarketed production and on the monetary and in-kind income of households in which women have become unemployed since the advent of the reforms.*

Increasing unemployment may also be leading to increasing family dissolution as the incidence of domestic violence and alcoholism rises (see U.S. Department of State 1997a, 1997 b). The field work needs to investigate these issues by interviewing men and women separately. The interviews should also investigate if and how rural women retain access to resources and income in the event of abandonment or divorce. Data on female-headed households is needed in terms of both its incidence and its effects on incomes and welfare. Care must be taken to investigate the situation of women who are required to provide for their children without a husband's or other male relative's support, but who are not considered to "head" their households in a juridical sense.

Focus group discussions can be used to identify income, output, and welfare indicators for various types of households. The results of these discussions should be compared with data on income and welfare from standard surveys. Issues such as domestic violence need to be raised in the context of attempts to identify the policy implications for dealing with both women's and men's unemployment.

SECTION FOUR

PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF FARM RESTRUCTURING

ACCESS TO LAND

Uzbekistan

In 1991, of the 3.5 million persons employed in Uzbekistan's agricultural sector, about 60 percent were employees of collective or state farms and 39 percent were temporary workers on those farms who also worked on household private plots (the latter group was probably mainly women). Less than 0.2 percent worked on private (dekhkan) farms (World Bank 1993, p. 286).

State and collective farms were very large: about 2,000 hectares in size with a population of 6,000 or more people. Most farm restructuring of these huge state-controlled entities has been cosmetic, reflecting the government's hesitancy to privatize the agricultural sector. Although nearly all state farms were formally reorganized into cooperatives or joint stock enterprises in 1994-95, these changes had little effect on the organization of production, marketing, or even employment (Mearns 1996, pp.16, 20). Workers still earned wages and followed the orders of the former brigade leaders.⁶ In 1996 the most important types of farms were still collectives of different types (72 percent of arable land) and household plots on collectives (12 percent) (Chemonics et al. 1997, p. 4).

From 1991 to 1995, the number of private (dekhkan) farms increased from 1,900 to 18,100, but they still accounted for only 6 percent of total arable land (Uzbekistan 1996, p. 41). Dekhkan farms are indeed private, but they are rarely "family farms" cultivated by a single family. Most are specialty farms, especially livestock operations, orchards, or vineyards that have been split off from a collective farm which itself remains intact (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 21, and mission interviews, January 1998). Most dekhkan farms were formed when the assets of the former collective farm brigade (a work and land unit uniting 20-40 households) were "purchased" by a private farmer, who then hired (or fired) as many of the former brigade members as he wished. (The "he" is used deliberately as it is doubtful that a significant share of private farmers are women —see below.)

To purchase a private farm, applicants had to meet certain qualifications. For example, they had to be able to "work well," as determined by the district head (hokhim), making personal acquaintance with the district head a factor in getting one's application approved. Another criterion was the number of sons an applicant had. District heads and private farmers interviewed for Eckert and Elwert 1996 suggested that "farmers without sons could not obtain private farms, even if they

As Eckert noted, this is somewhat surprising since over 50 percent of agricultural workers are women (information Eckert obtained from the Vice Minister of Labor in 1993), and because rural women do most of the work on the family plots around the houses and are less likely than men to have a job outside the kolkhoz. While all this suggests that women are unlikely to figure prominently among farm owners, I found no systematic information on the gender of private farmers. Among the private farmers who have been involved with Winrock

⁶ Real wages, however, declined precipitously from 1991 to 1995.

International's Farmer-to-Farmer program, some 10-15 percent are said to be women (Herman et al. 1996, p. 21).

Most districts also had the rule that the applicant had to be a full-time professional farmer, spending his time entirely on the land. This rule, however, was apparently not strictly followed. Eckert and Elwert (1996) found many cases in which members of the administration were the first (and sometimes the only) persons to found a private farm. Lestina and Voytan (1996) found that many of the new private "farmers" came from fields such as accounting, teaching, and transportation (pp.1-2). Another large group of private farmers are former economists, managers, or other specialists from the collective farm itself. These are the people with enough connections to mobilize a number of "sponsors" to loan them money to make a downpayment on the assets of a former state or collective farm. (Formal credit is largely unavailable, even to the well connected —see below.)

The practical criteria for farm ownership was succinctly summed up by a group of women interviewed by Eckert:

In order to found a dekhkan you firstly need good connections. Secondly, you need money for bribing your good connections. Thirdly you need money for machines and taxes. Fourthly you need money for training. And last you need money for labourers. And only then you can start and make some money with your farm. (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p.38)

Finally, owning a private farm in Uzbekistan does not necessarily give the farmer much latitude in decisionmaking. Due to state control over input supply and produce outlets, most "private" farmers in Uzbekistan have the power to decide on their crop mixes and markets in theory, but not in practice. This is a major difference from the situation in Kyrgyzstan.

Lack of decision making power by most of those who work the land is even more restricted in other forms of "privatization." In some cases, collective farms (kolkhoz) were transformed into leasehold (shirkat) farms, thereby officially placing them in the private sector. The kolkhoz was divided up into its former production units (grain, cotton, vegetables, livestock), which became a large leasehold (shirkat) farm (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 25). On these large "private" farms, production is still organized by the former brigade leaders. The individual leaseholder or "tenant" does not participate in production or marketing decisions, but the farm family, including the women who had formerly earned an individual wage on the kolkhoz, now have no guaranteed income. Family income depends on profits from the leased land. This profit is not always forthcoming, however, since leasehold contracts sometimes leave no surplus to the tenant (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 28).

Kyrgyzstan

In January 1995, single family "private" farms and multiple family "peasant" farms accounted for 12 percent of Kyrgyzstan's arable land, as compared to the 6 percent for private (dekhkan) farms in Uzbekistan. In addition, associations of peasant farms (which initially were essentially renamed state or collective farms) also controlled 12 percent of Kyrgyzstan's arable land, while cooperatives had 11 percent, collective farms had 25 percent, and state farms had 23 percent.

State agricultural research institutes and other state agricultural enterprises also controlled 17 percent (Delehanty and Rasmussen 1996, pp. 46, 56).

While this implies an agrarian institutional structure quite similar to that which currently exists in Uzbekistan, since 1995 this situation has apparently changed radically. In the past 2-3 years, Kyrgyzstan is said to have broken up nearly all state and collective farms into single or multiple family private farms (personal communication, K. Kadirkulov, General Director of the Republican Center of Land and Agrarian Reforms of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, January 1998).

The Kyrgyz process of farm restructuring started out much like that described for Uzbekistan, where the first private farms were former brigade land units that were split off from the state and collective farms. The rural and government elite —former managers, specialists, or administrators of the state or collective farm who had both the money and the connections necessary to operate individually in a collective economy —formed the large majority of the early private farmers. This first wave of private farmers had a significant advantage over those who followed because they had been able to purchase farm machinery, spare parts, feed, farm chemicals, seeds, etc., from the state at wholesale prices (Roth et al. 1996, p. 95).

In Kyrgyzstan, when an entire collective or state farm of some 2,000 or more ha was privatized, it was transformed into some 96-110 private single family farms, or 30-40 multiple family peasant farms, or 1-3 peasant associations or cooperatives (Roth et al. 1996, pp. 90, 94). (The first number in the range reflects the average from the 1991-93 period and the second is the average during the next phase of restructuring, after a February 1994 decree limited the size of individual land shares.) In this process, most former employees received land. Those who could not afford to farm as a single family, or who needed to farm larger parcels in order to make use of mechanized equipment from the former collective farm, pooled their land into multiple family peasant farms (the most common model) or formed cooperatives.

Roth et al. (1996) suggest that “the reforms appear relatively egalitarian, both in terms of land allocations to various classes of workers and in terms of gender.... Management and administrative staff, farm production workers, pensioners, service workers, and children all received between 0.66 and 0.73 ha/person. Only residents working off the farm received significantly smaller land shares. The vast majority of rural committees allocated identically sized land shares to both men and women” (p. 97).

The Land Tenure Center research team in the Osh and Djalal-Abad regions in the Ferghana Valley conducted interviews with the heads of 40 farm enterprises, of which 75 percent were peasant farms (multiple family enterprises), 7 percent were single family private farms, and 18 percent were cooperatives.⁷ The average number of households in a farm enterprise was 59, far higher than the country average of 31. The average size of the enterprises surveyed was 62 ha, of which 57 ha were arable and 35 ha irrigated. The mean number of people living on the enterprise was 391, with 102 working age adults (Roth et al. 1996, pp. 103-4).

All the farm enterprise heads were male, with a technical school, university, or graduate degree (Roth et al. 1996, p.104-5). Enterprise heads have the legal responsibility to organize

⁷ The mean size of cooperatives is about 445 ha in that area, whereas the mean size of peasant and private farms (together) is 26-27 ha (Delehanty and Rasmussen 1996, p. 57).

production and marketing. They decide which crops are grown, how farm labor is allocated, and where and on what terms produce is marketed. Roth et al. (1996) also found that the enterprise heads now have acquired de facto power to authorize land transfers and to set their terms. This power is as vast as that of former farm managers, but can presumably be curbed by democratic processes since most enterprises elect their heads.

Finally, interviews with enterprise heads in the Ferghana Valley regions of Kyrgyzstan indicated that privatization has done little to alleviate the surplus labor problem. In Osh and Djalal-Abad provinces (oblasts), 36 percent of enterprise heads indicated that the number of workers for the land available was “very excessive,” another 18 percent considered it “slightly excessive,” 41 percent said it was “about right,” and 5 percent indicated a “slight shortage” (Roth et al. 1996, p. 108).

