

Linking livelihoods and gender analysis for achieving gender transformative change



Christine Okali

2006



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Livelihood Support Programme (LSP)

An inter-departmental programme for improving support for enhancing livelihoods of the rural poor.

Linking livelihoods and gender analysis for achieving gender transformative change

Christine Okali

2006

Photograph by Christine Okali

This paper was prepared under contract with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The positions and opinions presented are those of the author alone, and are not intended to represent the views of FAO.

The Livelihood Support Programme

The Livelihood Support Programme (LSP) evolved from the belief that FAO could have a greater impact on reducing poverty and food insecurity, if its wealth of talent and experience were integrated into a more flexible and demand-responsive team approach.

The LSP works through teams of FAO staff members, who are attracted to specific themes being worked on in a sustainable livelihoods context. These cross-departmental and cross-disciplinary teams act to integrate sustainable livelihoods principles in FAO's work, at headquarters and in the field. These approaches build on experiences within FAO and other development agencies.

The programme is functioning as a testing ground for both team approaches and sustainable livelihoods principles.

Email: lsp@fao.org

Access to natural resources sub-programme

Access by the poor to natural resources (land, forests, water, fisheries, pastures, etc.), is essential for sustainable poverty reduction. The livelihoods of rural people without access, or with very limited access to natural resources are vulnerable because they have difficulty in obtaining food, accumulating other assets, and recuperating after natural or market shocks or misfortunes.

The main goal of this sub-programme is to build stakeholder capacity to improve poor people's access to natural resources through the application of sustainable livelihood approaches. The sub-programme is working in the following thematic areas:

1. *Sustainable livelihood approaches in the context of access to different natural resources*
2. *Access to natural resources and making rights real*
3. *Livelihoods and access to natural resources in a rapidly changing world*

This paper is one of a series which addresses livelihood issues in access to natural resources. It reviews the key elements of livelihoods and gender perspectives and their "fit" with each other. It draws attention to the challenge of addressing gender issues within natural resource-based development programmes using a livelihoods perspective. The paper emphasises the need to go beyond gender role analysis and proposes some generic questions to help analyse changing gender relations. The paper also looks ahead towards ways in which the gender project might be framed in the future, and advocates for more support to non-farm natural resource-based interventions for building livelihoods, especially the livelihoods of rural women.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LIVELIHOOD PERSPECTIVES AND THE GENDER PROJECT	5
3. GENDER PLANNING TOOLS AND NATURAL RESOURCES	9
4. LIVELIHOODS AND GENDER LINKAGES: LEARNING FROM POLICY AND PROJECT EXPERIENCE.....	11
5. LOOKING TOWARDS THE FUTURE: TAKING THE INSTITUTIONAL GENDER TRANSFORMATORY PROJECT FORWARD IN THE CONTEXT OF RURAL LIVELIHOODS	18
6. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	29
REFERENCES	31
ANNEX: GENDER ANALYSIS GUIDELINES FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCHERS	36

1. INTRODUCTION

Issues of transformative change in gender relations have been on the development agenda for four decades and no-one could say that there have not been significant policy initiatives taken to achieve this objective. The enthusiasm generated during the 1975 International Year for Women and throughout the UN international Women's Decade from 1976-1985 is undeniable and the achievements are clear. Gender is now widely accepted as a necessary analytical category for development programmes and a mass of statistics has been assembled on women's role and position in different, especially rural societies throughout the world. As a consequence, women's position has become more visible, and the direct participation of women as well as men in programmes has been accepted as essential for capturing women's special knowledge and concerns. Throughout this period, and partly because of the analysis of practical experiences gained, the understanding of how gender works increased amongst feminist scholars even if it was contested. Based on reported findings that women are more concerned about the welfare of other household members than men, and, therefore more likely to spend any increase in benefits on meeting household rather than personal needs and wants, agencies have adopted the assumption that where women are the lead actors (take decisions about resource use including income gained), not only are development interventions more likely to be effective and efficient but also, everyone will gain,

While all these are substantial achievements, the agreements embodied in the *Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs) to which 149 states were signatories at the 2000 UN Millennium Summit, demonstrate that we have a long way to go before we will be in a position to say that the objective of transformatory change for women has been achieved. In addition, many observers have argued that women have largely been incorporated into the development agenda simply on grounds of increased efficiency (See Jackson 1993 for a discussion of the issues here). By the 1990s, the participatory paradigm had also come under close scrutiny and the benefits to women of their representation on natural resource management committees for instance, was being questioned. Many countries have also experienced what has been described as an 'evaporation of gender-specific policies' in the face of new discourses on poverty alleviation, social protection and social exclusion (Subrahmanian, 2004). While some may argue that these policies are more conducive to gender advocacy, and therefore all is not lost, there are also feminist warnings about the different logic of gender and poverty (Jackson, 1996) and about the way social transformation can be folded into a participatory agenda (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Razavi (1997), amongst others, attributes the gap between the expectations of feminist scholars and gender policy discourses to the changing national and international political economies within which gender policy discourses need to be set; it is the inevitable outcome of mainstreaming: 'Only certain strands of feminist thinking have been taken up by policy-making institutions, while others have been abandoned ... as we would expect since entering the mainstream entails making alliances and compromises, and modifying ones agenda and language' (p.1112).

The analysis of gender policy discourses in this paper is set within the context of evolving themes in rural development (see Ellis and Biggs, 2001). The paper seeks specifically to identify the links between the theme of gender and livelihoods

perspectives that became popular in the late 1990s. The question being addressed is not whether gender has disappeared as livelihoods perspectives have moved into natural resources programmes, but rather whether this new paradigm has been able to advance gender interests and in what ways a closer alignment of the two might be beneficial to both.

While issues of gender have changed over time, often in line with current development policy thinking more generally, once gender entered substantially into the rural development agenda in the 1980s, the entire emphasis was on women's lack of control over resources and benefits compared with men, and hence their lack of incentives to be more productive.¹ This lack of resource and benefit control by women was contrasted with their substantial labour contributions. Studies of women's roles and their access and control over resources have resulted in calls for policies to provide women with the means (land, credit, information and technology) to increase their farm productivity (Ahmed, 1985; Stamp, 1989; Agarwal, 1994; Saito et al., 1994; CTA, 2001; Quisumbing et al., 2004). These observed characteristics of women's position in agriculture were made central to the *Harvard Analytical Framework*, or the Gender Roles Framework, developed as an agricultural planning tool in the 1980s as part of the Farming Systems movement.² This framework was one of the first to be used in undertaking gender analyses of smallholder farm families and has since become the standard for natural resource programmes and is even widely referred to as 'the' framework for gender analysis.

Sustainable livelihoods is possibly the most dominant, recent paradigm in rural development, especially in the context of poverty reduction. In contrast with the 1960s rural development paradigm on small family farms with its almost total focus on agricultural production issues, much of the work on sustainable rural livelihoods has focused on migration and income diversification, and even the deagrarianisation of rural areas (Bryceson and Jamal, 1997; Bryceson et al., 2000). It therefore has challenged orthodox rural development policy with its emphasis on agricultural development even though this continues to dominate some current policy initiatives (Hazell, 2005; Lipton, 2005; Dorward et al., 2004; Singh et al., 2002; Hazell and Haddad, 2001; IFAD, 2001; World Bank, 2000). It might even be argued that the new agenda that takes us beyond agricultural production is the most significant contribution of livelihoods perspectives.³

Our main argument in this paper is that livelihoods perspectives address some of the fundamental questions about change and differentiation in societies and therefore programmes adopting this perspective would seem to provide an ideal context for taking the gender transformatory project forward. While the importance of assets such

¹ See Dixon-Mueller (1989), Feldstein and Poats (eds.) (1989) and Feldstein and Jiggins (1994).

² The framework was developed at the Harvard Institute for International Development in the USA in collaboration with the WID office of USAID. March *et al.* (1999) provide details of this framework along with others. The abbreviation, the Harvard Framework will be used in the remainder of this paper.

³ However, this agenda is not entirely new. Non-agricultural income was included in earlier studies of agrarian societies and was often seen as an avenue for acquiring capital for agricultural investment. See Cotula et al. (2004.[WP 14]) for a more recent presentation of this agenda and the 2005 Workshop Report on *Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development* held in Rome by the Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development Sub-Programme (LSP Project and *Workshop Report 6*).

as land, capital equipment and financial capital have long been a focus of farm and farmer (male and female) economic analyses, the inclusion of a wider range of assets, and their significance not only for making a living, but also for making living meaningful and challenging the structures under which one makes a living (Bebbington, 1999), as is done in livelihoods thinking, is significant for this project. We would also argue that the emphasis in livelihoods perspectives on the term resource 'access' as against resource 'ownership', is a progressive move that has the potential to refocus the work away from women as individuals and towards gender relations, as well as towards a greater focus on the different kinds of claims that people have over assets and opportunities, and how these are acquired and sustained. While this places emphasis on the socially determined nature of assets, we note that there has been no automatic attention given to gender in programmes that have adopted a livelihoods approach. Although livelihoods approaches have caught the attention of a range of organisations therefore, partly because they are people focused and readily fit with the poverty and participatory approaches that are now considered to be essential elements in development interventions, gender concerns are not always addressed.

While admitting the validity of Razavi's arguments about political imperatives and institutional constraints shaping this gender project, the paper also argues that the failure to ask questions about the gender outcomes of pursuing these institutional imperatives can lead to a situation where women are worse off than before, the critique often placed at the door of Women in Development (WID) projects.

Thus the recent rural policy documents that present agricultural development strategies for rural growth and the alleviation of rural poverty focus are focused on small family farms. This focus is justified on the grounds that small family farms are the largest source of employment and income for the rural poor, especially in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. Our interest in these policies lies firstly in their explicit or implied understanding of the form taken by this particular institution; a male head managing the labour and other resources of a unit consisting of wives, children, and possibly brothers and other members of the wider family, working together on a joint enterprise. Questions of age and gender in relation to the allocation of resources and outputs, and issues around family and household management which have been integral to much of the agricultural policy literature for at least four decades and which question the continuing interest of different categories of women and men in farming, are not addressed. In particular, the literature is largely silent on the issue of where women fit into a policy scenario where men have already apparently been able to exit, from agricultural work and even rural areas. While switching the policy focus to women from men would appear to be a simple and obvious solution, the experience over the last 40 years has demonstrated the complexity of such a shift whose success depends on changes in wider cultural and social norms about what women and men should do and the value of what they do. The paper argues that there is a clear role for organizations such as FAO to bring these issues into the new policy agenda of major donors and national governments.

The paper begins with a review of the key elements of a livelihoods perspective and of the transformatory gender project, and their 'fit' with one another. It moves on to compare the issues of resource or asset access within livelihoods thinking with the gender debates in the natural resources sector. Using a range of livelihood studies the

paper then draws attention to the challenge of addressing gender issues within natural resource-based development programmes using a livelihoods perspective. This issue is taken up in more detail in the remainder of the paper. It looks ahead towards ways in which the gender project might be framed in the future by FAO, and other organizations. It advocates for a research agenda focusing on non-farm non-natural-resource based interventions for building livelihoods, and especially the livelihoods of rural women, and the adoption of a more proactive policy agenda that will feed into the small family farm policies that are currently being promoted and even adopted as the institutional basis for agriculture and for poverty reduction in the future in many third world countries.⁴ In looking forward, the paper also draws attention to issues around HIV/AIDS and conflict and post conflict situations which are a significant feature of rural life in a number of countries in the south and need to be built into future policies. This section on ways forward concludes by returning to the key gender strategy of mainstreaming, and especially the call for frameworks and guidelines designed to enable organizations integrate gender into their work. Section 6 of the paper consists of a synthesis and conclusions.

⁴ Wiggins and Proctor (2001) provide a framework for thinking about alternatives in different rural locations depending partly on market accessibility but also on other considerations. Barrett et al. (2001) talk specifically of the policy (programme) implications of investing in these alternatives.

2. LIVELIHOOD PERSPECTIVES AND THE GENDER PROJECT

It is not our intention in this paper to critique livelihood perspectives but rather to look at them in the context of our interest in how they might serve our gender interests. We are therefore concerned first with examining the links between what we regard as the main elements of a livelihoods perspective and their potential for understanding and addressing gender issues.

“Sustainable Rural Livelihoods” is a people-focused concept centring on the multiple livelihood options and strategies of the poor. Central to the concept is the understanding that livelihoods are built around a series of tangible and intangible assets or resources, of which income earned may be one but certainly not the only one, and the ability to make claims on resources is probably the most significant.

In terms of gender analysis within the small farm sector, since the 1980s and reflecting the popularity of the Harvard Framework, issues of resource access and control have been identified as key gender issues. Data collected using the tools provided in this framework have been used to demonstrate women’s lack of secure access to resources, including land, resources such as animal traction, information and other inputs, compared with men, along with their exclusion from decision-making bodies, in spite of the work burdens they carry both within agriculture and other natural resource-based activities and in their households, and their responsibility for household food security. The comparisons not only point to women’s production disadvantage but also suggest avenues to alleviate their disadvantage – providing these missing resources and encouraging their participation in decision-making bodies that affect their lives. At the same time therefore, they appear to provide an explanation for the lower status and position of women in society. Will providing assets to women and engaging them in decision-making bodies address their gender disadvantage? While both the livelihoods and these gender analyses point clearly to the value of assets for livelihood building - a very practical issue – neither analysis automatically assumes that asset provision (or participation and representation) will transform gender relations, that is, result in changes in the social positioning of women and men.

