

From voice to choice: lessons from a regional capacity development initiative to strengthen social and gender analysis in participatory natural resource management research

Liz Fajber^{1*} and Ronnie Vernooy²

¹*International Development Research Centre, New Delhi, India; and* ²*International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, ON, Canada*

Doing practical biodiversity and natural resources management research that is socially and gender sensitive remains a challenge. Most of the relevant literature is primarily at the conceptual level. There are few learning programmes that focus on systematic capacity development for gender and social analysis in applied research in this field. Efforts that systematically document and analyse this kind of capacity development process are also hard to find. This paper summarizes the main research and capacity development achievements and challenges of a novel, Asian-regional initiative that aimed to address these gaps. It is suggested that the success of capacity-building strategies for the integration of social and gender analysis can be enhanced by combining a mix of elements, including a 'learning by doing' approach, participatory (action) research methodologies, a diverse group of participants, regular peer review, flexible networking and strong personal and organizational commitment. These kinds of strategies will require a long(er) time horizon and sufficient resources.

Keywords: Asia, capacity development, gender analysis, participatory learning, social analysis

Introduction: addressing a capacity development gap

Asian societies are diverse and socially complex. Notions of class, caste, ethnicity, age and gender (the *socially* constructed roles and characteristics assigned to men and women in a specific culture), are integral to understanding power relations and decision-making processes concerning the access, use and management of natural resources. A sound understanding of social differences is needed to answer questions of who participates and how, and who benefits and how, from development

interventions, projects, programmes or policies. These questions require consideration and integration in intervention strategies if the aim is to support the more equitable and sustainable use of natural resources and derived benefits.

Some policy makers, activists and researchers in the region recognize this need to reflect on and integrate social and gender considerations, particularly as it relates to participation, inclusion and exclusion, decision-making and power relations. However, the practical and context-specific implementation of more socially sensitive research and development interventions in relation to biodiversity and natural resources management remains a very difficult process for many. Most of the social and gender analysis in natural resource

*Corresponding author. Email: efajber@idrc.org.in

management is primarily at the conceptual level. There are few effective existing learning programmes that focus on systematic capacity development for gender and social analysis in applied (participatory action) research in this field. There are even fewer initiatives that systematically document and analyse this kind of capacity development process (an exception are the chapters in Inter-Action-CAW and IIRR 2004).

In this paper we describe and reflect critically on a novel initiative that aimed to address these gaps. The initiative was developed by staff of the Community-Based Natural Resource Management in Asia (CBNRM) and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (SUB) programme initiatives of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), together with Asian and Canadian partners. This multi-component or 'umbrella' initiative responded to partners' voiced needs for capacity development support to practically integrate social and gender analysis into participatory natural resource management research (Vernooy & Fajber, 2006).

Our assessment of this initiative, which can be seen as a multi-component case study, suggests that the success of capacity-building strategies for the integration of social and gender analysis can be enhanced by combining a mix of elements, including a 'learning by doing' approach, participatory (action) research methodologies, a diverse group of participants, regular peer review, flexible networking, and strong personal and organizational commitment. Achievements will not come overnight however, and will require a long(er) time horizon and sufficient resources. Moving from individual to organizational change, and moving toward a more transformative research agenda emerge from our review as two of the major ongoing challenges. These lessons are of relevance to research and capacity development managers, researchers and donor agency professionals (as we are).

This paper is organized as follows. First, we summarize the main reasons for integrating social and gender analysis, and the main challenges to doing so. This is followed by a description of the 'umbrella' initiative. We conclude with a critical review of progress made to date, both in terms of the four main activities and in terms of the key capacity development elements informing the initiative.

Integrating social and gender analysis in participatory natural resource management research

There are several reasons why integrating social and gender analysis is important in natural resource management research and development. The first is to understand the institutional nature of the organization of production and reproduction at household and community levels and how these relate to (inform and are informed by) the market and the state. By production and reproduction we mean the activities and strategies used by the basic social units (families, households, kinship networks) to make a living and to guarantee the survival of the unit. Several recent studies show how this can be done effectively. By collecting a series of detailed case studies from around the world, Howard (2003) shows how gender relations inform biodiversity management and conservation and why, in several cases, women predominate – particularly in the management of local plant biodiversity. In an example related to crops and biodiversity, Farnworth and Jiggins (2003: 5) note: 'One of the strong reasons why different men and women, and women of different backgrounds, have different [varietal] preferences is because they relate to the *food chain* in different ways, and often at different times and places.' (italics in the original).