Implication for BASIS Research: *In both countries, access to land and lucrative commodity markets on a private basis has been associated with access to political power. The BASIS research needs to pay attention to the gender aspects of the links between access to political leadership and decision making, on the one hand, and access to economic resources and economic decision making, on the other.*

We also need to know more about individual and household ability to make production and marketing decisions under different types of farm enterprises and about the processes used to make decisions in multi-household farms of different types. Finally, the research should study what happens to access to land and other economic resources in cases of divorce or other forms of household dissolution. To what extent can men or women whose households break up can sell, rent, or exchange their land shares? More research needs to be conducted in separate focus groups (by sex and age) to determine how the allocation of land shares translates into rights to withdraw from a farm enterprise with a share value that can be invested in an alternative enterprise or parcel of land.

THE STRUCTURE OF EMPLOYMENT IN UZBEKISTAN'S AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

In 1985, 38 percent of total employment in Uzbekistan was in agriculture. By 1991, agriculture's share had risen to 42 percent (World Bank 1993, p. 254), and by 1995 to nearly 46 percent. What seems to be happening is that agriculture is absorbing people who have lost their jobs in other sectors, undoubtedly intensifying the excess labor problem, but presumably allowing people to produce at least something on private plots.

The changing institutional structure of agricultural production may help the sector absorb more workers if small-scale, intensive production on smaller land units can be effectively supported with marketing services. The institutional structure is changing in both countries: relatively slowly in Uzbekistan, and, of late, very rapidly in Kyrgyzstan, where nearly all state and collective (kolkhoz) farms have been transformed into private sector enterprises of single or multiple family farms.

The occupational structure of the collective and state farms is illustrated by data on the one million people employed on Uzbekistan's state farms in 1990: 2.5 percent of employees worked as farm managers; 8.5 percent as specialists such as economists, veterinarians, etc.; 1 percent as “other employees”; and nearly 88 percent as ordinary workers (World Bank 1993, p. 255). It is the upper echelons of this hierarchy who have become the “private” or dekhkan farmers in the early phases of

farm restructuring. Apparently this was also the case in the early years of restructuring in the Kyrgyz Republic (personal communication, Klara Ismailova, January 1998).

Implications for BASIS Research: *It is important to try to determine the gender and age characteristics of employees on state and collective farms, differentiating between regular farm workers, temporary farm workers, management and specialist staff, and people with no formal employment on the former (or current) collective and state farms. An effort could be made to find the raw data from past surveys to determine whether gender breakdowns can be made. If not, the BASIS research should include historical questions on the gender composition of the rural labor force in order to determine trends in rural employment by type (location, occupation) and by gender and age. It goes without saying that any new data collected on the labor force of leasehold, cooperative, and various forms of private farms should be distinguished by gender and age as well as by occupation and owner/dependent status.*

ACCESS TO CREDIT, INPUTS, AND MARKETS

Uzbekistan

Geetha Nagarajan, a financial market specialist working with the BASIS project, has described rural financial markets in Uzbekistan as “repressive, underdeveloped, and rudimentary, ... comprised of repressive and inefficient formal financial institutions, underdeveloped semi-formal agents and rudimentary informal arrangements” (Nagarajan 1997, p. 1). Banks “function more as conduits for subsidized government funds” to government-approved enterprises such as the agricultural cooperatives (former state farms) and collective farms. Banks’ ability to function as independent financial intermediaries is undermined by a very weak deposit base, a situation that is explained in part by the legal constraints within which they operate.

Current laws prohibit the withdrawal of cash from one’s own bank account. Payments may be made only to approved organizations by bank transfer (Mearns 1996, pp. 21-3). Leasehold farmers (former collective farm members who lease small plots on the “reorganized” farms) must buy their inputs from (and sell most output to) government-approved enterprises, a system that locks them into a monopolistic contract system. The contract system can literally prevent a leasehold farmer from making a profit. The unpredictability of real prices in the contract system also has dire implications for members of the leaseholder’s household, i.e., the wives and adult children who previously earned a wage from the collective farm, but now must live off the often unrealized “profits” of a “private” enterprise.

The current banking system also discourages expanded production for the market on the small, private household gardens every family has on state, cooperative, or collective farms (kolkhoz). With little access to cash and no access to credit, people who want to sell produce from their private plots are often forced to operate in a restricted barter economy.

The more privileged strata of private farmers, those with connections to state officials from their positions as collective farm managers, economists, etc., are less likely to operate through barter arrangements. Many current “private farmers” from this strata are working as much land or handling as much livestock as an entire brigade of 30-40 collective farmers worked in the past. Many of these farmers have obtained funding from “private sponsors” in order to make downpayments on the

physical capital (livestock, buildings, equipment) they are purchasing from a collective farm. In the case of the private livestock farmer visited by the BASIS team in January 1998, the loans from both the “sponsors” and the collective farm were reported to have been paid off in one year, apparently from the profits from milk sold to a state-run milk processing enterprise.⁸ (This example illustrates the capriciousness of state-controlled prices, which can either “break” or “make” a private farmer.)

“Semi-formal” financial markets, including NGOs that provide financial services, have only just started to emerge in Uzbekistan (Nagarajan 1997). They are not yet able to reach ordinary farmers. Mercy Corps International’s Uzbekistan branch is the only NGO currently active in this area, having begun in 1996. Mercy Corps is working with the Business Women’s Association (an independent NGO) and with private farmers’ associations to foster the development of savings and credit associations. As of December 1, 1997, there were only 147 members in 7 savings and credit associations (World Council of Credit Unions 1997/1998, pp. 3, 15). Since most savings and credit associations are organized by the Business Women’s Association, it is estimated that 60-70 percent of their members are women. Other savings and credit associations are being targeted at the private farmers’ associations. Unfortunately, the gender composition of private farmers’ associations is rarely reported. Lestina and Voytan, consultants for the World Council of Credit Unions, for example, interviewed 102 farmers from the 1,000 member Ferghana Private Farmers Association in April-May 1996 without mentioning whether any women farmers were among them.

Kyrgyzstan

Although I have no similar assessment of the credit and rural credit situation in Kyrgyzstan, interviews conducted by the Land Tenure Center with rural committee heads found that 87 percent of them considered the lack of credit to be serious, very serious, or extremely serious (50 percent), with a similar percentage citing the lack of fertilizer, farm chemicals, fuel, and spare parts or equipment in the serious/very serious/extremely serious categories (Roth et al. 1996, p. 123).

Implication for BASIS Research: *The BASIS research must pay particular attention to recording (or, if necessary, estimating) the gender composition of “private farmers,” both in the population and as members of groups or associations such as private farmers’ associations, savings and credit associations, and even business women’s associations. (Women’s associations may well include male members if they are among the few organizations to obtain the right to organize credit associations, which is a real possibility in Uzbekistan at this time.)*

If we don’t know the gender composition of organizations that can provide access to credit, we cannot understand how access to credit varies by gender or the implications of differing access for household productivity and incomes. Further, to understand the impact of gender and socioeconomic differences on access to credit, researchers need to examine the social status of members of savings and credit associations and private farmers’ associations (household heads, dependent youth, etc.) as well as their professional or occupational status (skilled versus unskilled labor, former collective farm workers, professionals from the collective or from other sectors, urban versus rural-based members of business women’s associations, etc.).

⁸ The farmer visited had been the *kolkhoz* economist prior to his decision to take up private farming. The land and physical capital he purchased had previously been used by an entire brigade (some 35 collective farmers). As a private farmer, the economist continued to employ 25 of the former livestock brigade workers. Among those retained were eight women. All 10 persons who lost their jobs were men.

Finally, even though women may not be members of formal organizations, they are likely to have informal networks or groups that they have developed (or could develop) to gain access to inputs, information, credit, etc. The BASIS research should attempt to identify informal groups of this type, since their very existence would indicate the need to make the formal systems more accessible to women.⁹ Interviews with women in informal groups or networks could help identify the policy-relevant constraints that impede their access to formal credit and other resources.

⁹ I am grateful to Dr. Simel Esim of the International Center for Research on women for suggesting this point.

SECTION FIVE

GENDER ISSUES IN FARM RESTRUCTURING

WOMEN'S WORK AND WOMEN'S WAGE EMPLOYMENT

Even though women in Central Asia seem to shoulder the entire responsibility for household maintenance and, to an increasing extent, for child care (see section two, "Demography, Health, Education, and Labor Force Participation"), women in both Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan have had very high labor force participation rates. Women, however, hold fewer full-time positions as agricultural wage earners than men, although they are always fully mobilized for the cotton harvest. Women are also less likely than men to hold a job outside the collective or state farm on which the great majority of rural families live. Finally, women have been over-represented in the social sectors (health and education) that have been hard hit by the economic crisis of the 1990s.

Implication for BASIS Research: *Comparable data on the labor force participation rates and the occupational structure of men and women who reside on farm enterprises will be critical to determining the gender impact of employment changes associated with different models of reform and of farm restructuring. People should be asked about their employment situations both before and after restructuring.*

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN UNEMPLOYMENT RATES (OFFICIAL AND SELF-DECLARED)

There is anecdotal and some survey evidence that women's job loss is outstripping This may vary by rural versus urban occupations. Official rates of unemployment are unlikely to indicate the magnitude or gender and age bias of job loss, so large-scale sampling may be needed to uncover the actual impact by age and gender.

There are also indications that sex discrimination may be playing a significant role. Two researchers on the impact of farm restructuring, for example, have suggested that men are getting more jobs in the social service sector as women lose them (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 46).

