

# ***GENDER, GLOBALIZATION AND LAND TENURE PUBLICATION WORKSHOP***

## **Final Report**

September 26-30, 2005

**IDRC**  
International Development  
Research Centre



**CRDI**  
Centre de recherches pour le  
développement international



## TABLE OF CONTENT

---

1. Publication Synopsis Document.....	3
2. Possible Book Layout.....	8
3. Editing and Time Lines.....	11
4. Chapter outlines.....	13
i. Brazil.....	14
ii. Ghana.....	16
iii. Vietnam.....	20
iv. Cameroon.....	22
5. End of Workshop Reports (Fiona Mackenzie/ Allison Goebel) .....	24
6. Compiled workshop evaluations.....	37
APPENDIX.....	40
I. Agenda.....	40
II. Literature review.....	48
III. List of participants.....	73
IV. Research results presentations..... (Hard Copies to be placed in Centre Files only)	
V. Rough Notes Day 1-2-3.....	75
VI. Rough notes from small groups session and methodology...	87

# **1. PUBLICATION SYNOPSIS DOCUMENT**

---

## **1. Working title**

**Land Tenure, Gender and Globalisation: Working The Connections**

## **2. Names and affiliations of editors**

### **Contributing editors (listed in alphabetical order):**

Mariama Awumbila, University of Ghana, Ghana

Joyce Bayande Endeley, University of Buea, Cameroon

Allison Goebel, Queen's University, Canada

Pamela Golah, International Development Research Centre, Canada

Khuat Thu Hong, Institute for Social Development Studies, Hanoi, Vietnam

A. Fiona D. Mackenzie, Carleton University, Canada

Nguyen Thi Van Anh, Institute for Social Development Studies, Hanoi, Vietnam

Noemi Miyasaka Porro, Associação do Movimento Interestadual das Quebraeiras de Coco Babaçu, Brazil

Fondo Sikod, University of Yaounde II, Cameroon

Dzodzi Tsikata, University of Ghana, Ghana

Alfredo Wagner Berno de Almedia, Brazil

## **3. Synopsis**

The main objective of the book is to explore the diversity of ways through which gender is negotiated in the context of changes in systems of land tenure which are, in turn, linked to processes operating at the global level. Through case studies located in four places - the Amazon forests (of Brazil, Bolivia, Peru), Cameroon, Ghana and Vietnam - the relationship between gender and the land is traced with a view to revealing both the specificities of the workings of global capital and of people's responses to it. In the Amazon forests, the focus is on the social movements which have emerged in the context of struggles over land rights which have to do with the extraction of Brazil nuts and

babaçu kernels in an increasingly globalised market in nuts and vegetable oils. In Cameroon, the research centres on the recently constructed Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline, the aim being to examine how processes of social differentiation and rights to land were caught up in this project. Two research sites are explored in Ghana - one in North Eastern Ghana, where the focus is on small-scale gold mining, the second in South Eastern Ghana where mangrove resources are exploited. In each case, discussion of the relationship between land tenure and local people illustrates different dimensions of the intricacy of the workings of global capital, here centering on processes of economic liberalisation and the experience of social and economic insecurity for many associated with structural adjustment programmes. In Vietnam, it is the process of decollectivising rights to land, associated with the repudiation of a centrally-planned economy in the 1980s, that is examined with a view to understanding how gender and other social differences are reworked in a market economy. In each situation, there is a concern to make visible people's resistance to, or challenging of, global forces, frequently through an insistence on the uniqueness of their livelihoods.

While the case studies demonstrate considerable conceptual diversity, they have in common a commitment to disturbing the 'given-ness' of the central themes around which the book is organised. 'Gender', 'land' and 'globalisation' are questioned in terms of their adequacy as analytical categories. Thus, for example, gender may be recognised as a key axis of social differentiation, but it is also seen as articulated with 'class', age, marital status, stage of the life cycle, ethnicity, social position, level of formal education, as examples. And it may not always be the most visible social difference. Innovatively, some of the case studies show that not only are existing social categories re-worked through struggles over rights to land, but that new categories may emerge as people try to strengthen their political positions. The research further demonstrates the importance of exploring identities, including gender, not only through a focus on individual experience - necessary in order to probe the often contested terrain of the household - but also through the mobilisation of collective identities in the new political spaces created through the intersection of the local with the global.

Similarly, 'land' is conceptualised as always in the process of 'becoming'. Land may, as the means of production, have an obvious materiality, but each case study shows how the struggle for land rights also takes place through a contestation of the meanings of the land. At times, this is evident within the framework of statutory rights; at other times, the struggle concerns the constant renegotiation of customary law. One question that emerges is, who can draw on which legal resources - of state or custom in situations of legal plurality - in the attempt to exert individual or collective claims to the land in the new political and economic contexts? Further questions that emerge from some of the case studies concern the relationship between rights to labour and rights to land: to what extent are rights to land related to the exercise of rights to labour? To what extent is this relationship undergoing change with growing commodification of the land? And does the relationship between land and labour play itself out differently where land is an abundant rather than a scarce resource?

Globalisation, in so far as it concerns contemporary policies and practices of trade liberalisation and structural adjustment, or a growing 'ethic' of privatisation that has specific meanings for land tenure reform, as well as its historical (colonial and post-independence) antecedents ('betterment', 'development', 'modernisation'), may be recognised as 'context' for what goes on at the local level, but the research identified here challenges the view that it is nothing but context. A conceptual thread that runs through the research is that globalisation is a process through which social categories, such as those of gender, class, ethnicity, are constituted. To differing degrees, some of the case studies importantly also make visible how globalisation as process is contested. There is, for example, among the women breakers of Brazil nuts and babaçu kernel breakers of the Amazon forests no acceptance of the inevitability of trade relations which work against their interests. Rather, the response is one of collective mobilisation and action at a number of scales. Together, the case studies show how heterogeneous the experiences of and responses to globalisation are. Again innovatively, and investigated more centrally in some case studies than in others, the research demonstrates how processes of globalisation are bound up with the creation of discourses of 'nature'. This is not simply a matter of examining 'environmental impact', for example, of an oil pipeline, small-scale surface gold mining, or the privatisation of paddy fields, although it may be recognised that an intensification of exploitation of the environment in any of these sites is part and parcel of the exploitation of the land, tied in turn into the workings of global capital. It is rather a matter of exploring how 'nature', as a social construct, enters the vocabularies of actors who seek to make claims to the land. Expressed otherwise, how, through claims to 'nature', are political positions *vis à vis* the land created or consolidated?

#### **4. Special features**

a. The book addresses a gap in the literature on land tenure and gender in the South. It does so by tracing, through case studies in four different contexts, how processes of globalisation play themselves out with respect to the reworking of rights to land and the reconstitution of social categories such as gender. Through in-depth qualitative research, some of it ethnographic, it addresses the question: how does each situation contribute to an understanding of the interrelationships among gender, rights to land, and global capital? The research raises new questions about the process of globalisation, particularly about who the actors are - local people, the state, non-governmental organisations, multinational companies - and the shifting relations among them.

b. Methodologically, a key feature of the book is the visibility accorded to the research process. This includes discussion of the 'field' experiences of four research teams, of their reflection on the research process, and of how the research contributed to building research capacity. The last includes an examination of cases where participatory action research was carried out with social movements in the Amazon forests, where South-South dialogue and networking was fostered, and where institutional research capacity was enhanced. This is research for social change and key issues of social justice are central to the project.

## 5. Audience

- a. Academics, researchers, postgraduate and senior undergraduate students in the social sciences.
- b. Professionals in donor and development agencies.
- c. Policy and decision makers in government, international development agencies, and civil society (non-governmental organisations).

## 6. Schedule

Ready to go out for review in September 2006.

## 7. Table of Contents

Foreword - possibly by Bina Agarwal

Preface - including discussion of the background to the project - Pamela Golah

**Chapter 1 Towards a conceptual framework** (approx. 10,000 words)

A. Fiona D. Mackenzie

**Chapter 2 Reflections on research methodology** (10,000 - 12,000 words)

Allison Goebel, with research teams and Pamela Golah

**Chapter 3 Gender Equity, Changing Rural Livelihoods and Land Tenure Reforms in Ghana** (10,000 - 12,000 words)

Dzodzi Tsikata and Mariana Awumbila

**Chapter 4 The impact of the Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline operations on gender relations, land resources in selected communities in Cameroon** (approx. 12,000 words)

Joyce Bayande Endeley and Fondo Sikod

**Chapter 5 Gender, land tenure and globalisation in Vietnam** (approx. 12,000 words)

Khuat Thu Hong and Nguyen Thi Van Anh

**Chapter 6** **Facing the global market: new strategies by women in extractive activities in the Amazon forests of Bolivia, Brazil and Peru** (approx. 12,000 words)

Noemi Miyasaka Porro and Alfredo Wagner Berno de Almeida

**Chapter 7** **Conclusion** (approx. 5,000 words)

(To be decided)

**References**

## 2. POSSIBLE BOOK LAYOUT

---

A starting point for discussion, 30 September 2005

2 pages	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Foreword</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Short think piece -- broad brush to issue</li> </ul>	<u>To be identified</u>
Chapter 4-5 pages	<p>Preface</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Call for papers</li> <li>○ Background of how the project came into being</li> <li>○ Objective of the book</li> <li>○ Dialogue and organization of the project</li> </ul>	<b>Pamela and others</b>
Chapter 40 book pages	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Literature review (will make links)</li> <li>○ Conceptual Approaches</li> <li>○ Introduction of Each Chapter</li> </ul>	Fiona (Contributions from each Researchers)
Chapter	<p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Capacity Building</li> <li>○ Levels of methodology – impact of having a project funded from Donor, how this facilitates choices around methodology</li> </ul>	Allison Pamela (Contributions from each Researchers)
Chapter	The Impact Of The Chad – Cameroon Oil Pipeline Operations On Gender Relations, Land Resources And Community Livelihood	Cameroon authors
Chapter	Women’s Rights and Access to land in Vietnam	Vietnam authors
Chapter	Facing the Global Market: New Strategies by Women in Extractive Activities in the	Brazil authors

	Amazon Forests of Bolivia, Brazil and Peru	
Chapter	Gender Equity, Rural Livelihoods And Land Tenure Reforms In Ghana	Ghana authors
Chapter 10 pages	Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New Research Directions (theoretical, methodology)</li> <li>○ Review of conclusions from all the chapters</li> </ul>	Lead ? All Authors Perhaps different people can take responsibility for different parts.
Chapter		

### Notes from conversation with Bill Carmen

#### How should we order the book?

- Chapter ordering can be reviewed after the introductory chapter is written
- Think about moving from broader to more specific studies

#### How long should the book be?

- 300 pages
- Word count no more than 100 000 (including references)
- 40 book pages / 10 000 – 12 000 words (text, pictures, photos, etc)
- One list of references at the end
- Images (make sure you have high resolution photo – 300 dpi)
- Photos in black and white
- Remember data behind the graph (publisher will need this)
- Map (supply jpeg of map or tif i.e. file)

#### What is the best publisher for the book?

- Many will be interested in this book
- Bill – take the book proposal, circulate to number of publishers (ZED, Routledge, Asia, LA, EarthScan etc)
- We may have to choose the publisher

#### Preferences? ---

- African Book Collective is good for distribution
- Price? Some publishers has a differential scheme
- IDRC tries to get publishers form the South as a partner --Partnership (IDRC- Northern Publisher- Southern Publisher)
- IDRC will try to get enough book to make an initial distribution
- We will put the book on website and on CD-ROM (freely available)
- Zed – may not be interested—now focussing on single author books
- IDRC – Co-publisher buyback
- Print Run determined by publisher

- Style sheets (Chicago Style – keep notes as endnotes, rather than footnotes)

### **Peer Review**

- Added Value – before going to the publisher
- Build a peer review process in the process
- We have to do this before submitting it to the publisher
- Publisher (will just send to a reader)
- Different Publishers? Different Policies? – Some publishers will undertake a peer review
- This one may not receive a peer review (as opposed to an academic monologue)
- Maybe we should embed peer review into the editing process.
- Circulation among ourselves is not peer review (we have an authorship)
- We have to identify an external academic

### **Translation**

**○ 3. DRAFT - COLLABORATIVE EDITING AND TIME LINES**

Literature review	August 31-05	Commission Pam
End of Project/Publication Workshop	Sep 26-30	Organize Pam
Detailed Chapter Outlines	Sep 26-30	All authors
Write Publication Synthesis Document and Circulate to list	October 21	Fiona/Pam
Collaborative review of publication synopsis document	November 11	All authors
Final Synopsis Document to be circulated	November 30	Fiona
Submission of Final Reports to IDRC	December 28	All authors
Submission of draft introductory chapter	December	Fiona
Submission of draft introductory chapter Methodology	December	Allison
Collaborative review & submission of written comments on draft chapters on methodology and Introduction	End of Feb	All authors & Pam to synthesize
Submission of case study draft chapters and circulation to list	Mar 31	All authors
Collaborative review and submission of written comments (project team to project team review)	April 30	All authors
Submission of Revised draft chapters (excluding conclusion)	May 30	All authors
Submission of comments on manuscript	August	All Authors

(excluding conclusions) – include contributions for conclusion		
Preparation of Concluding chapter	September	All Authors
Review of conclusion	October	All Authors
Revision of conclusion and Submission of Final Chapters for manuscript before it goes for peer review	November	All Authors
Revision of Manuscript		
Send for copy editing		

- Fiona – supportive of this process of collaborative inputs
- Can we think about one team commenting on another teams work instead of the review of all case chapters?
- Has to be input from everyone for introduction, methodology, and conclusions
- This has to be an iterative process
- Suggestion – perhaps we can stay in the pairs that we used in the workshop
- Agreement to comment on one other case study chapter

## 4. CHAPTER OUTLINES

---

### BRAZIL

#### 1. Introduction (2 pages)

In this section we will:

- give a brief general overview of the contexts of our five research sites;
- describe methodological and theoretical frameworks from which the research was launched;
- describe how each studied social group has elicited their social identities, and how these identities and ways of life were connected/based on the relationship with their lands and forests;
- begin to introduce the reader to our concerns with new social identities, their positioning in the political arena and their perceptions of the globalization processes;
- call the attention on how gender is an intrinsic component of these social identities and, therefore, how gender is an integral part of the struggles to sustain their own ways of life in dealing with markets in the process of globalization;

#### 2. Narratives from the field (7 cases x 4 pages each = 28 pages)

- 2.1. Comunarias: Brazil-nut gatherers in the Manuripi Wildlife Reserve
- 2.2. Seringueiras: Brazil-nut gatherers in the Chico Mendes Extractive Reserve
- 2.3. Concessionarias: Brazil-nut gatherers in Peruvian Concessions
- 2.4. Castaneros: Brazil-nut gatherers in Bolivia
- 2.5. Fabriles: Brazil-nut peeler in a Bolivian Cooperative factory
- 2.6. Peladoras: Brazil-nut peeler in a Peruvian Alternative Trade Organization
- 2.7. Quebradeiras: Babaçu Breaker Women

- Each of these narratives will describe their unique social identities, emerged from diverse economic and social positions. Their positions in the political arena are also diverse: there are situations ranging from nationally and internationally recognized social movements to completely ignored strategies of social and resource mobilization at family and community levels;
- Women are reinterpreting their relations with nature and their gender relations. There are cases in which, by transposing their struggles for land and forest resources to a political and public arena, women are managing to transform customary, traditional, culturally defined roles for gender and corresponding relationships with land and forests. They break with the fixed, frozen aspects of culture and embrace the dynamism of their ways of life. This dynamism is reflected in the changes in the patterns of relationships with land and forests, and even of the very own kinship relations.
- In the observed cases, there is a pattern of grandmothers currently assuming, through matrifocal practices, the social, economic and political reproduction of the social groups. These protagonists have not always followed the conventionally

recognized representations of the social movements. Although they are in the federations, unions, associations and women's groups, much can be observed in family and community-based strategies of social mobilization. The fragility and vulnerability of these protagonists express the contradictions and possibilities between global trends fragmenting solidarities and the emergence of new forms of associations.

- Diverse forms of regulating access and control over land and forests are in the edge of succumbing to the forces of global markets. Protected areas and reserves, including those allowing extractive activities, have been threatened by the pavement of roads built to connect Amazonian resources to markets around the globe.

### **3. Discussion ( 8 pages)**

- Gender as a concept (as local NGOs and agencies in Latin America usually know and apply today) has emerged from contexts and agents that are either alien or antagonistic to the studied subjects. As the construction of the social actor man and the social actor woman is carried out by the way people live, gender is intrinsic to their livelihoods and to understand gender we have to understand their livelihoods, which include their struggles in the political arena;
- More fixed notions of traditions and customary norms should be revised. Conceptually speaking, today traditional can not be understood within a temporal or historic linearity. Tradition is an essential component of the present; it is not a residue, a remnant factor. In the global market discourses, propaganda and marketing recalls “from the ancient and exotic Amazonian traditions...” These can be examined as ways of erasing the present political struggles of the current actors, and mask the promoters and drivers of these markets as antagonists and threats to their ways of life that assure their citizenship in the present.
- Globalization can be conceptualized as deliberate acts by specific agents constituting a process, expressed by a set of phenomena and contexts. These deliberated acts are translated into neo-liberal policies, which affect national policies and national and international markets. Although the ruling notion moving this process is homogenization in diverse fields, including legal frameworks, it has instead stressed differences, for the diverse readings, interpretations and counteracts emerging from the impacted fields. Although the national policies have incorporated neo-liberal economic policies as the only venue for development, our field observations have not revealed direct effects and expected reactions.
- The emergence of new social identities implies new perceptions and relationships with the land and markets. Therefore, we observed differentiated processes of construction of territories (*territorialization process*), inherently correlated to such identities. These processes lead these social groups to break up with the conventional geographic, juridical, agrarian, and historical norms regulating land and markets. Authorities emitting “certificates”, an almost mandatory “pass” sanctioning access and circulation in lands and markets ruled by the global order. These “passes” (authorizing “rights of passage” in the so-called “free” market) have not been recognized by social groups assuming new identities, as resources and spaces are already perceived as part of their own territories.

#### **4. Conclusion ( 2 pages)**

Reflecting critically on the examined cases, we learned that gender and land imply simultaneously in diverse forms of perceiving and diverse forms of concretely acting upon these perceptions. The current social movements have translated their struggles into concrete counteracts, which all challenge the authorities intending to homogenize and generalize their ways of living, as men and women, their relationships with land and forests.

## GHANA

**Title: *Gender Equity, Changing Rural Livelihoods and Land Tenure Reforms in Ghana.***

### **Chapter Outline: Ghana Study**

#### **1. Introduction:**

This chapter's contribution is what it illuminates about a) the interconnectedness of processes of economic liberalization, the increased competition for hitherto marginal resources and changing land and resource tenures; and b) the implications of these developments for rural livelihoods and the social relations underpinning the exploitation of resources. This is done with a study focusing on the increased importance of two different kinds of resources- gold and mangroves for two different communities with particular socio-economic trajectories and inhabiting environmental contexts with distinct characteristics.

The chapter also contributes to some of the debates in the literature on gender and land tenure. The case study on mangroves illustrates how legal pluralism operates in practice, showing clearly the interconnectedness of statutory and customary land tenures and therefore the need to look beyond such dichotomies in the search for land tenure systems which address the needs of the disadvantaged social groups. The study on mining illustrates the modification and creation of social identities in the struggle over resources and the intersection of several social relations in the organization of land tenure and livelihoods. Both studies draw attention to the importance of examining the linkages between labour and land relations in order to properly appreciate the processes of land and resource tenure change.

The Chapter is structured as follow: The introduction is followed by a section discussing the literature and the conceptual and methodological issues. The background and contextual aspects of the study are discussed, followed by two sections which focus on two case studies. Section six then discusses the similarities and specificities of the two cases studies and their implications for the literature. This is followed by a discussion of the policy implications of the study, specifically what it means for the ongoing Land Tenure Reforms in Ghana. A summary and conclusion follow.

#### **2. The Literature, Conceptual and methodological issues**

The chapter will review three main bodies of literature- studies of rural livelihoods and land tenure, feminist literature on gender and land tenure and studies of gold mining and mangrove exploitation. Within this literature, four main issues will be explored. These are the issue of legal pluralism; the land-labour nexus, the flexibility or otherwise of land tenure norms, the intersections of various social relations in land tenure and livelihoods, and discussions about commercialization and access.

Regarding conceptual questions, the paper will explore how the key concepts of the study, globalization, environmental change, land tenure and social relations and gender have been used. This section will focus on the importance of working out the inter-linkages of these different concepts. As well, the ways in which the various

concepts are used will be discussed. This will include the view that globalization is both context and process; the idea that environmental change is a dimension of globalization processes even though the environmental changes which frame our study predated the liberalization agenda of the 80s. However, liberalization and commercialisation within the context of gold mining and mangrove exploitation have had serious environmental impacts. Regarding land tenure, we draw attention to the importance of the distinction between land and resource tenure and the challenges of maintaining this distinction in the field especially in relation to the mangrove areas.

The main methodological issues we focus on include the challenges of capturing social relations and social change and operationalising concepts and the questions of which methods are best suited for particular research questions and objectives. The particular questions of ethics which arose in the research and our experiences with the different research instruments will also receive some attention. This section also sets out the methods used in the study which included in-depth interviews of local leaders and officials, life histories, resource mapping, transect walks and a survey as well as the procedures of the study. The analytical strategies of the study will also be discussed.

### 3. Background / Context for the study

This section discusses the environment under which globalisation in the form of economic liberalisation policies have impacted on local livelihood systems. It will provide an historical analysis of colonial and post independence policies and examine how these are implicated in the situation of communities in the two research areas. It will also describe the environmental deterioration taking place in north eastern Ghana as a result of changing climatic conditions and in the Lower Volta Area as a result of the impact of the construction of the Akosombo dam (1965) and the Kpong dam (1982) on the volta river for hydro-electric power. These ecological conditions in the areas have combined with colonial legacies and post independence policies to leave the two areas very deprived and areas of high out migration.

The main argument in this section will be that macro level policies in the form of economic liberalisation policies and the damming of the Volta River to produce hydro electric power for national development have either resulted in or combined with in environmental changes. This has added new economic pressures to the challenges facing already marginalised regions, leading to the diminishing of traditional livelihood activities and setting the stage for the re-structuring of livelihoods. It will also discuss land tenure systems in Ghana and the factors structuring access to land and other resources. The section also discusses the construction of gender relations in Ghana, drawing attention to how it is often intersected by other social relations which then determine access to resources and labour relations as a basis for livelihoods. This section forms the basis for the discussion of the two case studies.