In their characterisation of the poor, Chambers and Conway (1993) emphasise the significance of social structure for determining who is able and under what circumstances resource claims or resource entitlements can be gained. In its emphasis on structural constraints a livelihoods perspective provides an entry point for identifying and addressing the transformation of gender relations, and at the same time, points to the complexity of addressing asset poverty directly. Thus, although livelihood perspectives incorporate acts of agency as the means by which structural constraints are or can be overcome, economic disadvantage is viewed as an expression of social, political and institutional inequalities, which may even be perceived as just, and which needs to be addressed if sustainable change is to be achieved.⁵

⁵ Arce (2003) is of the view that while such an actor perspective is implicit if not explicitly integrated into livelihoods analyses, it is not taken seriously by development agencies since it goes beyond their own remit. Cleaver (2005), Wood (2003) and Devereux (2001) on the other hand express the view that the livelihoods perspective is too positive in the power it gives to peoples’ ability to act in their own interests: it fails to address the inability of the poorest and most vulnerable to take risks and build

Just as small farm family farms have been central to the rural development agenda since the 1960s, through the 70s and 80s as part of the farming systems movement and until to-day, households have been at the core of gender analyses undertaken using the Harvard Framework. In parallel with the policy-focused understanding gained from using this framework were other understandings gained from more theoretical research examining intra-household relations, including those of gender. While these pointed to significant differences in social relations depending on household types and even regional context, they also pointed to ways in which household members actively pursue their own interests, through bargaining and negotiation, challenging, in the case of women, their apparent structural disadvantage and even their presumed altruism – that is, acts of agency.⁶ The link with households and the relationships between women and men is less obvious in work using a livelihoods perspective even though planning and strategising by and within households would seem to be the obvious focus of the analysis. A key institution, therefore which has been and continues to be central to gender analysis both for planning and monitoring changes in gender relations, is by-passed. Rather, the institutional context of much natural resource-based practice is based on community organisations, including resource management groups. Locke's analysis of Joint Forest Management (JFM) programmes in India concludes that JFM programmes are based on a gender analysis that points first and foremost to the importance of formal provisions for women's representation on management committees, reflecting the core interest of the organisations concerned, in this case, forest user group management processes, rather than the social institutions to which user members belong and within which gender relations are often formed and played out (Locke, 1999).⁷ There are nevertheless a number of livelihood studies that have focused on household and intra-household relations that emphasise the importance of understanding resource management at this level for assessing the key elements in achieving livelihood security.⁸

Bargaining is now widely understood to describe how women and men themselves, as individuals or collectively, negotiate for change, and there has been a call for more attention to be given to such acts of bargaining or other strategies adopted by women and men if we want to learn more about how we might support their own ongoing attempts to change their situations. While the focus of the gender bargaining models has largely been on households, and even on relations between spouses, Kevane (2000) argues for a shift to focusing on supra-household institutions (and even beyond community-based organisations) on the grounds that real change will only come for women when wider 'local patriarchal norms change'. Kabeer (2000) makes a similar

assets.

⁶ In a Cameroon study, Jones (1986) while using the Harvard Framework went beyond it and incorporated some of the understanding from this theoretical literature. She looked at bargaining within households in response to the introduction of new crops. In a later study Seur (1992) details how women 'negotiated and bargained' with men and others in addressing constraints on their 'new activities. These gender household studies have contributed substantially to the understanding of gender dynamics. A detailed review of work on bargaining can be found in Hart (1995).

⁷ This takes us back to Razavi's point about organizational priorities and the need to match expectations of organizational engagement with gender issues with these priorities.

⁸ See articles in the *Journal of International Development* Vol. 42, 2006 for a recent collection of these and the publications of Whitehead (2002) and Francis (2000).

point in relation to gender changes in Bangladesh. In her comparative study of women in the garment industry, she argues that changes in wider culture or norms about what women and men could and could not do made it possible for the women involved in garment manufacturing for export in Dakha to benefit from this activity in terms of their position and role in society. Gaining access to the income-earning activity alone would not have done this as she shows from her comparison with women home-workers in the north of England. The importance of institutional change, including within the state and its agencies, but also within market institutions, is emphasised in many analyses of rural livelihoods.

The other key elements of both livelihood and gender perspectives is the incorporation of what are now widely referred to as human and social capital. These are presented in much of the livelihoods literature as resources in themselves, but also as resources that accord access to other resources: they are viewed as the means by which social, political and institutional inequalities (structural disadvantages) can be overcome.

The notion of human capital incorporates the concept of Sen's capabilities (1997) in the sense of knowing what is possible and being able to take advantage of opportunities (and in the case of Bebbington [1999] to change the world). In gender, this 'knowing' is incorporated into the notion of gender awareness which is widely seen as a necessary first step in addressing gender issues. The concept of human capital also refers to skills and knowledge in a more conventional sense. In terms of the gender transformatory project, this understanding is central: not only is it important to improve women's claims to material and non-material resources and opportunities, but also to enhance their capacity to use these in their own interests.

Social capital is considered to be especially important for accessing resources in contexts where states or markets have failed or are 'imperfect' and has been interpreted to refer to 'the metaphorical glue holding societies and groups together' (Francis, 2001). Its combination of networks, organisations and values points to the organisational and normative elements of a resource that inheres in relationships rather than in individuals or objects, and the positive externalities of social phenomena. At the level of development practice, social capital as the outcome of association and public representation (such as community based natural resource management groups), is seen to provide the means by which both the problems of collective action, especially those of free riding and distrust, and of structural disadvantage that constrains the 'empowerment of the poor' (Cleaver, 2005:894) can be overcome. However, existing associations or groups are frequently seen to be linked with established elites who act in their own interests, and customary processes that are viewed in large part, as negative. Thus, new associations are frequently seen to provide the setting within which women, for example, are placed in a position where they can use their individual agency to greater effect and achieve more sustainable outcomes.

Of particular interest to this discussion of the linkages between gender and livelihoods analyses is the Strategic Results Framework (2004-2006) of UNIFEM in South Asia in its statement on the interrelated primary domains or components of gender equality which are: 1) The capabilities domain that refers to basic human abilities through education, health and nutrition; 2) The Access to Resources and Opportunities

Domain that refers primarily to equality in the opportunity to use or apply basic capabilities through access to economic assets (such as land and property) and resources (such as income and employment) and; 3) The Agency Domain that refers to the ability to make choices and decisions that can alter outcomes. Gender equality in this domain can only result from an equalizing in the balance of power between women and men in the household and societal institutions (UNIFEM, 2003, Vol. 2).

While we can see overlaps in understanding between these two approaches, and certainly some interesting ways in which the different terminologies have been merged, as in the UNIFEM statement, the gender project referred to in our heading for this sub-section is about this issue of gender equality and the necessary changes in power relations that this implies. This objective differs from that of the livelihoods objectives – issues of power are neither explicit nor implicit in the livelihoods frameworks even though they do point to structures constraining the ability of some to achieve livelihood sustainability and take into account the impact of the wider context within which livelihoods are built – climate, government policies and culture – on sustainable livelihood building. Both Molyneux (2002) and Cleaver (2005), based on their own work in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa respectively, argue that women frequently engage in social and institutional life on adverse terms – they are less able to negotiate the ‘right way to do things’, to create room for maneuver and to shape social relationships to their advantage. In different ways they both point out that unless attention is given to challenging systemic sources of power, social capital remains weak as a policy tool.

3. GENDER PLANNING TOOLS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Central to gender planning and the understanding of gender issues is gender analysis. Since the 1980s, and in parallel with attempts to mainstream gender within development organisations and their programmes, considerable attention has been given to the development and use of gender toolkits for this purpose. Two frameworks have been central to gender planning since the 1980s and continue to shape gender analysis, the Moser and Harvard frameworks, both detailed in the volume by March *et al.* (1999). The Moser Framework provides the broad guidelines for a gender planning analysis that links women's productive, reproductive and community roles, in terms of workloads, and perhaps more important, in terms of how what they do is valued.⁹ It also provides a notional distinction between women's practical and strategic gender needs, and later, gender interests. The understanding of gender interests creates room for thinking about women's agency and women's own role in transforming their position in society. The Harvard Framework, already mentioned, provides a detailed guideline for the analysis of economic and other activities by gender and incorporates understandings about the value of individual and private property as incentives for investment, increased productivity and efficiency. Within natural resource analyses, it focuses on differences in access to and control over a fixed set of similar assets by women and men. Task allocations and differences identified are then used to argue the case for allocating resources to women as well as to men. The framework does not provide a guideline for the transformation of gender relations that may be central to livelihood improvements and to overall social development and economic improvement.¹⁰

The influence of the Harvard Framework is evident in all gender analyses in the natural resource sector whether the focus is on water, land, genetic resources, forests and forest products. In some instances it has been used in its original form as in the examples detailed in the volume by Feldstein and Jiggins (1994), while in others it has been adapted and revised. In the document *Gender and Farming Systems: Lessons from Nicaragua* (FAO 2005), prepared under the auspices of the FAO Gender and Natural Resources Management Team, a conceptual and methodological framework that integrates a gender perspective (The Harvard Framework) into the analysis of farming systems with the aim of producing a reference guide for future rural development programmes and projects with women at the centre, is presented. It contrasts the gender analysis when applied to agriculture with farming systems analysis in the following way: the gender analysis includes the different spheres of production (agricultural and non-agricultural), and reproduction, the division of labour by sex, access and control over tangible and intangible resources (borrowing from both gender analysis as presented in the Harvard Framework and livelihoods analysis), and decision-making and management in the farm family units and the community, and lastly, it differentiates between practical and strategic gender needs (as Moser) (p.12).¹¹ Another recent example is provided by the FAO Small-scale

⁹ There is no similar framework representing the responsibility of men although it is assumed that the labour burdens created by development were very different for men than for women.

¹⁰ As implied in the Millennium Development Goals.

¹¹ The conceptual and ideological roots of the gender analysis include both theoretical and practical work: feminist economic studies, the SEAGA (Socio-Economic and gender Analysis of FAO, ILO and UNDP), WID and GAD approaches, amongst others.

Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (SFLP) (FAO, 2006). Its gender strategy has been to mainstream gender through the various relevant stakeholder institutions at micro, meso and macro-levels. This strategy was seen to require the building of skills and capacity in gender analysis within these various organisations. For this the programme developed a gender analysis toolkit. The toolkit takes the analysis of gender beyond describing gender roles by integrating 3 existing gender analysis frameworks into a sustainable livelihoods framework. It therefore draws attention to the need to disaggregate women and men into different socio-economic sub-groups and to assess their different needs and interests within the context of their livelihood vulnerability.

What are the expectations from these gender analyses? In large part, the cross-cutting purpose of the Moser and Harvard frameworks has been to develop and target interventions, usually at women, in order to achieve gender equity. For instance, some of the popularity of the Harvard Framework derives from the clear directives it gives for avoiding obvious errors in targeting that might 'increase gender inequality'. Similarly, these frameworks promote the understanding that 'impact' on gender equity can be easily measured, improvements can be ascribed to specific interventions, and clear recommendations for concrete action can be distilled from retrospective judgements about policy performance. It could be argued that this serves the (necessary?) instrumentalism of gender advocates working in and with natural resource research and projects (Rasavi, 1997).

This 'damage control' – in targeting - perspective (Rasavi 1997, p.1120) is not without value as it helps projects improve organisations' definitions of objectives and to some extent anticipate the effect of their activities on women. However, the Harvard Framework assumes that if the correct units of production, consumption and distribution are identified and become the focus of project activity, there will be no increase in gender gaps, discrimination and subordination. This "bureaucratisation" of knowledge about gender in "evaluating and packaging information for development planning [has tended to] obliterate the implications of women's experience of development for our understandings of the meaning and purpose of development" (Goetz, 1994, p.28). In practice, it is also now widely understood that targeting can be undermined.

While gender analysis and gender monitoring are used in large part, therefore to increase the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes, these outcomes are more often than not concerned with creating equity. This concept is rarely problematised and is frequently operationalised in simplistic terms as progress towards 'equal shares' whether of resources, decision-making or participation that may in turn be interpreted as 'empowering'. This takes us back to the earlier critique of women in development programmes (WID) - that they failed to visualise any difference in the way women and men might value ongoing changes into which women were yet to be integrated. Jackson questions such a "one size fits all" approach by illustrating the different meaning of resources including credit, land and employment for women and men, as well as the varying nature and implications of social inclusion for women and men (1999). Both Molyneux (2002) and Cleaver (2005) also warn against the enthusiastic interpretation of social inclusion where women are concerned. Although frequently attributed to donor demand, the reluctance to question the equality discourse as the benchmark for gender justice is in fact far reaching, despite considerable controversy and counter-claims (Rasavi, 1997, p.1122; Kabeer, 1999a).

4. LIVELIHOODS AND GENDER LINKAGES: LEARNING FROM POLICY AND PROJECT EXPERIENCE¹²

‘The promotion of equitable access to natural and economic resources and social services is crucial and ‘may require specific action to address gender disparities’
(FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015, Rome, Italy)

Apart from what we might refer to as gender specific programmes, such as those focusing on home gardens, or on seed collection and forest resources apart from trees, all of which are resources that lie primarily within women’s domain, programmes vary considerably in the extent to which they pay attention to gender issues or even disaggregate their findings by gender. The discussion here focuses on resources

All development activities reviewed for this paper that focus primarily on the importance of land access make some reference to the issues of women’s rights versus those of men: they have incorporated, in large part, the mainstream feminist agenda of individual land rights for women. The now well-known story of the exclusion of women from the planning of rice development programmes in The Gambia and their consequent loss of land rights points to all the issues.¹³ These rights are based largely on assessments of women’s practical needs for resources to maintain households, of which they are *de jure* or *de facto* heads, or for fulfilling their food security responsibilities in households in general: ‘Access to wild and weedy foods is an important part of livelihood diversification Due to the fact that women are often associated with their collection and use, this access is of particular value to them’ (Seschia and Scoones., 2003, p. 25).