Thus, developing a better understanding and awareness of the social and power relations that govern access to, use of, and control over natural resources implies analysing the differences and the inequities among social actors. These are always dependent on the local context. As Cornwall (2000) has argued:

Shifting the focus from fixed identities to positions of power and powerlessness opens up new possibilities for addressing issues of equity. In practical development terms, this implies more of a role for participatory approaches to explore, analyze and work with the differences that people identify with, rather than for identifying the 'needs' of predetermined categories of people. This calls for an approach that is sensitive to local dimensions of difference and works with these differences through building on identifications rather than superimposed identities. (Cornwall, 2000: 28–29)

It is also important for facilitating the recognition of the social and gendered nature of technologies, policies and interventions. Policies and technologies are value-laden; women and men and different social groups are involved and affected differently. Different responses to interventions, and resulting inequalities are created through a dynamic interplay of the social relations of production and reproduction (Kabeer, 1997: 280–281). Bina Agarwal has forcefully drawn the attention to processes of exclusions in the case of the formation and operation of community forest groups, interventions that supposedly aimed to be participatory in nature (Agarwal, 2001: 1623). Studies such as Agarwal's improve our understanding of key social and political processes (and the often unintended results) informed by gender and other variables.

Another reason for integrating social and gender analysis into research is to create space for social actors (women and men) to manoeuvre and to enhance their bargaining and negotiating power. This could allow marginalized and discriminated groups, as initiators of action research efforts or as partners, to bring about some form of transformation gaining more access to, control over, and benefits from natural resources. Suffice to say that we know from experience that this is easier said than done.

Simple answers and solutions to the integration of social and gender analysis in research and development are unlikely to be found (Kabeer, 2003: 193). Translating these insights to practical and effective capacity building efforts, in particular at the organizational level, has not been easy, as several authors have concluded (Ahmed, 2001; Cornwell, 2004; PRGA, 2006; Rao & Kelleher, 2005). We list the main challenges encountered as IDRC programme officers, which take into account those of colleagues (for the most recent IDRC review on gender mainstreaming, see Fajber & O'Manique, 2005, see also previous IDRC reviews, Scholey, 2001; Woolfrey, 2001), and of partners from Asia and other regions (Do Thi Binh & Dagenais, 2000):

- Knowledge and experience of social science research among natural resource management researchers and research managers is limited; and social science researchers are often unfamiliar with natural science approaches.

- Social science components are not well integrated with natural science components in most research efforts. This hampers the development of (more) holistic approaches.
- Researchers and research organizations have different starting points, interests and expertise about social and gender issues. Developing a common language and agenda takes time and energy.
- 'Gender blindness' or the refusal to acknowledge the importance of gender issues is common in research and research policy making. This often closes the door to any change effort, even if small in nature.
- Short-term training has limited impact.
- Resources about social/gender analysis and natural resource management in Asia are not widely available.
- Networking of learners has the potential to create synergies, enhance critical thinking, and provide spaces for joint action, but operationally is not so easy.

In addition, in Asia, the diversity of cultures and languages reinforce the need for locally relevant methodologies and training approaches, recognizing that those methods and concepts grounded in 'western' thought are not always applicable in other social and cultural contexts. We also note that few reading and training materials are available in languages other than English (Vernooy & Fajber, 2004).

The 'umbrella' initiative

Taking these insights into consideration and building on experiences with previous capacity building efforts (by IDRC and others), we set out to develop an 'umbrella' initiative combining a number of different elements and strategies and approaches (which could be seen as smaller case studies under the 'umbrella'), that allowed for locally relevant approaches but also supported opportunities for shared learning, exchange and networking. The underlying idea was that partners and IDRC staff were able to integrate and learn from the combined knowledge, experiences and capabilities gained from a number of separate, but linked, activities implemented for a common purpose.