### 4. Case Study 1: Of Shanking Ladies, Ghetto Owners and Loco Boys: Small-scale Gold Mining In Tallensi Nabdram District

This section will provide an analysis of the introduction of small scale mining into the Tallensi-Nabdam District since the early 1990s and the impact this has had on the local economy, land use and tenure and gender and other social relations.

It will examine the participation of locals and migrants in mining and the emerging hierarchies of participation with different labour relations based on a combination of ethnicity, gender, migrant status and access to capital and the implications for the nature of local participation in mining. It will argue that struggles over resources and emerging labour relations have brought about new social identities in mining areas. The gendered health implications and risks of the technologies and organisation of small scale mining will be analysed.

The land tenure system of the area will be discussed focusing on the complications of legal plurality, its gendered implications and the impact of the expansion of small scale gold mining on farming and other livelihood activities as well as on land use tenure and conflicts. It will also discuss how these are impacting on gender relations. The central argument here will be that the relative abundance of land and the integration of mining with farming and other income generating activities have been factors in the low incidence of land use conflicts. However, this integration has different implications for men and women and for migrants and locals. Finally sustainability issues particularly impact of mining on the environment will be examined.

##### 5. Case Study 2: Changing the Rules of the Game: Pursuing the Logic of Increased Competition and Commoditisation in the Lower Volta.

The mangrove case study examines the changing importance of mangrove resources in the study community and their transformation after the Akosombo dam into an important activity in the livelihood portfolios of both men and women. The case also examines how the customary rules of land and resource tenure were changed through the deployment of litigation in the courts resulting in the transformation of mangrove tenure. The particular importance of gender relations in the exploitation of mangroves and the gendered nature of work and earnings from mangroves in a situation where the majority of the population now have to purchase mangroves will also be considered. This will be linked with the gender and age segmentation of other livelihood activities and the implications of this for livelihood outcomes. The section will also address the importance of labour relations in the transformation of land and resource tenure.

The main arguments of this section would be that Akosombo Dam plus environmental degradation changed the importance of mangrove resources and resulted in their increased exploitation and commercialization. With the commercialization of mangroves and the resultant reorganization of mangrove tenures, there is increasing insecurities and tensions around mangrove exploitation. The labour relations of exploitation have meant that men and women are enjoying differential benefits from mangrove resources and from other livelihood activities. The section also tackles issues of sustainability arising from changing mangrove tenures and their long term implications for the livelihoods in an area of substantial male out-migration, gendered livelihood activities and their organization and extensive child labour practices.

## 6. Discussing the Two Case studies.

In the section which discusses the two case studies, we draw the similarities and contrasts between the cases and examine their implications for understanding the problematic of the study, i.e. how the increased competition for hitherto marginal resources affects the livelihoods of men and women. We note the difference between our two cases arising from environmental contextual issues, the characteristics of the resources and their forms of exploitation, the technologies and capital base needed for exploitation, the terms of access, the rigidity and flexibility of the sexual division of labour and what this implies for returns; the social relations of exploitation and the construction of various identities and questions of sustainability. This section also returns to literature in discussing how the cases illustrate, confirm or challenge some of the conclusions in the current literature. We argue that these processes have to be situated within the globalizing discourses around the commercialization of land and its benefits especially for the poor and for women. Also, that the resort to the courts to change traditional mangrove tenures is a powerful illustration of how legal pluralism works in practice to the detriment of the livelihoods of ordinary persons. The section also examines the debates about whether people have to turn to the statutory or the customary land laws to realize access to resources and social justice. Other issues to be discussed include the interconnections of land and labour relations; legal pluralism and the flexibility of land tenure systems and the advantages of liberalization and commercialization.

## 7. Policy Implications and Implications for the Land Reform Programme

The Section will discuss the implications of the issues arising from the two case studies for the land reform programme (LAP) in Ghana. It will examine the LAP and Land policy as currently designed and analyse how it has addressed questions of gender equity and customary land tenure practices and issues arising from the intersecting social relations of gender, class, kinship and generation.

### Summary Outline and Structure:

1. Introduction 2 pages
2. The literature, conceptual and methodological issues 5 pages
3. The Context/Background: Globalisation, land tenure, social relations and rural livelihoods in North-Eastern and South-Eastern Ghana-5 pages.
4. Case Study 1: Of Shanking Ladies, Ghetto Owners and Loco boys- 10 pages
5. Case Study 2: Changing the Rules of the Game: Pursuing the Logic of Increased Competition and Commoditisation - 10 pages
6. Discussing the two cases- the particularities of the resources and contexts; land and resource tenures and social relations- 5 pages.
7. Policy implications of changing resource tenures and implications for the LAP- 3 pages.
8. Summary and Conclusions- 2 pages

# VIETNAM

## GENDER, LAND TENURE AND GLOBALIZATION IN VIETNAM

### GLOBALIZATION AS A CONTEXT FOR CHANGE (5-6 pages)

#### Socio-Economic reform

*Renovation Policy – Doi moi since 1986 – From central planned economy to free market economy*

- Trade liberalization

#### Agriculture Reform

*Decollectivization: Household becomes basic economic production unit*

- Crop diversification:
- High-yield value crops for trading and export;
- Livestock; aquaculture;

*Agricultural intensification*

- Intensive use of land
- Use of chemical substances (fertilizer, pesticide and other)

#### Land Tenure Reform

- Brief about land reform since 1945
- Land laws and land policy revision: contract system- 1981-1988; Land law 1986; Land law 1993; Land law 2003;
- Land administration – joint land entitlement certification (for entire household)

#### Labour Market and Migration

*International migration:*

- Labour export
- Migration for marriage

*Internal migration: rural to urban migration (long term and seasonal migration)*

analytical framework (2 page)

#### Study sites

#### Target groups

#### Dimensions of analysis:

*North-South*

*Age*

*Marital status*

*Household head*

## Change of meaning of agriculture land and implication on gender relations (25 pages)

### Land is no longer the solely resource for living

*Diversification of job opportunities for men and women (different sources of income)*

*Increase of migration of men:*

- Increase of feminization of agriculture

*Women: More opportunity – more burden*

- Women have more power over land matters (land use, land transactions – regional difference)
- Triple role
- Health hazard

### Land continue to be a primary income source for disadvantaged groups

- Single, divorced, poor households rely on agriculture for living
- Regional difference

### Land attachment – traditional value

*Symbol of homeland*

*Type of asset*

*Land as a source of life security (when facing risk or old age)*

*Issues of land inheritance (men inherit land, women have no land)*

*Role of kinship and traditional norms and values*

## change of land use and emergence of land market

### Change of land use purpose

*Urbanization*

*Industrialization*

*Building infrastructure (road, bridge ...)*

### Tendency of land concentration

#### Implications

- Potential landlessness (men sell land)
- Increase of women's vulnerability: livelihood, power

## conclusion

### **Strong gender implications:**

- Negotiation power over land matters
- Feminization of agriculture
- Women's opportunity and burden (migration, health, work burden)
- Landlessness among young family (increase women's vulnerability)

## CAMEROON

### **THE IMPACT OF THE CHAD – CAMEROON OIL PIPELINE PROJECT ON GENDER RELATIONS AND LAND RESOURCES IN SELECTED COMMUNITIES IN CAMEROON.**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

##### ***The Context:***

Justification of project-several axis such as current macro-policies in Cameroon, Chad and international demand and market for oil; gender in macro-policies in Cameroon.

##### ***Statement of the Problem:***

The Chad – Cameroon Oil pipeline project is a reality and is bound to bring some effects of globalisation to the doorsteps of communities within the scope of this study. The fact that globalisation, like most other events, operates in a gendered context, means that women and men are likely to experience globalisation differently. The multiplicity of inequalities (that result from the intersections of gender, class, education, age, ethnicity and race) in globalisation makes interesting and apt the exploration of changes in gender relations due to the Oil Pipeline project. The emphasis is on changing gender relations as concerns land. The following research questions have emerged and are of interest in this study of the Oil Pipeline project in selected communities in Cameroon:

- How has the project reshaped gender relations as concerns land rights (access, use and control), social behaviour, power relations, community governance and job opportunities?
- How has the different categories of women (widow, married, single, family head) been affected by the project in terms of their rights and entitlements to resources, particularly land, compensation and socio-economic and political positions?
- Has the project adequately compensated the local communities that have been affected? What sort of redress exists for individuals and communities? Who are vulnerable and losers?

##### ***Objectives:***

The paper explores how the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline Project, a globalisation force, is reshaping gender relations in the areas of access to, use and control over important land and land resources in the affected communities.

##### ***Importance of the study:***

There is a dearth of studies on globalization in Cameroon, let alone the gender perspective. Therefore this paper is strategic as it would provide information on how emerging changes due to this globalising-oil project is reshaping gender relations. The information gathered would enable the government, researchers and other interested bodies (such as civil society, human rights and development agencies) to verify if there were major flaws in the transnational investment agreements signed between the government of Cameroon and the pipeline consortium. Beyond the identification of loop-holes and successes, information gathered will provide helpful hints on corrective measures and how to chart the way forward, since the project has a life-span of about 30 years (Nanfosso, 2003:17).

#### **LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

- ***Gender:***

1. a social category of difference and how it plays with other social categories such as age, education, space (rural/urban) and rights in the construction of individual and collective entitlements, opportunities,

- ***Globalisation and gender relations:***

1. Concept of globalisation-as context and process, north construction of the south in globalisation; politics of ecology versus nature-how global vision imposes on local vision; contested (resistance-individual and collective).
  2. Gender relations within globalisation: conceptions of male/female in globalisation, nature of relationship (particular in oil exploration projects)
- ***Land Tenure and gender relations:***
    1. Concept of land tenure-customary; statutory and other forms;
    2. Gender relations to land-rights, use, access, control;
    3. Valuation of land (social, economic, cultural, symbolic-social and material meanings) and the politics of compensation by gender, ethnicity, class
  - ***NGOs/Civil Society and local participation in the globalisation Discourse***

## **METHODOLOGY**

- Study area (characteristics of areas, map and demographics).
- Instrumentation, data collection and analysis

## **RESULTS**

- Description of the pipeline project;
- Description of the gender, gender relations and Land tenure systems in affected communities.
- Construction of gender and other social categories in the project
- Impact of project on the land tenure and gender relations to land (rights, use, access and control).
- Impact of project on land valuation (social, material and symbolic and quantity/scarcity of land) vis-à-vis gender.
- The politics of compensation: debates of ecology vs nature, north construction of the south debate vis-à-vis gender- context of compensation (what was compensated, who, how and why; who was compensated); process of compensation (participation) and quality and adequacy of compensation.
- Community reaction to project: individual and collective support/resistance.
- Issues of rights, capacity building and role of NGOs in local communities.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

- Impact of pipeline project on gender relations to land and tenure systems.
- The role of TNC in the promotion of social development

## **RECOMMENDATION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- Policy makers
- COTCO-project owners
- World Bank
- Affected communities
- Civil societies and others

## **AREA OF FURTHER RESEARCH**

- Need to replicate study in Northern part of Cameroon and Chad for a holistic understanding for better appreciation of the project.

## **End of workshop report Research Competition on Gender, Land Tenure and Globalisation**

**A. Fiona D. Mackenzie**

**14 October 2005**

---

This report is organised in three sections. The first identifies key conceptual and methodological themes that link the four projects. This section also includes a brief commentary on methodological themes; the second reflects on the workshop process; the final section includes comments on the chapter outlines of the individual projects, identifying in particular, conceptual movement or challenges that emerged during the workshop.

### **Key conceptual and methodological themes**

The objective of the research competition was to support research that explored the diversity of ways through which gender is negotiated in the context of changes in land tenure system, changes which are, in turn, linked to processes operating at the global level. Employing a case study approach, four teams conducted research in the Amazon forests (of Brazil, Bolivia, Peru), Cameroon, Ghana and Vietnam, tracing the relationship between gender and the land with a view to revealing both the specificities of the workings of global capital and of people's responses to it. In the Amazon forests, the focus is on the social movements which have emerged in the context of struggles over land rights which have to do with the extraction of Brazil nuts and babaçu kernels in an increasingly globalised market in nuts and vegetable oils. In Cameroon, the research centres on the recently constructed Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline, the aim being to examine how processes of social differentiation and rights to land were caught up in this project. Two research sites are explored in Ghana - one in North Eastern Ghana, where the focus is on small-scale gold mining, the second in South Eastern Ghana where mangrove resources are exploited. In each case, discussion of the relationship between land tenure and local people illustrates different dimensions of the intricacy of the workings of global capital, here centring on processes of economic liberalisation and the experience of social and economic insecurity for many associated with structural adjustment programmes. In Vietnam, it is the process of decollectivising rights to land, associated with the repudiation of a centrally-planned economy in the 1980s, that is examined with a view to understanding how gender and other social differences are reworked in a market economy. In each situation, there is a concern to make visible people's resistance to, or challenging of, global forces, frequently through an insistence on the uniqueness of their livelihoods.

The case studies demonstrate considerable conceptual diversity, but have in common a commitment to disturbing the 'given-ness' of the central themes around which the book is organised. 'Gender', 'land' and 'globalisation' are questioned in terms of their adequacy as analytical categories. Thus, for example, gender may be recognised as a key axis of social differentiation, but it is also seen as articulated with 'class', age, marital status,

stage of the life cycle, ethnicity, social position, level of formal education, as examples. And it may not always be the most visible social difference. Innovatively, some of the case studies show that not only are existing social categories re-worked through struggles over rights to land, but that new categories may emerge as people try to strengthen their political positions. The research further demonstrates the importance of exploring identities, including gender, not only through a focus on individual experience - necessary in order to probe the often contested terrain of the household - but also through the mobilisation of collective identities in the new political spaces created through the intersection of the local with the global.

Similarly, 'land' is conceptualised as always in the process of 'becoming'. Land may, as the means of production, have an obvious materiality, but each case study shows how the struggle for land rights also takes place through a contestation of the meanings of the land. At times, this is evident within the framework of statutory rights; at other times, the struggle concerns the constant renegotiation of customary law. One question that emerges is, who can draw on which legal resources - of state or custom in situations of legal plurality - in the attempt to exert individual or collective claims to the land in the new political and economic contexts? Further questions that emerge from some of the case studies concern the relationship between rights to labour and rights to land: to what extent are rights to land related to the exercise of rights to labour? To what extent is this relationship undergoing change with growing commodification of the land? And does the relationship between land and labour play itself out differently where land is an abundant rather than a scarce resource?

Globalisation, in so far as it concerns contemporary policies and practices of trade liberalisation and structural adjustment, or a growing 'ethic' of privatisation that has specific meanings for land tenure reform, as well as its historical (colonial and post-independence) antecedents ('betterment', 'development', 'modernisation'), may be recognised as 'context' for what goes on at the local level, but the research identified here challenges the view that it is nothing but context. A conceptual thread that runs through the research is that globalisation is a process through which social categories, such as those of gender, class, ethnicity, are constituted. To differing degrees, some of the case studies importantly also make visible how globalisation as process is contested. There is, for example, among the women breakers of Brazil nuts and babaçu kernels of the Amazon forests no acceptance of the inevitability of trade relations which work against their interests. Rather, the response is one of collective mobilisation and action at a number of scales. Together, the case studies show how heterogeneous the experiences of and responses to globalisation are. Again innovatively, and investigated more centrally in some case studies than in others, the research demonstrates how processes of globalisation are bound up with the creation of discourses of 'nature'. This is not simply a matter of examining 'environmental impact', for example, of an oil pipeline, small-scale surface gold mining, or the privatisation of paddy fields, although it may be recognised that an intensification of exploitation of the environment in any of these sites is part and parcel of the exploitation of the land, tied in turn into the workings of global capital. It is rather a matter of exploring how 'nature', as a social construct, enters the vocabularies of

actors who seek to make claims to the land. Expressed otherwise, how, through claims to 'nature', are political positions *vis à vis* the land created or consolidated?

My comments with respect to methodology are less extensive, simply as my remit for the workshop was to focus on conceptual issues. I will make four points. First, to place the research within the larger methodological context, for me an important part of engagement with the research teams has been the building of a collaborative network of researchers, facilitated during the workshops through discussion of a process of collaborative editing of a book. The process of peer review of each proposal, through two research teams working with each other in the workshop, worked very well, and indicates the collaborative ethos that has informed the project. Second, this process has, in turn, facilitated capacity building in a variety of ways. In the cases of Cameroon and Ghana, this may be most visible at the institutional and personal levels. In the case of Vietnam, it would appear that the collaborative process has perhaps benefitted the researchers themselves particularly, in terms of providing them with ideas about how to challenge what appears to be a somewhat formulaic approach to research and analysis of its findings. But it is in the context of research into the Brazil nut and babaçu kernel breakers in the Amazon forests that capacity building has emerged as particularly exciting. Here, it is evident that the research is well-integrated with local women's movements and has the potential to provide insights into the interrelationships between the local and the global that are of immediate benefit to these movements. This is indeed participatory action research.

Third, a key methodological feature of the research has been the use of case studies to facilitate in-depth analysis of the complex interrelationships among gender, land tenure and globalisation. The case study here does not, therefore, consider a locale in isolation from broader political, social and economic currents, as some kind of box whose contents may be understood without recourse to anything outside it. Rather, following what has been called the extended case study method in geography or 'global ethnography' (Burawoy, 2000) in anthropology, each case study engages in an iterative process of teasing out the different ways through which the local and the global interrelate. This probing is achieved through the adoption of different qualitative research methods, some of them ethnographic. The result is exceptionally rich data that do indeed provide insights into these interrelations. As was emphasised in the workshop, the intent of the case study approach was not to move towards generalisation but, recognising the heterogeneity of ways through which global capital works and is resisted, to focus on what each study could say about the particular ways in which the local and the global intersect in the context of the negotiation of gender and changes in tenurial regimes. This, I think, is in the process of being achieved. Finally, a methodological strength of the research has to do with the degree to which each researcher has engaged in a process of reflection of their role in carrying out the research.

### **Reflections on the workshop process**

The central objective of the workshop was to focus on the production of a publication which would disseminate research findings. Although there was a clear commitment to

produce research outputs that would be of popular interest, the workshop itself focused on the production of a book. In working towards this end, the strengths of the workshop included the following:

**1.** An openness to re-examine the workshop process as it progressed and to adjust the schedule (which had previously been circulated to all participants) in line with suggestions. In my view, what contributed substantially to this openness was the decision to place ‘process’ up-front in the first session of the workshop on Monday morning. There was some need to work through a tension between ‘process’ and ‘content’ at this time but, in my view, what emerged was a healthy dialogue which brought to the fore issues such as the process of collaborative editing.

**2.** An ethos of collaborative editing did indeed inform how the workshop was structured, with considerable emphasis placed on the four research teams working in pairs - to consider conceptual and methodological issues on the second and third days and, on the final day, to comment on the chapter outlines which had been produced on the Thursday. This process, in my view, led to a non-hierarchical working relationship among the participants which was a key to the workshop’s success.

**3.** It was essential, I think, to allow plenty of time for the small group sessions to consider conceptual and methodological issues in some depth. The two hours allocated was probably right - it certainly needed a tight discussion, at least as far as my experience with the conceptual sessions went. It was also essential to allow a day for the individual research teams to work on their own and then to exchange their chapter outlines with the team with whom they were paired, for the purpose of feedback on the Friday.

**4.** While I had not been initially convinced of the need for a facilitator, I came to recognise very quickly the considerable skills that Stephanie brought to the workshop. I valued her participation in sessions where I had visible responsibility particularly as it allowed my full attention to be given to the discussions without having to be concerned about recording what was going on

**5.** Finally, with the exception of Bill’s involvement for a specific purpose, those others whom IDRC asked to be involved in the workshop - Allison and myself - were known to the research teams, even if not to every member of each team. This helped to ensure a measure of continuity between the first project workshop and this one. This was also helped by the substantial work that Pamela and others had done in preparing for the workshop. Considerable credit for the success of the workshop should go to them.

## Comments on chapter outlines

(Please note: reference is made both to the 5-page discussion documents that each team prepared prior to the workshop and which focused on conceptual and methodological issues [Document 1] and to the chapter outlines produced by each research team by the end of the workshop [Document 2].

### 1. The Amazon forests - Brazil, Bolivia, Peru

Conceptually and methodologically, I find this research to be the most exciting of the four research projects:

- it is evident from the outline that the researchers are not only working with a theoretical framework that is challenging their thinking about the construction of social categories, and is leading to the identification of new collective and individual identities (for example, the political centrality of grandmothers in the struggle to exert control over the process of nut gathering and breaking), but that this new thinking comes about through an iterative process of constantly re-thinking the meanings of the rich qualitative research data they have collected. They have succeeded in tracing with an unusual degree of clarity and intricacy the mutual constitution of the local and the global.
- further, the researchers' theorisation of resistance is central to this theorisation. The research is exceptionally insightful into the different ways through which people work the connections between the 'local' and the 'global'. In part, this analysis of resistance makes visible the diversity of local initiatives (federations, unions, women's groups .....); it also involves exploring how local people resist 'tradition' or 'customary norms' where these are used discursively by global forces to 'eras[e] the present political struggles of the current actors's' (Document 2, page 2).
- I very much like the way in which the researchers plan to make narratives from the field central to their discussion. This should ensure that the theorisation in which they are engaged is seen to be well-grounded in a rich evidential base.
- a particular strength of this work is the researchers' commitment to action research. It is clear that, whatever the particular struggles this approach to the research encountered, the research has been well-connected with the different local organisations of nut gatherers and breakers.
- in writing the chapter for the book, I think it will be important for the authors to identify explicitly, in the introduction, the main argument they are making. As expressed during the researchers' presentation on the final day of the workshop, I take this to include the idea that people's resistance to, or negotiation of, the global and its processes of homogenising that with which it comes into contact,

centres on the maintenance of the uniqueness or specificity of their lives/livelihoods.

## 2. The Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline

From the presentations and discussions, it is clear that the researchers have collected rich data to investigate the impact of the pipeline on people living in the communities through which it passes. Axes of social differentiation that appear to be analytically significant for this study include gender, generation, 'class' (allied to level of formal education), and ethnicity.