Implication for BASIS Research: *The research should attempt to estimate the differences between official and actual unemployment rates in the Ferghana Valley by sex, occupation, and age category. Since the impact of the loss of formal employment may be far greater than the loss of a wage or salary, the research should investigate what social services, access to housing, and other benefits were also lost when people lost their formal employment. If a woman is divorced and also loses her job on a collective farm, can she retain (or obtain) access to a house and yard?*

It is very important to study how both men and women have reacted to job loss in the formal sector. Subsequent income-seeking activities in both formal and informal sectors, as well as changes in self-provisioning of goods (food, housing) and services (tutoring of children, cooking/selling snack foods, etc.) need to be systematically studied.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT MODELS OF FARM RESTRUCTURING

Different farm restructuring models are likely to have different gender implications with respect to men's versus women's ability to earn and control income. Eckert and Elwert (1996, p. 27) noted that wives of male "leaseholders," for example, often gave up their formal jobs on the kolkhoz in order to assist the husband with farming, but the household may have gained little or no benefit if the leaseholder's contract drastically limited the profit that could be made.

***Implication for BASIS Research:** The gender effects of the entire range of processes of farm restructuring need to be investigated with respect to types of income lost and types of income gained. It is also important to determine whether those changes have affected men's or women's ability to control the use of income generated by individuals in different relationships to the household head. Women's reasons for exiting or failing to attempt to re-enter formal employment need to be studied in conjunction with their position as family members in rural households undergoing farm restructuring.*

BASIS should also study the relationship among farm restructuring, women's loss of employment as wage earners (full-time or seasonal), and intra-household decision making processes, especially with respect to women's decisions about the allocation of household income.

GENDER-SPECIFIC EFFECTS OF REDUCTIONS IN SOCIAL SERVICES AND CHILD CARE FACILITIES

The severity of cutbacks in different social service sectors —health, education, and state-subsidized day care and preschools —may differ between Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. Different paces of farm restructuring and different policies regarding state support for these services are likely to have a differential effect on the incidence of job-loss changes in wage levels in these sectors. Since women represent a high share of employees in the social service sectors, job loss in these sectors is likely to have a significant impact on women's employment and incomes. Both these issues require investigation.

It is notable that research on wage and employment changes during Russia's economic transition found that median female wages fell from 83 percent of male wages in 1991 to only 60 percent of male wages just three years later. The change was not attributable to shorter hours (women actually worked longer hours than men), but to a shift in the overall wage structure that penalized the lower-wage positions held disproportionately by women. In other words, women started out in lower wage positions, and when the transition to a privatized economy resulted in a significant increase in wage dispersion between higher and lower-paid positions, women lost ground relative to men (Brainerd 1995, pp. 30-31, 44). There may well be a similar phenomenon at work in both the social service and agricultural sectors in Central Asia.

Day care facilities and after school programs have declined precipitously in Kyrgyzstan since fees were introduced (section two, "Demography, Health, Education, and Labor Force

The loss of these important social services may or may not have had an important impact on women's ability to seek and hold employment in the formal sector, to pursue higher

education, or to engage in microenterprise endeavors in the informal sector. In any event, the loss of these services is likely to have a greater impact on women than on men. These hypotheses need to be investigated in order to determine their impact on both the labor market and intra-household labor allocation.

Implication for BASIS Research: *A gender breakdown of data on changes in employment by occupational category and on changes in wage levels in the occupations highly represented in the rural sector should be collected. The extent and gender-specific wage/employment effects of changes in social services in health, education, and child care should be a particular area of concern.*

The research should attempt to determine whether and how changes in child care facilities have affected women's entry into or exit from the labor force. Given the extended family system and the custom of living with the husband's parents, the availability of nonfamily-based child care may or may not be a major factor in women's decision to enter or exit the formal labor force. It may, however, affect women's and children's welfare in a manner that is serious enough to have policy implications.

PRIVATE PLOTS AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME

In Uzbekistan private plots have contributed a growing share of aggregate household income since 1991, while the shares of real wages and state transfers have declined (section two, "Demography, Health, Education, and Labor Force Participation"). What is not clear is whether actual output and real income from private plots has increased. The increase in relative share may be offset by the overall decline in real incomes, such that people are neither producing more nor earning more (in an absolute sense) from their private plots.

Eckert and Elwert's research has indicated that household yards are cultivated mainly by women and children (1996, p. 31). The fact that these private plots yield both food for household consumption and a surplus for sale raises the question of who controls the output from the private plot and the money earned from it.

Implication for BASIS Research: *The question of who, within the household, cultivates the private plot and who controls the produce should be systematically investigated at the field level. Do women and/or men have access to a similar private plot on various new types of farms, such as private multi-family farms? Is there evidence at the field level that both output and incomes from private plots are increasing? If so, how are the benefits from this change distributed within the household. Could more be produced or earned if constraints on financial, capital, and commodity markets were eased?*

MEN'S AND WOMEN'S LIVESTOCK-REARING ROLES AND OWNERSHIP RIGHTS

In many cultures, women own and rear small stock on their own account; that is, they may use the proceeds from sales or the processing of livestock products for whatever purpose they see fit. If this is the case in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, the mode of disposing of the livestock (milk cows and goats, in particular) from a "privatized" state or collective farm or a privatized livestock brigade

will have gender implications. If all the livestock is sold to a single private farmer, women can lose access to livestock products they may have formerly consumed or sold. If the animals are distributed among individual households, women have a greater chance of retaining access to milk, eggs, and meat, and may even obtain ownership to small stock.

In Uzbekistan it has been common for the entire livestock-rearing operation of a collective farm to be sold to a single person. These operations can be very profitable. One farmer interviewed by the BASIS team was able to pay for a large herd of cattle and sheep in a single year (interview with Mr. Arabayov, Chinov District, January 27, 1998). This mode of privatizing livestock has apparently concentrated income in a few hands.

In Kyrgyzstan, a serious economic crisis apparently caused the massive sale and slaughter of livestock after it had been equally distributed among farm households. This loss of livestock was the result of many factors and does not necessarily prove the superiority of the Uzbek policy. How livestock is dealt with during farm restructuring is an important arena for comparative research, and one in which different policies may have different implications for men and for women.

Implication for BASIS Research: *Gender roles in livestock rearing and gender-specific rights of ownership and/or rights to dispose of livestock or of livestock products should be investigated both for the pre-restructuring situation and on various forms of newly created farms. If women formerly earned income from either privately held animals or animals owned by the collective or state farm, did restructuring change their ownership or use rights and/or their ability to profit from livestock rearing? If livestock was sold to single farmers, what factors have made the private livestock operations profitable? In this case, what has been the impact of the loss of access to the livestock or to livestock products on other members of the collective farm, by age and sex?*

WOMEN'S LAND RIGHTS

Land rights are normally analyzed vis-à-vis households as a unit. Women's individual land rights are generally based on cultural constructions associated with parentage and marriage, which may leave women with few or no rights to land upon divorce, widowhood, or abandonment. Land use rights are critical to women's ability to engage in farming. Customary use rights, however, can change radically with farm restructuring. Gender-specific land rights are also likely to vary in practice depending on the quality of the land (irrigated, rain-fed, high or low fertility). It is important to investigate the gender-specificity of land control rights and land use rights for different types of land both in principle and in practice.

Implication for BASIS Research: *The BASIS research should conduct a comparative study of various forms of men's and women's formal and informal land rights in the pre- and post-restructuring situations. Women's rights both within and outside marriage should be identified and the impact of loss of various types of rights studied. There may well be policy and legal implications for the welfare of women and children who do not have husbands or fathers.*

WOMEN'S OFF-FARM EMPLOYMENT/SELF-EMPLOYMENT

In Uzbekistan, it is said that more men than women have jobs outside the collective farm or outside the local village (interviews at Kim Pen Khwa collective farm, January 21-22, 1998). The location and occupational structure of men's and women's work needs to be investigated by age and educational category. On Kim Pen Khwa, which is located near Tashkent, several small and medium-scale rural industries have been created, including a joint venture with Bangladesh for cotton spinning and a ready-made clothing enterprise. The work force in the cotton spinning plant is predominantly young women. There may be occupational opportunities in the Ferghana Valley, where there are many small and medium-scale textile and food processing enterprises.

It is also possible that an informal sector is emerging in both countries in which people are creating self-employment as traders, food processors, and other types of microentrepreneurs. Research into the characteristics of the emerging informal sector (including gender aspects), the identification of conditions that are constraining or encouraging its development, and the relationship of all these factors to farm restructuring could have important policy implications.

Implication for BASIS Research: *The age, gender, and household position of rural residents who are employed in nonagricultural, formal jobs should be investigated. Given the patriarchal traditions of the area, researchers should also investigate who (within the household) controls the off-farm income earned by wives and dependents, and who decides which family members should seek off-farm employment in the formal sector. Men's and women's self-employment in the off-farm informal sector (retail trade, microenterprise) or in nonagricultural self-employment carried out on the farm (food processing, tutoring school children) should also be studied both before and after farm restructuring.*

SURPLUS LABOR AND GENDER EFFECTS ON EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS WITH PRIVATIZATION

As pointed out earlier in this report (section three, "Impact on Women"), the World Bank's 1993 publication, *Uzbekistan: An Agenda for Economic Reform*, suggested that the severity of the potential unemployment problem under privatization might not be as great as feared if women were to "voluntarily" withdraw from the labor force and return to the household. The idea that many Uzbek women probably want to leave their jobs is based on international averages which show far lower labor force participation for women in other parts of the world. It is therefore assumed that women's very high labor force participation rates throughout the Soviet period is somehow artificial and inimical to women's interests. The World Bank's assumptions are contradicted by interview data with unemployed Kyrgyz women (Kuehnast 1993).