Four different sub-initiatives or smaller case studies were implemented under the ‘umbrella,’ which we describe briefly.

- Two iterative training projects: in Vietnam, and the Eastern Himalayan region;
- A learning stories project bringing together experiences from China, India, Mongolia, Nepal and Vietnam; and
- A review study that put together the results from the three projects and the entire ‘umbrella’ initiative.

The Vietnam/Canada iterative training initiative

The Vietnam/Canada iterative training initiative is a Vietnam–Canada collaborative project that started in 2000 with 16 participants (both women and men) in the training, eight of whom were IDRC partners in then active CBNRM projects. The resource team consisted of one Vietnamese and three Canadian scholars/researchers (from Laval University and the University of British Columbia), all women. The work was coordinated by the Centre for Family and Women’s Studies in Hanoi and by Laval University. The training process included face-to-face and virtual (through e-mail) teaching/tutoring about social and gender concepts and methods, the design of research proposals, fieldwork, reporting on research progress, report writing, and the presentation of results. Interactions between trainers and trainees took place through face-to-face meetings and workshops (in Vietnam), and through the use of e-mail (Canada–Vietnam, and Vietnam–Vietnam).

In the first phase of two years (2000–2002), the 16 Vietnamese participants significantly enhanced their capacities and developed new knowledge and methodological skills pertaining to gender and social research. Each participant designed and implemented a complete small grant research project, applying their learning in the field, and exchanging progress and challenges with mentors and peers. They also increased their ability to use computers for research purposes and to communicate via e-mail.

Participants, mostly with a natural science background, increasingly valued social science research and qualitative methods in their everyday professional practice. This led to a second phase to deepen the learning and experiment more with

qualitative methods. As one of them expressed (Enhancing capacity to engender research, 2001): ‘I would like to continue to be trained more in qualitative analysis methods. I am a natural scientist so I often use quantitative analysis method in my research. When I joined this project, this was the first time I learned about qualitative analysis methods from the trainers. However, the project is too short and so my capacity in doing qualitative analysis is still poor. I need to learn more about that.’

Both participants and trainers also underscored the limitations of distance tutoring when dealing with matters as complex as engendering research. In their evaluations of Phase 1 the trainers concurred with participants as to a need to deepen understanding of gender relations and their cutting across all other social relations (age, class, race, ethnicity) in all dimensions of life in society. Phase 2 was designed to respond to these needs and learning expectations, while developing participants’ abilities to cooperate as social and natural scientists in common projects. Operationally, three small but multidisciplinary research teams were formed, based in Hanoi (Nguyen Phuong Thao, Pham Thi Ly and Ha Thi Thanh Van, with Dawn Currie), Ho Chi Minh City (Tran Kim Xuyen, Nguyen Thi Hoa and Tran Thi Ut, with Huguette Dagenais), and Hue (Le Van An, Hoang Thi Sen, Bui Thu Tan, Nguyen Thi My Trinh, with Do Thi Binh) respectively.

These three studies investigated gender relations in the process of social and economic change in Vietnam: rapid urbanization; socio-cultural and economic obstacles to minority women’s participation in rural development; living conditions of young migrants working in the urban informal sector. Through this initiative, participants have expressed repeatedly that they have consolidated their methodology and analytical skills, but also have enhanced their leadership capacity, ability to work in multidisciplinary and multi-institutional teams and strengthened their scientific writing and communication skills.

The Eastern Himalayan iterative training project

The Vietnam experience provided the inspiration for a second initiative that started in 2003 in the Eastern Himalayan region – an area that is

culturally diverse, but much more closely related to each other than many groups on the Indo-Gangetic plains. Here there is much more social/cultural, and even geographical similarity with parts of Southeast Asia (hill regions of Thailand, Laos, Vietnam). This effort concentrated on developing social and gender analysis and research skills of predominantly indigenous researchers. As in the Vietnamese project, the focus was on developing and adapting approaches, methods, and tools to be more locally relevant, culturally appropriate and in local languages. This involved training, small grants research, and electronic networking and more intensive interaction between the resource persons and the small grant participants, including field visits, for additional assistance in implementing the methodologies and approaches. Peer support through cluster group learning and exchange provided additional regional support and confidence to the researchers.

The Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) System Wide Initiative of the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) managed and provided leadership. The Northeast Network (NEN), based in Northeast India, provided regional support in networking and exchange. The 15 participants of this capacity-building initiative came from Bhutan, Eastern Nepal, Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh, Yunnan Province in China and Northeast India and are researchers from universities, government research institutes, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Participants carried out small research projects, some of which were integrated in larger initiatives of their home-organization (see Appendix 1 for details). These projects emphasized an action-oriented approach towards transformative strategies to improve participation, decision-making power and livelihoods of disadvantaged groups, including women and landless poor. The small grants focused on a range of issues relating to participation and governance of natural resources, impacts and opportunities of growing agricultural markets and gendered access to government resources related to agriculture and natural resource management. Interestingly, one key topic that emerged was the high incidences of conflict in this region. This created challenges in conducting (action-oriented) research, especially considering gender and ethnic issues.

Responding to this challenge, some participants integrated conflict-oriented questions in their research design. In terms of implementing the research, there was consensus that local context played an important role. Researchers thus became aware of the importance of researcher–community relationships and participatory approaches for building trust and ownership of community members over the research process and results.

Through this experience, the participants prioritized discussions about the expanded role of the researchers in an action-research setting that moved beyond traditional roles as investigator to facilitator; the importance of self-reflexivity and consideration of the researcher's identity and power; the dynamic nature of social and gender relations within society, and recognition of formal and informal spaces for action and empowerment. Networking activities, through face-to-face and electronic interactions, were developed to enable peer support among the participants, as well as with the resource persons involved. Discussions on the e-list strengthened interaction among the participants. They focused on issues such as comparing field experiences and the challenges of facing resistance on social and gender issues within their respective organizations, and strategies used to address these.

The learning stories initiative

This initiative, that began in 2002, recognized the steps that researchers are already taking in implementing social analysis and gender analysis research (including questions of class, caste and ethnicity) in natural resource management, and documented 'learning stories' which could be both successes or failures, but which illustrate a learning in this process. The initiative brought together six diverse research teams from five Asian countries representing both academic and non-academic sectors, a variety of research organizations, and researching a number of natural resource management questions including biodiversity conservation, crop and livestock improvement and sustainable grassland development (see Appendix 2 for details).

The six teams acknowledged that learning is in itself an iterative process. Through cross-regional exchanges, they supported and encouraged those

steps that are made along the learning way. The teams carried out community-based (action) research highlighting a number of different methods used and adapted in the very diverse contexts within the Asian region. The project used a case study approach with six guiding questions as a basis, some guiding conceptual and methodological elements (an action-oriented approach), and a methodological process of workshops, fieldwork and the production of a number of outputs. The six cases together reflect a diversity of strategies, approaches and methods. At two international workshops the research teams presented work in progress, critiqued each other's work and identified similarities and differences among the case studies. These workshops also provided the inputs for the publication of a book (Vernooy, 2006).

The review study

Given that the 'umbrella' initiative was a new initiative for IDRC and its partners, and in itself an example of practical 'learning by doing' (including for IDRC staff), it was important to systematically document, reflect on, and share insights from the components and associated learning processes. We supported a review study (started at the end of 2003) that focused explicitly on understanding the challenges and opportunities of social analysis/gender analysis knowledge creation and use through the modalities outlined above. The study, carried out by Bhaswati Chakravorty (2004), used a critical, ethnographically oriented approach of the learning experiences, as opposed to a more traditional (external) assessment of objectives and results. In particular, the study

reviewed how the joint programme initiative has dealt with the main tenets of the challenges of integrating social analysis/gender analysis in natural resource management and biodiversity research that we have described above.

The study looked at how methods and activities have facilitated culturally appropriate learning processes, how a better integration of social and natural sciences has been fostered, how differential expertise and experiences have been dealt with, and how networking has contributed to strengthening individual and collective capacities. Methods included participation in workshops of the various components of the project, interviews with resource persons and participants, and review of materials generated (training modules, workshop materials, reports). The review (Chakravorty, 2004) was presented and discussed at a workshop with key partners involved in all of the components coming together to identify and review insights and challenges to date, to improve networking across the components and to identify key elements for next steps and follow-up, including but not limited to elements for a next phase.