As noted already, gender equality is often interpreted as women and men carrying similar workloads and having similar terms of access to a fixed set of resources that are highly valued by society.¹⁴ The issues of which assets are valued and the

¹² Since the 1990s the adoption of a livelihoods perspective by natural resources programmes has been much in evidence. Apart from other factors, this largely reflects donor funding for the approach and it has resulted in a considerable body of literature. One of the most recent collections of papers that use elements of this approach is published in a special volume of the *Journal of International Studies* (Volume 42, 2006). Information from detailed case studies undertaken in Mali, Ethiopia and Zimbabwe edited by Scoones and Wolmer (2002) and recently published Working Papers and Briefing Notes on the activities of the LSP Sub Programme of FAO that focus on the full range of natural resources, along with related reports in the wider literature, provided the material for this section along with reports from wider literature on specific aspects of livelihood perspectives.

¹³ The paper by Dey (1981) is the earliest on this Gambia story. It has been continued by others (Carney, 1993 and Schroeder, 1993). For reports from other countries see Davison (1988) especially for Kenya, and more recently Shamin (1997) for South Africa and Khadiagala (2001) for Uganda. Land rights are given first priority in a 2020 IFPRI Policy Brief for empowering women to achieve food security (Quisumbing and Meinzen-Dick, 2001). The titles of all these publications point to the importance given to land issues as well as to the extent to which change is resisted: “tensions in gender relations”, “unequal partners”, “shady practice”, “popular justice”, “the struggle over resources”. Carney however shows how these same women in The Gambia were able to use customary means to renegotiate their positions.

¹⁴ It is very clear from the gender literature on work that who does what and under what circumstances, including for whom, determines the value of an activity. Some argue that women are likely to fare better where assets are accessed via the market than by other means (See the collection edited by Spring [2000]) but since markets are socially and politically embedded institutions this distinction is not as clear cut as it seems.

circumstances within which their value changes to which reference has already been made, are critical to gender analysis as well as being highly contentious. This is as true for land as for other resources. While everyone argues that land access is a mechanism for reducing poverty, both because it has value in itself but also because it provides access to other resources such as credit and inputs required to make land productive, as well as to decision-making processes (see for instance Hanstad *et al.*, 2004), others point to the different ways in which land is valued. Walker (2002) provides an excellent example from her studies in South Africa. Here women are reported to be less interested in the direct production value of land than in its value for their self esteem and the access it provides to other inputs. Based on her data she concludes that both rural women and men see land primarily as a social rather than an economic resource and look to the urban sector and to urban jobs as the route to household economic advancement. At the same time, she notes that women's specific interest in land is shaped by their social responsibilities and their marginalisation from formal wage work. As is true of all resources, land can not be valued in isolation from other resources and a key question to be answered is what can be done with the resources compared to other resources – such as jobs, education, health services or the reform of discriminatory laws.

This questioning on land takes us back to the discussion of role analysis and the central position it has held in gender analytical frameworks. While role analysis might definitely be seen to be central to gender analysis, current role allocations still need to be explained and the extent to which they should be a basis for planning needs to be critically examined. Locke (1999) provides us with an example of what this means in her analysis of Joint Forest Management policies in India. She argues that the identification of women's resource interests from their resource use roles may lead to ignoring gender inequalities that underpin them and, 'runs the risk of entrenching existing inequalities' and 'engrain[ing] low status, low return work as "women's work" if used for programme planning (pp. 278 and 280). She reports that at least one of her informants suggested strongly that for very poor women, the tasks they perform (like the collection of leaf litter for making organic compost) may simply reflect 'the women's desperation, drawing attention to its [their] arduous, low paid and stigmatized nature' (p.278).

Participation is necessary for sustainable development, gender roles and relations are central and disadvantaged people are a priority (SEAGA principles)

Participatory solutions to social exclusion have now been on the development agenda for at least two decades and certainly it would be almost impossible for anyone to question the need to engage the subjects of development in micro-planning decision-making processes. In many documents therefore we read something like the following: 'the policy implications of a poverty focused programme include, creating means of access and, increasing participation in micro-level planning'. Participatory principles are linked with the understanding that this is the route to ownership which makes development initiatives sustainable by placing local communities more firmly within national planning frameworks for instance (see Cleaver [2005] and Norfolk [2004] for example). Participatory planning or management committees are also widely viewed as the means by which structural and other constraints on asset accumulation, as well as the achievement of equity and empowerment, might be overcome through the acquisition by participants of social capital. The formation of

natural resource management groups has therefore become the primary means by which the principal natural resource objectives of many organisations can be met at the same time as the social objectives, including gender equity, of many donors.

The social outcomes of group management processes are all incorporated in the concepts of human and social capital for livelihood building. Although most programmes do not go as far as Bebbington (1999) who writes of human capital enhancing the capacity to change the world in his discussion of capitals and capabilities, many authors come very close to this: Norfolk (2004) writes of the empowered 'community voice' enabling access to be gained to the judicial system and providing a first step in enabling local people challenge powerful local actors, and the value of information given to citizens on Land, Forestry and Wildlife Laws in Mozambique in ensuring the delivery of services from the state; Cotula et al. (2004) point to their importance in migration processes while Seshia and Scoones (2003) talk of their importance for accessing plant genetic resources, the ownership of which may contribute to the formation of social capital. The ability to gain from the inherent value of social and human capital in these development processes is all contingent nevertheless on the position and status of group members both within and outside the group.¹⁵

In general, the participation of rural women in group activities is assumed to lead to their empowerment¹⁶ although this assumption is rarely examined in any detail and frequently only minimal attempts are made to disaggregate women (or men) as a category.¹⁷ Rather, as is true in many studies, all rural women (and men) involved in the activities under discussion are presumed to be poor, lacking in control (decision-making) over resources and benefits, and disempowered overall. However, in terms of our understanding of how gender works, neither participation nor 'representation' are straightforward processes. Again, the issues are about social norms and institutions that determine who can speak in what situations, and how what people express as what they need and want is shaped. While there is a set of gender literature that emphasises women's agency, and differences based on individual histories and subjectivities (see Jackson and Palmer-Jones, 1999), there is also the understanding that some women (and men) accept that they have a lesser claim on resources, and what they perceive their interests to be depends on their sense of their own well-being, of what are legitimate allocations (perceptions of their rights to make claims), and perceptions of the value of their contributions. Their claims do not necessarily change therefore with increases in productivity and decisions made do not necessarily reveal their choice.¹⁸ Gender analyses of fisheries communities in the Republic of Bénin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Gabon and The Gambia (SFLP, 2006), point to various factors blocking women's effective participation in new institutional arrangements. These include their household level commitments, restrictions on their physical movement and literacy levels, their experience of group management and public speaking as well

¹⁵ In saying this, we are not denying the possible enabling action of group processes, otherwise often referred to as 'group agency' even though the evidence around the value of group agency is difficult to locate in this natural resource literature or even in the wider gender literature.

¹⁶ The participation of women has been argued on grounds of efficiency, decreased costs of development, better information about local situations, empowerment and wider social transformation.

¹⁷ In many documents we are made aware of group membership differences only from photo captions.

¹⁸ It is also widely accepted that participatory assessments and processes are as gender blind or gender aware as the practitioners.

as local social and cultural norms that often support male decision-making in public gatherings. The African women that were the subject of this research also reported that men may perceive that their participation and increased access to know-how and information will make them less submissive, more independent and therefore able to challenge them. As a result, although they may participate in meetings, women may hesitate to take on leadership positions, follow up on decisions and new information, and practice their newly acquired skills. Programmes are needed to address these issues of exclusion.

Assumptions about knowledge being directly linked with roles have also been questioned although the link has been assumed in the local knowledge literature since the 1980s. Locke (1999), again talking of JFM programmes in India, suggests that it is not possible to assume that resource use roles imply some specific 'special' knowledge on the part of the performer, or even resource value to this individual or group. Consequently, engaging women collecting forest resources in, for example, species prioritisation, is unlikely to yield new knowledge since they have little experience in managing trees. Mitchell and Hanstad (2004) make a similar point in relation to home gardens.

Since the main body of livelihoods literature does not substantially address gender issues, and may not even consistently present sex disaggregated information, the impacts on gender relations of natural resource related activities do not feature in the main body of livelihood literature. When they do, there is often a very real problem of how to interpret what we might refer to as 'social outcomes' of interventions. It is almost impossible to make any sense of the discussion on gender without making some reference to values, norms, beliefs and the way these are maintained and challenged by different people in different contexts. These contexts may be domestic or in other spheres - in the marketplace for instance. This issue of interpretation is demonstrated by the following example. One recorded outcome from one of six Participatory Research for Gender Analysis (PRGA) studies of the CGIAR was of a change in composition of a farmer research group, from one dominated almost entirely by men, to one dominated entirely by women.¹⁹ The research team had evaluated this shift positively: as a move in the direction of empowerment for women, and they may have been right. However, the first reaction of the gender specialists was to say that the women might simply be representing 'their' men, and we could interpret this to mean that the project had given men the opportunity to simply demonstrate their existing control over women (in this case we might presume that participation is not linked with the empowerment of women). Even if this were true, an interesting question to ask from a gender perspective might be: In what way have

¹⁹ The CGIAR initiated a Gender Program that is now referred to as the CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research for Gender Analysis and Technical Innovation (PRGA). At a review of its small grants program in natural resources management (NRM), six learning cases, four from Africa, were presented for review at an "End of Project Workshop" held at CIAT, Cali, Colombia, Nov 13-17, 2001. The NRM Small Grants were awarded in 1998 to selected CGIAR centres and national partners to assess the benefits of participation and gender analysis in NRM research and development. The small grants were part of a larger grant to be used for "Assessing the benefits of rural women's participation in natural resource management research". The six studies are very different from those of conventional agricultural research. They were designed specifically to demonstrate the added value of client participation and disaggregation by gender, to research. They all involved partnerships with non-government organisations as well as national extension systems and a regional or national agricultural research organisation.

the women (if at all) been able to use this opportunity to access something new for example?

Although local participatory processes are widely applauded if critiqued, we have to conclude that by focusing on women or by including women in decision-making processes, agricultural and rural development interventions will not necessarily result in desired outcomes for them.²⁰ Everything we know about the organisation of society, and including gender relations, should lead us to question this assumption. This has implications for how research and development programmes and projects might address gender issues. As is evident from the above example, while documents may refer to “gender”, changes under discussion frequently relate to women. Positive change is implicitly about married women being given (as above) more independence by their husbands, or participating more in community meetings (see Norfolk, 2004 for example), or enjoying more security over land for farming or housing. These are assumed to be positive changes but it is often not made clear in the documentation that their meaning and value for all those directly involved has been assessed. Little sense is given of men’s specific needs, responsibilities and interests, and certainly indications are rarely given of what are the implications for gender relations of women being able to act independently, or of what acting independently means for the women concerned.

Like the gender analytical frameworks, it is clear from the literature that a livelihoods analysis, and especially a framework, provides a possible entry point for many to address the social agenda of development, and possibly, to take steps towards achieving the transformation of power relations.²¹ Although a livelihoods perspective does not automatically result in gender being addressed, or in social issues being placed at the centre of activities, we would argue that it is reasonable to assume that better policy might be developed using gender and livelihoods analyses together along with their theoretical understandings. We would also argue, however that considerably more attention needs to be given to looking at specific categories of people working in specific contexts for desired outcomes to be realistic. Again, questions also need to be asked about the meaning and value of outcomes for these different categories of people.

While the gender analytical frameworks lead directly to the collection of data and its analysis by gender, the livelihoods frameworks do not.²² Nevertheless, even when

²⁰ On the other hand, from a comparative study of a number of resource management groups, Westerman *et al.* (2006) conclude that there are gains to group processes and management outcomes from including women in these groups.

²¹ Arce (2003) remarks that the livelihoods perspective never set out to do this which is very problematic if true since there is ample evidence that providing resource access to marginal groups is not a straightforward process. At the same time, it might be argued that the ability of women for example to exercise agency in their own interests has been under-estimated in the gender literature. As already noted, Kabeer (2000) suggests that the wider context plays a major role in determining when individual agency (and possible group agency) is likely to result in positive outcomes. Both Arce (2003) and Locke (1999) argue that in development practice, this also depends on peoples’ own agenda (agency) along with their socio-political activities and organisational practices, being made central concerns in both methodological approaches and development frameworks.

²² For an excellent piece on divisions among women and implications for their mutual support and collective agency, see Whitehead (1984). In this piece, Whitehead discusses class, family and kinship structures, life or development cycle as well as personal biographical differences.

programmes begin with a gender disaggregated description of roles and linked resource access, these differences are not necessarily pulled through the analysis. In a review of research undertaken at the Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) in 1999,²³ while the gender analysis began with the collection of gender disaggregated data, on roles, resource access and control, the research outcomes read like a set of conventional on-farm trial outputs from the application of fertilizer to maize: ‘that gender relations are the same for everyone; that gender relations will not change [that households are characterised by an all-powerful male head]; that there will be no bargaining around land, labour and tools; that effects [for different age and sex groups] can be identified as negative or positive; that the effects [on cassava fields] will be an increase in the amount of labour for young men and all women, that an increase will occur in the levels of control of labour and cash by adult men. At the same time it was suggested that both adult women and men will have increased access to and control over savings from cassava production and overall there will be more food, hence reduced control over food, and increased social standing for everyone’ (Okali 1999, p.67).