My concern is that the analytical potential of these social constructions is not evident in the written documents produced for the workshop. These documents (particularly Document 1) tend towards the descriptive and generalisable - the impact of the pipeline *on* local people - rather than a focus on examining how social differences were caught up in, or re-made through, this engagement with the 'global'. Certainly the given-ness of, for example, gender is questioned. It is recognised, for instance, that women (and the focus at times did seem to be on 'women' rather than 'gender') could be widowed, married, single, or heads of families. But the *meanings* of gender, in so far as they were linked to processes of globalisation, is less evident in the documents. These came out more clearly in group discussions and conversations I had with the researchers.

The challenge, it seems to me, in the writing of the chapter, will be to encourage such detailed engagement with the data that the tension, between what I read as a discomfort with anything that questions that there is one truth out there to get hold of (a positivist methodology) and the evidence which their in-depth field research has uncovered, is resolved in favour of the latter.

With respect to theorisation, I certainly hope that the authors carry through with respect to incorporating the notion of resistance into their analysis. (It is identified in Document 2, but not in Document 1). Whether or not social mobilisation became very visible, as Noemi pointed out in her commentary of Document 2, there needs to be analysis of how social groups (youth, well-educated people now living in urban centres ..... ) were constituted and how they acted in the context of the new political spaces afforded by the installation of the pipeline. Basically, there needs to be an identification of actors and an analysis of their activities during and after the period of construction. In other words, there needs to be a visible working against the idea of people only being *acted upon*, and a re-visioning them as actors in their own environments.

One interesting idea that emerged from discussions during the workshop concerned how 'nature' was understood differently by different actors in the oil pipeline project. Joyce, for instance, spoke of the different ways in which the concept was discursively employed by the multinational in negotiating compensation with people from two ethnic groups, Pygmy and Bantu. The potential of following this line of analysis for understanding how 'nature' might be bound up with the local construction of identities and processes of globalisation became evident in these discussions. (Incidentally, I'm not sure what is

meant, in Document 2 (page 2), by ‘politics of ecology versus nature’ and have indicated this to the research team).

Finally, while the research objectives are clearly outlined, the researchers still need to identify explicitly the main argument that runs through the story they are telling. There is also a need to situate the research in the context of other relevant research.

### **3. Ghana - gold mining in the north and mangroves in the south**

As is the case with research in the Amazon forests, the research in Ghana has the potential to make an important contribution to theory. The main areas where I think such contribution will lie include, first, the theorisation of identity. Not only do the researchers examine how gender, among other axes of social differentiation, is constructed through rights to land and resources, but recognise that new collective and individual identities are created in the struggles that emerge in these contexts. ‘Loco boys’ and ‘shanking ladies’ are examples of this in the mining areas, as are cases where chiefs have blurred the boundaries between their administrative status and that of local religious leaders in authorising the use of land for the purpose of mining. Second, with respect to rights to land, the authors intend to explore the relationship between rights to land (and, in the case of the mangroves, to resources) and rights to labour, recognising that this is a critical nexus of relations to unravel if the workings of gender as well as, for example, the status of migrants, are to be understood. Given the contexts of legal plurality within which they work (‘customary’ and ‘statutory’ law), tracing these links is likely to produce very nuanced analyses of how social relations are constructed. Third, the researchers are concerned to situate their engagement with the global in an historical context, recognising the processes which are now referred to as global (‘economic liberalisation’ as manifested in the structural adjustment programmes) have their antecedents in processes set in motion during the colonial era. The value of taking this approach is immediately seen in the context of the researchers’ emphasis on examining how ‘the environment’ is bound up with global process. In Document 2 (pages 1 and 2), for example, they write, ‘environmental change is a dimension of globalisation processes even though the environmental changes which frame our study predated the liberalisation agenda of the 80s’.

The challenge the researchers face, in my view, is to work with the two case studies in such a way as to draw out overarching theoretical points that can be made more authoritatively from the analysis of the two case studies than would have been the case with one. In other words, there is a need to think through how analysis of these two case studies (why were these two chosen?) contributes to the development of a particular argument of theoretical significance. At present, several important arguments are identified in Document 2, but these are not explicitly linked to some underlying line of argumentation. Presumably, the underlying argument will have something to say about the constitution of identity as struggles for land and resources intensify with commodification, but this will need to be spelt out with some precision. More explicit use of the notion of resistance might assist in this process.

#### 4. Vietnam

One of the strengths of this research project is its close consideration of the historical underpinnings of recent changes in land tenure. Questions of decollectivisation of rights to the land in the north and privatisation of land in the south are explored, for example, with reference to changes in state policy associated with the adoption of a 'free market economy'. What is happening with respect to land rights and land use is also linked with changes in internal and international labour markets. Directly, the researchers situate their work within this complex broader frame of national and global forces. They are also concerned to unpack the meaning of gender in their analysis - recognising that, for example, age, marital status, status as household head, kinship, occupation and practices of migration disturb any preconceived definition of gender in so far as it concerns rights to land and land use. From Document 2 as well as from discussions with the research team, it is also evident that the researchers now recognise the analytical potential of exploring the meanings of the land with respect to understanding social differentiation, not just material changes in land rights. Conceptually, this represents considerable movement from Document 1. Document 2 also indicates, albeit in a very abbreviated form, that there is an interest in examining how environmental change (fertiliser and pesticide use) is tied into agricultural reform. This (in my view important) observation, is not at this stage, however, connected to their discussion of the 'analytical framework' presented on pages 1 and 2 of Document 2.

There is thus room for further thought as to how to conceptualise the research to take into account more comprehensively how environmental change is caught up in changes in how gender is negotiated through rights to land and, in turn, how the 'local' and the national interrelate with the 'global'. The researchers also face the challenge of deepening their engagement with gender as it intersects with other axes of social differentiation.. The theoretical framework identified in Document 1 does indeed focus on the workings of gender through analysis of 'cooperation and conflict' within the family and through extra-household relations, but the emphasis in Document 2 appears to be on women. This may well be related to the limited space (2 pages) that was suggested for the chapter outline produced at the end of the workshop but, as Dzodzi pointed out in her discussion of Document 2, there is a lack of investigation of how gender is implicated in the construction of other social differences. Explicitly considering the notion of resistance might help here.

For the purposes of an academic publication, it is also necessary to identify the central argument of the paper and to demonstrate how the structure of the paper will lead to the development of this argument. In this respect, it might be useful to consider more explicitly how a comparison between research sites in the north and south of Vietnam contribute to understanding the interrelations among gender, land tenure and global forces.

Follow up Report for the "Gender, Globalization and Land Tenure Writing/Publishing Workshop, September 26-30, 2005"

**To:** The Gender Unit, International Development Research Centre  
Ottawa, On.

**Submitted by:** Dr. Allison Goebel, Methodology Resource Person  
Associate Professor in Women's Studies and Environmental  
Studies  
Queen's University, Kingston, On.

---

### **1.0 Introductory Remarks**

In my view, this workshop was absolutely critical in working towards the objective of a synthesized publication of the four projects. Whether this turns out to be a book (the agreement going into the workshop), or a special issue of a journal, the workshop provided the interactive space to tease out similarities and differences among these very different projects. The process has ensured that the final publication will be very much more than the "sum of its parts". Workshop participants engaged with each other's projects in ways that actually transformed their own work. There is no way that this level of interaction could have been achieved without face-to-face, intensive and well-facilitated work together.

Indeed, I felt all week that I was part of a "state of the art" feminist collaborative intellectual endeavour. This is a tribute both to the commitment to and excellent implementation of the tools and principles of feminist collaborative and egalitarian work-shopping, by the Gender Unit, but also to the extraordinary good will, enthusiasm, seriousness and capabilities of the project teams themselves. I would suggest that while I think the workshop met its "hard" stated objectives regarding consensus on the nature of the publication and the process of its production, reporting on project findings and the preparation of draft chapter outlines, there are also other types of "outcomes" that are to me equally worth noting. These include the synergistic relationships built in the workshop (even if temporary), across continents, cultures, languages and North-South divides, and (more long-term), a sense of global intellectual community of feminist scholars working with shared knowledge of concepts, methodological approaches, research literatures and the embodiment of female scholarly work.

As I was part of the original Methodology workshop in September 2002, I was very happy to see the successful progress of the projects. All teams had developed a much more deliberate and reflexive approach to their methodology than was evident in the original proposals, and the richness of the research findings was the gratifying result. While there remains a wide range of approaches from more traditional social science methods, to participatory feminist ethnography, in all cases, team members articulated in much more definite terms, the reasons for their methodological choices, and the implications these have for analysis and limitations in the research. Specifically, in the sessions I lead with the teams, in which we used the questions listed on the agenda as a guide, I was deeply impressed and excited by the quality of the reflections on methodological issues in the projects. Indeed, I think there are possibilities of making contributions to the methodology literature itself, in addition to the literatures on gender, land tenure and globalization. I think it was particularly useful to have

the groups divided into sets of two teams each, as this allowed deeper discussion by all the teams, and members within them. I have already submitted my detailed notes recording the discussions of these sessions. The next section represents my analysis of the key themes emerging in these sessions, which could form the basis of a methodology chapter or article for the planned publication.

## 2.0 Emerging methodological issues and themes

### 2.1 *Research for social change*

In the projects there is a large range of ways in which research is linked to social change. As expected, these depend on the concepts used, and the team's approach to methodology in general. For example, the Latin American project was from the very beginning committed to an action-based participatory project with social movements, and hence had direct and purposeful approaches to research *as* social change, while the Cameroon project was initially interested in more academic questions of raising the profile of gender research in the university and policy settings, and hence had more indirect links to social change.

More unexpectedly, differences among the projects also depend heavily on the institutional location of the projects, and the overall political context within which research takes place within different countries. The Latin American project, for example, took place within social movement organizations, which valued and in fact demanded qualitative, process-driven research. Meanwhile, the Vietnam project operated in a context with heavy government surveillance of research projects and a culture of "top-down" approaches, which includes adherence to traditional, scientific and quantitative approaches to research as a necessary element of having research approved and accepted, especially in relation to policy formation. Similarly, the Cameroon team spoke of the university research and policy context as very traditional in its recognition of types of research, and that they needed to follow a traditional approach in order to communicate their findings to other researchers and policy makers. Hence, while it is possible to identify different paradigmatic approaches to the relationship between research and social change among the projects, it is possibly more relevant that teams made strategic choices in their institutional contexts to maximize the potential for their research to make change.

Another element to consider, as evident in the Ghana, Vietnam and Cameroon projects, is that the question of whether social change is directly or indirectly linked to the research process, also depends upon the types of research questions pursued and the identity and location of the key players or targets of the research. For example, in all of these projects, base-line data on the issues under study were lacking, and hence there was a heavy knowledge generation component to the projects seen as critical before any direct actions at either the policy or the local levels could be meaningfully engaged in. Also, different actors have different mandates: the Latin American project worked with social movements, which have social change and action as their main reason for existing. In all other projects, the key actors were more likely to be policy makers, with the role of researchers therefore more generally cast as generating information to inform their policy making and decisions (which will be slow to change).

The role of the funder was also seen as central to this discussion. All groups found that the IDRC provided a kind of licence to pursue some non-traditional approaches to research, particularly qualitative and action-oriented approaches, which are not always supported by other funders (although it is also ironic to have the call for "grass roots" research to come

from a northern-based donor nation!). This was seen as an opportunity to pursue multi-method research with a deliberate eye on action-oriented outcomes. Indeed, all teams engaged with communities, for example through reconnaissance visits prior to the development of research instruments and tools, in ways that improved the potential impacts of the research at local levels.

## *2.2. Research Ethics*

Research can raise expectations in communities, especially in contexts where there are many aid projects and NGOs active (true in all countries of the studies). In the Vietnam case, for example, the existence of many NGO projects that produce some kind of immediate result or benefit in communities, means that it is very hard to promote an informed understanding of the nature of research, which may only have long term impacts. In the Ghana case, “research fatigue” caused by many NGO and research projects carried out in communities that see no subsequent benefits exists in some places, raising complex ethical dilemmas about research. Research may also have unintended negative effects for local people, such as recording indigenous knowledge regarding medicinal herbs in Latin America, which subsequently may be exploited by multi-national companies in ways that disempower indigenous knowers and their communities. In a world full of inequalities and exploitation, researchers travel an ethical minefield, and the tools for negotiating these realities are not yet fully developed. The IDRC research ethics guidelines, for example, which were followed in all projects as best as possible, leave critical gaps in some ways and in some cases are inappropriate. The practice of obtaining signed consent, for example, is often perceived with suspicion among some people who may fear government or other types of surveillance. Requiring parental consent for the participation of children, may also be a violation of cultural norms in some contexts. Current practices of informing people of what use will be made of their information are inadequate in this digital world of fast flowing information, from which many research participants themselves may be excluded or lack adequate knowledge about. Overall, the experiences of the project teams suggest that greater flexibility is needed in research ethics practices and requirements, and further development and research on these questions would likely be helpful.

A positive element in this is that it is often quite easy to do small things in the field that are very much appreciated by local participants and/or their communities, and this helps to create good will and some reciprocity in the research relationships. The Ghana team made contributions to a local school, for example, while the Vietnam team were able to make small targeted interventions with some particularly needy families, which were approved of by the communities.

## *2.3 Methods Used*

There was a large array of research methods used in the projects, including ethnography, in-depth interviewing, life histories, PRA tools (transect walks, resource mapping, etc), survey questionnaires, observation, photography, documentary research, etc. While the selection of methods was in part influenced by the institutional constraints and preferences discussed above, selection was also strongly driven by the research questions, and the different scales at which these questions were directed. All projects used multiple methods, with quantitative methods typically chosen to produce base-line descriptive data needed at the level of communities or regions (and/or to satisfy demands higher up for statistics), and qualitative approaches used in complimentary fashion to investigate meanings, micro-level relations, power and perceptions. Choice of methods also reflected the desire for

team members to experiment, to learn new methods themselves, to train research assistants and involve research participants in ways that were empowering. For example, the Vietnam team were very excited by their learning and use of PRA methods, which they also found were enjoyed by village participants, who also gained important knowledge about themselves and their communities in the process. This became part of what they felt they left behind in the communities as a positive contribution. The Cameroon and Ghana teams were keen to enhance gender research training through involvement of research assistants from their universities in their fieldwork.

Whether the methods were quantitative or qualitative in nature, there were differences in the ways in which subjects or participants in the research were treated or conceptualized as “subjects”. The most notable contrast exists between the Cameroon and Latin American projects. In the Cameroon project, social categories that the researchers observed people seemed to “naturally” organize themselves into (women, men, leaders, youth, etc), became the basis for disaggregated data collection and analysis, an approach that seems to objectify research subjects, or reduce them to one social category or aspect of their identity. This approach did yield very important information about gender relations and women’s entitlements. On the other hand, the Latin American project followed an approach where research subjects “identified themselves”, and wherein the research engaged in the existing lives and patterns of the research participants as they defined them, particularly in terms of their collective identity as women in their social movements. Indeed, it is how they live their lives, engage in struggle and identity formation, which constitutes how the project views them as “subjects” (may be getting this wrong, Noemi!).

Overall, teams agreed that it was not the methods themselves that made the research feminist, but the attention to women and gender. This attention represented certain types of commitments to dig deep into social research, and often indirect approaches were needed.

#### *2.4 Analysis*

Commitment to multi-method research automatically means complicated analysis, if not least because of the sheer volume of data collected, and the various types of skills that are needed to work with data of different types. Just to start with language issues, the Cameroon team, for example, needed to draw on linguistic expertise in their university to help with all the local languages they encountered, the Ghana team had local language interpretation challenges and the Vietnam team faced challenges with transcription of tapes because of differences in local dialects. All teams had to deal with the process of statistical analysis of quantitative data, as well as the transcribing and analysis of interview and other qualitative data.

A common thread to emerge was that teams found that the qualitative data helped to analyse the quantitative data. For example in the Latin American study it was found that it was not the quantity of nuts being sold in the international market that mattered most for the women involved, but their perceptions of the process and how it affected their lives that explained the intensity of the impact of globalization. Teams also found that insights gained through one method helped build the next stage or method of the research. In the Vietnam study, for example, knowledge gained in resource mapping and transect walks made their subsequent in-depth interviews much more productive than they would have been otherwise.

Another insight arrived at by the Ghana team was how designing their research as comparative (mining and mangrove based resource activities), allowed for the emergence of

key analytical issues. In their case, the issue of the relationships between labour, gender and resources emerged, leading to a new area of literature to explore in the analysis stage. They also found that legal pluralism was critical in understanding local realities, and required more theorizing.

In all projects, issues arising from the data are leading to investigation of new literatures, or re-engagement with literatures used in the early development of the research in new ways. The Vietnam team, for example, found that the profound regional differences revealed in their study have led to a need to deepen the historical elements of their literature search. They have also found that the policy literature, and literature on the state are woefully inadequate to deal with the emergent issues of gaps between policy and implementation, especially as policy is mediated through institutional levels and kinship systems. The Latin American project revealed grassroots challenges to the concept of “empowerment” and the whole package of “development” as passed down from bodies such as the World Bank. As such, researchers will engage critically with these concepts in the literature through the voices of grassroots women. The Cameroon study has also raised issues that contradict the literature or conventional wisdom, such as the idea that “women don’t have land” because patriarchy does not permit it. The realities are less rigid, and hence theories of women and land tenure require revision. The Cameroon data also challenge theories of civil society in relation to communities and the state in the context of globalization, particularly in relation to social responsibility.

Overall, all teams engaged in critical, reflexive and ongoing dialogue between their data and the literatures in very deliberate ways.

END.

## 6. COMPILED WORKSHOP EVALUATIONS

---

### 1. Do you think that we met our overall objectives in a meaningful way?

Our objectives were:

- 1) **To reach an agreement on the objective of the publication (what), the target audience (who) and the editing process (how/timelines)**
- 2) **To report on research results**
- 3) **To prepare draft chapter outlines**

- We met our overall objectives in a very meaningful way. We did a fairly good job for the time at our disposal. The interdisciplinary, inter-cultural, and interregional approach was particularly useful in attaining the objectives. The discussions and presentations and exercises made it possible for us to appreciate the entire exercises and thus made it easier to determine the objectives of the publication and the target. The editing process was not totally clear but one got some basic understanding of the process.
- We in general met our overall objectives in a meaningful way. Specifically we:
  - Discussed thoroughly objectives of the publication (for what our book will be published), who is our target audience (who is primary, secondary...) and we also agreed on the editing process in terms of how and timeframe.
  - We all reported our research results and have discussed the key points of the results
  - We have written our draft chapter outline and had the chance to get feedback from our project partner and vice versa.
- Regarding objective 1, I believe we have reached an acceptable level of agreement on the objectives, target, audiences and editing process. But I am still wondering how we are going to manage some incompatible concepts and theoretical frameworks (i.e. hurricanes vs. “a globe with a face”) and I am still insecure as to how separate methodological chapters will deal with each chapters. That said, I trust team work will be handling these issues with extreme care and solidarity.
- Objectives 2 and 3 were perfect.
- Objective 2: helped us learn more about the other projects and was very useful.
- Objective 3: doing this was extremely useful and for me the best achievement of the workshop. Things are now much clearer after writing out the outline.
- I am very impressed with the open discussion on planning the implication and about the concepts; the different approaches resulting in rich dialogue and an agreement on the objective of the publication; the comparisons between research results allowed us in the elaboration of the draft chapter outlines. The workshop

- has been particularly useful in helping us to understand how the draft chapter outlines. Prepare chapter outline and small group works and very productive. We learn a lot from our colleagues in other countries and from our facilitators. This helped me to reshape my thinking of methodological and conceptual issues, and also brought new ideas, new highlights on the issues. The diversified contexts of different countries give me insight and broader view of looking at the issues. I enjoyed a lot and learnt a lot from this useful workshop.
- Reporting on research results was reinforced in the workshop. I gained a lot from the workshop and the reasons why it was organized.
  - In general, all our objectives are met. I think we have had a very intensive and productive working week. However, there are some thing that needed more time and did not have sufficient time allowed: for instance, more time should have been given to each team to report their work and research results. More time should be given for floor discussion/comments about other projects. More discussion was needed for section on presentations of research results. It is difficult to present 3 years of research in 25 minutes! Additionally, it would have been good to have time or to know in advance that we had to prepare a presentation so we could have put all presentations in the computer. It would have been good also to have an editing guideline; this is not too late and will help in what we should look for.
  - Above all, the opportunity to meet the partners again was very valuable and important to me as a person and for practitioners/researchers.
  - A very intensive and fruitful process!

**Answer the following four (4) questions by circling the appropriate number in the boxes. If you have further comments, please use page 3.**

**2. Did you find the small group sessions useful for clarifying your ideas on conceptual approaches?**

<i>1 (not very useful)</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4 (25%)</b>	<b>5 (75%)</b> <i>(very useful)</i>
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------------	-------------------------------------

Comments:

- Yes, but the plenary is also very important because of the possibilities to see the ‘contrasts’. It helped to sharpen my understanding of conceptual approaches
- The discussion helped us to better conceptualize the key concepts of our research— globalization and its different dimensions. We also learned a lot from project partners.
- It helped us to focus on key conceptual issues for our paper.
- I came to distinguish how I was using concepts...[can’t read the rest]

**3. Did you find the small group sessions useful for clarifying your ideas on methodology?**

1 (not very useful)	2	3 (12.5%)	4 (25%)	5 (62.5%) (very useful)
---------------------	---	-----------	---------	-------------------------

Comments:

- The description of the main data collection phases is essential for clarifying my ideas on methodology. The small group help me to understand the other studies.
- A very good approach to help is people understand the methodological approach. A good process for refining methodology.
- The discussion helped us to see strength and weaknesses of our approaches by exchanging with project partners. We also realized the importance/meaning of social change that method approach brought all along.
- The discussion on research for social change was especially useful.

**4. Was the discussion with your project partner following the small group work useful to start thinking about the structure of the chapter outline?**

1 (not very useful)	2	3	4 (25%)	5 (75%) (very useful)
---------------------	---	---	---------	-----------------------

Comments:

- When we participate in small group we organize steps to the presentation of the research results and this is the first phase of the chapter outline.
- Sharpened our idea of what should go into the chapter. Comments by participants were also very helpful.
- The discussion played important role in helping us to restructure our mind about the chapter. Exchanging ideas with project partners suggested us how to focus on our own data and to pull out the most important points.
- At least we have a common sense of what we are to do even though we live in different towns.
- It helped us narrow and define the structure as well as what goes into what section.