There are several factors that can force women out of the labor force, be they willing or not. An important one that seems to be taking place in both Russia and Central Asia is gender-biased firing when firms and farms are privatized. Another is gender-biased hiring. A third might be increased patriarchal control over women's employment options, especially if male private farmers want women to work on the family farm or if multi-family farms require women's unpaid participation in order to become profitable. There are many scenarios that could be taking place,

including some that may produce better formal employment opportunities for women than for men if it is felt that women in certain categories (such as young, unmarried women) can be paid less than men. All these possibilities need to be investigated in order to understand the options that different groups in the rural labor force have, and how the existence of these options (or constraints) affects their ability to maintain or improve their welfare under farm restructuring.

Implication for BASIS Research: *The research should focus heavily on changes in men's and women's employment options and employment histories over the course of the transition. Work in the home, on private farm land, in the informal sector, and formal employment must be distinguished. All types of work should be analyzed to assess the importance of monetary and in-kind income associated with it. This research should begin with open discussions in gender-specific focus groups in order to identify major patterns in changing work/employment opportunities and histories. Various patterns or trajectories that have been distinguished should be researched in two ways: (1) case studies to determine the income and welfare implications of different trajectories, and (2) surveys to determine the relative incidence of the most important scenarios of employment change.*

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN LABOR TIMES AND ROLES IN THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Macroeconomic reform, privatization of the industrial and service sectors, and farm restructuring itself will obviously have differing impacts on different segments of the population. Among these impacts are changes in monetary income, changes in in-kind income, and changes in total labor time (including unpaid domestic labor time). Changes in monetary income can also have an impact on an individual's influence over the allocation of household or personal income. These changes need to be investigated for various population groups, distinguished by gender, age, and socioeconomic status.

Implication for BASIS Research: *Since time is an important component of welfare, both for the individual and for those who depend on that individual for care, it should be an important component of the analysis of the effects of farm restructuring and privatization, in general. As part of the initial focus group research on patterns of change associated with farm restructuring (see section five, "Surplus Labor and Gender Effects on Employment Options with Privatization"), effects on overall work time and on specific types of labor time (paid, unpaid with an in-kind return, domestic or reproductive work time) need to be explored. Once basic patterns are discerned, their incidence can be investigated with larger survey instruments.*

SECTION SIX

GENDER ISSUES IN THE FIRST STAGE OF THE RESEARCH

Although BASIS research in Central Asia is not necessarily time bound, there are two stages to the current research project in the Ferghana Valley:

- 1) a very short-term research period from the research planning workshop to March/April 1998, and
- 2) a three-year research period (to be funded annually), for which a research plan will be more fully elaborated in April 1998.

No field work was conducted during the first stage, but much of the research of the second stage is expected to focus on field work in the Ferghana Valley, specifically on the Andijan oblast in Uzbekistan and the Osh oblast in Kyrgyzstan.

During the first stage of the research, working groups in each country compiled existing statistical data and reviewed legislation to answer specific questions in six areas: land, labor and income, water, mechanization, finance, and farm restructuring. Statistical data were gathered for the country as a whole and for the Andijan and Osh oblasts. In both cases data were recorded for 1991 and 1996 (and 1997 if available).

This subsection comments on the research questions set for the first stage of the research. Suggestions are made here to indicate how the second stage of the research might attempt to gather data that cannot be found in official sources or to elaborate on issues raised by the data that are available. These comments are based on meetings held with four of the six research subgroups formed to carry out the first stage research in Uzbekistan.

LAND

In the land legislation area, questions about the official legislation are assumed unlikely to turn up any official discrimination on the basis of gender for various types of land tenure. The second stage will be an opportunity to investigate the gender aspects of land tenure in practice. Two questions on land transactions, however, may find gender specificity in the legislation: 1) How is land held in common share or common joint ownership divided? 2) What are the rules about division of land in case of divorce or death of a spouse? In the statistical data on land, only the number of titles granted each year from 1991 to 1997 will be investigated. It must still be determined whether data are kept at the local level by the gender of the person (or owner of the entity) holding the title.

LABOR

Questions on data related to labor and income are more gender specific. All demographic data, rural/urban breakdowns, employment data (by sector and by occupational category) and surplus labor estimates are to be broken down by sex and age. It is notable that in Uzbekistan migration data are disaggregated mainly by nationality. It is not clear whether either external or internal migration data are reported by sex or by age. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees published a migration study in 1997, but it concentrated almost exclusively on the nationalities of external immigrants and emigrants. It is likely that information on urban/rural and rural/urban migration will have to be collected during the field work. Data should be collected by sex, age, and occupational category.

In the legislative area, the research will investigate whether there are any safety or other work-related rules that affect men and women differently, any legal disincentives for women to engage in any types of agricultural work, and any legal rules restricting migration that differ by age or sex. We know that the pension age is 55 for women and 60 for men, but the research should also investigate whether or not there are requirements to leave work at retirement age that may affect men and women in the agricultural sector differently from people in other sectors.

WATER

The statistical questions on water investigate sources and uses of water by amounts used in different sectors, as well as water costs and rainfall data. The legal issues regarding water rights could have gender implications, especially in the relationship between water rights and land rights, and in the (potentially) different rules for access to water by different types of agricultural enterprises, including private plots, which may be of greater importance to women's income and

MECHANIZATION

Among the legal issues with potentially different implications by gender is the question of whether collective farm members have a right to a share of the property (nonland assets) of the farm if they withdraw from the collective to start a private farm. The formal and informal rules for the allocation and use of machinery in leasehold farms should also be investigated. The criteria upon which the division of farm assets are based could discriminate against women if they are based on the number of years a person has been employed by the collective farm. Women who live on collective farms are more likely to be part-time employees than men, more likely to have worked in nonagricultural sectors such as education and health than men, and more likely to have left the labor force for childbearing and child rearing than men. Any of these factors might make a woman less eligible to receive shares in farm equipment than men.

FINANCE

The legal questions about access to agricultural loans —in particular, who can borrow — could have gender implications if borrowing is predicated on the holding of land titles or land shares in one's own name. The research should determine whether existing loan data or data on owners of savings accounts have been disaggregated by gender.

RESTRUCTURING

Among the legal issues that may have gender-differentiated impacts are: the legal procedures for individuals or families to obtain agricultural land, the method of distributing land and property when an agricultural enterprise is restructured, and the criteria for determining to whom (agricultural workers, social sphere workers, pensioners, etc.) land and property will be distributed. There are also gender implications in the existence (or nonexistence) of legislation that shifts the financing of social services, such as day care, after-school programs, and health facilities, to local governments or to consumers. Any changes in the location, costs, and availability of health, education, and child care services accompanying restructuring should be noted.

The specific questions on restructuring that have gender implications are: the average number of workers or shareholders of agricultural enterprises by type and by age category and sex; and the status of the provision of social services (schools, kindergartens, canteens, health clinics) by type of provider (state, district, farm enterprise, private).

SECTION SEVEN

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE RESEARCH

This section expands on several of the research issues outlined at the Tashkent planning workshop. Under each topic identified at the workshop, research questions that can illuminate related gender and socioeconomic difference issues are proposed. These questions should be seen as examples of potential research questions. As new information becomes available, many of these questions will need to be refined, expanded, or perhaps discarded.

The section also include issues and questions which have already been highlighted (in italics) in the preceding sections of this report. Some of these fit under the issues identified at the workshop and some are included separately.

A Preliminary Methodological Note: To capture socioeconomic differences, it is proposed that most of the research dealing with household issues should be carried out in interviews with focus groups or using sample survey techniques that separate two different types of households:

- 1) households that had skilled employees on pre-reform state and collective farms (e.g., farm managers, economists, mechanics, tractor drivers); and
- 2) households with only farm laborers on pre-reform collective farms.

Other categories of households, such as those in which several nuclear families live in a single house (a sign of poverty) or those with social service workers, or with members who work in urban areas, or women-headed households, should also be distinguished for some the issues.

PROPOSED RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

NOTE: Most of the questions in this section should be studied for two periods: before and after restructuring.

Land and Water

Workshop Issue 3:¹⁰ Distribution of Land to the User (by Category and Type)

1. What are the differences between men's and women's land rights (e.g., ability to use land for self-determined purposes, to inherit, to transfer to others, etc.) in law, custom, and current practice? This question should be posed for all different types of farm enterprises and should be studied separately for different types of households.
2. How are water rights associated with land rights? Does this differ by gender, household position, farm type?
3. Which household members (household head, female spouse, married versus single man, single woman, male and female youth) can obtain access to land and water for farming or livestock rearing on their own account, i.e., where they control the income generated? Does this vary by type of farm enterprise? By socioeconomic status? By gender of the head of household?
4. Who, in households located on collective/state farms, cultivates the private plot? Who controls the produce? Do women and/or men have access to the same type of "private plot" or to additional private garden plots on new types of farms, such as private multi-family farms, leasehold farms, etc.?
5. What happens to the land rights of different household members if the household is split by divorce, abandonment, death of the household head?

Workshop Issue 4: Study of Institutions Taking Part in Land Distribution

1. Who are the formal and nonformal decisionmakers in various processes associated with land distribution? What is the gender and socioeconomic profile of each group of decisionmakers? Would a different socioeconomic and gender profile of decisionmakers be expected to have different outcomes in terms of who gets land and water rights? If so, what evidence is there to support this hypothesis?
2. What are the formal and nonformal, but influential, criteria upon which land distribution decisions are made? What socioeconomic, gender, and age/family status groups are favored by these criteria? To what extent does the profile of actual land recipients reflect formal versus informal criteria of different types?