Therefore, while social norms and institutional constraints on individual and group ability to make claims on resources might be acknowledged in programmes (as in Scoones and Wolmer [2002] and Seshia and Scoones [2003] for example), processes of asset targeting that include building social capital especially through group processes, and human capital enhancement in the form of improved knowledge and skills, more often than not are presented as the means by which poorer and more marginal groups will both acquire and accumulate assets: little or no indication is given of which women or which men are under discussion or are being targeted, beyond ‘the poor’. These issues are discussed further below. As Ramisch *et al.* (2002) also conclude based on evidence from various natural resources programmes, since the central concern in terms of livelihoods is first and foremost on income generation for the poor, emphasis is placed on demonstrating the value of a range of resources, especially land as we have seen above, but also water, seeds, trees and other forest products, and new resource management groups, for achieving this income outcome. The problems being addressed in most programmes are therefore those of how to achieve desired (usually by the programme) or potential (defined by research) production and productivity increases: regardless of the social issues also being addressed, the natural resource disciplinary focus remains intact within a framework of asset accumulation.

This discussion of natural resource access rights would be incomplete without some more reference to observed ongoing agrarian changes. Rigg (2006) in his account of the direction and trajectory of change in the rural South, but especially in parts of Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, lists among others the following changes: occupations and livelihoods are diversifying; occupational multiplicity is becoming more pronounced; the balance of household income is shifting from farm to non-farm; lives are becoming more mobile and livelihoods correspondingly delocalised. Bryceson and Jamal (1997) in their edited volume detail what they refer to as the process of ‘deagrarianisation’ of rural areas: a long-term process of ‘occupational adjustment,

²³ The review covered almost 300 papers reporting on research projects undertaken with NARP funding in Kenya. The reviews are detailed in Okali (1999).

income-earning reorientation, social identification and spatial relocation of rural dwellers away from strictly peasant modes of livelihood' (p.4).

Overall, the popularity of the livelihoods perspectives over the last decade has led to numerous studies pinpointing the increasing significance of non-farm incomes amongst rural people everywhere. Barrett et al.(2001) summarise much of this material for Africa and note the positive relationship between non-farm income and household welfare indicators across most of rural Africa. This reported widespread shift in income-earning activities is also accompanied by other shifts, in the locational aspect of livelihoods, the creation of non-traditional markets within rural areas resulting from globalisation, and in the value placed by rural people on natural resource based activities. Although some argue that there has been a merging of rural and urban in this process, we might claim that because of out-migration, especially of men in many rural areas, the differences have increased and the potential of development resources to follow men and men's interests may continue into the future with even more disastrous effects on rural areas. This is not to say that programmes designed to address food security - the practical - needs of rural women would not be met, but rather to note that this shift in population may deter agencies from seriously seeking alternatives for rural people *in situ*. We have already referred to the comments by Locke of women being left in under-resourced locations and jobs which do nothing to raise their status and position but need to add, following Rao (2006), concerns about women being in sectors already rejected by men, including farming. These comments have implications for the renewed calls for research to address the old agenda of increased productivity of staple crops for sub-Saharan Africa to be produced by family farms.

5. LOOKING TOWARDS THE FUTURE: TAKING THE INSTITUTIONAL GENDER TRANSFORMATORY PROJECT FORWARD IN THE CONTEXT OF RURAL LIVELIHOODS

We begin this discussion of possible ways forward by focusing on the policy implications of the changes referred to immediately above. We then move to the institutional context of changes, especially the organisations largely responsible for addressing natural resource management including technology development, to address their challenge of moving forward on gender. Suggestions are made regarding guidelines and frameworks for doing this. At the same time, these thoughts and suggestions, even recommendations, are made with the understanding that a multifaceted strategy is needed to achieve food security and growth over the long term in rural areas at the same time as taking the project to transform the status and position of women forward. In doing this, the paper emphatically supports the need for specific action to address gender inequities as expressed in FAO's Strategic Framework quoted earlier.

Regardless of the reported increase in non-natural resource-based incomes for rural people, there is clear evidence that these alternatives are not equally accessible to all rural residents, in particular women.²⁴ This plus the widespread reported out-migration from rural areas of men, and the consequent rise in female-headed households supports the view that in many rural areas, women will be - if they are not already - the key players responsible not only for household food security and the production of staple food crops, but also for generating surpluses adequate for asset building, as well as for the growth of the rural economy overall.²⁵ This fact needs to form the basis of any new thinking on gender for the future.

Women as the key players in small farm policy initiatives – a new paradigm for rural women. In terms of supporting women in farming (or other natural resource-based activities), we would suggest that it is time to move away from thinking primarily or even only, of women as subsistence producers in small farm families (the institutional context) and, as was emphasised by Whitehead in her 1994 publication on female farmers in Africa, to be very clear about the circumstances within which women are and wish to be involved in farming or natural-resource related activities before reaching any policy conclusions. Such a shift in the way rural women in the Third World are portrayed has implications for resource flows and it may not suit donors: women would no longer to be portrayed solely as members of the deserving poor requiring various forms of transfer payments.

²⁴ As Barrett *et al.* (2001) emphasise, there are barriers to remunerative non-farm incomes including education, market access, social contacts and financial capital and those who are already better off have greater access to these. They argue that the majority is likely to end up in occupations that do little to reduce household risk exposure or increase expected income: these are the very people often with no land or claims to land. These authors refer to this diversification as “distress diversification” that generates little surplus. In relation to women, their comparative exclusion from migratory processes that might provide access to other non-natural resource-based incomes is also well documented. They rather are recorded as receiving remittances from others who have migrated.

²⁵ Not to mention their reliance on common property resources for meeting their food security needs.

The ability of women to fulfil this role will no doubt also depend on their ability and willingness to engage in new crop markets and in commercial production more generally. What evidence is there about this? Certainly this is not entirely new for women. While most of the gender literature suggests that women are not in a position to make financial outlays for resources and/or are not taken seriously by banking and other service organisations, women have long engaged in own account farming, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. Spring, (2000), Stone and Stone (2000), Whitehead (1994), Idowu and Guyer (1993) and Okali (1983) have all detailed the engagement of some African women in cash cropping on their own behalf.

Will women have access to land to do this? These “own account” activities did not always rely on non-customary tenure arrangements. Adholla and Marie-Elena (1994) writing of sub-Saharan Africa, suggested a decade ago that “While women may not inherit land, they enjoy usufruct on land allocated to them at marriage. Given the need to ensure household survival under prevailing relations of production, tenure security for married women is not likely to differ from that enjoyed by husbands, particularly on plots devoted to household food”. “...the extent of security enjoyed by women depends on their own marital status and the position of their immediate male relatives – husbands, fathers or brothers”. They go on to conclude that, ‘Increasingly, “security of tenure” is largely academic where land of good quality has become scarce, plus the insecurity of marriage..’ and we might add, in the context where men have migrated.²⁶ In the volume edited by Spring (2000) there are examples of situations where women have made land purchases or, like men, have rented land.²⁷ Certainly to-day there is some suggestion that women are beginning to gain more secure land rights – that is access with some long-standing rights (Rao 2006; Rigg 2006), although both Rao and Rigg note that this is in the context where the value of farming or agricultural production has reduced.²⁸

One challenge will be to determine who are these women. In a recent report of the New Economics Foundation, London, Sumberg (2006) suggests five questions that might be asked to differentiate the likely strategies of individuals (and households). These questions take account of the natural resource and market access context of the locations concerned, whether indeed the individuals or groups are interested in increasing their farm productivity, whether they have the necessary resource rights

²⁶ Contrary to many reports, these two authors conclude that ‘Traditional kinship obligations to dependants appear to operate more favourably for widows than for divorced women, abandoned wives or unmarried mothers’. A recent paper on Kenya land policy (Aliber and Walker, 2006) suggests that, regardless of its limitations, this particular policy can protect vulnerable individuals (including widows and orphans) from tenure loss. Their evidence also included far less examples of widows and orphans losing existing rights than expected from a reading of the literature and anecdotal evidence. This might also be true for other locations but will depend on more data for verification.

²⁷ Discussions of land rights have changed considerably over the last decade. Rather than being totally focussed on individual freehold rights, they now cover a range of options and include rights to forest resources, wasteland and plant genetic resources (see FAO’s 2003 publication on *Gender and Access to Land* and 2003 publication on *Land Tenure and Rural Development*). Emphasis appears to be being placed on flexibility with a range of options being available depending on the specific context under discussion. However, for insight into the continued contested nature of land tenure rights for women see the special issue of the *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2003.

²⁸ Chen (1996) in a China study notes that women’s control over farming reflects a lack of choice and Stivens and Jomo (1994) describe younger Malaysian women looking for employment in urban industries rather than “persisting in the stagnant and socially devalued rural sector”.

and if not, whether any constraints could be removed, and whether they already have a significant non-farm or remittance income (which might determine for instance whether or not the strategy will be to continue to farm primarily for own consumption). If their answers are no to all five questions, the presumption is that migration will be the preferred strategy.

In calling for a new narrative that would support a changed view of rural women, it is not being suggested that resources would not be needed to support women in new ventures. Nor is it being suggested that women who are not able to meet their survival needs will not continue to require what Devereux (2001) refers to as “conventional social protection measures” - of emergency food aid, public works and vulnerable group feeding programmes. Certainly meeting women’s immediate food security needs remains an important agenda and where this depends on natural resources, their access needs to be protected in order to ensure their survival and security. As is made clear in a recent set of documents on social protection (Luttrell and Moser 2004; Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler 2004; Sabates-Wheeler and Kabeer 2003) women’s livelihoods are especially vulnerable because of the responsibilities they carry for caring for the sick and young. Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the studies of the impact of HIV/AIDS and conflict on rural women. However, conventional social protection programmes do not even come close to having transformatory potential. The more recent social protection literature referred to above points to a range of social transformatory policies which are being advocated as essential for especially vulnerable categories of people who have less freedom to take up options as they arise, and consistently achieve low returns to whatever few assets they have. These policies extend social protection into arenas such as equity, empowerment and economic, social and cultural rights rather its scope being confined to targeted income and consumption transfers. In their final note, Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler (2004) argue that such measures are financially more affordable than those more commonly used and have been shown to have benefits beyond simply protection, including leading to growth.

In terms of FAO’s overwhelming concern with food security for women, we would suggest that, in the first instance, if a clear distinction is made between short and long term food security, a step will have been taken in a direction that allows for the organisation to advocate for new directions in social protection which are focused on addressing long term sustainable change while continuing to meet the immediate practical needs of those whose very survival is at risk.

Supporting income diversification for women outside direct food production.

Rural women have long engaged in food processing or trading in food commodities at various levels. In some societies, their main income is derived from trading in such items as tomatoes and bananas, and in small-scale fishing economies, in fish, but also in non-natural resource-based commodities such as leaves and other forest products. In FAO’s recently produced policy document on small-scale fisheries (FAO, 2006), the changes in marketing arrangements, such as bulk buying of fish and the growth of a large wholesale trade, as well as the introduction of new hygiene or labour regulations resulting from globalization of the fish trade has diminished the role of small fish traders. The same is true for fish processors where international demand for certain fish species, and credit arrangements has favoured men rather than women. These comments are not being made to simply suggest that change should or even

could be stopped but it is being suggested that policy initiatives are being taken in some situations to support larger traders or urban traders, or new traders dependent on more distant sources of capital rather than enabling those who already work in this sector take advantage of these changes. There is also a growing body of evidence available demonstrating the need to ensure that money flows remain within rural communities in order for them to thrive (NEF, 2002). The value of livelihoods analyses such as these, focusing on community-level or local impacts - of globalization as in this case - for promoting a policy shift that would also meet the needs, and possibly the interests of women, is invaluable.

Some rural women are already involved in new product markets, especially global market chains for vegetables and flowers (Barrientos *et al.*, 2003 and various articles in Razavi, 2002). However there is considerable evidence to show that women working within these chains are more likely than men to be hired on temporary contracts, and to be placed in roles that are valued less (Dolan, 2004). They are also reported to suffer from sexual harassment. Organizations at all levels have a clear role to play in assisting with the development of codes of conduct that fit particular situations, and in advocating for their adoption and monitoring. Where landlessness is and will remain the norm for the majority of the poor, strategies to make these jobs more secure, with better conditions of work such as those described by Dolan (2004) and Barrientos *et al.* (2003) for women employed as factory workers in the agricultural export sector, may be the most important to pursue in working to secure the livelihoods of rural women.²⁹ In emphasising the need to adopt a non-farm diversification agenda for women, we are not minimising their constraints in education, market access, appropriate social contacts and financial capital raised by Barrett *et al.* (2001) with reference to poor and marginal people more generally, rather we are supporting their conclusion that it is essential to invest in non-farm opportunities for women, by for example stimulating rural financial systems, improving infrastructure and ensuring that they are in a position to take up educational and training opportunities, as well as providing the kind of protection in the workplace suggested above.