**5. Was the writing day adequate to write the preliminary chapter outline?**

1 (not very useful)	2	3	4 (50%)	5 (50%) (very useful)
---------------------	---	---	---------	-----------------------

Comments:

- Yes, because after the ‘exercise of contrast’ between the researches, it was easy to think and reflect on the outline
- Barely adequate. Required stretching oneself a bit to come up with the chapter outlines.
- We could have done better if we had pointers on what was expected in each section. Not sure whether we needed simply to have bullets or description.

**6. What was memorable for you – words, phrases, images, ideas?**

- I liked the idea that researchers from different backgrounds can accept each other's approaches and niches
- Phrase: "the impossible love story of the shanking lady with the loco-boy"
- Images certainly...there were also phrases very strong and clear that explained ideas and concepts
- New perspectives at describing certain phenomenon in the projects.
- Conceptualizing globalization;
- Globalization has its faces; Globalization as both context and process
- Changing of meaning of land
- Conceptual approach
- Group discussions
- Capacity building
- Brazil and Babaçu nuts
- Meeting entire group members
- Dinner!
- Friendly atmosphere, stories of others...
- Critical friend
- Picking compensation package from a brochure
- The good humour, the good will and commitment of all participants

## **7. Anything you'd like to mention?**

- This workshop has been extremely useful for me. I have come a long way in terms of this work from where I was on Monday morning when the workshop started
- I think the decline of capacity to focus on day three required less 'techniques' of facilitation and more alive/humane/... ways of conversation and interactions
- The mutual cooperation. In my case it was essential because I can't speak English well.
- IDRC's flexibility in terms of changing the programme wherever necessary to sort participants is especially commendable.
- Approach to organizing workshop was in itself globalizing
- I found the section of library very useful. If we could have more time with library that would be very helpful.
- Accommodation and logistics were excellent; lunch was quite good, but snacks were too monotonous and boring
- Everything was great!
- Thanks for the opportunities that enable our partners to attend the workshop. Hopefully, I will get better commitment and improve co-operation on the project (IDRC).
- Very well organized: Congratulation to Pam and Stephanie, Fiona and Allison in a very thought out process.

**APPENDIX I****AGENDA**

**Workshop to Prepare a Publication on  
“Gender, Globalization and Land Tenure”  
26-30 September, Gender Unit**

Monday 26 Sept	Tuesday 27 Sept	Wednesday 28 Sept	Thursday 29 Sept	Friday 30 Sept
<b>8:45 – 9:00am</b>	<b>8:45 – 9:00am</b>	<b>8:45 – 9:00am</b>		<b>8:45 – 9:00am</b>
Welcome/ Housekeeping (Pam)	Introduction (Pam)	Introduction (Pam)	<u>*Writing Day*</u>	Introduction (Pam)
<b>9:00 – 10:30am</b>	<b>9:00 – 10:35am</b>	<b>9:00- 11:00am</b>		<b>9:00 – 10:00am</b>
Book Publication Planning: Facilitated Discussion (Stephanie)	Team Presentations on Research Results and Outcomes	Small Group Work: Conceptual (Vietnam Ghana,) Methodology (Brazil, Cameroon)	<b>*Writing Day*</b>	Presentation of Chapter Outlines
<b>10:30 – 10:45am BREAK</b>	<b>10:45 – 11:00am BREAK</b>	<b>11:00 – 11:15am BREAK</b>		<b>10:00 – 10:15am BREAK</b>
<b>10:45 – 12:00pm</b>	<b>11:00 – 11:20</b>	<b>11:15 – 12:00pm</b>		<b>10:15 – 12:00pm</b>
Capacity Building Presentation (Stephanie)	Team Presentations on Research Results and Outcomes <b>11:30 – 12:00pm</b> Facilitated Group Discussion	Report Back in Plenary	<u>*Writing Day*</u>	Presentation of Chapter Outlines
<b>12:00 – 1:30pm LUNCH</b>	<b>12:00 – 1:30pm LUNCH</b>	<b>12:00 – 1:30pm LUNCH</b>		<b>12:00 – 1:30pm LUNCH</b>

<b>1:30 – 2:00pm</b> Examples of Capacity Building from Projects – Anecdotes (Stephanie)	<b>1:30 – 3:30pm</b> Small Group Work: Conceptual (Cameroon Brazil,) Methodology (Ghana Vietnam,)	<b>1:30 – 2:00pm</b> Synthesis of Common Themes: Conceptual Insights (Fiona)	<b>1:30 – 2:30pm</b> <i>*Writing Day*</i> Publication Synthesis (Stephanie & Bill)
<b>2:00 – 3:00pm</b> Library: Refworks and Databases	<b>3:30 – 4:00pm</b> Report Back in Plenary	<b>2:00 – 2:30pm</b> Synthesis of Common Themes: Methodology (Allison)	<b>2:30 – 3:45pm</b> <i>*Writing Day*</i> Setting Timelines (Fiona to facilitate; Stephanie to record)
		<b>2:30 – 3:45pm</b> Facilitated Group Discussion (Stephanie)	<b>3:45 – 4:00pm</b> Wrap Up (Stephanie)
<b><i>Evaluation of Day 1</i></b>	<b><i>Evaluation of Day 2</i></b>	<b><i>Evaluation of Day 3</i></b>	<b><i>Evaluation of Workshop</i></b>

**Overall Goal of Workshop:** To draft a synopsis/proposal for the publication (for circulation)

**Objectives:**

1. To reach agreement on the objective of the publication (what), the target audience (who) and the editing process (how);
2. To report on research (results) from individual research projects; and
3. To prepare draft outlines for individual chapters

**Annotated Agenda:  
Workshop to Prepare a Publication on  
“Gender, Globalization and Land Tenure”  
26 – 30 September 2005  
Gender Unit, IDRC**

**Monday September 26**

**Objective** – To discuss the “what, who and how of the publication process”, to reflect on capacity development in projects, and to receive and update on the IDRC’s databases/ref works program

**8.45 – 9.00am (Pam)**

Welcome / Housekeeping  
Introductions

**9.00 – 10.30am (Stephanie)**

Facilitated group discussion on planning the publication

**Goal:** To come to an agreement on the what, who, how of the publication and editing process. ***The output for this session will be a defined editing process.***

- What kind of publication (peer-reviewed, popular literature)? How do people define these kinds of publications? How are they similar/different? What do they each offer an audience? The form of the publication may depend on the content.
- If the group decides on a “formal” publication that needs a manuscript then we need to define the objectives:
  - What is the content of the publication (theory, methodology, research findings etc.)?
  - Is this publication trying to influence something? Is it filling a gap in the literature? What are the unique/special features of this publication (why would a publisher want to publish this)?
  - Who is the target audience (researchers, donors, decision-makers)?
- How do we want the publication to be written, edited, etc? Should one person take a lead role? Who?

**10.30 – 10.45am BREAK**

**10.45 –12.00 Stephanie**

***Presentation on “Capacity Building at IDRC”***

- What does CB mean at IDRC?
- What role does IDRC often take? What kinds of activities?

**11.05 – 11.40:**

- Break into small groups based on projects
- Fill in framework based on your own experience of capacity building in this project

**11.40 – 12.00pm**

- Discuss frameworks – how are they similar/different from the IDRC-based framework?
- How are the frameworks similar/different among the projects?

**12.00 – 1.30pm LUNCH**

**1.30 – 2.15pm**

*Anecdotes from projects: Examples of Capacity Building*

**2.15 – 3.30pm**

*Library*

Ref-Works and Databases

## **Tuesday 27 September**

**Overall Objective:** For project pairs to make presentations to allow for groups to think/discuss each project individually.

**8:45 –9:00**

*Introduction (Pam)*

**9:00 – 11:30am**

Team Presentations on Research Results and Outcomes

- 9:00 – 9:20 Brazil
- 9:30 –9:50 Cameroon
- 10:15 – 10:35 Vietnam

**10:45 – 11:00 BREAK**

- 11:00 – 11:20 Ghana

**11:30 – 12:00**

Group Discussion

12:00 – 1:30pm LUNCH

**1:30 –3:30 Small Group Work**

Group 1 - Conceptual Session -Brazil, Ghana

Group 2 – Methodology Session - Vietnam, Cameroon

### **Parallel Small Group Sessions on Conceptual & Methodological Approaches**

The objective of the small group work on conceptual approaches are to discuss: (a) how key themes of this competition were conceptualized: gender, globalization and land tenure, and (b) the theoretical frameworks used in your projects. The objective of the small group work on methodological approaches are to identify similarities and differences in approaches and issues in the four projects, and to identify themes with which to frame a discussion of methodology for the introductory chapter of the book. Over arching questions to encourage reflections on research methodologies in southern contexts include:

- Are there issues that don't fit in these 9 headings?
- Does the content and approach to methodology fit the type of publication/intended audience?
- Is there a methodology literature we are interested in engaging with?

**Questions for Small Group Discussion:**

Conceptual Approaches	Methodological Approaches
<p><b>Land/Tree Tenure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How were these rights defined?</li> <li>○ Were these rights defined by one or more than one tenure regime (e.g. customary /statutory)?</li> <li>○ Were these rights undergoing change?</li> <li>○ If so what was causing these changes?</li> <li>○ What conceptual issues arose from themes changes? e.g. does increasing privatisation of tenure lead to the loss of women's/poor women's /poor men's rights?</li> </ul> <p><b>Globalization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How did you conceive of the interrelationship between the local and the global at the beginning of the research?</li> <li>○ Did this change as the research progressed?</li> </ul> <p><b>Gender</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Was this axis of social differentiation clearly the most significant in your work?</li> <li>○ Or were class, ethnicity, age, marital status, and other categories of social differentiation important?</li> <li>○ How did some of these intersect e.g. class and gender?</li> </ul> <p><b>Theoretical frameworks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What theoretical frameworks did you find useful e.g. postcolonial theorizing, political ecology, livelihoods, feminist or others?</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>Defining the Research Questions &amp;</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Approach to research: engaging in research for social change from a gender perspective in southern contexts</li> <li>○ Developing a research question</li> <li>○ Positionality of the researcher(s) in relation to: a) research participants, and b) relation to northern partner.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Conducting the Field Work</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Selecting and developing appropriate methods for data gathering/generation</li> <li>○ Field experiences with methods chosen insights new developments?</li> <li>○ Research ethics: issues and approaches</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Analysis and Synthesis</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Approaches to Analysis</li> <li>○ Connecting research and social change (policy, activism, education, empowerment, capacity building, etc)</li> </ul>

**3:30 – 4:00pm**

**Reporting Back**

**Questions for discussion**

- 1) What are your overall observations about the conceptual/methodological themes/issues identified?
- 2) Does anything surprise you? What challenged something you believe(d) to be true?

- 3) What are some of the key factors that affected (contributed to /inhibited) the use of conceptual frameworks/methods?

### **Wednesday 28 September**

**8:45 – 9:00**

Introduction (Pam)

**9:00 –11:15**

Parallel Small Group Sessions on Conceptual & Methodological Approaches Continue

Group 1 - Methodology Session - Brazil, Ghana

Group 2 –Conceptual Session Vietnam, Cameroon

**10:00 – 10:15 BREAK**

**11:15 – 12:00**

Reporting to plenary (Stephanie facilitates)

**12:00 –1:30 LUNCH**

**1:30 – 3:30pm:** Preliminary Insights and Common Themes

- 1:30 – 2:00 Conceptual Insights (Fiona)
- 2:00 – 2:30 Methodology (Allison)
- 2:30 – 3:45 Reporting Back (Stephanie)

### ***\*\*Thursday 29 September – Writing detailed Chapter Outlines***

**Objective:** To write detailed chapter outlines and to discuss writing responsibilities with project partners, To read the chapter outline from another team and prepare very brief comments for the following day

### **Friday 30 September**

**Overall Objective:** For teams to present chapter outlines, for designated discussant to give very brief reaction/commentary on the chapter outlines, to allow time for any questions of clarification from the group as a whole.

**8:45 – 9:00am**

Introduction (Pam)

**9:00 – 10:00**

Presentations of Chapter Outlines

**10:00 – 10:15 BREAK**

**10:15 - 12:00**

Presentations of Chapter Outlines

## **12:00 – 1:30pm LUNCH**

### **1:30 – 2:30pm**

Publication Synthesis (Bill Carmen & Stephanie)

- **Goal:** to revisit the agreed upon publication plan developed by the group at the beginning of the workshop (Monday session) to ensure that the content and issues discussed throughout the week still make sense for the type of publication agreed to, the target audience, the objectives etc.
- To discuss as a group: any changes that have occurred, or that need to be made to the agreed plan considering the week's discussions.
- Does anything need to be added, changed, deleted etc.?

### **2:30 – 3:45pm**

Setting Timelines (Fiona to facilitate, Stephanie to record)

- **Goal:** To develop a draft outline of the publication synopsis for circulation to possible publishers; to confirm the what, who, how of the publication set forth earlier in the week (Monday morning)
- Publication synopsis document, time-lines for draft chapters

### **3:45 – 4:00pm**

Wrap up & Evaluation of the Workshop (Stephanie)

### Globalization, Gender and Land Tenure in the South A literature review

#### Introduction

At present, in different parts of the world, neoliberal economic restructuring, the expansion of land markets, international development interventions, and various efforts toward land reform are among some of the political-economic processes shaping (and reshaping) how people relate to land. These transformations in the global political economy do not produce a simple displacement of the traditional by the modern, the state by the market, or the local by the global but, rather, a “complex set of articulations” that take hybrid form (Watts and Peet 1996, 266). Among other things, recent changes in the world economy are provoking, undermining and reworking social relations of production and reproduction along with many of the cultural norms and practices of everyday life for people living in the South (Katz 2001, 1228). In this context, land has become an increasingly contested terrain, and arena of struggle, in which individuals and groups vie to retain, reclaim or establish new rights to land and other productive resources that remain crucial to sustaining rural livelihoods.

This paper provides a selective review of recent academic literature exploring some of the complex interconnections between globalization, gender and land tenure in different regions of the South. The first section of the paper provides a brief discussion of some of the ways in which patterns of macroeconomic change are broadly reshaping rural livelihoods and the place of land therein. Although the ways in which rural people are experiencing processes of macroeconomic change are diverse and context-specific, the continued importance of land in sustaining rural livelihoods is stressed.

The second section of the paper focuses on the contemporary struggles over land and their relation to broader political-economic processes. Though struggles over land are extraordinarily diverse in character, often revolving around key productive inequalities mediated by gender, class, race and/or ethnic differences, this review concentrates on recent literature examining the deeply *gendered* nature of contemporary land struggles in the South. Studies from Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and South Asia<sup>1</sup> suggest that these struggles are taking place in multiple, often overlapping, arenas. First, the introduction of new crops, agricultural techniques, and tenure arrangements are intensifying struggles over gender roles, obligations and rights to land and labour within the social relations of marriage and kinship. At the same time, national and international efforts aimed at land tenure reform are redefining rights to land, through the state, in

---

<sup>1</sup> Despite an extensive search of recent academic literature, studies on theme of globalization, gender and land tenure from Latin America and Asia were very limited in number. On Latin America, there appears to be a more extensive literature in Spanish, though this review was confined to that published in English. The work of Bina Agarwal (1994, 2003) is the only material obtained with a focus on Asia (Agarwal’s work focuses on South Asia). As such, the vast majority literature obtained focused on these themes in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa.

ways that are deeply gendered. As these complex processes place new demands and value on land, and transform the rules and norms governing land rights, social relations in the political arenas of household and state often explode with gender conflict. This section examines something of the nuance, complexity and dynamism of these struggles over land and how they are reshaping gender relations and land rights in different parts of the South.

Although the literature reviewed does not examine issues of methodology explicating, the third and final section of the review paper briefly examines analytical and methodological insights derived from the literature. Specifically, recognizing the extraordinary complexity and dynamism of gender and land tenure issues in the South, this literature demonstrates the need for detailed ethnographic research that seeks a much clear and deeper sense of this complexity and situates the analysis of gender relations and land rights in the everyday lives of rural women and men.

### Globalization, rural livelihoods, and the continued importance of land

To begin to understand how people relate to land in different parts of the world, it is necessary to examine how macroeconomic change is encountering and reworking rural livelihoods in different social, economic and political contexts. As Razavi (2003, 11) points out, it is the changing nature of rural livelihoods that will, to a significant extent, affect the processes shaping people's attachment to land, the functions land serves, and the meaning land holds, in rural and non-rural economies. Although the ways in which rural people are confronting, accommodating and resisting processes of macroeconomic change are diverse and context-specific, the literature reviewed points to a number of broad trends, related to internationally imposed and/or state led processes of economic restructuring in the South, that play a significant role in reshaping rural livelihoods and the place of land therein. In this section of the paper, I briefly examine a few of the global processes at play in the South as a means to explore, in next section of the paper, how these and other processes are being negotiated locally, and how they shape contemporary, and deeply gendered, struggles over land.

Since the early 1980s, international financial institutions (IFIs), including the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, have imposed a neoliberal economic agenda on indebted developing countries. Neoliberalism, as it informs the framing of orthodox development theory, can be characterized by "the combined significance attached to privatization, market relations, open economies, commodification, and possessive individualism" (Slater 2003, 53). Although the imposition of neoliberal policies by the North on the South is grounded in laissez-faire orthodoxies which claim that free markets will eliminate poverty and improve human welfare, David Slater (2003, 53) explains that the free market triumphalism of the 1980s was also driven by Northern policymakers finding that solutions to the domestic problems they face are increasingly associated with the economic and institutional functioning of other societies. More recently, as he goes on to explain, the terrain for intervention has been considerably extended so that by the early 1990s issues of "good governance", for example, came to occupy heightened importance in the official discourse of international development (ibid). Overall, the discursive construction of development as a "global challenge" to be

mastered, resulted in the emergence of conditionalities to international aid, most severely felt in the South through the implementation of “structural adjustment” (ibid).

This neoliberal economic agenda, explains Shahra Razavi, (2003, 10-11), involved a number of orthodox policies such as exchange rate devaluation, cuts in public spending, wage restraint, privatization, tariff reduction and open capital accounts. The deflationary impact of these measures and their impact on livelihoods across the globe has been critically discussed at length and cannot be recounted here (see for example Glover 1991, Mackenzie 1993, Williams 1994, Chussudovsky 1997). However, in order to provide some context for examining contemporary struggles over land in the South, it is useful to briefly highlight a few of the trends that are currently shaping the place, and continued importance, of land in rural livelihoods in different contexts.

First and foremost perhaps, the transition of many Southern economies towards a free market system, exacerbated in many cases by austerity measures imposed by IFIs, has drawn rural communities more deeply into the cash economy where they confront rising food prices, the imposition of user fee cost-recovery measures in education and health care, and the elimination of government subsidies in agriculture, all of which imply mounting cash needs for household reproduction (Razavi 2003, 19). While the response of rural households to this situation has been diverse and context-specific, and certainly cannot be generalized, recent literature points to a few trends that have emerged as the need for cash resources intensifies under economic restructuring. The first is that households increasingly divert land from food crop to cash crop production as a means to generate cash income. While this often involves the production of foods for sale in local and regional markets, increasingly, it entails a shift towards production for export – a move that is often initiated and/or financially supported by development programs and international lending institutions (Bassett 2002; Patnaik 2003; Agarwal 2003). In India, for example, Patnaik (2003) notes that the liberalization of trade resulted in a substantial shift in cropping patterns in which an estimated seven million hectares was diverted from food crops to export crops such as cotton in the 1990s. This transformation not only resulted in increasing food insecurity at the household level but also has had negative implications for per capital foodgrain availability in the country as a whole. At the same time, she goes on to explain, the volatility of international commodity prices exposes farmers to new sources of financial risk.

Recent studies find that the economic vulnerability of rural households in many parts of the South is further exacerbated by transformations in non-farm employment resulting from macroeconomic change. Again in India, Patnaik (2003) describes how processes of economic restructuring over the last two decades has resulted in cuts to the state’s development expenditures causing the collapse of rural non-farm employment and a decline in real wages. Although Agarwal (2003, 192) provides evidence to suggest that agrarian change in India has involved a general shift of labour from agriculture to non-agriculture, with the percentage of all rural workers in agriculture declining from 84 to 76 percent between the years 1972 and 2000, she emphasizes that this shift was due largely to male workers moving to non-farm employment. Women in India, according to Agarwal, remained substantially in agriculture, with their dependence increasing in recent years. The figures here are striking. As she explains, “Today 53 percent of all male workers, 75 of all female workers, and 85 percent of all *rural* female workers are in agriculture. And, for women, this percentage has declined less than four points since

1972-3” (ibid, emphasis in original). While the absorption of both women and men in non-farm employment has slowed down since 1987-8, she provides data to suggest that, for women, the slowing down has been dramatic; the compound growth rate of female non-farm employment fell from 5.2 per cent over 1978-88 to 0.2 per cent during 1988-94 (ibid). While the explanation of these trends is largely structural, Agarwal suggests that they also reflect women’s domestic work obligations, lower mobility, lesser education and fewer investable assets which limit their access and entry into non-farm employment in relation to men. To this one might add the pervasiveness of cultural norms about the appropriate kinds of work for women and men that limit women’s employment options. What these trends suggest is that rural households, and perhaps women in particular, remain significantly dependent on land, as unpaid family farmers and/or wage workers, as a source of livelihood.

Despite the continued centrality of land for sustaining rural livelihoods in many contexts, the expansion of commercial agriculture as well as non-agricultural land uses including resource extraction, tourist enterprises (e.g. nature reserves, safari parks), and industrial development – much of which is owned and controlled by transnational firms – in conjunction with the growing individualization of land has placed mounting pressure on land resources in many parts of the world (Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 68). This tension has translated into often-profound economic insecurity for many. In response to this situation, a number of recent studies point to the prevalence of livelihood diversification as a survival strategy (Adamo 1999, Verma 2001, Agarwal 2003, Kandiyoti 2003, Razavi 2003, Walker 2003). Here, livelihood diversification is defined as “the process by which rural families construct a diverse portfolio of activities and social support capabilities in their struggle for survival and in order to improve their standard of living” (Razavi 2003, 16). In South Africa, for example, Cheryl Walker (2003) explains that historically constructed and very unequal land relations has meant that while land remains critically important in people’s livelihoods for subsistence and market production, it is combined with incomes derived from wage labour and non-farm employment. Studies from Chile (Bee 2000), India (Agarwal 2003), and Uzbekistan (Kandiyoti 2003) describe a similar process of income diversification in rural households as land scarcity bites and economic restructuring intensifies their need for cash resources. While men have better opportunities to secure non-farm employment, Agarwal (2003) and Kandiyoti (2003) argue that that in conjunction with agricultural employment, either as unwaged family labourers or wage workers on commercial farms, women tend to be concentrated in the low and insecure earnings end of the non-farm occupational spectrum, such as informal trade and services that do not offer good long-term prospects. While these opportunities may not offer the kinds of security and income that go with formal sector employment, studies by Abra Adamo (1999) and Ritu Verma (2001), situated in Ghana and Kenya respectively, find that women’s informal business activities, which include petty trading and wage labour, enable many women to meet the escalating economic needs of households, especially given the growing out-migration of men to nearby cities and towns in search of employment.