Workshop Issue 5: Research on Land Quality before and after Farm Restructuring

1. If household members have individual land rights, is there any systematic difference between the quality of land allocated to men and women, especially on land that can be farmed on their own account?

¹⁰ The numbering of the research issues follows that of the Tashkent workshop listing.

2. Is there any systematic difference in the type of land (irrigated, rainfed, pasture, other) allocated to men and women from different socioeconomic groups?
3. Is there any systematic difference in the type or quality of land allocated to male-headed versus female-headed households from different socioeconomic or age groups?
4. Is there any evidence that men's and women's farming practices differ in a manner that affects the quality of the land?

Workshop Issue 6: Productivity and Yield on Arable Land

1. Is there any difference in the yields obtained by men versus women farmers working on the same type (irrigated, rainfed, yard, supplementary garden, etc.) and quality of land?

Workshop Issue 7: Taxes and Rent for Different Land Types

1. Is there any difference in the taxes and rent paid for the same type and quality of land by households from different socioeconomic categories? Does this differ according to the sex of the household head?

LABOR AND INCOMES

Comparable data on the labor force participation rates and the occupational structure of men and women involved in the farm enterprises studied will be critical to determining the gender impact of employment changes associated with different models of reform and of farm restructuring. The research should focus heavily on changes in men's and women's employment options and employment histories over the course of the transition.

The age, gender, and household position characteristics of persons who live on the farm but work in nonagricultural wage or salaried employment should be investigated. Given the patriarchal traditions of the area, researchers should also investigate who (within the household) controls the off-farm income earned by wives and male and female dependents, and who decides which family members should seek off-farm employment in the formal sector.

Men's and women's self-employment in the off-farm informal sector (retail trade, microenterprise) or in nonagricultural self-employment carried out on the farm (food processing, tutoring school children) should also be studied both before and after farm restructuring. Finally, work in the home and on private farm land should be analyzed to assess the importance of monetary and in-kind income associated with it.

Since time is an important component of welfare, both for the individual and for his or her dependents, changes in labor times should be an important component of the analysis of the effects of farm restructuring and privatization. The effects of farm restructuring on overall labor time and on

specific types of labor time (paid, unpaid with an in-kind return, domestic or reproductive work time) need to be explored.

This research on all types of work should begin with open discussions in gender-specific focus groups in order to identify major patterns in changing work and employment opportunities and histories. Various patterns or trajectories that have been distinguished should be researched in two ways: 1) case studies to determine the income and welfare implications of different trajectories, and 2) surveys to determine the relative incidence of the most important scenarios of employment change.

Workshop Issue 4: Study of Changes in the Structure and Purchasing Power of Household Incomes in the Course of Farm Restructuring by Farm Type (Private Farms, Leasehold Farms, Collectives) in Each Region

Each of the following questions should be investigated for all farm types and should distinguish among households from different socioeconomic categories.

1. What are the sources of household income on different types of farms?
2. What household members (by gender, age, and household position such as head, spouse, adult children, etc.) contribute what types of monetary and in-kind income? (Household services such as child care, cooking, and house repair can be included by noting the hours spent on these tasks.)
3. What changes have taken place in the purchasing power of each source of income in the past several (5-8) years? (How to measure changes in purchasing power should be discussed among the different research teams so that a common method can be used.)
4. What changes have taken place in the amount of work (hours or days) each household member spends on each source of income?
5. What are the most profitable sources of income for the household? How has this changed over the past several (5-8?) years?

Workshop Issue 6: Study of Relationships between Changes in Employment Opportunities and Changes in Household and Individual Incomes (by Age, Sex, and Occupation) over the Course of Farm Restructuring in Each Region

It is important to try to determine the gender and age characteristics of employees on state and collective farms, differentiating among regular farm workers, temporary farm workers, management and specialist staff, and people with no formal employment on the collective and state farms. An effort could be made to find the raw data from past surveys to determine whether gender breakdowns can be made. If not, the BASIS research should include historical questions on the gender composition of the rural labor force in order to study trends in rural employment by type (location, occupation) and by gender and age. All new data collected on the labor forces of different

types of farm enterprises should be distinguished by gender and age as well as by occupation and owner or dependent status.

1. How have formal employment positions and other types of work (informal sector jobs, production on private plots, domestic work) changed for different household members (by gender, age, household position) over the past (x number of) years?
2. What types of jobs have been lost by sex, age, socioeconomic and occupational status? What new types of jobs or other work have been taken up by different groups?
3. What are the differences in income between jobs that were lost and new work taken up by various categories of household members? (How to ask this question and how to measure changes in income are sensitive methodological issues that should be addressed by the research team and agreed upon before the field research takes place.)
4. Women's reasons for leaving and/or not trying to find a job in the formal sector need to be studied. Women should be categorized by their positions as wives, daughters, widows, or heads of rural households undergoing some form of farm restructuring. Their training and job experience should also be noted.
5. What are the effects of losing access to different types of income? Of gaining access to other types of income? Have those changes have affected men's or women's ability to control the use of income they themselves generate? Does this vary by an individual's relationship to the household head?
6. Since the impact of the loss of formal employment may be far greater than the loss of a wage or salary, the research should investigate what social services, access to housing, and other benefits are lost when people lose jobs in the formal sector. If a woman is divorced, for example, and also loses her job on a collective farm, can she retain (or obtain) access to a house and yard?
7. The research should attempt to estimate the differences between official and actual unemployment rates in the Ferghana Valley by sex, occupation, and age category.

Workshop Issue 7: Trends in Migration Patterns in the Andijan and Osh Regions

1. What household members have either returned to the farm or left the farm over the past 5-8 years (by sex, age, household position, and occupational status)? What was the reason for each person's leaving or return?
2. What type of work does each person who migrated or returned do now? What type of work did he/she do previously?

FINANCE

Workshop Issue 1: Sources of Finance and Structure of Its Use

This topic can be investigated at several levels, including the informal credit market (loans among friends or in informal savings/credit groups such as revolving credit associations), the semi-formal market (such as donor-supported NGOs or international NGOs), and the formal financial market. All levels and types of credit should be included in the research.

1. What are the sources of credit actually received by farmers and microentrepreneurs living on former state and collective farms? A survey may be used to estimate the percentage of persons in various social groups (by sex, age, occupation) who have access to different types of credit, including loans from friends and relatives.
2. To understand the impact of gender and socioeconomic differences on access to credit, researchers need to examine the gender and family status of members of savings and credit associations and private farmers' associations (household heads, dependent youth, etc.), as well as their professional or occupational status (skilled versus unskilled labor, former collective farm workers, professionals in nonfarm sectors, etc.).
3. For what purposes have various rural social groups sought credit?
4. Who are the "sponsors" who have financed the emerging private farmers in Uzbekistan? What is needed in order to obtain access to relatively large loans from private parties? What are the terms of these loans?

Workshop Issue 4: Access by Farmers to Formal Credit and Saving Services

1. What are the socioeconomic, age, and gender characteristics of farmers who have received loans from formal financial institutions?
2. Are there any legal or administrative criteria for the identification and vetting of borrowers that discriminate by sex, age, or occupation?

Workshop Issue 5: Accumulation of Financial Resources (Savings) by Agricultural Enterprises

1. In what form do different types of agricultural enterprises accumulate and store financial resources?
2. Do women-run agricultural enterprises accumulate and store savings differently from male-run enterprises? Describe the differences and discuss their rationale.

Workshop Issue 6: Structure of the Demand for Credit

1. What are the occupational, wealth, gender, and age characteristics of individuals who seek credit for different purposes (productive investment, consumption, personal emergencies, etc.)?

Workshop Issue 7: Possibilities for Savings Mobilization by the Rural Population

1. From interviews with different social groups (by sex, age, occupation, etc.), determine how different groups attempt to save (for example, by purchasing small livestock or jewelry, joining revolving credit and savings associations, etc.). What is the relative importance of different types of savings to different social groups?
2. What requirements do male and female farmers, microentrepreneurs, or small business people have for institutions such as banks or savings and credit associations that would induce them to use these institutions for saving?

Workshop Issue 8: Possibilities for Transferring Financial Resources from the Urban to the Rural Sector

1. What investments have urban-based men and women made in various types of rural enterprises, including farms, equipment, livestock?
2. What are the occupational, age, and gender characteristics of urban residents who have made investments in rural enterprises?
3. What other types of individual transfers are made among urban and rural residents? Note the sex, age, and occupational characteristics, and the kinship or other types of relationships among individuals conducting these types of transfers.