Key research issues: similarities and differences

A comparative look at the issues researched across the field studies (see Table 1 for a synthesis), highlights regional commonalities and differences.

All studies emphasize that natural resource management questions, whether addressed from a micro or macro perspective, are not social or

Table 1 Key research topics of the field studies

Studies	Common	Specific
Vietnam cases	Socio-cultural and economic obstacles to minority women's participation in rural development	Gender relations in the process of rapid urbanization Living conditions of young migrants working in the urban informal sector
Eastern Himalayas cases	Women's roles in natural resource management Women and/in marketing	Gender and land/natural resource tenure
Learning studies cases	Women's roles in rural development and natural resource (co)management as influenced by class, caste, ethnicity, and culture Women and/in marketing	Feminization of agriculture Gender and service provision

gender neutral. At the same time, the case studies demonstrate that the processes that shape everyday management practices are never homogeneous by definition. A striking result of the comparative analysis is that social and gender inequities in decision-making, access and control of natural resources continue. In several cases, inequities seem to be deepening. This tendency is often reinforced by conservative cultural norms and political systems, and further intensified by specific impacts of macro-level forces including globalization, privatization and commoditization. In a number of countries, these forces play out in the form of out-migration of men. This, in turn, is leading to the feminization of agriculture, which is increasing burdens on many women. Women's changing roles in the marketing of crops and other natural resource products appears as another important common issue. Both negative tendencies, e.g. little or no respect, nor support for women vendors from municipal authorities, and positive tendencies exist, e.g. women collectively entering the seed market.

Although not explicitly addressed by all studies, another important issue concerns the continuing gender-blindness or gender-insensitiveness of policies and government services that affect natural resource management practices. This leads some of the study authors to argue for the urgency of improving the linkages of relevant research results to policy makers, and the need to prioritize this at the outset. The China case study team states this most eloquently: 'Social and gender analysis is essential, not optional, for the formulation of responsive and gender sensitive policies/regulations and related implementation and management to avoid further marginalization and biases in the mainstreaming process' (quoted in Vernooy & Zhang, 2006: 231). The 'Learning studies' work in China, as well as in Nepal and Vietnam, emphasizes that building linkages between local communities and the level of national institutions and policy makers helps local actors exert a demand for services and influence policy agendas.

Strengthening capacities

We now turn to a synthesis of the main results in terms of strengthening the capacity of the

researchers. They all agreed that they learned and applied new ways of doing field research through participatory action research methods and tools, with a focus on social and gender issues. In addition to learning new methods and enhancing the rigour of social science methodologies, participants improved their research and analytical capacity beyond social/gender issues and beyond the individual projects. They changed their approach to the design, implementation, analysis and evaluation of other research and development activities. As noted in the review report:

Such an approach – lab to field – not only helped the partners to test their own assumptions on gender but also to develop the perspective and ability to address the gender discrimination and social prejudice that were embedded in their specific socio-cultural context. Since the research topics were specific to researcher's context, the process also assisted in forging and building a relationship between researcher and community. Development of this new understanding about the social reality and building new forms of alliances in turn helped the researchers in formulation of new research questions and/or hypothesis for more extensive research in the future. (Chakravorty, 2004: 8)

Researchers also recognized and defined an expanded role of the researcher. They engaged in a social learning process in which multiple social actors with competing claims on a natural resource move towards concerted action at multiple scales (Röling, 2002). As such, they diversified their roles as researchers, drawing on and further developing skills of communication, negotiation, facilitation, participatory monitoring and evaluation and advocacy. They also increased their own awareness of the gendered and social identity of researchers, and related impacts on research. The Nagaland team describes the changes as follows:

The learning and capacity building of stakeholders about the social/gender analysis approach is at various levels, but everyone has learned something. Some stakeholders were sensitized with the approach and started voicing out for a negotiating space. Some are mainstreaming it in the long term planning process. By carrying out this action research, we have enhanced our research skills and become more

systematic in our approach to the research problems. We better understand the ground realities and have become more sensitive to the problems of the primary stakeholders, especially the part-time vendors who are vulnerable to exploitation and harassment. ... This research has also led to an emotional attachment between us, and the women-vendors. We have increased our negotiating skills to influence decision makers: we have started voicing out the 'voices' of vendors to the public, using mass media and interacting with policy decision-makers. (Nakro & Kikhi, 2006: 230)