While by no means comprehensive, these findings suggest that the ways in which people in the South relate to land as a source of livelihood is being shaped significantly by globalization processes, especially those associated with neoliberal economic

restructuring. Specifically, this work highlights a tension between, on the one hand, the continued importance of land for sustaining rural livelihoods given the often-limited availability of non-farm employment and the increasing need for cash resources for household reproduction, and on the other, a situation of increased land scarcity with the expansion of land intensive industries and the individualization of land that have accompanied the opening up of Southern economies to transnational capital. To some extent, it is this tension that continues to intensify struggles over land, struggles that are simultaneously, and increasingly, global and local in character.

### Globalization and the contested terrain of gender relations and rights to land

Since the early 1990s a growing body of literature has emerged that examines they many ways in which globalization, and macroeconomic change more specifically, is transforming rights to land, and intensifying struggles over land and other productive resources in different places. Though struggles over land are extraordinarily diverse in character, often revolving around key productive inequalities mediated by gender, class, race and/or ethnic differences, this review concentrates on recent literature examining the deeply gendered nature of contemporary land struggles in the South.

Specifically, the literature presented here examines how political-economic processes are reworking existing tenure relations and, in-so-doing, transforming land into an increasingly contested terrain in which women and men struggle to reclaim, retain or establish new rights to this and other productive resources. Studies from Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America suggest that these struggles are taking place in multiple, often overlapping, arenas. The introduction of new crops, agricultural techniques, and tenure arrangements, for example, are intensifying struggles over gender roles, obligations and rights to land and labour within the social relations of marriage and kinship. At the same time, national and international efforts aimed at land tenure reform are redefining rights to land, through the state, in ways that are deeply gendered. As these complex processes place new demands and value on land (and labour), and transform the rules and norms governing rights to land, social relations in the political arenas of household and state often explode with gender conflict. In this section of the paper, I draw on recent literature to examine some of the nuance of these struggles over land and how they are reshaping gender relations and land rights in different parts of the South.

### **Political-economic change and the micropolitics of gender and land**

A crucial contribution of recent work in political ecology is its focus on gender relations, particularly at the intra-household level, as a way of conceptualizing the complex and historically changing relations that shape rights in land. In so doing, it extends the definition of “politics” beyond the state (Paulson, Gezon and Watts 2004, 28) to one that includes the political areas of the household, as well as social relations and institutions associated with kinship. This emphasis, as Carney (1996, 165) explains, brings attention the crucial role of family authority relations and property relations in structuring the gender division of labour and access to resources such as land and labour. However, as

recent studies in this field make clear, as political-economic restructuring, international development interventions, and land reform processes unfold throughout the South, “the norms governing rights in land and in flux” (Kevane and Gray 1999a, 17). As a result, these social relations become an arena of struggle in which the historically constituted rights and obligations of women and men are redefined, negotiated and contested. The literature presented here offers considerable insight into the complexity of these struggles and what they reveal about the dynamic relationship between globalization, gender relations, and land tenure, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa from which these studies are drawn<sup>2</sup>. Where useful, I examine the arguments and evidence from individual studies in some detail in order to capture the nuance and complexity of these contemporary struggles over land.

Within the discussions of gender and land tenure in research, development, and policy circles, the nature of women’s rights to land, vis-à-vis men, is the subject of considerable contestation and debate. As Ingrid Yngstrom (2002) explains, the predominant view holds that women’s rights – as wives, sisters, daughters or mothers – are “secondary” to and dependent on, those of men, and, as will be discussed later in this paper, it is this characterization that has led many to argue that women should receive their own titles to land. Though this perspective recognizes multiple claims on land, it understands them as hierarchically ordered and gendered with women having weaker “use rights”, while men or lineages have the strong “ownership” or “control” rights (Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 77). Ann Whitehead and Dzodzi Tsikata (2003, 77) point to recent studies that, while recognizing that there are multiple claims on land, question the core distinction between primary and secondary rights and also the idea of a hierarchical ordering of claims (see for example, Carney and Watts 1990; Moore and Vaughan 1994; Kevane and Gray 1999; Yngstrom 2002). These authors emphasize that the usual view women as holders of weaker or “secondary” rights to land vis-à-vis men, particularly in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa, must be supplemented by a more nuanced understanding of the “negotiated, dynamic and fluid nature of tenure relations and tenure claims” (Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 77).

Gray and Kevane (1999) argue that the conventional view of women’s rights as weaker and secondary to those of men holds that when land becomes scarce or rises in value women lose their pre-existing rights to land, or at least face diminished access to land as men use their “position of dominance” to “expropriate” women’s rights to land. While they and other authors do not deny, or wish to minimize, the often-dramatic reductions in rights that many women in the South regularly encounter, they argue, and provide evidence to suggest that this characterization of gender relations vis-à-vis land is, in some ways, too crude. It renders invisible the *contestations* that often take place when, for example, governments or international development interventions introduce new crops, tenure arrangements, or land use practices, that reshape women’s and men’s historically constituted rights to land and labour. It is within these struggles that men *and* women both vie to retain, reclaim or establish new rights to land. As Gray and Kevane (1999, 19) note: “land rights that are disputed depend on the ability to press claims before statutory and customary authorities, and particularly before the constituents of jural groups regulated by customary authorities”. Following Moore and Vaughan (1994), they

---

<sup>2</sup> Despite an extensive literature search, case studies examining struggles over land at the intra-household and community level could not be found for the regions of Latin America and Asia.

explain that the power of individual women and men to press claims comes from many sources – “one is the subtle ability to manipulate and interpret notions of identity that determine who has rights to what and where” (Gray and Kevane 1999, 19).

Several recent studies emphasize this crucial point. The work of Carney and Watts (1990) is particularly instructive in that it draws clear attention to the ways in which struggles over land reveal deeper struggles over meanings in the ways that rights in land are defined, negotiated and contested through intra-household and wider social relations. Since independence in 1965, Judith Carney and Michael Watts (1991) explain that the Gambia has experienced rainfall declines, and accelerated environmental degradation of its uplands, a massive influx of foreign aid for development assistance, policy shifts favoring commodification of the wetlands, and an IMF structural adjustment program, all of which, they suggest, have transformed the political ecology of the area through multiple, successive attempts to introduce irrigated rice development in the wetlands (Carney and Watts 1991; Carney 1996). In their analysis of the IFAD-supported Jahaly-Pacharr rice irrigation scheme, Carney and Watts illustrate how the introduction of a new production regime has had fundamental consequences for the micropolitics of the Mandinka household, giving rise to contradictory, and deeply gendered, developments with respect to domestic access to, and control over, and definition of land and labour (Carney and Watts 1990, 231). In part because Mandinka women were historically responsible for rice cultivation, but also in response to growing international concern for gender equity expressed by donors, the Jahaly-Pacharr project targeted women as the primary beneficiaries. Yet, while the irrigated plots were registered in women’s names, men successfully reclassified these plots as *maruo* (household subsistence fields) rather than *kamanyango* (individually controlled). This, the authors explain, translated into a loss of individual control over their lands and the product of their labour because *maruo* land is under the material and symbolic control of men as household heads. The naming of the project’s plots as household fields enabled the household head to make claims on women’s unpaid labour while in practice the plots functioned in part as his individual field capable of generating investable surpluses (Carney and Watts 1990, 225). In addition, since *maruo* labour claims had historically evolved within the confines of a single agricultural season (there was no precedent for women to perform *maruo* labour obligations during two cropping periods), the introduction of a project which required that irrigated rice be cultivated on a year-round basis, meant that women’s customary rights to dry season *kamanyango* production were also marginalized (Carney 1996). Co-optation by men of the term *maruo*, therefore, strengthened prevailing patriarchal power relations by undermining women’s customary rights of access to rice land for income generation while enabling male household heads to capture surplus value (Carney 1996; Carney and Watts 1990).

Women contested the semantics of *maruo* precisely because it provides a mechanism for the loss of their customary rights. As Carney (1996, 183) explains, women are “acutely aware” that the rules of access to and control over land and labour are not a “codification of immemorial tradition”, but rather the outcome of struggle and negotiation with husbands, male community leaders, as well as state and donor officials. Women in the project contested the loss of *kamanyango* rights and the intensification of their unremunerated labour under the irrigation scheme by refusing to work on household irrigated lands without remuneration for their labour either in the form of *kamanyango*

rights or a share of the rice harvest (Carney and Watts 1991 227). In so doing, women contested the basis of the conjugal contract, namely the right of their husbands to lay claim to their labour without remuneration, thereby effecting from within the household a challenge to patriarchal social relations (ibid, 226). This work provides valuable insight into the ways in which material struggles over the recomposition of labour and the reclassification of land rights, are simultaneously interpretative struggles over the naming of land, and so, a symbolic struggle over meaning.

Similarly, Fiona Mackenzie's (1990) historical study of land in Central Province of Kenya offers insight into the ways in which "customary" rights to land are "malleable and manipulable", and "subject to continual construction and reconstruction" (Mackenzie 1990, 609), by individuals or groups seeking to retain, reclaim or assert new rights to land. Beginning with efforts to codify customary law in the 1920s, and later within the process of land tenure reform in the 1950s, Mackenzie explains that men in Murang'a District were able to manipulate custom in order to exercise greater control over land to the detriment of women. For example, when a women without sons, holding title deed to the land sought to register the holdings in her daughter's name, her proposal was challenged by her deceased husband's brother (with the support of her husband's *mbari* or subclan) who, fearing the loss of territory should one of the daughters marry, argued, on the basis of "customary" practices of inheritance, that the land be returned to the *mbari*. To the extent that rules of succession were only one element of *ng'undu* tenure, and did not confer ownership rights, Mackenzie (1990, 634) argues that customary law was "recreated" in this case in the interest of a particular individual or group. While these processes translated into greater tenure insecurity for many women in Murang'a, Mackenzie explains that women, like men, have able to assert rights to land by manipulating custom to their own advantage. Through the customary idiom of the "female husband", for example, a woman without sons, chose to "marry" a women (with sons) upon her husband's death to prevent her brother-in-law from "snatching" the land from her (ibid, 624, 631-32). Alternatively, women have also organized themselves under collective idiom of *ngwatio* (in the past a reciprocal work group) through which members have been able to purchase and register land in the collective's name as a means to secure rights to land (Mackenzie 1995, 19).

In situations where women have been unable to maintain historically constituted rights to land, such as through marriage, in the face of political-economic change, recent studies suggest that some women, depending on circumstance, may be able to secure rights to land through non-traditional, extra-household social relations. In southwestern Burkina Faso, where in the span of a decade population has almost doubled through large-scale migration of Mossi households to Bwa areas, and where cotton has emerged as the single most important economic activity sustaining local livelihoods, Kevane and Gray (1999) argue that local struggles between Bwa and Mossi households to retain their rights to land in a situation of growing land scarcity and increasingly land value has led to changing interpretations of local custom with respect to women's rights to land. Particularly among the Mossi, as settlers with less secure and extensive rights to land vis-à-vis their Bwa hosts, the authors argue that the rights of Mossi women to obtain fields seemed to be evolving away from a generalized obligation on the part of the husband to provide for his wife or wives with personal fields. Yet, as husbands seek to exert greater control over limited and high

value land, women's options vis-à-vis land are not completely foreclosed. Despite land scarcity and a rise in land value, certain types of rights available to women are strengthening. For example, Mossi and Bwa women alike are increasingly borrowing land from men outside their households, usually large Bwa landholders who have excess land and are increasingly willing to lend to women precisely because women cannot claim permanent rights. As the authors explain, the husband of the woman is fully in favour of her obtaining land from outside the household because new technologies such as tractors and animal traction are making land, not labour, the scarce resource in production. So while this certainly translates into an erosion of women's "customary" rights to land through marriage, the authors stress that it has also created opportunities for women to negotiate rights to land outside the material and symbolic control of husbands.

The extent to which women have been able to make claims to land, and sustain these claims vis-à-vis men, has also depended, in some circumstances, on their ability to challenge prevailing gender roles and norms. Richard Schroeder (1996, 1997), for example, describes how the intensification of female market gardening on the North Bank of the Gambia in the 1980s - itself rooted in a complicated set of agro-ecological shifts, subsequent attempts to adjust the Gambian economy to suit the needs of international debtors, as well as increased capital expenditure in women's agriculture by donor and voluntary agencies - involved women securing access to land for the expansion of vegetable gardens through one-time cash payments to local landholders in exchange for the transfer of use rights. Although use rights to land were not secured through their relations with husbands, Schroeder explains that the ability of women to expand their participation in market gardening and, by extension, to sustain their claims to garden plots, rested on the not-always subtle renegotiation of gender roles vis-à-vis husbands. As Schroeder explains, male cash crop production in the Gambia had been seriously undermined by the financial crisis of the mid-1980s. The surge in female incomes that accompanied the garden boom meant that women had assumed the role as the primary breadwinners in many households. As women's ability to provide for the financial needs of the household increased dramatically in relation to the contribution of their husbands, women's position within the complex system of gender relations at the intra-household level were redefined such that, for example, women now held the economic upper hand in budgetary negotiations within the household. Although men challenged this shift in gender roles and decision-making power, Schroeder emphasizes that their contestations only went so far given the growing dependence of households on garden incomes. Likewise, landholders did not contest women's use rights to garden plots in the early days of the boom as the community's "moral economy" - the fluctuating sentiments of community members regarding notions of communal benefit and well-being - had shifted in favour of women's gardening (Schroeder 1997, 495). Despite later efforts by local landholders to "reclaim" garden plots as part of a donor-supported commercial agroforestry program 1990s, women by and large have been able to retain their use rights to garden land, at least in part, because of their now socially-sanctioned role, and collective identity, as gardeners on the North Bank.

Thomas Bassett (2002) illustrates a similar case wherein women's expanded role in cash-crop production produced an escalation in gender politics, in this case over the allocation of women's labour, with serious implications for their ability to cultivate land

to which they have rights. In Northern Cote d'Ivoire, Bassett (2002) examines how the intrusion of structural adjustment policies and the intensification of women's cultivation of a particularly demanding variety of cotton, upset women's production strategies by exacerbating an already tense negotiation over labour vis-à-vis husbands. Whereas in the 1980s women typically cultivated a field of peanuts and a swamp rice plot on lands obtained through marriage, Bassett explains that the diffusion of ox-plows, as well as high yielding cotton varieties, fertilizers and pesticides through cotton development programs funded by French foreign assistance and the World Bank, fundamentally altered the labour process for both men and women. Specifically, he notes that the labour burden of women belonging to household employing oxen and herbicides significantly lessened enabling them to increase the size of their fields and invest in cotton. In the 1990s, however, Bassett explains that the introduction of a new, and more labour demanding variety of cotton by international cotton buyers, combined with the elimination of the pesticide subsidy, the currency devaluation, and a decline in real producer prices under the adjustment process, male household heads increasingly tried to rein in women's cotton growing. Men argued that they would no longer support their wives' cotton growing as they were making too many demands on household resources (such as men's labour for ploughing women's fields), though Bassett suggests that it was men's anxiety over changing gender roles in household production, characterized by greater economic autonomy among women with personal cotton fields, and men's increasing inability to command women's labour power that was at stake. Men sought to undermine women's cotton growing by restricting women's access to household labour (namely, children), redefining women's "customary" work days to capture more of women's labour time, and by refusing to take women's cotton to the cooperative cotton marketplace where men were in the socially awkward position of being viewed by other men as "working for their wives" (Bassett 2002, 365). Women resisted their husband's attempts to undermine their cotton activities and to channel their labour power to household versus non-household fields by refusing to harvest their husband's cotton, by spending more time in their individual fields and by showing less interest in having sexual relations with their husbands (ibid, 366). Women also increasingly invested in extra-household social relations as a means to secure access to labour, oxen, and resources outside the control of their husbands. Importantly, as Bassett notes, these strategies were particularly prevalent among senior wives who, more so than junior wives, who felt they deserved greater economic autonomy. These generational differences, he explains, points to the obvious complexity of local gender politics and struggles over cash cropping in the area.

These recent studies reveal a great deal about the complexity and dynamism of gender relations and land rights, in the context of on-going political economic change, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. First and foremost perhaps, these studies make explicit some of the ways in which continued political-economic transformations, particularly those associated with economic restructuring, are intimately connected to rural economies to the extent that the rights in land and labour within the conjugal contract, for example, cannot be understood apart from the wider political economy. This work provides some insight into how these processes are reworking existing social relations of production and reproduction and intensifying struggles over gender roles and rights land and labour, particularly at the intra-household level. In this way, this work

reinforces an understanding of globalization not as abstract, immutable and unwavering global forces that act on households and communities from outside, but rather as a complex set of processes that are encountered, accommodated, resisted and transformed through struggle.

In this way, this work crucially emphasizes that gender roles, and the rules governing access to and control over resources are not fixed or immutable; that is, they are not to recall Carney's phrase "a codification of immemorial tradition", but rather the outcome of struggle and negotiation between various, differently empowered actors, including husbands and wives, community leaders, as well as state and international donor officials. While these struggles are certainly material, this work draws critical attention to the ways in which they are simultaneously discursive struggles over cultural meaning, often articulated through the manipulation of "custom" or "tradition", since gender norms and rights to resources are tightly woven into the ideological fabric of societies, social institutions and structures (Agarwal 1994a, 84).

Following Sara Berry (1997), this work invites a view of social relations and institutions not as clearly bounded consensual social entities, but rather as arenas of struggle in which "people move, exchange ideas and resources, and negotiate or contest the terms of production, authority, and obligation" (Berry 1997:1228 ) in the context of changing historical and political-economic circumstances. Thinking about institutions as arenas of struggle is contingent upon the idea of people, not as simply disembodied social categories (based on gender, class, age or race) or passive victims of social structures but as social actors, capable of strategizing and finding spaces to maneuver in the situations they face and manipulating resources and meanings within and across multiple social boundaries. Rather than structure shaping (or dictating) action, social institutions are constituted by "multiple, simultaneous and successive acts of participation" (ibid), and as such, rules and structures are given meaning only through practice. Understood in this way, gendered resource rights and obligations within the conjugal contract, for example, are defined less by the rigid application of social rules and norms related to marriage than by the processes of negotiation through which such rules and norms are contested, reinterpreted, and redefined. In this way, social identities and institutions take on permanent qualities of "fluidity, ambiguity, and creativity" (ibid).

These studies also represent an important break with the interpretation of the difference in women's land claims from men's as necessarily implying their claims are weaker and secondary. The material presented above suggests that, at least in Sub-Saharan Africa, women's claims to land are much more diverse and often much stronger than usually represented. Although women may, and indeed do, encounter difficulty reaffirming or asserting new claims to land vis-à-vis male-dominated institutions and patriarchal power relations, there is evidence to suggest that given the flexibility and dynamism of tenure relations women, in specific situations, have been able to make and sustain claims to land.

## Gender and land tenure reform

The state is another arena in which struggles over rights to land are currently articulated. In the last two decades, many countries in Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Asia have been undertaking land reform in various guises as a means to promote economic growth and development, reduce poverty, and encourage more sustainable management of natural resources. Strongly influenced by global development policies and agendas, a dominant trend within land reform processes in the 1980s was to push to replace “indigenous” or “customary” land tenure systems with Western-styled private property regimes. As Susana Lastarria-Cornhiel (1997, 1317) explains, this change has been motivated by the prevailing, and predominantly neoliberal, argument that customary tenure systems constrain long-term investment in land and so hinder agricultural development and exacerbate poverty. As part of broader efforts to liberalize economies through free market approaches to rural economic development, land reform has commonly involved a shift toward individual and private ownership of land through which, it was thought, greater security of tenure would provide the necessary incentives for farmers to improve and invest in land as a productive resource (ibid).

Recent literature from Latin America (Deere and Leon 2003, Deere 2003), South Asia (Agarwal 2003), and Sub-Saharan Africa (Hilhorst 2000; Tsikata 2003; Whitehead and Tsikata 2003; Walker 2003) examine specific land tenure reform processes and their implications for women’s rights to land. This section explores three particular issues related to gender and land reform explored in the literature. The first relates to the exclusion of women in early land reform efforts, particularly in Latin America and South Asia, given cultural norms that view women’s role in agriculture as secondary to that of men and prevailing assumptions about households as sites of shared interest and resource pooling. The second focuses on more recent efforts to promote women’s individual legal rights to land within land reform processes. The third, specific to Sub-Saharan Africa, examines the recent (re)turn in policy discourse towards customary law and its potential implications for women’s access to land in the region.

### *The exclusion of women in early land reform efforts*

Studies from Latin America and South Asia focus considerable attention on questions of land reform and how these processes are shaping women’s rights to land in these regions. These studies similarly find that while land reform laws often appear to be gender neutral, these laws have in many cases reinforced gender inequality in terms of access to and control over land with women largely excluded from titling and registration processes for legal, cultural and/or ideological reasons. These studies identify two significant barriers to the inclusion of women in land registration and titling. The first relates to the widespread identification of men as the owners and primary tillers of land (Agarwal 2003; Deere and Leon 2001, 2003). Irrespective of the amount of labour that rural women dedicate to farming, Deere and Leon (2003, 935) assert that in Latin America, agriculture has been socially constructed as a predominantly male occupation. As a result, they explain, women’s work in agriculture is largely invisible and if considered at all, it is understood simply as “help” to a husband or as “secondary” to women’s primary role in the provision of domestic labour. The other culturally charged

concept that has permeated land reform policies in these regions relates to the definition of “the household” and assumptions about how households function and members relate. As Agarwal (2003, 200) notes in her discussion of land reform in South Asia, public policy typically operates on the basis of the unitary household model that assumes that family members share common interests and preferences, and pool all resources and incomes. As a result, public policy assumes that providing land titles to heads of households confers rights and benefits to other household members. With this, most land reform policies in the 1980s typically targeted “households” as their focus, in which the legal beneficiary of land is the household head. In the context of land redistribution in Latin America, Deere and Leon (2003, 935) explain, “those laws that did not explicitly designate household heads as beneficiaries stipulated that only one person per household could be a beneficiary” of redistributed land.