RESTRUCTURING, MECHANIZATION, AND LABOR USE

Workshop Issue 9 from the Land Section, Issue 9 from Mechanization, and Issue 3 from Restructuring: Relationships between Changes in the Intensity of Land Use and the Demand for Labor over the Course of Farm Restructuring in Each Region, with Particular Attention to the Influence of Changing Patterns of Mechanization on the Demand for Labor and to Mechanisms for Allocating Labor and Providing Incentives for Labor under Different Forms of Farm Management

Questions for managers of each type of farm:

1. How has the total number of people employed on the farm changed over the past 5-8 years?

2. How many male and female farm workers were employed 5 years ago? How many are currently employed? (Farm workers with different occupational categories and skill levels should be distinguished; e.g., livestock workers, crop production workers, tractor drivers, etc.)
3. How has the structure of farm management positions changed? What jobs have been eliminated or added? How many managers or specialists in each category have lost their jobs (by specialty and gender)? How many new specialist or managerial jobs have been added (by specialty and gender)?
4. What are the reasons for the changes? (e.g., are changes in crop choices, technology, mechanization, etc., due to changes in incentives, prices of inputs or outputs, the desire to increase profits by reducing the number of workers? to new opportunities?)
5. Who made the decisions about the reallocation of labor? Who participated in the decisionmaking process at the farm, district, and regional levels?
6. What incentives, if any (wages, other benefits), were offered to people newly employed in the various positions discussed above? For what categories of worker or specialist/manager have real wages and benefits improved or declined?
7. What compensation, if any, was given to people who lost their jobs and were not offered a new position?
8. What impact have former and current forms of mechanization in production and crop processing had on the changing employment situation? Is the type of mechanized production in use the major factor in determining what type of labor is needed?
9. Are the sex and age characteristics of workers related to particular occupations that are in greater or lesser demand due to current patterns of mechanization?
10. Is there any flexibility in making choices about the use of current equipment, machinery, etc., that could alleviate the surplus labor problem? If yes, what could be done?
11. To what extent has the type of mechanization used in crop and livestock production determined the feasibility of different types of farm restructuring and the sizes of the resulting farm enterprises?
12. Are there differences in the ability of men and women to gain access to mechanization services? Are these services needed to succeed as a private farmer? Explain the factors that improve and/or impede a farmer's access to mechanization for crop and livestock production and for crop and livestock product processing.

Workshop Issue 6 from Farm Restructuring Section: The Impact of Restructuring on Labor and Incomes, Mechanization, Water Distribution, Financial Requirements, Storage and Processing, and Marketing

1. What has been the impact of restructuring at the household level on overall employment and incomes? Households should be differentiated by socioeconomic status (occupational and other criteria are suggested above) and gender of the head.
2. What has been the impact of restructuring on the employment and incomes of different population groups by sex, age, socioeconomic status? For example ,on young men and women from farm management versus farm worker households.
3. Has farm restructuring differentially affected individual access to mechanization for crop production? If so, what are the differences by sex, age, occupation?
4. Have the financial requirements of establishing different types of farm enterprises affected the profile of private farmers (by sex, age, former occupation)? If so, what are the characteristics of groups that have been excluded? What types of financial services do these groups suggest they would need in order to become either individual private farmers or members of a multi-family farm enterprise?
5. Has farm restructuring affected the types of processing and storage used for crops and livestock products? If so, describe the changes and cite any changes in the gender, age, and occupational categories of people involved in these processes.
6. Have any new opportunities become available for individuals or households to engage in microenterprises related to crop or livestock product processing as a result of restructuring? If so, describe the new opportunities and investigate the gender, age, and occupational categories of people involved in any new microenterprises.
7. Have any new opportunities become available for individuals or households to engage in marketing enterprises for crops or livestock products as a result of restructuring? If so, describe the new opportunities and investigate the gender, age, and occupational categories of people involved in crop and livestock marketing.
8. The research on farm restructuring must not only to investigate the employment, unemployment, and migration status of farm residents, but also try to understand the underlying factors contributing to age, sex, and occupational differences in the distribution of the labor force between the formal and informal sectors. We need to investigate what people who are underemployed in the formal sector do in an attempt to supplement family income from outside the formal sector.
9. The data on the increasing contribution of private plots to aggregate household income may indicate that an informal private sector is developing based at least in part on production from private plots. If job loss is indeed skewed against women, female unemployment may be pushing women into the informal sector at a faster rate than men. The gender, age, and socioeconomic characteristics of entrants into the informal sector

need to be investigated at the field level, as do the form and level of remuneration associated with socioeconomic, age, and gender differences.

Issues Not Raised at the Tashkent Workshop

1. Gender roles in livestock rearing and gender-specific rights of ownership and/or rights to dispose of livestock or of livestock products should be investigated both in the pre-restructuring situation and in various forms of newly created farms. If women formerly earned income from either privately held animals or animals owned by the collective or state farm, how did restructuring change women's rights and their ability to profit from livestock rearing?
2. Since data on women's (and men's) changing access to education will affect the gender composition of employment, the gender composition of government decisionmakers, and gender aspects of the income structure, data on male and female enrollment in educational institutions at all levels should be collected. Both men's and women's assessment of current declines in women's participation in the higher levels of the educational and employment hierarchies should be investigated.
3. The research on the effects of farm restructuring in the Ferghana Valley should assess the impact of increasing female unemployment on women's and children's welfare in terms of access to subsidies, day care and other services, etc., as well as on changes in monetary income. Data should be collected on changes in the availability of day care and after school programs. The effects of farm restructuring on child care should be studied from the mothers' perspective. It should attempt to determine whether and how changes in the availability of subsidized child care facilities have affected women's entry into or exit from the labor force.

It has been suggested that increasing male and female unemployment may be leading to increasing family dissolution (abandonment or divorce) as well as to an increasing rate of domestic violence and alcoholism. If this is true, government may want to deal with the problem at a policy level. Men and women need to be interviewed separately both to investigate changes in domestic violence, alcoholism, and family dissolution and to determine whether and how women retain access to resources and income in the event of divorce or abandonment.

SECTION EIGHT

GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCE-SENSITIVE RESEARCH METHODS

DEALING WITH CULTURALLY SENSITIVE ISSUES

Because the initial review of legislative issues and existing statistical data is unlikely to provide extensive information on the gender implications of farm restructuring and economic reform, the most important gender and socioeconomic differences in the impact on farm restructuring must be sought in field research. The findings of the field work stage of the research, to the extent that they uncover differences in the impact of reform policies and practices based on socioeconomic and gender differences, can be expected to have important implications for future policy. It is therefore critical that differences in impact by sex, age group, and socioeconomic status be taken very seriously in the planning of the second or field work stage of the research.

Here methodological questions will be paramount. One method strongly emphasized by gender experts is the need to seek information from men and women separately. This is critical if women's voices are to be heard and if women are to feel free to discuss socially, culturally, or economically sensitive issues. Researchers must be aware, however, that requests to meet with women, youth, or people from poor households in separate groups may be met with suspicion or even resistance by local authorities and/or male elders. If important gender and socioeconomic issues that may be culturally sensitive are not to be omitted from the research, this problem must be anticipated.

The best approach is to discuss the problem openly and in advance with all research teams, seeking ideas about how to explain the goals, the specific questions to be investigated, and the policy importance of the research to all persons involved. It is also critical to seek ideas from rural women themselves about how and where to investigate issues that are "gender-sensitive" in the sense that they can cause tension and public disputes between men and women. Women should never be asked sensitive questions about assets or income, intra-household decisionmaking, or domestic violence in public settings. Any issues that might place women or other minority groups at risk of retribution should be discussed only in separate focus groups. When researchers meet with gender and age-specific groups, informants will have the opportunity to make the researchers aware of the sensitivity of different issues and to suggest how information about these issues might best be obtained.

A PROPOSED METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The following remarks and suggestions are focused only on methods to investigate the research questions presented in this report. Even so, not all relevant research methods are covered. For example, case studies of different types of farms, households, informal sector activities, etc., might also be useful, but are not discussed here.

In order to better focus the research on the most important issues in the Ferghana Valley, I would suggest that the field work stage of the research begin with rapid rural appraisal (RRA) and participatory rural appraisal (PRA) methods. Once the basic outlines of the most important impact issues are understood, more systematic survey and case study research can be planned to investigate the scope and incidence of those issues with greatest policy relevance.

Field Work: Part One

I would suggest that the teams initiate the field work by using the tools of RRA/PRA to focus on participatory problem identification and analysis. Professional researchers (who may need to be trained in PRA methods) and villagers should meet together in gender, age, and occupationally distinct focus groups with the aim of exploring the impact of economic reforms and farm restructuring on each group's land rights, labor and incomes (including formal employment, informal sector participation, and agricultural and domestic work for household consumption), and access to means of production such as water, mechanized technology, and finance.¹¹

Tools

Many appropriate gender and socioeconomic difference-sensitive tools for RRA and PRA are available in publications being developed by the Women in Development Service of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. The WID Service has developed four handbooks in an ongoing series entitled SEAGA: Socioeconomic and Gender Analysis Programme. The field level handbook describes an excellent set of tools for participatory livelihood analysis (farming systems, time use, income and expenditure analysis, etc.) as well as for problem identification, analysis, and priority ranking. There is also a handbook focused on institutional analysis, one on macroeconomic analysis, and a special handbook on irrigation.

Analysis

A preliminary analysis of the results of focus group sessions and key informant interviews should be conducted by the research team (perhaps with representatives from the focus groups) before they leave the research site. This analysis should be presented to the focus groups for correction and further elaboration. It should then be discussed in a larger public meeting. (Focus groups may bring up certain sensitive issues that they do not want presented publicly. In such cases researchers must be sure to explore this possibility with focus groups and to respect all requests for confidentiality.)

Once the RRAs and PRAs have been conducted at several research sites, the research team should engage in a larger comparative analysis. One of the goals of this process would be to identify those issues on which more systematic information should be collected in larger surveys. A second goal would be to highlight the issues that are considered important by a wide range of focus groups of a particular type; for example, male and female youth from farm worker households, married women from farm worker households, women who head their own households, etc.

¹¹ Before small groups are formed, it is of course essential to have meetings with village and farm leaders as well as information sharing meetings with all community members who may be interested.