Many of the partners are now considered within their organizations as key local resource persons. Outsiders have also called upon their expertise. This has increased their confidence substantially. As noted by Bhaswati Chakravorty;

Encouraging group work among the participants facilitated learning from each other's experience and struggle. More importantly, it reduced the intellectual isolation of the participants and allowed creative space for reflection. Such collaborative and experiential learning were the critical factors in enhancing capacities of partners, which often resulted in arriving at a possible menu of strategies to address their specific and cross-cutting problems. (Chakravorty, 2004: 10)

The efforts not only strengthened researchers' capacities, but also strengthened rural women's capacity as economic agents, developing new opportunities, increase meaningful participation, and valuing (and adding value to) local knowledge. Space does not allow us to elaborate on this aspect.

Conclusions

Our assessment suggests that the success of capacity building strategies for the integration of social and gender analysis can be enhanced by combining a 'learning by doing' approach, participatory (action) research methodologies, a diverse group of participants, regular peer review, flexible networking and strong personal and organizational commitment. First, learning by doing, focuses on internalizing theories and concepts, and understanding how these can be practically

implemented in the field. Such an approach, combined with iterative training and mentoring enables researchers to develop, adapt and adopt approaches and methods that are relevant to their social/cultural contexts. It also allows receiving the support of resource persons and peers to discuss ongoing challenges and emerging issues. This iterative approach significantly increased the quality and rigour of the research methods, data collection, analysis and hence emerging results.

Second, the value of rooting social and gender analysis in participatory methodologies – both in terms of an overall approach to research in the field involving work with communities (including associated tools such as engendering needs assessment, multilevel stakeholder analyses), and of the training methods used in the capacity-building programmes with the participants. This was a challenge for many of the participants, but partners felt strongly that it was a key aspect. They also expressed that it needs to be strengthened in ongoing work. This included the need to consider the 'research for whom' questions, such as, how stakeholders contribute to the goal, how they gain from the process and from potential impacts of development research activities.

Third, peer review fosters creativity and critical thinking among participants while also supporting researchers in recognizing the potentials of research, highlighting challenges with constructive suggestions and offering a platform for exchange of similar experiences and strategies. This peer learning and exchange not only provided additional information and ideas, but also directly strengthened the confidence of researchers, as they were able to comment on and give support to peers.

A fourth element is the opportunities presented by networking to draw on the wide diversity of the partnership base for peer support, information exchange and sharing of experiences in pursuing a common purpose of integrating social/gender analysis for change into research and development. However, this was also a challenge, as electronic networking in particular was difficult for many due to limited connectivity, language differences, and a predominantly oral culture particularly among indigenous researchers. Whatever the directions various networking efforts will take in the future, the value of forming or joining a network seems firmly rooted in partners.

Fifth, there is the importance of understanding the organizational context in which partners are working, and the need to strengthen institutional support. A high level of commitment and desire to enhance learning towards integration of social and gender analysis is required among participants coming from natural science backgrounds and technical disciplines. However, this commitment also has to come from management of the organizations in which they are working. Continuous awareness-raising efforts, dynamic communications, incentives, active 'champions,' examples of good practice and an effective monitoring system are some of the elements required to make sound social and gender research part of the everyday practice of a research organization. A key mechanism to support this is to support the development and implementation of curricula and thorough training of trainers. This is in many ways a logical next step to the base of research and training established to date.

While capacities were strengthened, substantial research insights were also generated as we have discussed. This brings us full circle. Several new activities are now underway to build on the results, as part of another cycle of capacity development experimentation.

Acknowledgements

We recognize that we have not discussed much about our own roles and learning throughout this initiative. This is largely because our partners have done most of the work. We would like to thank them all for their remarkable commitment, to the communities, to their organizations and to their peers. They have been exceptional in persevering to better understand social, cultural and political complexities, and work towards making the world a better, more equitable and sustainable place. We thank Jespal Panesar for her assistance with the review of literature. We are grateful for the very useful comments made by two reviewers.