Establish a clear constituency for the rural non-farm economy. Barrett *et al.* argue that the major challenge in supporting the growth of a rural non-farm economy will be to determine who will be responsible for the category of people needing or wanting to invest in this economy. They advocate establishing a clear constituency for the rural non-farm economy with governments, donor organizations and research institutions that might include organizations that have supported or engaged with programmes such as FAO's Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development Programme (LSP 3.3). While this FAO programme has not chosen to take on a gender agenda even though many of the enterprise groups are of women, it could, along with other programmes, provide relevant data long after the project termination date. Determining the constituency membership is only one of the first tasks to be addressed. Information is needed on the women themselves, their relationships with others as well as on the kinds of assets that offer them leverage (Jackson, 1999) and the investigation would need to be framed within a culturally-specific understanding of assets and their value.

²⁹ These are the kind of policies included in the social protection measures discussed by Devereux and Sebates Wheeler (2004). Also see Heyer 1989 for a discussion of the assets of value to landless people.

Support data collection for targeting for a multifaceted agenda addressing different livelihood scenarios. Although we have suggested earlier that targeting can be problematic this should not be interpreted to mean that targeting has no value. On the contrary, targeting to meet specific practical gender needs appears to be feasible and efficient, and works. If targeting is done well, that is, if we are very clear about the kind of action proposed, the resources involved, the benefits to be expected over the existing situation, and who is an appropriate target, we might already expect to see substantial improvements in well-being for many rural women working in rural areas.

There is already some information about the kinds of actions that are amenable to policy intervention and less likely to be challenged on the ground. Dolan (2002), based on research in Uganda suggests that access to credit, agricultural extension (of the results of research from the formal agricultural research system), and training are amongst these actions.³⁰ Likewise, initiatives to support trading activities (she refers to measures to limit taxation as an example), and to alleviate unequal labour burdens through labour saving devices, even improved water access, could advance gender equity at the same time as increasing productivity.³¹

While the enthusiasm for supporting programmes using a livelihoods perspective is declining, we would suggest that there is information available or that can be made available within a variety of programmes that could provide insight into the natural resource-based interests of specific categories of women and men, as well as their non-farm diversification interests that extend to their engagement with globalization and seeking good governance – that is for thinking about action in support of livelihood protection and livelihood building in a changing rural environment.

There are already some indications of how this might be approached, in FAO programmes and projects. The SFLP itself adopted a strategy of examining current issues in livelihoods that were common across its programmes in different locations in its 23 project countries in West and Central Africa. This approach was significant for its learning about strategies of migration and diversification for instance, and the importance of poverty and gender for determining these strategies in different contexts.

The call for more data is always being made and the accumulation of masses of new data is not being proposed here. Rather, it is being suggested that with a clear set of questions that take account of ongoing changes in rural areas and with respect to specific natural resources, local cultural situations, and the links between these two, improvements in targeting can be made.

Mainstreaming gender within livelihoods programmes. Institutional issues are central to gender mainstreaming and we began this paper with a brief commentary that pointed to some disappointment with the outcomes of mainstreaming that reflect

³⁰ As Goetz demonstrated in her paper on frontline workers, even these constraints are difficult to remove since the organisations and their staff who are responsible for implementing changes are themselves part of society and responsible for enforcing the norms which we might be seeking to change.

³¹ The term ‘Gender specific constraints’ might be used to explain why training and education for women do not always result in meaningful outcomes such as increased incomes under their control.

the practicalities of achieving change in certain organizational settings. As a solution to this problem of unrealistic expectations, Subrahmanian (2004) suggests that organizations break the processes implied by the term mainstreaming into their component parts, of policy reform, administrative reform, analytical and conceptual strengthening, and political advocacy. Gains and setbacks can then be assessed in each of these, or in one or more of these, thus providing a disaggregated view of gender mainstreaming. While it has been customary to view all organizations as being able to “mainstream gender” in a broad sense or become “gender sensitive”, it is necessary for organizations to select the area in which they see themselves as being in a position to take forward the agenda. We have already suggested above that FAO and its other UN partners, would seem to be ideal for advocating or promoting a different view of the way rural women are portrayed, amongst other things. Below we address the possibility of their taking on advocating analytical and conceptual strengthening.

We have already also emphasized that most natural resources livelihood programmes are not in a position to address the transformatory social protection agendas and indeed the overview of programmes given earlier supports this conclusion. Based on the evidence, we might conclude that the majority will always continue to focus on the same issues – of production and good management of the resource base - while finding ways of incorporating new agendas that do not disrupt the key organizational objectives. For these organizations we would agree with Molyneux (2002) that their own objectives must “be accompanied by some strategy for achieving gender justice as part of a broader commitment to greater social and economic equality” (pp.112-1150). At a minimum they should be constrained by the need to demonstrate that the position and status of women, and also children, is not more problematic at the end than at the beginning of each programme. Although this might suggest that all that is required is a baseline and an evaluation, we would argue that it remains essential for organizations to adopt a critical gender perspective if existing social divisions and power relations are not simply to be strengthened: they need to be able to answer the question: Which policies and practices are detrimental to women’s status and opportunities and in what way?

Incorporate new conceptual understanding into gender frameworks and move beyond role analysis. Frameworks and guidelines have always been central to the thinking about gender mainstreaming. In this paper we have already acknowledged the value of the main gender frameworks used while at the same time emphasising a need for further conceptual and analytical strengthening. The obvious solution that comes to mind in relation to this for organizations lacking in capacity to undertake the task themselves, is to develop partnerships with other organizations, and/ or to engage resource persons to work with them. Another alternative is to make some of the conceptual understandings more explicit within the frameworks themselves. The table below (page 27) presents one such framework. It is based on gender literature as well as the work in rural development of the two people involved in its design.³² It begins with conceptual understandings and moves on to raising generic questions in relation to these and the implications for data. The framework is not intended to replace frameworks that already exist but rather to build on these.

³² Catherine Locke and Christine Okali developed this framework in response to the demand from organizations wanting to move forward on gender. They then worked with them to assess how practicable it was. The framework itself reflects the analysis presented in Locke and Okali (1999). It has been used by researchers in Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Nepal.

Although the way in which gender relations are maintained or changed over time is not yet fully understood, there have been significant conceptual improvements in thinking about this which need to be incorporated into gender analyses. The framework acknowledges three aspects of gender relations, their dynamic, relational and social nature. It also addresses the understanding that women and men have both joint and separate interests and that these frame processes of strategising and bargaining for change. Finally, it accepts that changes may be subtle and ambiguous and therefore difficult to interpret and their value to the women and men themselves must be included in the analysis (Locke and Okali, 1999).

Gender relations are dynamic: Gender relations within households, communities and other social institutions are not ‘givens’ but are constantly being renegotiated and reconstructed in response to the changing needs and interests of the individuals and groups involved, but also in response to changing conditions in the wider context, such as the introduction of new technology, policies on land rights or cash transfers to poor women with children in school.

The relational analysis of gender: With respect to bringing the relational quality of gender into focus, men are brought into the gender analysis and emphasis placed on similar and joint as well as different and competing interests between individuals. Information on gendered work patterns and differential access to and control over resources within households needs to be placed within an understanding of how such patterns are maintained and/or renegotiated within the wider range of social and economic relationships (within other households and in supra-household settings) in which women and men are engaged. While a change in market relations for example does not necessarily lead to a change in domestic gender relations, these contexts are linked in terms of peoples’ livelihoods. A relational analysis also implies the need to include other aspects of social difference, such as age and marital status in order to reveal, for example, the way in which older married women tend to have more control over their own time, to generate more independent income and to have a greater influence on household decision-making than younger married women.

Gender as a social analysis : In order to appreciate the meaning of particular tasks, divisions of labour, resources and authority, and the value of specific changes in these for the relationships concerned, attention must be given to the symbolic and qualitative aspects of gender relations. For example, the value of women’s weeding labour may vary depending for whom it is carried out and the particular crops concerned. Under certain conditions, wives may receive cash payment from husbands for weeding while under others, they may not.

Another example relates to the task of collecting firewood which is often seen simply as a ‘woman’s job’. However, social norms may only suggest that firewood collection is a woman’s job when it is carried on her back or her head for household use and it may be seen as an acceptable job for a man if he uses a cart or for making charcoal for sale or if he is carrying it for wages. In practice, there are also particular locations and circumstances where these norms are broken and where individual women use carts and individual men carry firewood for their own use on their heads or backs.

The generic questions suggested in the top half of the table need be tailored to reflect a specific location and issues around a particular activity. They add to the existing frameworks by looking at :

- the active strategies of women and men to optimise their joint and separate livelihood interests and security
- the process of negotiation or bargaining between women and men within and beyond the household over gender relations
- the more complex valuing of outcomes of bargaining processes and interventions.

Processes of changing gender relations. As noted, gender relations are constantly being renegotiated and reconstructed around joint and separate interests, rights, obligations and resources of women and men. While these processes are often presented in different ways in the theoretical literature, they are presented in this framework as follows:

Strategizing: In contrast to earlier portrayals of women as helpless victims, recent understandings of gender relations have emphasised that both women and men strategize to optimise their separate and joint livelihoods and security, and that disadvantaged women even resist and contest male power in various ways. Both individual women and men may employ strategies, around their maize production for example, that go counter to local understandings about their behaviour and roles.

Bargaining: Although there is widespread evidence of conflict of interests between women and men within households, bargaining must be moulded with the general format of cooperation if the household is to survive, and this has been shown to influence the behaviour of women and men.

Relative bargaining power is also influenced by extra-household factors such as access to external networks of kin and economic variables such as employment, and local understandings about the various points of leverage to which women, for instance, have access (such as appealing to male relatives for support, withholding food or labour from their husbands or using ‘the forum of women’s groups to legitimise actions which are at the borderline of acceptable female behaviour’). Women and men may also individually and collectively draw on cultural ideas (or ‘taken for granted knowledge about existing gender relations’ or norms about relations between husbands and wives) in their struggle and bargaining over meanings, to advance their interests in the process of negotiation.

Bargaining within the household is often covert, involving emotional manipulation and unspoken power games, and complex, often involving bargaining on behalf of others, all of which makes both the process and the outcomes difficult to detect.

Valuing outcomes: Conventional gender analysis may not only mistake significant elements of ‘success’, but implicitly prejudge the value of shifts in gender relations. The achievement of technical project objectives, such as ‘grinding mill adopted’, and the advancing of practical or strategic interests, such as ‘increasing women’s autonomy’, is invariably interpreted as success

with little or no attention given to how women and men themselves interpret and experience changing gender relations around interventions. This is demonstrated in the case of a project that ‘failed’ in their efforts to introduce a maize sheller to a women’s co-operative in western Nigeria (Ladipo, 1991). Men forced the women’s co-operative to sell the shelling machine because manual shelling was performed for free by wives as a family obligation and men were afraid that the machine would eventually lead to their losing control over the shelling process. After the sale of the machine women returned to shelling maize by hand but they were successful in demanding payment for doing so. To value this outcome as project failure is to miss the opportunity that the sheller provided for women to renegotiate the basis on which they shelled maize. It is suggested in this framework that gender analysis can only be used to value the outcomes of interventions and bargaining processes by looking at the way in which women and men themselves interpret and value changing gender relations. Women and men may prioritise other interests, such as better enforcement of conventional female and male responsibilities, over project goals, and ‘failed’ projects may conceal substantial gains for women and men.

Apparently similar outcomes can therefore, have very different implications, and understanding the subtlety of outcomes requires being sensitive to the overall livelihood strategies of women and men and the way in which resources from one activity may be invested in others. It is also important to note that changes in activities do not automatically lead to changes in socio-cultural perceptions of women and men.

The value of frameworks depends on the way in which they are used. They are largely conceptual in nature and not to be used in a prescriptive sense. In the case of this particular design, it includes some generic questions and a note about how the questions might be addressed. This was done in response to the demand of organizations, largely but not entirely research organizations, for even more guidance on how to move forward. It was followed by a set of guidelines which spelt out in more detail, the steps to be taken. Each researcher was expected to develop their own questions in relation to their specific research, whether this was on pasture and forage production, potato diseases or the integrated management of grain stores. The guidelines included four steps linked with four types of information.

In adopting this approach, our understanding was that we were not seeking to create gender specialists out of the agricultural or natural resource researchers concerned: this was not their individual principal objective and likewise the objective of their organization. It was also our understanding that in order to engage these researchers in the subject of our concern, gender analysis, they needed to be able to apply it to their specific research. The guidelines for the national agricultural research service in Nepal read:

“An abstracted analysis of gender relations for an organisation like NARC makes no sense. For NARC a gender analysis must be rooted in a concrete, focussed and detailed empirical examination of a specific context, such as around the management of a livestock enterprise, or the management of an on-farm trial to examine the

possibility of incorporating green manure, or around the introduction of mechanical weeders.

All assumptions about gender relations must be examined in the specific context within which technical change is being considered. The focus will be on changes that take place around the technology itself - we must look at the way in which women and men value and use interventions for achieving their joint and separate objectives, and we must ask,

How do men and women value the resources and activities that we as researchers feel it is important to improve?" (p.6)

Additional information on the guidelines, steps to be taken and information to be collected, is provided in the attached appendix.

The process of introducing the framework and the guidelines was viewed by us as a process of developing gender awareness, acquiring skills in gender analysis and in using these skills to integrate gender questions into their ongoing agricultural research.³³ In engaging with this analysis, in all cases, the researchers had to adopt a broader and more holistic perspective that is in line with both gender and livelihoods analysis.