Dissemination of RRA/PRA Results

Reports on the village level participatory analysis should be distributed to the village or farm leaders and to representatives of the different focus groups that have been involved. Once a comparative analysis has been done and critical issues that require further research have been identified, these results should be discussed with the villagers from the original research sites (to the extent possible). New information or a further emphasis on particular issues might result from this process. Written interim reports could be distributed to all participating communities.

Training of the Research Team in RRA/PRA Methods

If the above proposal is accepted, a training program in RRA/PRA methods should be planned before the second (field work) stage of the research is initiated. It is likely that much of the research team, including the senior researchers from government and academic institutions, are not familiar with the methods and tools of PRA, especially those tools and methods that have been developed to be sensitive to socioeconomic and gender differences. All the researchers need be familiar with RRA/PRA methods so that they can better evaluate the results.

I suggest a two-part training program. The first would be to bring the research teams in each country together for a one or two-day workshop on RRA/PRA. The organizers of the workshop should prepare for it by conducting an abbreviated PRA-type exercise in the Ferghana Valley. The results of that exercise would illustrate the potential outcomes from using different PRA tools for the identification and elaboration of research issues and questions. The one-day workshop would only introduce the range of methods and tools. Its purpose would be to convince senior researchers of the validity and usefulness of the approach and to interest them in learning more. Some senior researchers might thereby be motivated to participate in field-based training in PRA for those who will conduct the RRA/PRA field research.

The second part of the training program would train the research team that would actually carry out the field research. This would be a program of some 7-10 days in which actual field research would be conducted to apply the tools. The persons trained in this session would be the core of the RRA/PRA research team. Later, during the actual field research, they themselves might also train local collaborators in each research area.

Field Work: Part Two

Questions or issues that cannot be adequately investigated with rapid appraisal methods, especially the frequency and distribution of specific problems or reform/restructuring impact indicators, will need to be investigated with more formal survey methods. The design and analysis of these surveys should involve several members from the different subgroups of the research team, with major participation by those who have carried out the RRAs/PRA. The professional researchers who designed and analyzed the research instruments for the first stage of the field work should also be involved in the design and analysis of the second stage and in the training of enumerators for this phase. Similarly, it is recommended that the local collaborators who participated in the appraisals be

engaged as survey enumerators for the second stage of the field work. This would allow them to deepen their research and analysis skills and to use them in the future to better identify and represent the interests of the community.

Results of the various surveys instruments should be shared not only among national and regional-level policymakers, government representatives, farmer representatives, NGOs, and so forth, but also among representatives of the various focus groups who participated in the first stage of the field research. Representatives from these groups should be invited to workshops in which the second stage results are discussed. As a supplementary dissemination activity, the final research results might also be discussed in public meetings in the communities where the RRA/PRA exercises took place.

As a general principle, during all phases of the field research, research teams should make a point of continually informing not only officials and farm managers, but the entire community, both about the objectives and methods of the research, and about the results of each phase of the research. This will serve several purposes, including providing wider networks for feedback on the research, and alleviating the inevitable suspicion and curiosity about why the research is taking place. It will be important for the validity of the research results to pay close and continual attention to transparency about the research issues and methods at all levels. Taking the time to fully explain goals and methods of the research before it is conducted at official, community, and focus group levels and then later returning to discuss the results at all these levels will require time, patience, and money. It can, however, be important not only for improving the quality of the results, but for increasing the interest of policymakers in those results.

SECTION NINE

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PARTICIPATION OF G/WID ASSISTANCE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BASIS RESEARCH

There are three areas in which future assistance from Central Asian and possibly also Western gender/women in development experts could be important:

- Participation in the design of the field work,
- Providing training for the research teams in gender and socioeconomic difference-sensitive rapid rural appraisal methods, and
- Participation in the planning of research questionnaires and sample surveys.

It is important that several of the researchers who will supervise and/or carry out the field research have some expertise in gender and socioeconomic difference-sensitive research methods. While the proposed in-country training might be adequate for building this expertise, it will also be useful to have an experienced RRA/WID expert participate in some of the early field research. This person would help orient and supervise the field research teams as they conduct the first one or two RRA/PRA sessions and analyze and disseminate the results.

A G/WID and RRA/PRA expert's language skills will be a critical factor in the success of his or her involvement in the above activities. Knowledge of Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages would be ideal. (This would probably involve two different experts.) Knowledge of Russian would allow the same expert to be involved in training and research planning in both countries.

For the PRA training, language skills are critical. If an expert with PRA, gender analysis, and appropriate language skills is not available, I would suggest that BASIS consider sending a local expert who knows both English and Uzbek and who is knowledgeable about issues of concern to rural women to be trained in gender-sensitive PRA. A second expert from Kyrgyzstan should also be trained. PRA training might be obtained at the eight-week PRA training session at Egerton University in Kenya which is usually held in August. If this is not feasible, the Women in Development Service of FAO can be contacted for information about other training programs.

Alternatively, a foreign expert in gender and socioeconomic-sensitive PRA could conduct the training and participate in research design with the constant assistance of an interpreter who is fluent in the relevant local language and Russian. An ideal situation would be to have a local gender analysis expert who is tri-lingual and who is interested in learning RRA/PRA techniques and in participating in the field research to act as interpreter for the PRA/gender analysis expert. This may be the more feasible option if the research is to be initiated in mid-1998.

Either of these options (for external training or for the engagement of an interpreter) has budget implications that should be fully provided for, if the research is to be oriented in the manner proposed in this report.

SECTION TEN

HUMAN AND INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES FOR DOING OR SUPPORTING GENDER-SENSITIVE RESEARCH IN UZBEKISTAN AND KYRGYZSTAN

This section lists institutions and individuals who should be contacted regarding the gender and socioeconomic issues in the BASIS Central Asian research. Basic information about their work and contact telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, etc. are provided.

BASIS Coordinators in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan

1. Alim S. Pulatov
Director
Center for International Development and Training
Tashkent Institute of Engineers of Irrigation and Agriculture Mechanization
39 Kary-Niyazova Street
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 700000

Tel: 7-3712-353-379
Fax: 7-3711-331-439
e-mail: admin@tiame.uz OR alim@cer.freenet.uz

2. Klara Ismailova
Associate Professor
Chair of Land Management, Kyrgyz Agrarian Academy
President of Kyrgyz Republic Association of Land Managers
68 Mederov Street
Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan 72000

Tel: 996-3312-441-797
Fax: 996-3321-444-707
e-mail: klara@infokaa.freenet.bishkek.su

NGOs Formed by Women Researchers, Activists, and Business Entrepreneurs in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan

1. Women's Resource Center (Zgenski resursni tsentre)
11 Abdulla Kadiri Prospect
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 700011

Telephone: (7-3712) 418931 or 354878 or 412949
e-mail: marfua@silk.glas.apc.org

Chairperson: Marfua Tokhtakhodjaeva

Organized as an independent, self-financed NGO in 1995, the Women's Resource Center has about 30 members. Most are university trained professionals active in research, advocacy, and organizational work with grassroots women in urban and rural areas. The organization conducts studies on its own, collaborates with outside researchers, works with grassroots women's groups to assist with projects, and does advocacy work around issues of women's rights as human rights, women's health and reproductive rights, and ecological issues of particular importance to women. It also runs a media monitoring project, which has recently published its findings in Pravda Vostoka.

The Center is currently collaborating with Rome University and Bilston College in the U.K. in a research project on the status of women in rural areas. This research will take place in the Ferghana District, the Tashkent District, and the Kashkadaria District. Researchers from the Women's Resource Center will conduct the research in collaboration with Eduoardo Burlini, Marta Bruno, and E. Fadeeva. The Center's chairperson will travel to Rome in March 1998 for training, apparently in conjunction with FAO (possibly with the WID Service, which has developed the Socioeconomic and Gender Analysis Programme research tools discussed in the preceding section).

The Center's chairperson, Marfua Tokhtakhodjaeva, has published two books on Uzbek women, *Between the Slogans of Communism and the Laws of Islam*, Lahore: Shirkat Gah, 1995, and *The Daughters of Amazons: Voices from Central Asia*, Lahore: Shirkat Gah, 1996. These publications are not currently sold in Uzbekistan (although there are copies at the UNDP office), but can be ordered from Shirkat Gah, 208 Scotch Corner, Upper Mall, Lahore, Pakistan (e-mail: sgah@shah.brain.net.pk). Another member of the Center, Barno Valiva, a specialist in Islamic law, has recently finished a study on Women, Society and Law, which will be published in Uzbek.

The Center has completed a study of the status of women in the textile and pharmaceutical industries with the United Nations University in Helsinki. It has also conducted studies on Women and Criminal Law, funded by the Eurasia foundation, and on Women in Mahallah, funded by the Counterpart Consortium. The findings of these studies, particularly that on women in the textile industry, may have insights about the conditions of nonagricultural employment for rural women that could be relevant to the BASIS research.

2. Business Women's Association of Uzbekistan (Tadbirkor Ayol)
41 Afrosiab St.
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 700015

Telephone: (7-3712) 565147, 566578
Fax: 567328, 568158

Director: Tadzgikhon Saiidikramova
Chairperson: Dildora M. Alimbekova
Chairperson, Kokand Branch: Sakhiba Ergaiova (spelling may be different)
Chairperson, Tashkent Region: Makhmudova Gulnora (Telephone: 586890, 796393)

An independent, self-financed NGO founded in 1991, the Business Women's Association has about 200 affiliated organizations in 10 regions. Many of the affiliates are government financed. The BWA conducts training courses for women in the areas of business planning, bookkeeping, accounting, computer skills, and the organization of credit unions. It is currently working closely with Mercy Corps and Winrock International on a government requested proposal to establish a legal

framework for savings and credit unions. The BWA has received grants from USAID, Counterpart Corporation, Mercy Corps, Eurasia Fund, the Global Fund for Women, and many German organizations.