According to the most recent data available for eight Latin American countries undertaking land reforms between 1960 and the late 1980s studied by Deere and Leon (2001) the proportion of beneficiaries who were women ranged from negligible in Chile and Peru to 15 percent in Mexico, with other countries situated somewhere in between (e.g. Honduras 3.8%, Colombia 11.2%, and Costa Rica 11.8%). Most land reform schemes required beneficiaries to be household heads and so this land went to men (except in the cases of widow or single mothers). In Chile, Peru and El Salvador when large estates were expropriated, only permanent wage agricultural workers employed on the estates were eligible – these were usually men, as women were typically “seasonal workers” and therefore ineligible for land. In Colombia, education and farming experience were among the criteria for eligibility for redistributed land which again disadvantaged women due to their lower levels of education and the assumption, already mentioned, that men were the primary agriculturalists with women considered “helpers”, when considered at all. So, although the allocation criteria appeared gender neutral, Deere and Leon (2001; 2003) emphasize that they embody gendered norms and perceptions that served to exclude most women from land reform processes.

### *Promoting women’s individual rights to land*

Given the crucial role played by contemporary land reform programs in redefining rights to land in many parts of the world, and given the trends pointing to the predominant male bias of these reforms, pressure to prioritize women’s access to land – particularly through joint and individual titling for women - in agrarian reforms in Latin American, South Asia and Africa has been substantial, particularly by international agencies, national women’s coalitions, and indigenous social movements. Although the call for women’s individual land rights in different parts of the world is highly context specific, it has been shaped to a significant degree by western feminist perspectives with its focus on equality and rights. The 1979 UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, for example, included a section on property rights that made clear that efforts to end discrimination against women must include recognition of women’s rights to own, inherit and administer property in their own names (Deere and Leon 2003, 936). The subsequent UN World Conferences on Women dedicated greater attention to women’s land rights, argued not only in terms of efficiency (a strategy for raising women’s productivity) but as an economic right, with clear recognition of the importance

of women's ownership of land to their empowerment and pursuit of economic autonomy (ibid). These arguments are echoed more recently in the writings of Bina Agarwal, particularly her seminal book *A Field of One's Own* (1994b) in which she justifies the call for land rights for women in terms of welfare, efficiency and empowerment gains (also see Agarwal 2003). For Agarwal (1994b: 27-45), the welfare argument refers to the recognition that: women's land rights are associated with an increase in the well-being of women and their children; owned land can serve as collateral for credit or as a mortgageable or saleable asset during a crisis; land increases the probability of securing supplementary wage employment; land rights enhance children's, especially daughters', prospects for education and non-farm employment; and it can improve family nutrition. The efficiency argument refers to the "incentive effect", namely the effect of secure rights in land and control over its produce on the farmer's motivation to put in greater effort and investment in land. And finally, the empowerment argument recognizes that women's land rights are critical to enhancing their bargaining power within the household and community, to ending their subordination by men, and hence, to achieving real equality between women and men. While these arguments continue to underlie efforts to promote women's land rights under statutory law in different regions of the South, it is worth noting Cecil Jackson's (2003, 462) cautionary remark that the evidence to support these arguments remain far too macro and too limited to capture meaningfully the extent to which such statutory rights will prove central to overcoming the subordination of women.

In Latin America, the literature reviewed suggests that the demand for women's land rights evolved especially through rural social movements addressing broader questions of land rights (Deere and Leon 2001; Deere and Leon 2003; Deere 2003). In Brazil, for example, Carmen Deere (2003) explains that land rights for women was taken up to varying degrees as an issue within the landless movement, rural unions, and the autonomous rural women's movement. Despite this, the Brazilian case points to an interesting tension in land reform in the region. Although women's formal land rights were attained in the constitutional reform of 1988, which Deere largely attributes to the effort to end discrimination against women in all its dimensions, the achievement of formal equality in land rights did not lead to increased in the share of female beneficiaries of the reform, which remained low in the mid-1990s. According to Deere this was largely because women's land rights, in practice, was not a top priority of any of the rural social movements in Brazil. In particular, she argues that the main social movement determining the pace and direction of agrarian reform, the landless movement, considered class and gender issues to be incompatible; as she explains, "Gender issues were seen as divisive issues for the movement particularly at a moment (during the Collor Government) when the struggle for agrarian reform was becoming even more contentious, and in some cases, violent. The primary concern was for the unity of the movement – a struggle that demanded unity from all family members" (Deere 2003, 274). Although women's land rights were not being wholly ignored in the other movements in the 1990s, this issue was less central than, for example, the issue of rural women's paid maternity leave, and the right to retirement benefits which has been among the main concerns of women in rural unions. More recently, Deere explains that the growing consensus among all the rural social movements of the importance of securing women's land rights, coupled with effective lobbying, encouraged the Brazilian

government in 2001 to adopt specific mechanisms for the inclusion of women in agrarian reform (ibid).

Throughout Latin America, Deere and Leon (2003, 936) argue that the most important advance in favour of gender equity is legislation which contains explicit mechanisms of inclusion, namely, provision for the mandatory joint adjudication and titling of land to couples and/or that give priority to female-headed households or specific groups of women. Joint titling legislation, which establishes explicitly that property rights are vested in both the man and woman who comprise a couple, has now been established in Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Peru. In most of these countries, joint titling reinforces the notion of a dual-headed household and so it guards against one spouse making decisions with which the other spouse is not in accord, such as sale, rental or mortgage of the farm and protects widows from being disinherited through the will (ibid). Deere and Leon further assert that joint titling in these countries is likely to increase the bargaining power of women vis-à-vis men, enhancing their role in household and farm decision-making and promoting “family stability” (ibid, 937). Agarwal (2003, 201), on the other hand is less optimistic about the potential of joint titles to accrue real benefits for women. As she explains, under joint titling women may find it difficult to gain control over the produce, or to bequeath the land as they want, or to claim their shares in case of marital conflict or divorce. Wives may also have different land use priorities than husbands, yet it is not clear at all that joint titles would enable women to exercise these preferences for the same reason cited above. It is on this basis that Agarwal advocates passionately for individual land rights for women that are outside the authority of husbands and kin.

In South Asia, where women experience considerable difficulty securing rights to through marriage and kinship relations and through agrarian reforms processes, Agrawal argues that the organization of women into collectives might enable them to negotiate rights to land through the market. As Lastarria-Cornhiel (1997, 1326-27) explains, women in different parts of the South often encounter significant obstacles entering land markets. Women often enter the land market system with no property, little cash income, minimal political power and a family to maintain - not to mention prevailing gender norms against women owning land. Drawing on the experience of the Deccan Development Society’s support of land leasing through women’s collective organization, Agarwal is optimistic about the potential of this strategy to provide resource-poor women with secure rights to land outside the material and symbolic control of husbands and kin.

In the literature from Latin America and South Asia alike, what appears to be missing from the discussion around land rights for women, whether through joint or individual titling, or through collective lease arrangements, is any consideration of how these processes are being negotiated, and possibly contested, within and through the micropolitics of rural households and communities in these regions. In other words, rather than focusing on “women” as a category, greater attention to gender and gender relations seems necessary. For example, there seems the need for detailed ethnographic examination of the extent to which titling of different types 1) provides women with greater access to land for agricultural production and greater control over the product of their labour; 2) improves women’s decision-making authority vis-à-vis men in terms of how land is used and managed; and, 3) confers rights to women to bequeath, sell, or otherwise transfer the land as they wish. Given the pervasiveness of gender norms

underscored by both Deere and Leon (2001, 2003) and Agarwal (2003) that understand women not as farmers in their own right but as “helpers” whose role in agriculture, when considered at all, is seen as secondary to the contributions of men, these become crucial issues. As Mackenzie’s (1990) study from Kenya critically illustrates, statutory law does not replace existing institutions, rules and norms vis-à-vis rights to land, rather the two spheres interact, or are articulated with each other; they are overlapping arenas of struggle rather than rigid structures. To recall, where a married woman purchased land in Murang’a, the purchase and registration of title in her name was bitterly disputed within the household and lineage (Mackenzie 1990, 1995). Similarly, in Uganda, Thea Hillhorst (2000, 190) notes that social pressure and coercion are often used to force women to surrender their titles to male relatives, sell land cheaply, or relinquish their inheritance rights. In other cases, a man may stop contributing to the basic necessities of the household when his wife acquires a plot of land, or title, and thus a source of revenue. While these findings are certainly specific to their historical and cultural contexts, the point that households are fraught with gender relations of power that may shape the extent to which women benefit from land titling is widely relevant.

Though few would challenge the importance of pressing women’s rights to land recognized by statutory law, in Sub-Saharan Africa, where social relations vis-à-vis land differ considerably from Latin America and South Asia, the issue of advocating individual rights to land is less clear cut. As part of recent land reform efforts in South Africa, for example, the Department of Land Affairs’ Gender Unit strongly advocated women’s independent rights to land. But as Cherryl Walker (2003, 128) argues, this position has been informed largely by the DLA’s “uncritical reliance” on external research and international orthodoxies that espouse independent rights for women. According to Walker, this reliance has hindered critical reflection on South African conditions in the development of its gender policy. As she explains, “Theory is presented in training and policy documents as something static, given, which comes from experts who tend to be foreign. It does not have a dynamic relationship to actual practice” (ibid, 129), especially the everyday lived experiences of women and men in different historical, political-economic, and cultural contexts. Although the international discourse on gender has been important in legitimizing the struggle for gender equity, Walker insists that the authority accorded to international structures and experts is potentially disabling, suggesting there are “ready-made solutions to pre-given problems of inequity and subordination” (ibid). In the South African context, she suggests that the focus on individual rights for women needs to be tempered by “a deeper appreciation of the importance of household membership in poor women’s lives ... While a minority [of women] were interested in the idea of independent rights in land, delinked from that of their husbands and families, few saw this as the solution to their problems. They were more interested in mechanisms for securing, even extending their rights *within* their households” (ibid, 143, emphasis added). While households may be sites of subordination of many kinds, they are also, importantly, a source of material, social and emotional resources, a source of identity and support, providing membership in a social network that is often a crucial resource especially for poor women (Walker 2003; Jackson 2003). Given this, Walker argues that in South Africa “supporting a more gender-equitable reconfiguration of these ties, rather than a politics of withdrawal from patriarchal institutions, seems as important as promoting individual rights for those women for

whom that is an option”. There needs a recognition of the complexity, nuance and context-specificity of gendered social relations so as to avoid rushing to policy closure on land rights in all circumstances, or to blanket policy prescriptions.

*The return to “the customary” in African land reform: potential implications for women*

Another current running through recent literature on land tenure reform in Sub-Saharan Africa relates to the emerging debate about the potential of so-called “customary” systems to serve as the basis of land policy and their implications for women’s interests in land (Yngstrom 2002; Jackson 2003; Tsikata 2003; Whitehead and Tsikata 2003). As Whitehead and Tsikata explain, since the 1980s case studies in Sub-Saharan Africa have found considerable evidence to criticize free-market modernizing approaches to land tenure reform. As they explain, research on the economic effects of land registration shows “no clearly discernible impact on investment behaviour” (Platteau 2000 cited in Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 72). Moreover, studies consistently found that land registration had produced inequality and exacerbated insecurity: citing Platteau, “... land titling can be said to supply a mechanism for transfer of wealth in favour of the educated and economic and political elite ...”, as such “land titling opens up new possibilities of conflict and insecurity” (Platteau 2000 cited in Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 72). “Women, pastoralists, hunter-gathers, and low-caste people, former slaves, and people belonging to minority tribes” were among the groups whose customary claims were denied recognition in land registration processes (ibid). Strongly influenced by these and other findings, Whitehead and Tsikata (2003) note a shift in World Bank discourse on the issue of land reform emerging in the 1990s. Though still dominated by an orthodox modernizing position that “land markets and individual tenure are essential if individuals are to be willing to invest in land in order raise its productivity”, the authors note that current thinking in the Bank’s Land Policy Division has been swayed by recent evolutionary theories of tenure that see privatization developing from below, in response to population pressure and commercialization (also see Manji 2003). From this perspective, the Bank has developed a more positive view of the capacity of African customary systems of tenure to change in the “right” directions (Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 80).

Within the NGO community, Whitehead and Tsikata (2003, 88) find several justifications for basing reform on customary law. Land policy advocates OXFAM Great Britain and the International Institute for Environment and Development, for example, argue that local communities are best placed to manage their own affairs; that customary law has the merits of being embedded within local social relations and values; customary law is able to provide relative security to community members at lower cost than state-run structures, that it is flexible in that it allows different forms of access, and is more equitable in that it considers the needs of the poor.

The question for many has been what such a “return to the customary” might imply for women’s rights to land in the region. Debates around this issue are extraordinarily complex, involving a range of actors, interests and arguments, and will not be discussed at length here (see Yngstrom 2002; Tsikata 2003 for insightful analyses of debates around such reforms in Tanzania). Generally, although some contend that a reformed and strengthened customary law is in women’s interests the literature reviewed

expresses clear concern over insufficient attention being paid to power relations within customary institutions that structure rights to land. While there is certainly evidence that suggests women's rights under customary tenure arrangements in Africa are more diverse, and often much stronger, than typically recognized, and that women, in many circumstances, have been able to make and sustain claims to land either through subtle manipulation of custom or through the strategic allocation or withdrawal of women's labour, it remains that, whether as wives, sisters, or mothers, case studies show that women still have to "fight harder and strategize more skilfully" (Whitehead and Tsikata 2003, 102) to secure rights to land. As some of the studies presented earlier attest, more powerful individuals – usually men – fare better when the content of custom is subject to negotiation in new institutional arenas. Given this, Yngstrom (2002, 34) argues that for women who experience particular difficulties in exercising their land claims, the issue of control over land and mechanisms for dispute resolution are vital. In Tanzania, she explains, the new Land Acts make provision for Village Councils (elected village governments) to adjudicate and register customary rights and to preside over land disputes. Though female representation on these Councils will be mandatory, the author explains that women elected to these Councils are unlikely to demonstrate particular support for women's land claims since, across Africa, social claims made on others in support of land claims are typically made on the basis of kin or patron-client alliances rather than on the basis of alliances of gender or class. Moreover, as the ultimate authority for dispute resolutions in matters of lineage land rests with senior male lineage elders, she questions whether Village Councils could successfully (or fairly) adjudicate landholdings for women and men.

So while customary law might be understood as more democratic in the sense that that rural people have the right to their own cultural practices, "this may come at the expense of the right not to have one's livelihood threatened by discriminatory practices in the name of culture and tradition" (Tsikata 2003, 179). The Village Council may be more democratic and representative, but it will also have a stronger interest than the state in protecting customary practices, such as those that discriminate against women's rights to land. For Dzodzi Tsikata, "to ask women to wait until customary practices have themselves evolved through contest within their societies is to deny them a level playing field, and that is discriminatory" (ibid). She insists that if customary principles need to be changed with care, "then surely women need all the help they can get to achieve this and statutory law maybe one of a number of measures that are needed, even granting all of its limitations and what is required to make it work"

Yngstrom (2002, 34) argues that one way of addressing women's tenure insecurity might be through family law. Family law, she explains, could be restructured so as "to recognize men and women's equal claims on marital assets in the context of the mutual rights and responsibilities they have towards each other in the production process under custom" and this could prove a powerful tool for women to exercise their claims (ibid). Among other things, this would give a woman's case far more weight in a court of law – although the problem of limited access to courts and knowledge about rights and presentation of evidence needs to be tackled for this to be realizable. Moreover, citing Ghana's 1985 Intestate Succession Law as example, Yngstrom suggests that family law reform has the potential to ensure that a woman has the right to her deceased husband's land in the face of claims from the husband's kin. Reform of marriage laws could

likewise enable divorced women to claim rights to a proportion of land acquired upon marriage, and married women could be protected against sales of conjugal property (ibid).

For Whitehead and Tsikata (2003, 103) the issue of how best to secure rural women's land rights depends crucially on democratic reform, particularly with respect to women's political interests and voices in all decision-making levels that are implied by the land question: in local-level management systems, within the formal law, and also within the government and civil society itself. More specifically, they stress the need for sustained and serious discussion of how new functions for existing local-level institutions, or new local-level land management systems, might ensure that women's land use claims are supported, rather than undermined. Whatever the mechanism, they argue that "women's land claims need to be based on a nuanced and highly sensitive set of policy discourses and policy instruments – ones which reflect the social embeddedness of land claims, the frequent gender inequality in such relations and the rights to livelihood of African women" (ibid). What form this might take is yet to be imagined.

While the historical, cultural and political-economic complexities both within and across the regions of Latin America, Asia, and Africa make it difficult to examine questions of "gender and land tenure" in any meaningful way, this review highlights something of the extraordinarily complex and lively nature of gender relations and rights in land.

Questions of gender and land rights are subject to on-going contestation, negotiation and redefinition in the political arenas of household and state in ways that continue to have dramatic and far-reaching implications for women's (and men's) access to land. Given the continued importance of land for sustaining rural livelihoods, research that examines how political-economic restructuring, international development interventions, on-going efforts in land tenure reform and other processes are reshaping rights to land, and how these are encountered and negotiated through local gender relations in different contexts, remains crucial to ensuring greater equity between women and men vis-à-vis land in the South.

### Approaching globalization, gender and land tenure: methodological issues suggested by the literature

Although the literature reviewed did not, for the most part, examine issues of research methodology, it did emphasize something of the extraordinary complexity and dynamism of gender and land tenure issues in the South, demonstrating the need for a richer analytical framework and a much more fine-grained contextual analysis of social relations than is often found in studies engaging in "gender analysis". What clearly emerges from this work is that equating "gender" with "women" is analytically and politically inadequate. For Jackson (2003), thinking of gender in terms of social identities and relations, rather than focusing on women as a category, casts the gendering of land issues in a different light requiring a more sophisticated analytical and methodological stance. It prioritizes detailed critical ethnographies and poses research questions around,

for example, the diverse and overlapping subject positions of women and men (as wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, lineage members, farmers, wage labourers etc.) in relation to land, the importance of subjectivities in relation to desire for land, the ways household structures, lineage ideologies and marriage practices are experienced by differently positioned women, and how women and men as actors make and are made by processes of political-economic change (Jackson 2003, 472).

Jackson (2003) also stresses, importantly, the need to disaggregate the term “land”. As she explains, “the social relations that inhere in homestead land and gardens are very different to those of intensively cultivated infields or lowland paddy, or extensively cultivated dry uplands, or land with permanent tree crops. Land of differing value, location, soil type, topography, as well as land with differing tenure and production relations – owned jointly or individually, inherited, purchased, borrowed or share-cropped – will have distinctive kinds of social relations, norms and discourses that pattern their use”. Recalling the work of Carney and Watts (1990) discussed earlier, the cultural designations of fields for household use as *maruo* and those for individual personal use as *kamanyango* imply very different kinds of social relations (in terms of gendered labour obligations, rights to control of the product etc.) and as such became a locus of struggle when men tried to reclassify women’s individual *kamanyango* plots as *maruo* under the Jahaly-Pacharr irrigation project.

Most importantly perhaps, the literature reviewed illustrates that “gender” and “land” as concepts, are not fixed or immutable, but rather are historically and socially specific constructions that are made and remade through negotiation and struggle between men and women, though also along other axes of difference, in response to political-economic change of different kinds. Recent studies cited above demonstrate that as macroeconomic restructuring, international development intervention, and land reform processes place new demands and value on land, property rights become an arena of struggle. As illustrated above, these struggles, while certainly material, reveal deeper struggles over meanings in the ways that land and labour are defined, negotiated and contested within the social relations of the marriage, household and kinship (Carney 1996; Carney and Watts 1990; Mackenzie 1990; Schroeder 1997). These complex and dynamic social realities are difficult to unravel analytically, and even more difficult to convey to policymakers.

Methodologically, these insights suggest the need for fine-grained ethnographic research of the kind detailed earlier (e.g. Carney and Watts 1990; Mackenzie 1990; Schroeder 1997; Gray and Kevane 1999). Ethnography offers an approach to research and writing that refuses generalization. The danger of generalization, of course, is that it produces the effect of homogeneity, coherence, and timelessness that flattens out differences among people and variability across different contexts, smoothing over contradictions, conflicts, and historical circumstances (Abu-Lughod 1993, 9). Ethnographic research recognizes difference and explores the concrete, lived experiences of women and men within and across different historical, cultural and political-economic situations. As Lela Abu-Lughod (1992, 27) explains:

[Exploring] the dailiness, by breaking with coherence and introducing time, trains our gaze on flux and contradiction; and the particulars suggest that others live as we perceive ourselves living – not as automations programmed according to

“cultural” rules or acting our social rules, but as people going through life wondering what they should do, making mistakes, being opinionated, vacillating, trying to make themselves look good, enduring tragic personal losses, enjoying others, and finding moments of laughter. It is hard for the language of generalization to convey these sorts of experiences and activities.

Qualitative methods such as personal narratives, semi-structured interviewing, and participatory rural appraisal techniques seek to differentiate rather than homogenize, focus on diversity rather than universality, on variability rather than averages (Chambers 1992, 14). Only through such a qualitative approach can researchers begin to explore the everyday livelihood struggles of rural people in the context of rapid political-economic change. Ethnography grounded in the everyday, allows us to question, for example, the place and importance of land for sustaining rural livelihoods as macroeconomic restructuring unfolds in different places; how the introduction of new crops, agricultural techniques and/or tenure arrangements are intensifying struggles over gender roles, rights and obligations within the social relations of marriage and kinship in ways that have far-reaching, and highly context-specific, implications for women and men’s access to land and labour; or how government efforts aimed at land tenure reform, especially through land titling and registrations, are “playing out” in practice, on the ground, in the everyday lives of women and men in the South.