References

Agarwal, B. (2001) Participatory exclusions, community forestry, and gender: An analysis for South Asia and a

- conceptual framework. *World Development* 29 (10), 1623–1648.
- Ahmed, S. (2001) Empowering rural women? Policies, institutions, and gendered outcomes in natural resource management. *Development in Practice* 11 (4), 535–537.
- Chakravorty, B. (2004) Documentation of sharing of good practices in social/gender analysis. Unpublished report. New Delhi: International Development Research Centre.
- Cornwall, A. (2000) *Making a Difference? Gender and Participatory Development*. IDS discussion paper 378. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
- Cornwall, A. (2003) Whose voices? Whose choices? Reflections on gender and participatory development. *World Development* 31 (8), 1325–1342.
- Cornwell, L. (2004) Mainstreaming gender: Imperatives for development studies. *Africanus* 34 (1), 51–63.
- Do Thi Binh and Dagenais, H. (2000) Natural resource management and social/gender analysis and capacity building for social/gender analysis. Ottawa: IDRC. Unpublished document.
- Enhancing Capacity to Engender Research (Vietnam) (2001) Participants' evaluation. Unpublished report. Quebec: Laval University.
- Fajber, L. and O'Manique, E. (2005) Strengthening gender in the ENRM program area: A discussion paper. Ottawa: IDRC. Unpublished document.
- Farnworth, C.R. and Jiggins, J. (2003) *Participatory Plant Breeding and Gender Analysis*. PPB monograph no. 4. Cali: Participatory Research/Gender Analysis Program.
- Howard, P. (ed.) (2003) *Women and Plants: Gender Relations in Biodiversity Management and Conservation*. London: Zed Books.
- InterAction's Commission on the Advancement of Women and International Institute of Rural Reconstruction. (2004) *Gender Mainstreaming in Action: Successful Innovations from Asia and the Pacific*. Washington: InterAction's Commission on the Advancement of Women and Silang, Cavite: International Institute of Rural Reconstruction.
- Kabeer, N. (1997) *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*. London/New York: Verso.
- Kabeer, N. (2003) *Gender Mainstreaming in Poverty Eradication and the Millennium Development Goals: A Handbook for Policy-Makers and other Stakeholders*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat; Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; Hull: Canadian International Development Agency.
- Kanji, N. (2003) *Mind the Gap: Mainstreaming Participation in Gender and Development*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development; Sussex: Institute for Development Studies.
- Nakro, V. and Kikhi, C. (2006) Strengthening market linkages for women vegetable vendors: Experiences

- from Kohima, Nagaland, India. In R. Vernooy (ed.) *Integrating Social and Gender Analysis into Natural Resource Management Research: Experiences from South and South-East Asia*. New Delhi: Sage; Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; Beijing: China Agricultural Press.
- Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) (2006) Mainstreaming of participatory research and gender analysis. On WWW at <http://www.prga-program.org/index.php?module=htmlpages&func=display&pid=15>. Accessed 21. 02. 2006.
- Rao, A. and Kelleher, D. (2005) Is there life after gender mainstreaming? *Gender and Development* 13 (2), 57–69.
- Röling, N. (2002) Beyond the aggregation of individual preferences: Moving from multiple to distributed cognition in resource dilemmas. In C. Leeuwis and R. Pyburn (eds) *Wheel-Barrows Full of Frogs: Social Learning in Rural Resource Management* (pp. 25–47). Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.
- Scholey, P. (2001) Gender unit programming in research and mainstreaming, 2001–2004. Ottawa: IDRC. Unpublished document.
- Vernooy, R. (ed.) (2006) *Integrating Social and Gender Analysis into Natural Resource Management Research: Experiences from South and South-East Asia*. New Delhi: Sage; Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; Beijing: China Agricultural Press.
- Vernooy, R. and Fajber, L. (2004) Making gender and social analysis work for natural resource management research: an umbrella program for building researcher capacity. In InterAction's Commission on the Advancement of Women and International Institute of Rural Reconstruction. *Gender Mainstreaming in Action: Successful Innovations from Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 208–223). Washington: InterAction's Commission on the Advancement of Women and Silang, Cavite: International Institute of Rural Reconstruction.
- Vernooy, R. and Fajber, L. (2006) Integrating social and gender analysis into natural resource management research. In R. Vernooy (ed.) *Integrating Social and Gender Analysis into Natural Resource Management Research: Experiences from South and South-east Asia* (pp. 17–36). New Delhi: Sage; Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; Beijing: China Agricultural Press.
- Vernooy, R. and Zhang, L. (2006) Social and gender analysis is essential, not optional: Enhanced capacities and remaining challenges. In R. Vernooy (ed.) *Integrating Social and Gender Analysis into Natural Resource Management Research: Experiences from South and South-east Asia* (pp. 225–236). New Delhi: Sage; Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; Beijing: China Agricultural Press.
- Woolfrey, J. (2001) IDRC learning study: Special expert advisory fund for mainstreaming gender in IDRC. Ottawa: IDRC. Unpublished document.