³³ This work was undertaken within a programme entitled, 'Analysing Changing Gender Relations for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Renewable Natural Resource Sector'. It was funded by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) under the Socio-economic Methodologies component of the Renewable Natural Resources Research Strategy, with contributions from DFID's Crop Post-harvest Programme. Whilst these guidelines draw on this DFID-funded research project, DFID can accept no responsibility for any information provided or views expressed. These remain the responsibility of the authors.

Table : Implications of Conceptual Understandings of Changing Gender Relations for Gender Analysis

Conceptual understandings	Generic questions for the analysis of changing gender relations arising from the conceptual understandings	Implications for the approach to the analysis of changing gender relations
Dynamic Analysis: Gender relations are formed and constantly renegotiated and reconstructed by individuals and groups in direct confrontations or through everyday events, and in response to external changes, in available technology or government policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the historical directions of change in gender relations? • What is the nature of local gender relations? • What aspects of local gender relations are currently relatively “accepted” and stable, highly contested, fluid or changing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a historical perspective • Focus on change • Develop a local understandings through field analysis
Relational Analysis: The experiences and strategies of men and women and negotiations around separate and joint interests, both within households and supra-household institutions, are integral to a gendered analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do women and men maintain and renegotiate gender relations? • How are gender relations shaped by other social identity? • What is the nature of gender relations in different local institutions? • How do women and men use these institutions to maintain and renegotiate gender relations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate men into gender analysis • Include other social relationships in analysis • Include local institutions in analysis
Social Analysis: Gender is an organising concept for all aspects of social reality, including situations not directly concerned with relations between women and men, and is indicated in local cultural values which affect behaviour although behaviour cannot be read directly from these.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are local values about gender roles, resource allocations and authority? • What are cultural perceptions of agricultural services and technologies? • How are these two related? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probe links between local values about gender relations and the roles, resources allocations and authority of women and men • Probe links between perceptions of specific technologies and local gender values
Strategising: Women and men strategise to optimise their separate and joint livelihoods and security, and junior and disadvantaged individuals resist and contest powerful individuals and strategies may not reflect local cultural values about appropriate and acceptable behaviour.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the shared and separate livelihood interests of women and men? • What strategies do women and men employ to advance their joint and separate livelihood interests? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be alert to the joint and separate interests and strategies
Bargaining: The relative bargaining power of women and men is determined by concerns about household survival, extra-household networks, economic variables and local understandings about legitimate acts, including drawing on and redefining cultural meanings in order to advance their interests in the process of negotiation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are generalised local understandings of the relative bargaining positions of women and men? • How do women and men use these local understandings in their bargaining strategies? • How is this worked out at an individual level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on the process of bargaining • Report on specific acts of bargaining
Valuing Outcomes: In relation to gender concerns, women and men themselves interpret and value interventions for meeting their own needs and interests and for their own ongoing negotiations. Apparently similar outcomes can have different implications and valued outcomes may be unrelated to project objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do women and men strategise around interventions? • How do women and men experience and value outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect ambiguous and contradictory findings

6. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper set out to explore the links between the gender project of transforming the status and position of women and livelihoods perspectives adopted in natural resource-based programmes and projects and it did this by examining the way in which these two have been conceptualised and then integrated into practice. The paper traces the changes in the way gender issues have been addressed over time, and focuses on natural resource programmes in which a livelihoods perspective has been adopted.

The paper adopts the view that there are conceptual links between current understandings of gender and livelihood building, but while natural resource programmes might have taken on board the collection of a set of data around roles and access and control over assets, they have largely failed to adopt the political gender project. Nevertheless, the need to engage women in natural resource management groups is widely accepted and understood to provide the avenue towards meeting this political objective.

Current gender and livelihoods analyses are underpinned by notions of change, of negotiation and bargaining between women and men - exercising their agency – and in doing so, they implicitly accept that rural people are not only challenging dominant themes in rural development as mentioned above, but are also subverting and reformulating local social norms. This shift in understanding takes us closer to the transformatory agenda that speaks to “women’s interests and capabilities rather than of their needs and capacities” (Subramanian, 2004:90) and fits with our interest in this paper of our need to support moves that may already be being taken by rural women and men, and to seek changes that align more closely with their joint and separate interests.

The paper draws particular attention to the gender analytical frameworks that have now been in use for almost four decades and which have, in the case of natural resources management, had a significant impact on the understanding of gender issues. The paper argues that their principle value lay in their accessibility and the guidance they provide to organizations and individuals on how to engage with the gender project. The assumptions of the Harvard Framework about assets and their value to both women and men fit the livelihoods understanding of the role of assets in poverty reduction and the building of a sustainable livelihood. However, the conclusion from this review of programmes is that if we are to incorporate ongoing efforts of rural people themselves to change while at the same time enabling them engage with ongoing wider changes, of globalization for example, it is time to move beyond this understanding that the gender project needs to focus on gap filling – bringing women into alignment with men depending principally if not entirely on the natural resource base. The paper joins others in reminding us that men appear to be moving on, along with governments and donors while women continue to face constraints. In line with this understanding, the paper argues that a first step in moving forward is for organizations to adopt a new paradigm on the role of women in rural development.

The paper presents five ways forward for addressing gender issues in the context of changing rural livelihoods. The first four of these focus on new perspectives on rural women while the last two address the continuing demand for “mainstreaming” gender into ongoing activities:

- Women as the key players in small farm policy initiatives – a new paradigm for rural women.
- Supporting income diversification for women outside direct food production.
- Establish a clear constituency for the rural non-farm economy.
- Support data collection for targeting for a multifaceted agenda addressing different livelihood scenarios.
- Mainstreaming gender within livelihoods programmes.
- Incorporate new conceptual understanding into frameworks and move beyond role analysis.

In presenting these proposals, the paper is not advocating for a choice to be made between seeing rural women as engaging in new crops and markets etc., and seeing them as part of the chronically poor. Rather it advocates the need for a multifaceted agenda that requires shifts in thinking and alignment with opinions that provide space for new perspectives, supporting institutional partnerships and the merging of agendas such as the transformative social protection policies.

In line with these proposals it is appropriate to end the paper with a commentary on communications. Although it is suggested in the paper that much of the necessary information needed to support a multifaceted agenda is not available, it is also true that much of what is available may not be available in the form needed: that is, presented in a language and format appropriate to specific organizations and communicated directly to if not negotiated with them. This task of translation of findings into appropriate forms and formats is one ideally suited to organizations such as FAO, with its multi-country and organizational contacts. Equally, the task of developing and promoting a new narrative on rural women requires shifting orthodox thinking. This will not be any easy task but needs to begin now within organizations that have already shown some commitment to the larger gender project or have at least adopted the livelihoods agenda to which it is close.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, Bina, 1994, *A Field of One's Own: Gender and Land Rights in Southeast Asia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ahmed, I., 1994, 'Technology and Feminisation of Work', *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 30: WS-34.
- Aliber, M. and C. Walker, 2006, 'Aids and Land Tenure', *World Development*, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 704-727.
- Arce, A., 2003, 'Value Contestations in Development Interventions: Community Development and Sustainable Livelihood Approaches'. *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 199-212.
- Barrett, C. B., Reardon, T. and P. Webb, 2001, 'Off farm income diversification and household livelihood strategies in rural Africa: concepts, dynamics and policy implications', *Food Policy*, 26, pp. 315-31.
- Barrientos, S., Dolan, C. and A. Tallontire, 2003, 'Gendered Value Chain Approach to Codes of Conduct in African Horticulture', *World Development* Vol. 31, No. 9, pp.1511-1526.
- Bebbington, A., 1999, 'Capitals and Capabilities: A Framework for Analysing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty' *World Development*, Vol. 27, No. 12, pp. 2021-2044.
- Bryceson, D., Kay, C. and J. Mooij (Eds.) 2000, *Disappearing Peasantries? Rural Labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America*. UK: ITDG.
- Bryceson, D. F. and V. Jamal (eds.), 1997, 'Farewell to Farms: Deagrarianisation and Employment in Africa', *Research Series* No. 1997/10, Leiden, Netherlands, African Studies Centre.
- Carney, D., 1999, *Livelihood Approaches Compared*. London, Department for International Development.
- Chambers, R. and G.R. Conway, 1992, 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century', *IDS Discussion Paper*, No. 296. Brighton, Institute of Development Studies.
- Chen, H., 1996, *The Role of Gender in Farming Household Decision-Making in Yaan, South-western China*, PhD Thesis, Wageningen University, The Netherlands.
- Cleaver, F., 2005, 'The Inequality of Social Capital and the Reproduction of Chronic Poverty', *World Development* Vol 33, No. 6, pp. 893-906.
- Cooke, B. and Uma Kothari, 2001, *Participation, The New Tyranny?* Zed Books, London.
- Cotula, L., and Toulmin, C., with van Vlaenderen, H., Mansour Tall, S., Gaye, G., Saunders, J., Ahiadeke, C. and J.K.Anarfi, 2004, 'Till to Tiller: Linkages between International Remittances and Access to Land in West Africa.' *FAO LSP Working Paper* No.14, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- CTA, 2001, Final Report on the 'Regional Workshop for Eastern and Southern Africa on *Strengthening the Economic Condition and Role of Women in Agricultural and Rural Development by Revisiting the Legal Environment* organised by the CTA in collaboration with the Ministry of Gender, Uganda. CTA, GTZ and the Austrian Development Cooperation, Kampala, Uganda.
- Davison, J., 1988, 'Who Owns What? Land Registration and Tensions in Gender Relations', in J. Davison (ed.), *Agriculture, Women and Land: the African Experience*, Boulder, Westview Press.

- Devereux, S., 2001, 'Livelihood Insecurity and Social Protection: A Re-emerging Issue in Rural Development', *Development Policy Review*, Vol.19, No. 4, pp.507-519.
- Devereux, S. and R. Sabates-Wheeler, 2004, 'Transformative Social Protection', *IDS Working Paper*, No. 232.
- Dey, Jennie, 1981, 'Gambian Women: Unequal Partners in Rice Development Projects?' *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 109-122.
- Dixon-Mueller, R., 1989, 'Women's Work in Third World Agriculture: Concepts and Indicators', *Women, Work and Development Series*, No. 9. Geneva, ILO.
- Dolan, C. S., 2004, 'On Farm and Packhouse: Employment at the Bottom of a Global Value Chain. *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 99-126.
- Dorward, A., Kydd, J., Morrison, J. and I. Urey, 2004, 'A Policy Agenda for Pro-Poor Agricultural Growth'. *World Development*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 73-89.
- Ellis, F. and S. Biggs, 2001, 'Evolving Themes in Rural Development 1950s-2000s', *Development Policy Review*, Vol.19, No. 4, pp. 437-448.
- FAO, 2006, Gender Policies for Responsible Fisheries – Policies to support Gender Equity and Livelihoods in small-scale fisheries. *New Directions in Fisheries – A Series of Policy Briefs on Development Issues*, No. 6. Rome.
- FAO, 2003, 'Gender and Access to Land', *FAO Land Tenure Series*, No. 4, FAO, Rome
- FAO, 2003, 'Land Tenure and Rural Development' Land Tenure Studies No. 3, FAO, Rome.
- FAO, 2005, *Gender and Farming Systems: Lessons from Nicaragua*, FAO, Rome.
- Feldstein, H.S. and S.V. Poats, (eds.), 1989, *Working Together: Gender Analysis in Agriculture. Volume 2*, West Harford, Kumarian Press.
- Feldstein, H. and J. Jiggins, 1994, *Tools for the Field: Methodologies Handbook for Gender Analysis in Agriculture*, London, Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Francis, E., 2000, *Making a Living: Changing Livelihoods in Rural Africa*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Francis, P., 2001, 'Participatory Development at The World Bank: the Primacy of Process', in *Participation, The New Tyranny?* edited by Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari, Zed Books, London: 72-87.
- Goetz, A-M, 1994, 'From Feminist Knowledge to Data for Development: The Bureaucratic Management of Information on Women and Development', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 27-36.
- Hanstad, T., Nielsen, R., J. Brown, Rural Development Institute (RDI), USA, 2004. 'Land and Livelihoods: Making land Rights Real for India's Rural Poor.' *FAO LSP Working Paper* No.12, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Hart, G., 1995, 'Gender and Household Dynamics: Recent Theories and Their Applications', in M.G. Quibria (ed.), *Critical Issues in Asian Development: Theories, Experiences and Policies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 39-74.
- Hazell, P., 2005, 'The Role of Agriculture and Small Farms in Economic Development'. Paper prepared for the research workshop on *The Future of Small Farms* organized by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and Imperial College, London at the Withersdane Conference Centre, Wye, Kent, UK, 26-29 June.
- Hazell, P. and L. Haddad, 2001, 'Agricultural Research and Poverty Reduction', *Food, Agriculture and the Environment Discussion Paper*, No. 34. Washington, International Food Policy Research Institute.