Although BWA is most active in urban areas and works mainly with middle class women, it also works with rural women. In the Ferghana Valley, it has active branches in Namangan, Andijan, and Kokand. The chairperson of the Kokand branch, Sakhiba Ergaiova (spelling may be incorrect) is well known for her commitment and effectiveness.

3. Diamond Association (Assosiatsia Diamonde), Kyrgyzstan
164-15 Chuiski Prospect
Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan 720001

Telephone/fax: (7-3312) 226384, 225484
e-mail: root@kprc.bishkek.su

President: B. Tugelbaeva
Vice President: A. Tabishalieva
Secretary: D. Shukurova

The Diamond Association in Kyrgyzstan is similar to the Women's Resource Center in Uzbekistan in that it was founded by a group of university women (in 1994) as an independent NGO to study the participation of women in the economic, social, and political life of post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan. It is focused on seeking solutions to women's economic problems.

Like the Women's Resource Center, the Diamond Association may have members with the research skills and interests to help ensure that the BASIS research in the Ferghana Valley is sensitive to the issues of major importance to women. Some might be available to participate on the research teams.

Uzbek Women with BASIS-Relevant Skills Working with International NGOs

1. Winrock International
98 Uzbekistan Ave.
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 700000

Telephone: (7-3712) 455961 Tel/Fax: 459265
e-mail: win@win.tashkent.su

Inobat Avezmuratova is trained in women's advocacy and in gender-sensitive research and community organization methods that include many of the tools used in rapid and participatory rural appraisal. She has fluent in English as well as Russian and Uzbek. She is a former teacher, currently employed as Winrock's office manager.

2. Mercy Corps
56-A, building 7
C-14, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Telephone: (7-3712) 1440896, 1442268, 1442368 fax: 1440996
e-mail for L. Mameva: lena@mci.silk.org

Lena Mameva, currently employed as assistant to the director at Mercy Corps, has recently had three months of training in the United States on the organization and operation of savings and credit unions and in computer programs relevant to the savings and credit unions. She has been active in training women in the organization and management of savings and credit unions and is fluent in English, Russian, and Uzbek.

United Nations Organizations with BASIS-relevant Resources and Information

1. UNDP Uzbekistan
4 Taras Shevchenko St.
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 700029

Telephone: (7-3712) 560606 Fax: 406291
e-mail for D. Abdurazakova: dona@fouzb.undp.org

The UNDP Programme in Uzbekistan is an important resource for sharing information about BASIS research plans and progress, for potential collaboration and funding, and for making contact with other researchers doing studies on women. Dona Abdurazakova is a UNDP national program officer and the gender focal point. Her office has information on several researchers working on women's issues, including two who are being sponsored by UNDP: Dr. Deniz Kandiyoti of SOAS at the University of London and Ms. Meryem Aslan, a former UN volunteer who worked with rural women in Karakalpakstan (see below for more info).

The BASIS research team should also contact the UNDP gender focal point in Kyrgyzstan.

2. Women in Development Service
Food and Agriculture Organization
Viale delle Terme de Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy

Telephone: (39-6) 5225-5102
Fax: (39-6) 5225-2004
e-mail: SEAGA@fao.org

The Socioeconomic and Gender Analysis Programme of the Women in Development Service at FAO-Rome is currently developing a set of handbooks containing materials for conducting participatory socioeconomic and gender analysis in rural areas. These materials contain many useful field research tools. They include institutional analysis and macroeconomic issue analysis tools relevant to policymaking. I highly recommend these materials to the BASIS research team. They would provide an excellent basis for training in gender and socioeconomic difference sensitive rapid rural appraisal research methods.

Currently there are five handbooks available in draft form:

SEAGA Framework and Users Reference
 SEAGA Macro Level Handbook
 SEAGA Intermediate Level Handbook (institutional analysis)
 SEAGA Field Level Handbook (the most important single volume for BASIS)
 SEAGA Sector Guide: Irrigation

Expatriate Scholars Doing Research on Uzbek and Kyrgyz Rural Women

1. The researchers working with the Women's Research Center research project on rural women are:

 Eduardo Burlini Rome University; e-mail: e.burlini@mclink.it
 E. Fadeeva Bilston College, U.K.; e-mail: E.Fadeeva@bilston.ac.uk
 Marta Bruno Bilston College, U.K.; e-mail: sbruno@caspar.it
2. Professor Deniz Kandiyoti from the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, will be conducting a study in Andijan District, apparently with research support from UNDP.
 e-mail: DK1@soas.ac.uk
3. Meryem Alsan will conduct a study on rural women in Karakalpakstan. Ms. Alsan was a UN volunteer who spent one year in the Aral Sea area.
 e-mail: MeryemAslan@novib.nl
4. Elizabeth Constantine, Central Asian Program, Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Iowa. Telephone: (319) 335-35584
 e-mail: elizabeth-constantine@uiowa.edu

Ms. Constantine conducted Ph.D. dissertation research in the Andijan District in the village of Oiim near the border with Osh Region. Constantine used her knowledge of the Uzbek language to interview 100 rural women, focusing on the values that orient their economic and social lives and the extent to which Soviet values have been accepted and assimilated. Her dissertation, for the Department of Central Eurasian Issues at Indiana University, is nearly finished. It is provisionally titled: Uzbek Women Under Soviet Rule: Public Discourse and Private Lives. She would be interested in hearing more about the BASIS research.

Elizabeth Constantine informed me that there are also two historians working on women's history in Uzbekistan: Doug Northrup has written a Ph.D. dissertation for Stanford University on the campaign during the 1930s and 1940s to unveil women. Meryann Camp of Whitman College has conducted research on Uzbek women in the 1920s.

5. John Schoeberline Engel at the Central Asia Forum, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, has been collecting information on Ph.D. dissertations dealing with Central Asia at Harvard and other universities. He is also compiling a list of scholars working on Central Asia.
 Telephone: (617) 495-4338.

REFERENCES

- Bloch, Peter C. et al, eds. Land and Agrarian Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic. LTC Research Paper 128. Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison. July 1996.
- Brainerd, Elizabeth. Winners and Losers in Russia's Economic Transition. Manuscript, Harvard University Department of Economics. November 1995.
- Chemonics International et al. Uzbekistan: Farm Restructuring and Development Program Feasibility Study. Washington, D.C. January 1997.
- Delehanty, James and Katie Rasmussen. "Agrarian Structure," in Land and Agrarian Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic. Edited by Peter C. Bloch et al. LTC Research Paper 128. Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison. July 1996.
- Eckert, Julia and Georg Elwert. Land Tenure in Uzbekistan. Report for GTZ Sector Project: Relevance of Land Tenure Development for Developing Countries. February 1996.
- Herman, Robert, Cate Johnson, and Valerie Estes. Gender Considerations in the Central Asian Republics: A Preliminary Assessment. Draft report prepared for USAID/CAR. December 1996.
- Kuehnast, Kathleen. A Beneficiary Assessment: Women and Economic Changes in Kyrgyzstan, Coping Mechanisms and Attitudes Towards Social Policies. World Bank. 1993.
- Kyrgyz Republic, National Statistical Committee. Women of the Kyrgyz Republic, Statistical Book. Bishkek (publication sponsored by UNDP). 1996.
- Lestina, Robert and Charles Voytan. Determining the Feasibility of Credit Union Formation for Members of the Private Farmers Association, Fergana Oblast, Uzbekistan. Completion of Assignment Report, Winrock International. Tashkent. April-May 1996.
- Mearns, Robin. Commons and Collectives: The Lack of Social Capital in Central Asia's Land Reforms. Working Paper. Institute of Development Studies. September 1996.
- Nagarajan, Geetha. Rural Financial Markets in Uzbekistan: A Note. Draft (for BASIS project mission). Ohio State University. November 15, 1997.
- Roth, Michael et al. "Dimensions of Farm Restructuring in the Kyrgyz Republic: Assessment of Farm-Level Processes and Constraints," in Land and Agrarian Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic. Edited by Peter C. Bloch et al. LTC Research Paper 128. Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison. July 1996.
- State Committee on Forecasting and Statistics of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Uzbekistan-Business Partner. Tashkent: SHARC. 1996.
- UNDP. Human Development Report Uzbekistan 1997. UNDP Tashkent. 1997.

UNDP. Human Development Report Uzbekistan 1996. UNDP Tashkent. 1996.

UNDP. Human Development Report Uzbekistan 1995. UNDP Tashkent. 1995.

UNICEF. Women and Gender in Countries in Transition: A UNICEF Perspective. Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States and Baltic States. October 1994.

_____. Signs of Hope: Current Issues in Child Rights in the Central Asian Republics. February 1997.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Population Migration in Uzbekistan (1989-1996). Tashkent. 1997.

U.S. Department of State. (1997a) Uzbekistan Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. January 1997.

_____. (1997b) Kyrgyz Republic Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. January 1997.

Uzbekistan. Economy of the State of Uzbekistan 1991-1995. State Committee for Forecasting and Statistics of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Tashkent, 1996.

World Bank. Uzbekistan: An Agenda for Economic Reform, World Bank Publications, Washington, D.C., 1993.

World Council of Credit Unions, Inc. Creating Savings and Credit Associations to Serve Microentrepreneurs in Uzbekistan: A Pilot Project. Draft. 1997/1998.