Appendix 1: 'Eastern Himalayan study' researchers and research topics

- (1) **Miatmon Sooting** – *Gender and Land Tenure in Meghalaya*
- (2) **Wang Yu** – *Women's Roles in Community Forestry Management in Tachen, NW Yunnan*
- (3) **Rukhmini Karki and Dr. Bisheswar Shah** – *The Impact of Insurgency on Women's Access and Control to Natural Resources in Nepal*
- (4) **Smita Kumari** – *Gender Roles in Vegetable Production and Marketing for Improved Livelihoods (Nepal)*
- (5) **Biplab Chakma**: – *Forest Resource Use and Management in the Chittagong Hill Tracts: Conflicts, Interests and Stakes*
- (6) **Prof. BK Tiwari** – *Impact of Land Use Change and Introduction of Cash Crops on Social and Gender Relations among Jhumias of Meghalaya, India*
- (7) **Latashori Keithellakpam** – *Gender and Small Livestock Production: A Case Study on Pig Rearing in the Uplands of North Eastern States, India*
- (8) **Ashok Kumar Chakma and Gitika Tripura** – *Decision-Making Role of Indigenous Women in Natural Resources Management: A Case Study of the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh*
- (9) **Phub Dem** – *Participation of Women and Men in Agricultural Trainings (Bhutan)*
- (10) **D.R. Michael Buam** – *Assessing Gender Roles in the Practice of Local Health Tradition (Meghalaya)*
- (11) **Chozhule Kikhi** – *Gender and Influence in Forest Management (Nagaland, India)*
- (12) **Nawraj Gurung and Dr. Anjana Thapa** – *Impact of Vegetable Marketing on Women's Status and Crop Diversity (Sikkim, India)*

Appendix 2: 'Learning studies' teams

- Sikkim/West Bengal: Eastern Himalayan Network (EHN). The EHN team included Chanda Gurung, a gender and natural resource management specialist, and Nawraj Gurung, an extensionist by training, currently focusing on agricultural and horticultural issues.

- Nagaland, India: Nagaland Empowerment of People through Economic Development (NEPED) project. The NEPED team was formed by Chozhule Kiki, a social scientist with an interest in food and agriculture, and Vengota Nakro, a natural scientist specialized in agriculture and silviculture.
- Nepal: Local Initiatives for Biodiversity Conservation and Development (Li-Bird, an NGO). Deepa Singh, a horticulturist; Anil Subedi, a rural extensionist; and Pitamber Shrestha, a rural development specialist, made up the Li-Bird team.
- China: Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy (CCAP) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS). Two social scientists represented the CCAP team: Yiching Song, with a background in rural development studies, and Linxiu Zhang, an agricultural economist.
- Vietnam: Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry (HUAF). The HUAF team was represented by Hoang Thi Sen, who has a background in forestry and agriculture, and Le Van An, an animal scientist. Both have a strong interest in rural development questions.
- Mongolia: Ministry of Nature and Environment (MNE) and the Gender Research Centre for Sustainable Development. The Mongolian SAGA team is represented by researchers from a number of organizations. Hijaba Ykhanbai and Enkhbat Bulgan work for the MNE. Tserendorj Odgerel is with the Gender Research Centre for Sustainable Development, and Baatar Naranchimeg is studying at the Mongolian State University.