- Heyer, J., 1989, 'Landless Agricultural Labourers' Asset Strategies'. *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 33-39.
- Idowu, O. and J. Guyer, 1993, 'Commercialization and the Harvest Work of Women, Ibarapa, Oyo State, Nigeria', *Working Paper* No. 172. African Studies Center, Boston University.
- IFAD, 2001, *Rural Poverty Report 2001: The Challenge of Ending Rural Poverty*, Oxford, OUP for International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).
- Jackson, C., 1999, Social Exclusion and Gender: Does One Size Fit All? *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol.11, No.1, pp. 125-146.
- Jackson, C. and R. Palmer-Jones, 1999, 'Rethinking Gendered Poverty and Work', *Development and Change*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 557-84.
- Jackson, C., 1996, 'Rescuing Gender from the Poverty Trap'. *World Development*, Vol. 24, No.3, pp. 489-504.
- Jones, C.W., 1986, 'Intra-Household Bargaining in Response to the Introduction of New Crops: A Case Study from North Cameroon', in J. Mook (ed.), *Understanding Africa's Rural Household and Farming Systems*, Boulder, CO, Westview Press, pp.105-23.
- Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2003.
- Journal of Development Studies*, 2006, Vol. 42, No. 2.
- Kabeer, N., 2000, *The Power to Choose*, London, Verso Press.
- Kabeer, N., 1999a, 'Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment', *Development and Change*, Vol. 30, pp. 435-464.
- Kabeer, N., 1999b, 'Social Relations Approach' in March, C., Smith, I. and M. Mukhopadhyay, *A Guide to Gender-analysis Frameworks*, UK, Oxfam, pp.102-122.
- Kevane, M., 2000, 'Extrahousehold Norms and Intra-household Bargaining: Gender in Sudan and Burkina Faso', in *Women Farmers and Commercial Ventures: increasing Food Security in Developing Countries* edited by Anita Spring. Boulder, Lynne Rienner, pp. 89-112.
- Khadiagala, L.S., 2001, 'The Failure of Popular Justice in Uganda: Local Councils and Women's Property Rights', *Development and Change*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 55-76.
- Ladipo, P., 1991, 'Looking beyond the farm for gender issues in FSRE', *Journal for Farming Systems Research*, Vol. 2, No.2, pp. 39-50.
- Lipton, M., 2005, 'The Family Farm in a Globalizing World: The Role of Crop Science in Alleviating Poverty', *2020 Discussion Paper* No. 40, Washington, International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Locke, C., 1999, 'Forest Policy: Constructing a Gender Policy for Joint Forest Management in India', *Development and Change*, Vol. 30, pp. 265-285.
- Locke, C. and C. Okali, 1999, 'Analysing changing gender relations: methodological challenges for gender planning', *Development in Practice*, Vol. 9, No. 3: pp. 274-286.
- Luttrell, C. and C. Moser, 2004, *Gender and Social Protection* Draft submitted to DFID.
- March, C., Smith, I. and M. Mukhopadhyay, 1999, *A Guide to Gender-analysis Frameworks*, UK, Oxfam.
- Migot-Adholla, S. E. and J. Marie-Elena, 1994, *Development Anthropology Network*, Vol. 12, Nos. 1-2, pp.14-24.
- Mitchell, R. and T. Hanstad, 2004, 'Small Homegarden Plots and Sustainable Livelihoods for the Poor', *FAO LSP Working Paper* No.11, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.

- Molyneux, M., 2002, 'Gender and Silences of Social Capital: Lessons from Latin America', *Development and Change*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 167-188.
- New Economics Foundation, 2002, *Plugging the Leaks: Making the Most of every Pound that Enters your Local Economy*, NEF, London.
- Norfolk, S., 2004, 'Examining Access to Natural Resources and Linkages to Sustainable Livelihoods,' *FAO LSP Working Paper No.17*, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Okali, C., Locke, C. and John Mims, 2000, *Guidelines for the Development of Gender-Sensitive Interventions by Agricultural Researchers*, Overseas Development Group, School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia.
- Okali, C. Locke, C. and Mims, J. 2000. *Analysing Changing Gender Relations for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Renewable Natural Resources (RNR) Sector*. Final Technical Report submitted to DFID. Socio-Economic Methodologies Component and Crop Post Harvest Programme of the RNRSS (R7039)
- Okali, C., 1999, 'Social Differentiation and Gender in Agricultural Development. Synthesis of Theme 6'. *KARI/DFID NARP II Conference Towards Increased Use of Demand Driven Technology* edited by J.A.Sutherland and P Mundy, UK, DFID.
- Okali, C., 1983, *Cocoa and Kinship in Ghana: The Matrilineal Akan of Ghana*. London, Kegan Paul International.
- Quisumbing, A., Meizen-Dick, R. and L. Smith, 2004, 'Increasing the Effective Participation of Women in Food and Nutrition Security in Africa', *2020 Africa Conference Brief*, No. 4. Washington, DC., International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Quisumbing, A., and R. Meinzen-Dick, 2001, *Empowering Women to Achieve Food Security*, Washington, D.C., IFPRI.
- Ramisch, J., Keeley, J., Scoones, I. and W. Wolmer, 2002, Crop-Livestock Policy in Africa: What is to be Done? In *Pathways of change in Africa: Crops, Livestock & Livelihoods in Mali, Ethiopia and Zimbabwe* edited by Ian Scoones and William Wolmer, Oxford, James Currey, pp. 183-210.
- Rao, N., 2006, 'Land Rights, Gender Equity and Household Food Security: Exploring the Conceptual Links in the Case of India', *Food Policy*, Vol. 31, pp.180-193.
- Razavi, S., 1997, 'Fitting Gender into Development Institutions', *World Development*, Vol. 25, No.7, pp. 1111-1125.
- Rigg, J., 2006, 'Land, Farming, Livelihoods, and Poverty: Rethinking the Links in the Rural South', *World Development*, Vol. 34, No.1, pp. 180-202.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R. and N. Kabeer, 2003, 'Gender Equality and the Extension of Social Protection', *Social Security and Development Branch Paper*, No.16, ILO.
- Saito, K.A. with Mekonnen, H. and D. Spurling, 1994, 'Raising the Productivity of Women Farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa', *World Bank Discussion Papers* No. 230, Washington.
- Schroeder, R.A., 1993, 'Shady Practice: Gender and the Political Ecology of Resource Stabilization in Gambian Gardens/orchards', *Economic Geography*, pp. 349-365.
- Scoones, I. and W. Wolmer, (eds.), 2002, *Pathways of Change in Africa: Crops, Livestock & Livelihoods in Mali, Ethiopia and Zimbabwe*, Oxford, James Currey.
- Sen, A., 1997, 'Editorial: Human Capital and Human Capability', *World Development*, Vol. 25, No. 12, pp. 1959-1961.
- Seshia, S., and I. Scoones, 2003, 'Understanding Access to Seeds and Plant Genetic Resources: What Can a Livelihoods Perspective Offer?' *FAO, LSP Working Paper* No. 6, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.

- Seur, H., 1992, *Sowing the Good Seed: The Interweaving of Agricultural Change, Gender Relations and Religion in Serenje District, Zambia*. PhD Thesis, Wageningen University, The Netherlands.
- Shamin, M., 1997, 'Gender and Land Rights: The Struggle Over Resources in Post Apartheid South Africa', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 28, No. 3, p. 133.
- Singh, R.B., Kumar, P. and T. Woodhead, 2002, *Smallholder Farmers in India: Food Security and Agricultural Policy*, FAO, Bangkok.
- Spring, A., 2000, 'Agricultural Commercialisation and Women Farmers in Kenya', in *Women Farmers and Commercial Ventures: Increasing Food Security in Developing Countries* edited by Anita Spring, Boulder, Lynne Rienner, pp. 317-342.
- Stamp, P., 1989, *Technology, Gender and Power in Africa*, Ottawa, International Development Research Centre.
- Stevens, M., Ng, C. and K.S. Jomo, 1994, *Malay Women and the Land*, London and New Jersey, Zed Books.
- Stone, M.P. and G.D. Stone, 2000, 'Kofyar Women Who Get Ahead: Incentives for Agricultural Commercialization in Nigeria', in *Women Farmers and Commercial Ventures: Increasing Food Security in Developing Countries* edited by A. Spring, Boulder, Lynne Rienner, pp.153-189.
- Subrahmanian, R., 2004, 'Making Sense of Gender in Shifting Institutional Contexts: Some Reflection on Gender Mainstreaming', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 89-94.
- Sumberg, J., 2006 *A Long Row to Hoe: Family Farming and Rural Poverty in Developing Countries*, New Economics Foundation, London.
- UNIFEM, 2003, *Strategic Results Framework Vol 2*. UNIFEM, South Asia.
- Walker, C., 2002, 'Land Reform and the Empowerment of Rural Women in Postapartheid South Africa', in *Shifting Burdens: Gender and Agrarian Change under Neoliberalism*, edited by S. Razavi, UNRISD, Connecticut USA, pp. 67-92.
- Westermann, O., Ashby, J. and J. Pretty, 2005., 'Gender and Social Capital: The Importance of Gender Differences for the Maturity and Effectiveness of Natural Resource Management Groups', *World Development*, Vol. 33, No.11, pp.1783-1799.
- Whitehead, A., 2002, 'Tracking Livelihood Change: Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Perspectives from North-East Ghana,' *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol.28, No. 3, pp. 575-598.
- Whitehead, A., 1994, 'Wives and Mothers: Female Farmers in Africa', in *Gender, Work and Population in Sub-Saharan Africa* edited by A. Adepaju and C. Opong, pp. 35-53.
- Whitehead, A., 1984, 'Women's Solidarity and Divisions among Women', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol.13, No. 1, pp. 6-11.
- Wiggins, S. and S. Proctor, 2001, 'How Special are Rural Areas? The Economic Implications of Location for Rural Development', *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 427-436.
- Wood, G., 2003, 'Staying Secure, Staying Poor: The "Faustian Bargain"', *World Development*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 455-471.
- World Bank, 2000, *Can Africa Claim the 21st Century?* African Development Bank, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Washington, D.C.

ANNEX: GENDER ANALYSIS GUIDELINES FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCHERS³⁴

What information is needed to address gender concerns within agricultural research?

It is not possible, or advisable, to devise a standard set of data to be collected by all researchers regardless of the focus of the research itself. There are, however, two obvious data needs.

- The first type of information relates to the interventions themselves. *This information serves as the starting point for developing gender analyses around particular aspects of natural resources that are under investigation.*
- The second type of information relates to the locations and people for whom the interventions are being developed. *As is the case with all client-oriented research, the analysis begins with the identification of locally significant categories of women and men, and situations (both domestic and non-domestic), within which their positions, and therefore their needs, interests and associated knowledge, are the same or vary.*

FIRST TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on the interventions

For the technical interventions under consideration, list

- key resources involved
- existing and new activities or changes in the relative importance of different activities
- expected changes in outputs (crop mix, variety characteristics including processing features, production changes, etc.)

SECOND TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on locally significant categories of households and other possible units of analysis and individuals.

For the specific contexts within which the interventions are expected to prove beneficial, identify

- locally significant categories of households
- other units of analysis that are locally significant
- significant categories of women and men

This information can be collected in various ways, but especially from local informants ranging from personnel of various agencies working in the area to village leaders.

These data on locations and potential clients serve two purposes. Firstly, they are the basis on which specific research questions can be developed and secondly, they provide the framework

³⁴ Extracts from *Guidelines for the Development of Gender-Sensitive Interventions by Agricultural Researchers* prepared by Christine Okali, Catherine Locke and John Mims. Overseas Development Group, School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, January 2000.

for selecting points of contact for the researchers. In all cases, if researchers are to engage with gender and other social concerns, they need a direct point of contact with their proposed final beneficiaries. In some instances these may be processors and traders as well as producers.

Once this level of difference has been identified and used - to select households for trials around particular interventions, or different types of traders for an assessment of a new variety of potatoes, for example - this difference must be maintained throughout the analysis. Some researchers may decide that this level of social analysis is sufficient. However, for those who wish to move further, two other types of information are required.

Levels of analysis and types of information			
<u>First type</u>	<u>Second type</u>	<u>Third type</u>	<u>Forth type</u>
Social differences relevant to planned intervention		Gender differences in tasks, resource access and decision making	Changes in gender relations related to planned intervention

Increasing levels of gender analysis

Following decisions made about units of analysis and categories of people to be included in data collection, initial questions relating to gender concerns need to be developed. This demands a THIRD type of information:

THIRD TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on gender concerns

In general, in agricultural programmes in many countries, agricultural researchers have been encouraged to begin with questions about the following:

- patterns of labour use by women and men
- patterns of decision-making around natural resources
- patterns of access to and control over outputs and benefits of agricultural activities

While all researchers will have views about local gender relations, it is worthwhile to check these against fact by asking questions about:

- cultural perceptions of agricultural services and technologies
- local values about gender roles, resource allocations and authority
- aspects of local gender relations that are
 - a) relatively accepted and stable
 - b) currently highly contested, fluid or changing

Collection of the more detailed information may be time consuming and may demand greater sensitivity. In one recent study, this type of information was gained from incidental remarks and gestures made by respondents during repeated informal interviews. Researchers will need to make a decision about the level of data that is useful and practicable to collect.

A framework such as this provides us with valuable data for beginning our investigation of gender relations. However, while the analysis of these data takes us a long way, we need a FOURTH type of information if we are to fully assess the value of any research to the individuals concerned. We need to know more about their own separate and joint, short and long term strategies. With the understanding gained from this type of information, researchers will be in a better position to appreciate who might be expected to benefit from a particular intervention. This information may be initially collected for a small number of units of analysis but in all cases, it will require collecting information jointly and separately from different individuals.

FOURTH TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on strategies and negotiation

This set of data relates to individual and household strategies as they relate to the activities under investigation, and to the possible bargaining and negotiation that does or might take place around any change that might be introduced. A key question might be:

What are the circumstances within which men and women might bargain for control of a particular intervention?

What does this information look like in practice?