### Conclusion

The literature presented here provides considerable insight into how processes of political-economic change – including macroeconomic restructuring, international development interventions, agrarian reform processes – are transforming tenure relations and redefining rights to land in ways that are deeply gendered. Land in different parts of the South has become an increasingly contested terrain in which women and men struggle to reclaim, retain or establish new rights to this and other productive resources. Studies from Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America suggest that these struggles are taking place in the multiple, often overlapping, arenas of household and state. The introduction of new crops and forms of agriculture, for example, are intensifying struggles over gender roles, obligations and rights to land and labour within the social relations of marriage and kinship. At the same time, national and international efforts aimed at land tenure reform are redefining rights to land, through the state, in ways that are deeply gendered. As these complex processes place new demands and value on land (and labour), and transform the rules and norms governing rights to land, social relations in these political arenas often explode with gender conflict. Although women in many contexts have experienced an erosion of their pre-existing rights to land as a result of these processes, the literature emphasizes, if nothing else, that gender and land are historically and socially specific constructions that are made and remade through negotiation and struggle. Women, under some circumstances, have been able to prise open patriarchal control of property and secure rights to land through, for example, the subtle manipulation of customary law, through the strategic allocation or withdrawal of their labour from family farms, by investing in social relations through which to secure rights to land outside the material and symbolic control of husbands and male kin, such as

through the modern medium of local collective organization, and by advocating rural women's rights to land through public policy reform. Given the often-extraordinary complexity and dynamism of gender and land tenure issues in the South, this literature demonstrates the need for detailed ethnographic research that seeks a much clearer and deeper sense of this complexity and situates the analysis of gender relations and land rights in the everyday lives of rural women and men.

## References

- Abu-Lughod, L. 1993. *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin Stories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Adamo, A. 1999. *Wealth in People: Social Networks and Access to Resources Among Female Market Gardeners in Kakasunanka, Ghana*. M.A. Thesis. Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Agarwal, B. 1994a. Gender, Resistance, and Land: Interlinked Struggles Over Resources and Meanings in South Asia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 22 (1), 81-125.
- Agarwal, B. 1994b. *A field of one's own: Gender and land rights in South Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agarwal, B. 2003. Gender and Land Rights Revisited: Exploring New Prospects via the State, Family and Market. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3 (1,2), 184-224.
- Bassett, T. J. 2002. Women's Cotton and the Spaces of Gender Politics in Northern Cote d'Ivoire. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 9(4), 351-370.
- Bee, A. 2000. Globalization, grapes and gender: Women's work in traditional and agro export production in northern Chile. *The Geographical Journal*, 166 (3), 255-265.
- Berry, S. 1989. Social Institutions and Access to Resources. *Africa*, 59 (1), 41-55.
- Berry, S. 1997. Tomatoes, Land and Hearsay: Property and History in Asante in the Time of Structural Adjustment. *World Development*, 25 (8), 1225-1241.
- Carney, J. 1996. Converting the Wetlands, Engendering the Environment: The intersection of gender with agrarian change in Gambia. In *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*. eds. Watts, M. and R. Peet. 165-187. London: Routledge.
- Carney, J. and M. Watts. 1990. Manufacturing Dissent: Work, Gender and the Politics of Meaning in a Peasant Society. *Africa*, 60 (2), 207-240.

- Chambers, R. 1992. Rural Appraisal: Rapid, Relaxed, and Participatory. IDS Discussion Paper No. 311. University of Sussex.
- Chussudovsky, M. 1997. Economic Genocide in Rwanda, In The Globalization of Poverty. Penang, Malaysia: Third World Network, 111-122.
- Deere, C.D. and M. Leon. 2001. Empowering Women: Land and Property Rights in Latin America. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Deere, C.D. and M. Leon. 2003. The Gender Asset Gap: Land in Latin America. World Development, 31 (6), 925-947.
- Glover, D. 1991. A Layman's Guide to Structural Adjustment, Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 12(1), 173-186.
- Gray, L. and M. Kevane, 1999. Diminished Access, Diverted Exclusion: Women and Land Tenure in Sub-Saharan Africa, African Studies Review, 42 (2), 15-39.
- Hillhorst, T. 2000. Women's Land Rights: Current Developments in Sub-Saharan Africa. In Evolving land rights, policy and tenure in Africa. Eds. Toulmin, C. and J. Quan. 181-196. London: DFID/IIED/NRI.
- Jackson, C. 2003. Gender Analysis of Land: Beyond Land Rights for Women. Journal of Agrarian Change, 3(4), 453-480.
- Kandiyoti, D. 2003. The Cry for Land: Agrarian Reform, Gender and Land Rights in Uzbekistan. Journal of Agrarian Change, 3( (1,2), 225-256.
- Kevane, M. and L. Gray. 1999. A Woman's Field is Made at Night: Gendered Land Rights and Norms in Burkina Faso. Feminist Economics, 5(3), 1-26.
- Lastarria-Cornhiel, S. 1997. Impact of Privatization on Gender and Property Rights in Africa. World Development, 25 (8), 1317-1333.
- Mackenzie, Fiona, 1990. Gender and Land Rights in Murang'a District, Kenya. Journal of Peasant Studies, 17 (4), 609-642.
- Mackenzie, F. 1993. Exploring the Connections: Structural Adjustment, Gender and the Environment, Geoforum, 24(1), 71-87.
- Mackenzie, Fiona, 1995. "A farm is like a child who cannot be left unguarded": gender land and labour in Central Province, Kenya. IDS Bulletin, 26 (1), 24-32.
- Manji, A. 2003. Remortgaging Women's Lives: The World Bank's Land Agenda in Africa. Feminist Legal Studies, 11, 139-162.

- Moore, D. 1996. Marxism, Culture, and Political Ecology: Environmental Struggles in Zimbabwe's Eastern Highlands. In Liberation Ecologies. eds. Peet, R. and M.Watts. 125-147. London: Routledge.
- Moore, H.L. and Vaughan, M. 1994. Cutting Down Trees: Gender, Nutrition, and Agricultural Change in the Northern Province of Zambia. 1890-1990. Portsmouth, Hienemann.
- Paulson, S., L. Gezon, and M. Watts. 2004. Politics, Ecologies, Genealogies. In Political Ecology across Spaces, Scales and Social Groups. eds. Paulson, S. and L. Gezon. 17-37. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Peet, R. and M. Watts. 1996. Liberation Ecology: Development, Sustainability, and Environment in an age of market triumphalism. In Liberation Ecologies. eds. Peet, R. and M.Watts. 1-45. London: Routledge.
- Razavi, S. 2003. Introduction: Agrarian Change, Gender and Land Rights. Journal of Agrarian Change. 3(1,2), 2-32.
- Schroeder, R. 1996. "Gone to Their Second Husbands": Marital Metaphors and Conjugal Contracts in The Gambia's Female Garden Sector. Canadian Journal of African Studies, 30 (1), 69-87.
- Schroeder, R. 1997. "Re-claiming" Land in The Gambia: Gendered Property Rights and Environmental Intervention. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 87 (3), 487-508.
- Schroeder, R. 1999. Shady Practices: Agroforestry and Gender Politics in the Gambia. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Slater, D. 2003. Rethinking the Geopolitics of the Global: The case of North-South relations, In Globalization: Theory and Practice. E. Kofman and G. Young (eds) London: Continuum.
- Tsikata, D. 2003. Securing Women's Interests within Land Tenure Reforms: Recent Debates in Tanzania. Journal of Agrarian Change, 3 (1,2), 149-183.
- Verma, R. 2001. Gender, Land and Livelihoods in East Africa: Through Farmers' Eyes. Ottawa: IDRC.
- Walker, C. 2003. Piety in the Sky? Gender Policy and Land Reform in South Africa. Journal of Agrarian Change, 3 (1,2), 113-148.

- Whitehead, A. and D. Tsikata. 2003. Policy Discourses on Women's Land Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Implications of the Re-Turn to the Customary. Journal of Agrarian Change, 3 (1,2), 67-112.
- Williams, G. 1994. Why Structural Adjustment is Necessary and Why It Doesn't Work, Review of African Political Economy, 60, 214-225.
- Yngstrom, I. 2002. Women, Wives and Land Rights in Africa: Situating Gender Beyond the Household in the Debate Over Land Policy and Changing Tenure Systems. Oxford Development Studies, 30 (1), 21-40.

**1. Joyce Bayande Endeley**

Department of Women and Gender Studies  
Faculty of Social and Management Science,  
University of Buea  
P.O. Box . 63 Buea  
Cameroon  
Tel: 237-332 21 34 ext 3103/3035  
Alternate phone: 84 4 0913 380224  
Fax: 237-332 23 50  
Email: joyceendeley@yahoo.com;  
[j\\_bayande@hotmail.com](mailto:j_bayande@hotmail.com)

**2. Fondo Sikod**

University of Yaounde II  
P.O. Box 8302  
Biyem Assi  
Yaounde, Cameroon  
Tel.: +237-750-0869  
Email: [fsikod2002@yahoo.com](mailto:fsikod2002@yahoo.com)

**3. Khuat Thu Hong**

The Institute for Social Development Studies  
Suite 906, Building 17-T5  
Trung Hoa Nhan Chinh,  
Tran Duy Hung Road  
Hanoi, Vietnam  
Tel: (84-4) 2510232/33  
Fax: (84-4) 2510250  
Email: [isds@isds.org](mailto:isds@isds.org) /  
[kthong@isds.org.vn](mailto:kthong@isds.org.vn) /  
[khuatthuhong@yahoo.com](mailto:khuatthuhong@yahoo.com)

**4. Nguyen Thi Van Anh**

The Institute for Social Development Studies  
Suite 906, Building 17-T5  
Trung Hoa Nhan Chinh,  
Tran Duy Hung Road  
Hanoi, Vietnam  
Tel: (84-4) 2510232/33  
Fax: (84-4) 2510250  
Email: [vananh@isds.org.vn](mailto:vananh@isds.org.vn)

**5. Noemi Miyaska Porro**

Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM)  
Avenida Nazaré 669 - CEP: 66035-170  
Belém, Pará Brazil  
Tel: 55-91-32665389 (h); office at  
IPAM: 55-91-32834358  
Email: [noemi@ipam.org.br](mailto:noemi@ipam.org.br),  
[noemip@uol.com.br](mailto:noemip@uol.com.br)

**6. Alfredo Wagner Berno de Almedia**

Rua Gabriel Magalhaes 20  
P.O. Box 54  
Leopoldina, Minas Gerais  
36.700.00  
Brazil  
Email: [alfredow@leopoldina.com.br](mailto:alfredow@leopoldina.com.br)

**7. Dzodzi Tsikata**

Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER)  
University of Ghana P.O. Box LG74  
Accra Ghana  
Office Tel: 00 233 21  
512506/501182/512502/3;  
Fax: 00 233 21 512504/ 500937;  
Alternate fax: 00 233 21 511188  
Email: [dzodzit@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:dzodzit@yahoo.co.uk) ,  
[dtsikata@ug.edu.gh](mailto:dtsikata@ug.edu.gh) ,  
[dtsikata@isser.ug.edu.gh](mailto:dtsikata@isser.ug.edu.gh)

**8. Mariana Awumbila**

Department of Geography and resource and Development  
University of Ghana  
P.O. Box LG59  
Legon, Ghana  
Tel.: +233-21-500394  
Fax: +233-21-500382  
Email: [mawumbil@ug.edu.gh](mailto:mawumbil@ug.edu.gh)

**9. Fiona Mackenzie**

Department of Geography and  
Environmental Studies  
Carleton University  
1125 Colonel By Drive  
Ottawa, ON  
K1S 5B6  
Canada  
Tel: (613) 520 2600 ext. 2576  
Fax (613) 520 4301  
E-mail: [fiona\\_mackenzie@carleton.ca](mailto:fiona_mackenzie@carleton.ca) ,  
[afdmackenzie@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:afdmackenzie@abdn.ac.uk)

**10. Allison Goebel**

Women's Studies and Environmental  
Studies  
Mac-Corry D504  
Queen's University  
Kingston, ON  
K7L 3N6  
Canada  
Office tel: (613) 533 6000 ext. 75904  
Fax(613) 533-2824  
E-mail: [goebela@post.queensu.ca](mailto:goebela@post.queensu.ca)

**11. Stéphanie Neilson**

Universal Management Group  
100 Argyle Ave, Suite 200  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K2P 1B6  
Tel: (613) 232-8401  
Fax: (613) 232-7630  
E-mail : [sneilson@universalia.com](mailto:sneilson@universalia.com)

**12. Abra Adamo**

E-mail: [abrakadamo@yahoo.ca](mailto:abrakadamo@yahoo.ca)

**13. Bill Carman**

Communication Division  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext. 2089

E-mail: [bcarman@idrc.ca](mailto:bcarman@idrc.ca)

**14. Pamela Golah**

Gender Unit  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext.2209  
E-mail: [pgolah@idrc.ca](mailto:pgolah@idrc.ca)

**15. Emma Naughton**

Gender Unit  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext. 2311  
Email: [enaughton@idrc.ca](mailto:enaughton@idrc.ca)

**16. Colleen Duggan**

Gender Unit  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext. 2024  
Email: [CDuggan@idrc.ca](mailto:CDuggan@idrc.ca)

**17. Carla Yanez**

Gender Unit  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext.2027  
E-mail: [cyaney@idrc.ca](mailto:cyaney@idrc.ca)

**18. Genevieve Asselin**

Gender Unit  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext. 2486  
Email: [gasselin@idrc.ca](mailto:gasselin@idrc.ca)

**19. Barbara Porrett**

Research Information Service  
IDRC  
Tel: (613) 236 6163 ext.2243  
E-mail: [bporrett@idrc.ca](mailto:bporrett@idrc.ca)

DAY 1—26 September 2005

---

**1.0 When you reflect on your project and your literature review what are some of the ways in which your research can add to the literature?***Cameroon*

- Almost no literature on the issue in general in the region (Central Africa Region) as a whole
- The written literature does not exist – some written on land tenure but not incorporating globalization (oil exploration)
- Perception of gender by globalizing agents like oil companies – gender was not considered in terms
- Attempt at equity in payments of compensation (gender included by default – but not expressly considered – they did not think about it or talk about it)
- What is the priority – can you arrive at gender equality through equity? What is the contribution of gender analysis?
- What is the role of TNC's in undertaking development vs the role of the state?

*Brazil*

- Did not start from revising the literature and filling a gap --, went to the field listened to people, local knowledge identifies themes, dialogue with researchers and local, better refine the dialogue
- Each different group had different forms of knowledge and of dialoguing with the team
- Building capacities of the researchers, but also built the capacities of research subjects
- From the point of view of methodology – the contribution is on the use of dialoguing between the academics and local knowledge
- This relationship is a form of constructing local capacities (there is and our own)
- Local forms of conceptualizing land, gender and globalization
- How do people live their gender relations ... and their relationship with the land?
- We tried not to let analytical tools define what we encountered or reported
- Literature very legalised or geographical --- their conception of land was one of thinking of their territory –
- In some situation --- patrilineal -- “Common sense of male domination” in literature but there were some remaining matrifocal relations, gender was not separated from inter-generational issues (significance of the grandmothers in the social movements)
- Thought of the publication as a dialogue – different types of publication for research subjects (local people),
- They have done a small booklet only in Portuguese for researchers
- What about circulating life-stories of women --- short magazine (from country to country)
- Traditional forms of communication --- apart from newsletter what else ---

### *Ghana*

- We worked differently --- we went to the field having reviewed the literature --- but once we got there we identified new issues
- Globalization – commercialization of resources does not necessarily improve access for women (this has not improved access for women)
- Resources do not necessarily benefit local economies --- e.g. small scale gold mines not near the agricultural fields no real benefit
- Capital demands of entry to high in gold mining
- Close link between labour relations and land relations intertwined more in gold than in mangrove --- related to access to land --- Axes of social relations ---
- Flexibility ---non flexibility of land relations --- things were incredibly segmented and stiff in people's life --- it was a struggle to realize this flexibility -- - in situations of stress things really solidify
- Gold and mangrove case studies ---- dimensions not a lot of literature on the gender dimensions
- Legal pluralism --- very integrated and connected system between the customary and the statutory
- Issues of access to land not on the agenda as opposed to land titling
- Impact of scarcity

### *Vietnam*

- Rich data --- huge data sets
- Gap in literature
- Kinships relation more powerful – makes women very vulnerable
- Uniqueness of the political context – many land reforms
- Political changes are linked to globalization
- North --- communist --- south –
- Decollectivization --- women
- Better insight of the land tenure system
- Customary system very strong

### ***Literature Review – Fiona's comments on how this paper overlaps with the discussion above***

- Land tenure and gender and so enmeshed in other issues (democratization) ---
- Land tenure cannot be treated in isolation
- How gender is conceptualized --- not women --- gender relations are important in thinking land tenure
- Land is a material resource --- meanings of land change ---- meanings of land change -- meanings are continually rethought
- Nest of Values --- hierarchies
- Did not realize the values of what was coming to them – ability to demand for their right limited (how it relates to them missing) ---
- Who is responsible for what --- who failed the people (who is helping the locals to understand the situation)

### Gaps in Literature Review

- Gaps on regional literature
- Only northern literature cited
- Some Concepts not addressed – so that it can cover the scope of the studies (political economy – does it fit in?)
- Difficult to think about what makes the project globalizing.
- Think about how state policies determine how globalization plays out in different situations. SAP, HIPC

### **2.0 Who is this book targeted to?**

- A book that targets all – local people, academics,
- Language --- try to think about how to finance these translations --- funds available
- Academics
- Policy makers
- Local people
- NGOs
- Advocates
- Agreement with local institutions to publish- translate
- TNC's
- IFI's

### **3.0 How can we make this as a collaborative process?**

#### Group defines the collaborative editing process

- Fiona, Allison and Pam to take lead of conceptual and methodological chapters. They should use 5 pagers and contributions from workshop, synthesize them, and write draft chapters. These will be circulated for comments from all of the workshop participants
- Project teams take the responsibility for their own case study chapters (the content of which will partially emerge from group discussion). Each case study chapter will be written by the project team and then passed to the group for comment. Based on these comments project teams will revise their chapters
- The process of dialogue and review forms the basis of this collaborative editing process
- Firm deadlines will be set for the process above. Comments must be sent by the agreed upon deadlines.
- Fiona will compile the draft manuscript
- The manuscript will be sent for copy editing and peer review (to be discussed)

### **DAY 2—27 September 2005**

---

Key Issues on Conceptual Approaches Land, Globalization and Gender  
Cameroon and Brazil

## Land

- Specificity/ Geographical
- Social/Territorial
- Land as Process
- Land as related to collective and individual identity
- Land materiality and meaning --“ The palms are the mothers of the people”, the football field
- Land as resistance
- Questioning the discourse on rights to land e.g. customary/traditional, regional
- Land scarcity/abundance
- Labour rights and Land Rights

## Ecology/Nature

- Global visions imposed on local visions
- Nature as ground for the resistance “The woman is part of the land/
- In the context of globalization, new powerful actors are creating new categorizations
- Nature as part of how political positions are constructed

## Gender

- Social difference as puzzle/ grid
- Age, Class, Ethnicity, Community, Education
- Rural/Urban
- Nomad/Sedentary
- Class

## Globalization

- Local collective and individual identities identity vis a vis resistance
- Globalization as a deliberate/intentional act -- / “normative insistence”
- How the North constructs the South
- Contested globalization

## Resistance

- Commodity vs alternative markets

## **DAY 3—28 September 2005**

---

### Some Comments on Capacity Building

#### Noemi

- Capacity Building Occurred (dialogues)
- Participants
- Leaders
- Articulators
- Co-researchers
- Institutional Partners

- Research
- Advisor
- Activities vary varied
- Did not work well with institutional partners
- Went to the field some disagreements between NGOs and local people
- Advisor
- Filed Work
- Local Meetings and Workshops
- Regional -- Meetings, workshops and Public Hearings
- International – Workshops, Training at Public Hearings

Fondo --- (awareness raising)

- Understanding of capacity building has been dynamic
- Thought initially as a one way flow
- Flows both ways
- Beneficiaries, Rural Affected Communities, Rural Women, University Students and Staff, Policy Makers and NGO's, Project Owners
- Thought about ethics more deeply and wrote a paper.
- Enabled the women in households to think more deeply about their role
- End of Project Workshop – disseminate results to NGO's, Policy Makers
- Capacity Building – in terms of awareness building
- Oil company
- University Setting – lot of data – ripple effect that can go on in terms teaching etc.

Dzodzi and Mariama (use of methodology workshop)

- Their own skills
- Research Assistants
- Research Guides – reconnaissance survey
- After the workshop – the literature (thinking about issues of confidentiality)

Key lessons to share

- Lessons on entry into research communities – see chiefs, issues are different in temporary communities --- think about different ways of entry
- Were you the first workers --- mariama – worked with mangroves before

Vietnam and Ghana -- Key Issues from this group – Conceptual Approaches

Globalization

- Operationalizing Globalization as context land reform, trade liberalization
- Importance of specificity -- ways in which globalization plays out
- Operationalizing Globalization as process (– people have to negotiate on a daily basis)
- Environmental change also pre-dates globalization and acts as a mediating context historical legacy)
- Migration

### Gender or Social Difference

- Significance of gender does not come out in clear ways (groups did not not assume that gender is the primary social difference – other social relations may not be prominent)
- In both cases the creation of new social categories of meaning e.g. in the North of Ghana and with women in Vietnam
- Migrant-locals
- Reworking of existing social categories – chief calling himself a tendana
- Gender remained an important social issue and was always there

### Land

- How the meanings of the Land has changed – not just land use has changed but the meanings of land for the people has changed
- Difficult to distinguish between resource- land tenure
- Connections between land and labour relations

### **After the small group discussion – Plenary:**

***How has you thinking about the conceptual approaches or methodology progressed or changed from the 5- pager that you wrote in preparation for the workshop?***

### **Ghana**

#### Conceptual Approaches

- Use of the concepts of globalization – committed to working through globalization as process, we tended to focus on context
- Importance of environmental change, saw it as separate from globalization --- but we committed to seeing whether there are links between environmental change and globalization

#### Methodological issues

- Need to think more about how we study social change in our findings
- We were not ambitious about bringing about social change but realized that we underestimated how this may have occurred through project implementation

### **Cameroon**

#### Conceptual Approaches/ Methodological issues

- Thought about globalization differently – want to look into the politics of the construction of how north constructs the south,
- we want to think about the politics of ecology vs nature which we think is shaping how compensation is giving out, we think that the North pays more attention to ecology rather than to the people
- Think deeper into how the NGO community feeds into globalizing discourse --- do they help the rural people?
- Took for granted the social structure – want to think about the effect of the project on the social structure, want to think about intersections more deeply

- Want to think about different sources of resistance
- In terms of land we just assumed that there was abundant land --- but we now want to consider the loss of land that communities are attached to has an impact on the community – we want to consider the material and social meanings of land, this also affects the politics of compensation

### **Vietnam**

#### *Conceptual Approaches*

- Feel clearer with conceptual framework particularly with globalization – had difficulty with conceptualising globalization in research and want to think of it now as both a context and as a process
- We collected data on the environmental aspect, did not plan to include this but now we will include in our research
- Initially concerned that gender was not the only social difference, other social variables (age marital status, regional differences, occupation) also come up and these are also connected to the analysis of “gender, globalization and land tenure”

#### Methodological issues

- We now think that the methodology itself brought about social change, we did not initially consider the power the methodology to do this

### **Brazil**

#### Conceptual Change / Methodological issues

- Globalization is deliberate process, with identifiable actors, not faceless process
- A lot of anthropological views – our research should be able to establish dialogues, we want to be more prepared to present ourselves/research process and results to different institutions
- Research hosted by grassroots organization and has certain results, need to communicate our results across disciplines and institutions.
- We need to think about how to combine our approach and institutional backgrounds in the book as a whole

#### **What are some of the key conceptual/methodological issues that you want to feature in your chapter in the book?**

#### Ghana

- Want to discuss land and labour relations – how are these intertwined, how they are critical in determining access and control to land/resources
- Want to look at the complications concerning legal pluralism and how these are not always that clear cut,
- Will focus on how it is not easy to distinguish between the customary and the statutory,
- Also want to look at how customary laws are changing in response to resource pressure and how this affects gender relations.
- Want to look at how new social identities are being constructed in struggles over resource use

- Look at liberalization policies/ and commercialization of resources and the implication of these for resource access use.