To illustrate how these four types of information may be acquired, the example is given below of the questions that were drawn up during a recent soils research programme at Makoholi Research Station, Department of Research and Statistical Services, Zimbabwe. In this case, a gender analysis was incorporated within a programme around trials set up to address soil acidity problems by the addition of lime in a maize/groundnut mixture.

FIRST TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on the interventions

- What key resources are involved: land, labour, time/energy, lime, crops?
- What new activities will be introduced (over and above those normally involved to produce these same crops)?
- What will additional financial costs be?
- What changes are expected in crop/field as a result of adding lime?
- How would the trial/ test be described, including differences from 'normal' practice (mixed cropping etc.)

SECOND TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on locally significant categories of households and other possible units of analysis and individuals

- How will locally significant different categories of households, etc. be identified?

THIRD TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on gender concerns

Key Research Questions

- What is the likely effect of liming on gender equity?
(Who is likely to benefit and who to lose?)

Specific research questions

- Who 'owns' the field?
- Who takes what decisions relating to the field and the crops?
- Who is responsible for completing tasks on the field?
- Who controls crops (and other benefits) produced?

FOURTH TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on strategies and negotiation

Key Research Questions

- What is the impact of lime on the crop management strategy of women and men?

Specific research questions

- What are the interests of women and men in different crops?
- How do women and men decide on where to grow the different crops?
- What interests do women and men have in the limed field and the crops on it?
- Have there been changes in crop allocation in the limed field as a result of the experiment? (What are the implications of these changes?)

Continued

FOURTH TYPE OF INFORMATION

Information on strategies and negotiation

Additional questions that might have been asked around the joint and separate livelihood interests of those concerned:

- Who has an “interest” in the maize and groundnuts?
- What did you get from the groundnut/maize crop last season?
- How much was sold and how much was kept for consumption?
- How was this determined? (Who took what decisions and at what point in the year i.e., immediately after harvest, 2 months later, etc. What bargaining took place?)
- Is there any difference between the output from different fields?
- What is the value of the groundnuts/maize for meeting the livelihood needs of the women and men involved?
- How is change likely to be valued? i.e., of expected project outcomes
- How do these fit into the interests and strategies indicated from answers to the questions above? (How does this fit into the individual and joint plans and trends in their livelihoods?)

Further information about the LSP

The Livelihood Support Programme (LSP) works through the following sub-programmes:

Improving people's access to natural resources

Access of the poor to natural assets is essential for sustainable poverty reduction. The livelihoods of rural people with limited or no access to natural resources are vulnerable because they have difficulty in obtaining food, accumulating assets, and recuperating after shocks or misfortunes.

Participation, Policy and Local Governance

Local people, especially the poor, often have weak or indirect influence on policies that affect their livelihoods. Policies developed at the central level are often not responsive to local needs and may not enable access of the rural poor to needed assets and services.

Livelihoods diversification and enterprise development

Diversification can assist households to insulate themselves from environmental and economic shocks, trends and seasonality – in effect, to be less vulnerable. Livelihoods diversification is complex, and strategies can include enterprise development.

Natural resource conflict management

Resource conflicts are often about access to and control over natural assets that are fundamental to the livelihoods of many poor people. Therefore, the shocks caused by these conflicts can increase the vulnerability of the poor.

Institutional learning

The institutional learning sub-programme has been set up to ensure that lessons learned from cross-departmental, cross-sectoral team work, and the application of sustainable livelihoods approaches, are identified, analysed and evaluated for feedback into the programme.

Capacity building

The capacity building sub-programme functions as a service-provider to the overall programme, by building a training programme that responds to the emerging needs and priorities identified through the work of the other sub-programmes.

People-centred approaches in different cultural contexts

A critical review and comparison of different recent development approaches used in different development contexts is being conducted, drawing on experience at the strategic and field levels in different sectors and regions.

Mainstreaming sustainable livelihoods approaches in the field

FAO designs resource management projects worth more than US\$1.5 billion per year. Since smallholder agriculture continues to be the main livelihood source for most of the world's poor, if some of these projects could be improved, the potential impact could be substantial.

Sustainable Livelihoods Referral and Response Facility

A Referral and Response Facility has been established to respond to the increasing number of requests from within FAO for assistance on integrating sustainable livelihood and people-centred approaches into both new and existing programmes and activities.

For further information on the Livelihood Support Programme,
contact the programme coordinator:
Email: LSP@fao.org

LSP WORKING PAPERS to December 2006

- Baumann P., (July 2002) **Improving Access to Natural Resources for the Rural Poor: A critical analysis of central concepts and emerging trends from a sustainable livelihoods perspective.** FAO, LSP WP 1, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Cotula L., (August 2002) **Improving Access to Natural Resources for the Rural Poor: The experience of FAO and of other key organizations from a sustainable livelihoods perspective.** FAO, LSP WP 2, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Karl M., (August 2002) **Participatory Policy Reform from a Sustainable Livelihoods Perspective: Review of concepts and practical experiences.** FAO, LSP WP 3, Participation, Policy and Local Governance Sub-Programme. Also available in Spanish and French.
- Warren P., (December 2002) **Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development: An initial exploration of Concepts and Issues.** FAO, LSP WP 4, Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development Sub-Programme.
- Cleary D., with contributions from Pari Baumann, Marta Bruno, Ximena Flores and Patrizio Warren (September 2003) **People-Centred Approaches: A brief literature review and comparison of types.** FAO, LSP WP 5, People-Centered Approaches in Different Cultural Contexts Sub-Programme. Also available in Spanish and French.
- Seshia S. with Scoones I., Environment Group, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK (November 2003) **Understanding Access to Seeds and Plant Genetic Resources. What Can a Livelihoods Perspective Offer?** FAO, LSP WP 6, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Biggs S. D., and Messerschmidt D., (December 2003) **The Culture of Access to Mountain Natural Resources: Policy, Processes and Practices.** FAO, LSP WP 7, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Evrard O., (Janvier 2004) **La mise en oeuvre de la réforme foncière au Laos : Impacts sociaux et effets sur les conditions de vie en milieu rural** (with summary in English). FAO, LSP WP 8, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Ellis F., Allison E., Overseas Development Group, University of Anglia, UK (January 2004) **Livelihood Diversification and Natural Resource Access.** FAO, LSP WP 9, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme, Livelihood Diversification and Enterprise Development Sub-Programme.
- Hodgson S., (March 2004) **Land and Water – the rights interface.** FAO, LSP WP 10, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Mitchell R. and Hanstad T., Rural Development Institute (RDI), USA, (March 2004) **Small homegarden plots and sustainable livelihoods for the poor.** FAO LSP WP 11, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Hanstad T., Nielsen R., Brown J., Rural Development Institute (RDI), USA, (May 2004) **Land and Livelihoods: Making land rights real for India's rural poor.** FAO LSP WP 12, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Fisher R.J., Schmidt K., Steenhof B. and Akenshaev N., (May 2004) **Poverty and forestry : A case study of Kyrgyzstan with reference to other countries in West and Central Asia.** FAO LSP WP 13, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Cotula L., and Toulmin, C. with van Vlaenderen, H., Tall, S.M., Gaye, G., Saunders, J., Ahiadeke, C. and Anarfi, J.K, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), UK (July 2004) **Till to tiller: Linkages between international remittances and access to land in West Africa.** FAO LSP WP 14, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Baumann P., Bruno M., Cleary D., Dubois O. and Flores X., with contributions from Warren P., Maffei T. and Johnson J. (March 2004) **Applying people centred development approaches within FAO: some practical lessons.** FAO LSP WP 15, People Centred Approaches in Different Development Contexts Sub-Programme. Also available in Spanish and French.
- Neely C., Sutherland K., and Johnson J. (October 2004) **Do sustainable livelihoods approaches have a positive impact on the rural poor? – A look at twelve case studies.** FAO LSP WP 16, Institutional Learning Sub-Programme.
- Norfolk S. (2004) **Examining access to natural resources and linkages to sustainable livelihoods: A case study of Mozambique.** FAO LSP WP 17, Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Unruh J. (2004). **Post-conflict land tenure: using a sustainable livelihoods approach.** FAO LSP WP 18. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.

- Eckman, C. (2005). **Lessons Learned by the WIN Project on Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development: An Overview of WIN LDED-related Activities in Cambodia, Nepal and Zambia.** FAO LSP WP 19. Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development Sub-Programme.
- Warren, P. (2005). **Between the Household and the Market: A livelihoods analysis of SPFS seed multiplication in Southern Guatemala.** FAO LSP WP 20. Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development Sub-Programme.
- Strele M., Holtge K., Fiebeger M., Were J., Schulmeister A., with contributions from Weingartner L., (2006) **Participatory Livelihoods Monitoring . Linking Programmes and Poor People's Interests to Policies Experiences from Cambodia.** FAO LSP WP 21. Participation, Policy and Local Governance Sub-Programme.
- Unruh J. and Turray H. (2006). **Land tenure, food security and investment in postwar Sierra Leone.** FAO LSP WP 22. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Nielsen R., Hanstad T., and Rolfes L. **Rural Development Institute (RDI). (2006). Implementing homestead plot programmes: Experience from India.** FAO LSP WP 23. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Quan, J. Natural Resources Institute University of Greenwich. (2006). **Land access in the 21st century: Issues, trends, linkages and policy options.** FAO LSP WP 24. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Cotula L., Hesse C., Sylla O., Thébaud B., Vogt G., and Vogt K. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). (2006.) **Land and water rights in the Sahel: Tenure challenges of improving access to water for agriculture.** FAO LSP WP 25. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Gomes N. (2006). **Access to water, pastoral resource management and pastoralists' livelihoods: Lessons learned from water development in selected areas of Eastern Africa (Kenya, Ethiopia, Somalia).** FAO LSP WP 26. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Tanner C., Baleira S., Norfolk S., Cau B. and Assulai J. (2006). **Making rights a reality: Participation in practice and lessons learned in Mozambique.** FAO LSP WP 27. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Tanner C. and Baleira S. with Afonso Â, Azevedo J. P., Bila J., Chichava C., Moisés A., Pedro C. and Santos J. (2006). **Mozambique's legal framework for access to natural resources: The impact of new legal rights and community consultations on local livelihoods.** FAO LSP WP 28. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Romano F. and Reeb D. (2006). **Understanding forest tenure: What rights and for whom? Secure forest tenure for sustainable forest management and poverty alleviation: the case of South and Southeast Asia, with case studies of Orissa and Meghalaya, India and Nepal.** FAO LSP WP 29. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Lindsay J., Wingard J. and Manaljav Z. (2006). **Improving the legal framework for participatory forestry: Issues and options for Mongolia.** FAO LSP WP 30. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Schmidt S. with Altanchimeg C., Tungalagtuya K., Narangerel Y., Ganchimeg D., Erdenechimeg B., Dambayuren S. and Battogoo D. New Zealand Nature Institute - Initiative for People Centered Conservation. (2006). **Depleting natural wealth – perpetuating poverty: Rural livelihoods and access to forest resources in Mongolia.** FAO LSP WP 31. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Schmidt S. with Altanchimeg C., Tungalagtuya K., Narangerel Y., Ganchimeg D., Erdenechimeg B., Dambayuren S. and Battogoo D. New Zealand Nature Institute - Initiative for People Centered Conservation. (2006). **Rural livelihoods and access to forest resources in Mongolia: Methodology and case studies of Tsenkher Soum, Ulaan Uul Soum, Binder Soum, Teshig Soum and Baynlig Soum.** FAO LSP WP 32. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Shimizu T. (2006) **Assessing the access to forest resources for improving livelihoods in West and Central Asia countries.** FAO LSP WP 33. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Baumann P. (2006) **Forest - poverty linkages in West and Central Asia: The outlook from a sustainable livelihoods perspective.** FAO LSP WP 34. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Shimizu T., and Trudel M., with case studies by Asanbaeva A., Kananian M., Naseri Gh. and Sülüşoğlu M. (2006). **Methodology and case studies on linkages between poverty and forestry: Afghanistan, Iran, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey.** FAO LSP WP 35. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.

- Åkerlund U., in collaboration with Knuth L., Randrup T. and Schipperijn J. (2006). **Urban and peri-urban forestry and greening in west and Central Asia: Experiences, constraints and prospects**. FAO LSP WP 36. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Knuth L. (2006). **Greening cities for improving urban livelihoods: Legal, policy and institutional aspects of urban and peri-urban forestry in West and Central Asia (with a case study of Armenia)**. FAO LSP WP 37. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Cotula L., Chauveau J-P., Cissé S., Colin J-P., Lavigne Delville P., Neves N., Quan J., and Toulmin C. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). (2006). **Changes in “customary” land tenure systems in Africa**. FAO LSP WP 38. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Rose L. (2006). **Children’s property and inheritance rights and their livelihoods: The context of HIV and AIDS in Southern and East Africa**. FAO LSP WP 39. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Howard P. and Smith E. (2006). **Leaving two thirds out of development: Female headed households and common property resources in the highlands of Tigray, Ethiopia**. FAO LSP WP 40. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.
- Okali C. (2006). **Linking livelihoods and gender analysis for achieving gender transformative change**. FAO LSP WP 41. Access to Natural Resources Sub-Programme.

Livelihood Support Programme (LSP)

Email: LSP@fao.org

from OUTSIDE FAO:

http://www.fao.org/sd/dim_pe4/pe4_040501_en.htm

from INSIDE FAO:

<http://intranet.fao.org/en/departments/sd/en/projects/lsp/index.html>