### Vietnam

- Think of Globalization as a context and link this to land tenure reforms
- Think about how the meaning of land changed in this context (key point from which we will elaborate how the gender relations changed)
- How have the gender relations changed in terms of division of labour, livelihood, power/ relations
- Now able to link meaning of land to globalization

### Cameroon

- The politics of ecology vs nature
- How the North constructs the South in terms of the compensation that are made
- Resistance and resulting changes in the social structure (going to link compensation and land)
- Main focus in going to be on compensation and the relation of the points above

### Brazil

- Discuss locally based concepts of gender that emerged from grassroots and are to linked methodological approach
- From interviewees, women will not be empowered by the same agents that contribute to their disempowerment via globalization
- Discuss how this connects to their struggle for the land
- Think about how globalization homogenizes identities --- want to illustrate how different groups can come together to make collective ideas
- New identities can produce new social action that is different from the global idea
- New ideas (if we could see some trends in the four experiences – how does agrarian reform ---link to land reforms ---link to changes in the national level ---)
- Allowed the surfacing of ambiguities

## **Reflections on Conceptual Approaches--Fiona**

### General Comments

- We are taking a case study approach to get at questions that inform the analysis
- Privileging specificity
- What does each project contribute to the understanding of gender, globalization and Land tenure
- Tease out the intricacies of relationships between national and global
- Case study approach allows us to working at multiple scales
- How what happens at local level reverberates at what happens at the global level

### Globalization

- We frequently look as globalization as context against which people's actions take place

- It is also a process (this view allows the conceptualization of globalization as a process that does not have the same inevitability)
- Globalization – “normative insistence” ---- case studies show that this is not necessarily true
- It is a process through which social categories are constituted --calls into being new social categories (the “given-ness” of gender needs to be questioned)

### Nature

- How we configure nature affects how we configure the research issues
- The idea that nature as socially produced – the boundaries between what is natural and what is social are very fuzzy, we need to question this boundary
- How nature becomes part and parcel of the global project (Vietnam – pesticide use, Ghana – use of mercury),
- All of the projects are embedded in histories
- Cameroon “the women is part of the land” – thinking about how the land use change that has to accompany the laying of the pipeline
- Brazil – the creation of “green celebrities”, “eco-heroines”

### Resistance

- Came through strongly in Brazil’s work
- Collective resistance, globalization is contested, the homogenization is contested

### Social Difference & Gender

- We tend to conceptualize on an individual rather than collective basis (perhaps look at work groups)
- People were questioning what gender meant but looked at how it played itself out in relation to other social categories of difference (age, life cycle, class, ethnicity, etc)
- Talked most about gender but also focussed on other social identities
- Brazil -- Metaphor of gender as a “jigsaw – puzzle” –
- The meaning of gender is changing
- Vietnam – Emergence of new social categories
- Reworking of existing social categories in a very deliberate sense (in Ghana chief taking on the identity of a religious leader to assume greater influence)
- Gender is important (but necessarily the only issue)
- What are the emerging social categories? The political implications of these?
- How do you understand community identity? (e.g. compensations in Cameroon and how these were negotiated)
- --- Categories of gender are really rigid although it is a category that can be renegotiated it is difficult to do this --- is this linked to questions of labour? Particular activities (oil, farming etc)? Why? --- (Cameroon, Ghana, Vietnam)

### Other

- The issue of who has knowledge and how that plays itself out came up in all the research (came from Cameroon – how does mobilization occurred based on limited knowledge)

### Land Tenure

- Process – land is a process (land is always a doing, always becoming, meanings change over time)
- Meaning of land may have changed with commoditization, legal plurality (where the boundaries between customary and statutory are negotiated)---
- Tradition is invented and the meanings of customs will change as other factors change),
- Land is a material resource but has a symbolic meaning as well
- Ethnicity came up especially in the Cameroon case in relation to land
- Scarcity and abundance
- Mangrove swamps (distinction between land tenure and resource tenure difficult to make)
- Intertwining of rights to land and rights to labour (access, control more interesting /useful than the idea of ownership)

### **Allison - Reflections on methodology**

- In all the projects --- the idea of problematizing methodology comes naturally to this group
- We used the basic points of stages of research to think about issues that came out in research projects
- Organized reflections in the following four categories

### Research for social change

- Lots of different ways in which research was linked to social change
- Type of institutional location creates a specific set of pressures for researchers, and this puts parameters on how the research could be linked to the process to social change
- The Institutional context also affects types of research that can be engaged in – it has to do with paradigms of research and the acceptability of certain methodologies – different types of pressures on what researchers can do – e.g. in Vietnam very conventional ideas of what constitutes research, methods that comes from the institution rather than the grass-roots
- Locating research in a social movement was a very different reality from a location in a university setting
- The use of concepts – action research vs other more “conventional” research methods affected how project leaders thought about social change
- What does it mean to have a foreign funded research? Sense that people felt that the IDRC invitation legitimated the use of qualitative research, and encouraged them to engage in social change --- this was really helpful to implementing the case study approach

### Questions around ethics

- There is often the expectation that research will do some good – change will happen out of the research --- had to deal with that context and expectation --- many questions about how will you intend to change people's life
- More specifically there were many concerns with the mechanics of ethics especially informed consent – are these appropriate in the field
- Getting signed consent is inappropriate in many contexts (we need to talk more about informed consent, is this meaningful?) --- do people understand how their information can be used when they give consent
- How research can unintentionally lead to the exploitation of people e.g. indigenous knowledge on use of medicinal plants can be used to exploit resources
- How strict is IDRC in terms of informed consent? What about processes of using oral consent?

### Issues around Methods

- Critical role of an initial site visit? --- Went to the field first before defining research questions etc.
- Use of multi-method approach after the reconnaissance visit
- The debate was way beyond the qualitative/ quantitative debates --- more thought was directed on what was the best method to use and how to use this where?
- A sense that we have to use some quantitative research to be legitimate for our audience (policy makers)
- There was quite a range in way research teams categorised people as subjects in their methodologies
- What is feminist about any of this? Not the methods but it is the commitment of looking at gender/looking at women --- focus is on excavation

### Analysis and relations to methodological processes

- Analysis is emerging as you rethink your field work
- Use of team meetings very important to discuss analysis

### Next Steps

- Length of book
- Replication in chapters
- Location of methodological questions --- where do we want to put this
- Deal with research findings with respect to the concepts
- Double spaced – 10 000 words – 40 double spaced pages (excludes bibliography)
- Narrow the projects – choose some scale

What is the argument that you are making?

How will you illustrate this?

Connect you case to the literature

Introductory chapters --- maps

## Popular literature

- Video tapes which can be used for advocacy
- Pictures --- magazine --- oral stories
- Policy Brief – before meeting with policy makers
- 8 page briefs for local communities with all the different project --- add life story
- Looking at Radio Programming (arrange for a radio program)

## APPENDIX VI ROUGH NOTES FROM SMALL GROUP SESSION AND METHODOLOGY

### Sept 27 and 28, 2005 GLG Workshop—Allison's notes

---

Methodology Small Group Work

Group 1: Ghana and Vietnam teams

Group 2: Cameroon and Latin American teams

We used the points listed in the expanded agenda for this section as points of departure. The discussion occurred under the following headings:

1. Research for social change

G: people want to see tangible interventions out of research

-their research was designed to feed into land policy

-some new issues were pursued as a result of field interactions—eg. Health issues

V-we can report back to provincial gvt and other officials on our findings

G:research questions start from IDRC call for proposals—we took this as an opportunity to see what may be useful within this call for Ghana

V-asked advice at the provincial level about research objectives, selection of villages, etc; their buy-in is critical for the impact of the research for later interventions; they gave expert information about land transactions/kinship/law enforcement, etc

G-contacts with District officials also useful for key information; researchers also fed back info to them

V-involvement of local leaders also important for dissemination and follow-up

G- emphasis on grassroots driven research processes often seems a contradiction when research starts with a donor-defined agenda (although we can refract this agenda into our local realities)

-approach to communities will always be specific to the social structure in play (e.g. “traditional” vs new ie mining towns/villages new settlements—different institutional situation; need to approach different kind of leaders—eg mine owners)

V-in comparing doing research funded by foreign donors to research for funding from own gvt: own gvt puts more rigidly defined agenda than international funding (although it is very difficult to get outside funding—the gvt will monitor and ask for regular reporting on foreign-funded research (gvt is worried that researchers will say things to the world that the gvt does not want)

-local gvt may refuse to cop-operate with you if you have foreign funding

-fear there may be big changes in the community beyond gvt control

-local gvt can ask researchers to remove elements of research that are seen as sensitive or inappropriate

G-IDRC requires an internal body to approve the research and confirm it as beneficial to Ghana

-even internal sources of funds would come with conditions on the research

LA-the institution hosting (eg. Social mvmt vs university makes a difference in the methodology as well as goals and means of research

C-is this more re: management of research—no—also goals

-with univ. more tied to standard methodological approach; also univ. more bureaucratic difficulties in justifying research process (less flexibility)

LA- their methodology is very driven by the needs of the gr-roots mvmt

-so she had less authority than a univ. researcher

C-so pre-site visit—to make participants subjects of the research; the lit review not enough to know what research instruments to design; need to hear from ppl first; so out instrument was centred on the ppl—helped to dev the strategic elements of the project as well as knowing what questions to pursue, what the problems were according to local people

-also helped us identify different “units” in the population (men, women, youth, service providers/chiefs)—that these groups needed to be interviewed separately and data disaggregated according to these categories; also identifying key informants

LA-they also had a “survey phase” (reconnaissance) to help identify key issues

-budget affects the methodology eg. Number so site visits, types of methods you can use

-may use consultancies to “piggy back” trips, but also use new methods learned in consultancies and new partnerships—ppl worked with may become involved in the project

-working with social movements there is a lot of free cooperation and collaboration with participants

-their project was more deliberately action oriented in approach

C-their project is different—the issue of the pipeline was general knowledge in the country as a “big deal” for Cameroon—but the team wanted to increase the visibility of gender research, so thought it would be strategic to link gender research to this very visible and important thing going on in the country; they had a very academic perspective and starting point

-larger question of macro-economic issues and women/gender not dealt with well in policy or in academic research

-werent sure at first if they would be able to access the pipeline—both the company and the gvt were very sensitive about the project

-did get support from local ppl and the gvt, but not from the company

LA- social change has 2 ways to be thought about: sometimes the struggle for social change reinforces gender inequalities—need to design methodology to include gender perspectives in the ongoing processes

-process-driven research approach critical in action research (sometimes need indirect approaches to approach gender issues, or women's relationship to issues from which they have been marginalized in different ways—e.g women and land in out project)

C-need to find suitable entry points to get at gender and women

-they used different units of analysis (eg. Groups as they “naturally” formed—ie people preferred to gather in a public meeting was very obvious-women, men, youth, etc—they picked up on this as a means to divide population into groups to be worked with)

-requires a deliberate process on the part of researchers to think about how to get gendered research

LA-this deliberate process (which means much more than gathering disaggregated data)—it also more than “looking for women” but also engaging in the existing lives/patterns of women and their collective actions—has to be written into the funding proposal

-Noemi looked for funding that would allow this type of approach

C-social mvtns are for social action—different mandate than academics

-studies may only be about revealing realities

LA-but good research can be done in the grassroots organization if partnerships are properly developed

-academic research can more effectively devp this type of research too (ie be more deliberately linked to action outcomes)

-C-the funders are key in the framework allowed for the work—ie levels of flexibility allowed in the research methodology

LA-very important that IDRC sent a monitor to see the project and talk to participants about the northern partner

## 2. Positionality of the researchers

G-no special issue in this for southern researchers; similar to other research contexts and relationships: researchers are in a position of power vis-à-vis the participants;

-the community has to accept the researchers in, so participants do have some choice in this

-but the research is driven by the researchers, not by the communities themselves

-as such, researchers did not commit to any particular outcomes with the communities

V-used a similar approach to the Ghana team: in Vietnam there is a strong history of “top-down” institutional context

- research team has to fit into this context and way of doing things (both because of government practices and community expectations)
- as such, it is very difficult to start from the grassroots level first
- have to have research designed and start from the top (ie gvt institutions at all levels in order)
- communities accept the research without questions—it is the institutional and social culture of the country

### 3. Ethical Issues

V-the research raises expectations that something will happen—if it doesn't, you feel that you have failed in some way

G-some people (in communities) have “research fatigue” from too much research and no change in their situation

- have to be careful about not promising things that can't be delivered

V-must clarify to people what the role of research is—reach findings and report to the appropriate bodies: change will take time

- can provide some small things like information/education

G-sometimes expectations of communities that you are going to do things for them can affect the research findings; that is, the interests of different people and groups in the research site may make it difficult to figure out what is really going on (people make claims, or tell stories that support a certain action leading to a preferred outcome—eg of the gold mine study—people in the community wanted researchers to believe that there was enough gold in the flooded mine to make it worth pumping out the water, but to the technician (?) at the district level, it was not worth the cost of pumping out the water)

-research should contribute to something, but this may only be to explain an issue more clearly to aid another actor to move ahead, or that research sets up an issue or set of information to be easier for use in policy

-“action research” is more like mobilization of communities for action (Noemi's project)

- this was not the Ghana team's approach

V-existence of many organizations in Vietnam means that the model of research that leads immediately to an intervention is well-known; this adds to the misunderstanding of the nature of research

-the Vietnam team focussed on improving knowledge about issues (much more long-term goals with change likely only in long term)

-but the fieldwork itself can cause small changes: can lead to increased awareness in people about their own lives and concrete knowledge such as about laws and how they affect the people

G-participants had an opportunity to talk about their situations, but the project did not really provide any awareness raising or “training/education” function for participants

- contact with communities was very short term and focussed on research
- focus was on taking the issues to policy makers
- they did make a contribution to the community through the school to say thank you in a general way for the cooperation with the research; they thought this was best because the school was not directly involved in the research, so the thanks did not target any particular group or person, which could have caused tensions

V-team also made contributions to poorer families that clearly had specific needs and could be assisted in targeted ways that were approved of by the whole community, creating good will

C-informed consent for taping and rest of research participation was undertaken

LA-IDRC recommendations on ethics—they translated these for the field (eg. Research with children requires parental consent—signing for this by parents==this seems like a kind of violation of their ways)  
-really need more flexibility in process of consent

C-they also had problems with signed consent  
-but worried that participants don't understand how far their infor, their pictures may into the world, etc (although some really wanted to be made visible in concrete ways—put me on TV!)

LA-how to protect local knowledge (eg herbal medicines, IK)-huge issue in globalizing context; sometimes research into these issues serves “bio-piracy” often unintentionally—but making public this type of knowledge allows its exploitation by outside forces such as pharmaceutical companies

#### 4. Methods Used (Choice, development, implementation, etc)

V-team is always struggling with methods; in Vietnam, research without a quantitative base and statistically expressed findings cannot convince anyone about the research—therefore research must include this approach  
-also, there is a need for baseline quantitative information about gender and land in the country  
-but numbers don't say everything—kinship relations, issues in families require a qualitative approach  
-PRA was used and found to be very powerful for involving people in analysing their own problems, especially in relation to agriculture, land, gender roles and decision making  
-the team was very happy with this mix of methods  
-the gvt appreciated the qualitative findings, but still distrust it because it not based on enough people—but they did appreciate the richness of it  
-PRA was also empowering for community members—as such it helped the researchers feel that they had left something in the communities (ethics and social change elements)  
-community people learned from PRA and enjoyed it! (although it is time consuming)

G-their team had similar concerns regarding quantitative vs. qualitative methods

- they were studying social change, so they needed qualitative methods to catch the complexities of this, especially at the micro level
- it is also very important to hear people's voices, which you can only do with qualitative methods
- the team was also concerned about their own learning—wanted to learn and try new methods and teach each other methods they knew
- they were also concerned to be able to talk the language understood by policy makers, which demands a more quantitative approach
- triangulation was another concern—need to achieve this through use of multimethods (contradictions in data from different methods has to be carefully analysed)
- so had to choose methods based on different types of research questions
- they used life histories, transect walks, resource mapping, and survey research (240 respondents—comprehensive sampling of both community sites since these were small villages)
- the mining community was quite new, so baseline information was not available (last census was 2000) but also in the Mangrove village, available quantitative data does not address the research questions of the study, so needed to generate these data
- in terms of approach, reconnaissance of the communities was critical to the design of methods (ie to find out the basic context of the places, the geography, the key issues, etc); also the local languages had to be considered in the design of the research instruments; sampling was also informed by the early site visits
- also learned mining terms, structures/operatives of this industry as all this was new to the researchers
- policy makers are interested in quantitative as well, so need to have these data for them (also other types of researchers such as economists—need to be able to speak to them in a language they understand and respect)
- the team felt that they had too many research instruments, and expended more effort in data collection/generation than necessary as some of the data was redundant (e.g. resource mapping duplicated info in the indepth interviews)

V-team felt resource mapping and transect made indepth interviewing much more productive than it would have been otherwise, as the researchers had more ideas about what to ask

LA-had survey questionnaire designed and did some statistical analysis on them; but it became a supportive tool for qualitative methods

- qualitative helped interpretation of the quantitative
- co-researchers more interested in the qualitative—they found this more useful to their work, so this was pursued further
- local ppl as co-researchers were well-received

C-pre-site helped define the techniques—6 units identified from which to collect data (see above)

- chose 27 communities from 100+ and did these units in each in all—did questionnaires and interview guides (using an interactive approach)
- used Dictaphone/video
- used trained researchers—grads of gender studies training—these Ras worked in pairs to do the interviews
- converted tapes to quantitative data—ie recorded the interview and later filled in questionnaires; also transcribed qualitative elements of the interviews
- problems of translation to French—gender issues very difficult to translate
- sometimes also need local languages
- really needed the university for this—other expertise and space was critical (eg univ. translators)
- standard entry to villages was used (gvt-chief-village)

LA-participants self-selected—women have collective identity that they clearly express—research took them at that expression in the study—we could see this identification in the early workshops

- this will affect results (ie compared to telling ppl which groups they can choose to be put into)
- researchers took notes of how ppl spoke about themselves
- selected sites to work in
- interviews with members of movements and other people were done along the way—some life stories; they also reflected on the interactions and relationships among organizations and how they presented demands to the authorities—all these things were “data” for them—a very comprehensive ethnographic approach

## 5. Analysis

G-in the field the team talked about what was emerging in the research

- discussing the day really helped to build ideas

V-yes, they did this too; daily discussions with the team really helped analysis

- masses of data quite overwhelming
- timing of fieldwork was critical—avian flu really disrupted their research schedule

G-in Ghana, timing is also critical, especially in relation to seasons and accessibility of communities

V-regional differences have to figure in the analysis

G-local languages at times needed translation and local interpreters and often the quality of this was dubious

V-dialects also posed challenges, especially in transcription

LA- realized that it wasn't quantities that were important but ppl's perceptions about the issues—qualitative data much more important in the analysis

- also tried to make results usable for participants—magazine—useful for their own strategies
- also they wrote a common letter to politicians (foreign affairs departments)
- although Bolivia has largest quantity of brazil nuts, the experiences of the ppl most problematic in the region

## 6. Relationship with theory/literature/concepts

G-emerging issues in the findings speak to the literature and theory, for e.g. in regards to legal pluralism and the relationships between labour and gender

V-literature was used to inform the research questions and instruments, but then the findings led to re-engagement with the literature

- for e.g. the importance of regional differences—needed to go back and do more historical research about this
- also discovered the important of the different levels of gvt and issues of implementation of policy
- the fieldwork led to the need to re-theorize the state
- policy makers state that policies are implemented as written and no problems, but in reality, there are huge issues in implementation—mediation through institutional levels and kinship systems
- the literature on policy analysis totally misses this process of implementation as well as the complexities of communities

G-comparing different areas (either regional as in the Vietnam study or by different types of resources –mangroves and gold mining in the Ghana study) really helps analysis and can raise new theoretical questions (for example, looking at the importance of labour in relation to resources)

LA-participants challenged the concept of “empowerment” (ie WB “empowerment” approach is ironic to the women, as it is WB that took away their power)

- challenging whole package of “dvmt” from outside problematic in imposition of gender categories/concepts

C-now they are going back to the literature with the data, and dealing with emerging issues that contradict the lit; eg. Assumption that “women don’t have land”—ie that patriarchy doesn’t permit it

- but the reality is not as rigid as this
- having women/men’s groups allowed us to see that the men also confirmed areas of women’s power (not just the women’s view)
- data challenges the legitimacy of using biological explanations to justify social categories for eg: “women not strong enough to do work on pipeline
- data challenges theories about civil society and NGOs in relation to the ppl they are supposed to protect or represent
- timeframes and stress of other work puts limits on amount of analysis they can do
- pressure to move quickly to results and complete the project
- still have workshops to do which will allow more analysis

-methodology of separate groups was enjoyed by women

7. What was gendered or feminist about the work?

G-feminist literature and approaches were major forming influences on methods development and analysis

-but many methods also used by other researchers (e.g. participatory/action research oriented work, but it is not all feminist)

-we were committed to look at gender which influenced how we sampled, the interview subjects and the topics of inquiry

V-they were committed to look at gender relations and women in the research from the beginning, and this is what makes it feminist research