



Whose Voices? Whose Choices? Reflections on Gender and Participatory Development

ANDREA CORNWALL *

Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, UK

Summary. — Efforts to promote participation in projects, programs and policy consultation would appear to offer the prospect of giving everyone who has a stake a voice and a choice. But community-driven development, participatory planning and other fine-sounding initiatives that make claims of “full participation” and “empowerment” can turn out to be driven by particular gendered interests, leaving the least powerful without voice or much in the way of choice. Bringing a gender perspective to bear on the practice of participation in development may assist in identifying strategies for amplifying voice and access to decision making of those who tend to be marginalized or excluded by mainstream development initiatives. Yet “gender”—like “participation”—has multiple meanings. In this article, I explore some of the tensions, contradictions and complementarities between “gender-aware” and “participatory” approaches to development. I suggest that making a difference may come to depend on challenging embedded assumptions about gender and power, and on making new alliances out of old divisions, in order to build more inclusive, transformatory practice.

© 2003 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Key words — participation, gender, community, participatory planning, participatory poverty assessment

1. INTRODUCTION

Participation has become development orthodoxy. Holding out the promise of inclusion, of creating spaces for the less vocal and powerful to exercise their voices and begin to gain more choices, participatory approaches would appear to offer a lot to those struggling to bring about more equitable development. With the shift in the participation discourse beyond beneficiary participation to wider questions of citizenship, rights and governance (Gaventa, 2002), addressing challenges of equity and inclusion gain even greater importance. Yet claims to “full participation” and “the participation of all stakeholders”—familiar from innumerable project documents and descriptions of participatory processes—all too often boil down to situations in which only the voices and versions of the vocal few are raised and heard. Women, many critics argue, are those most likely to lose out, finding themselves and their interests marginalized or overlooked in apparently “participatory” processes (Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998; Mayoux, 1995; Mosse, 1995).

Talk about voice and choice, about rights and entitlements, and about obligations and

responsibilities demands, above all, approaches that are sensitive to the complexity of issues of difference. Gender and Development (GAD) ought to be able to teach those involved with participation in development a thing or two. But the relationship between gender and participation is rather more fraught with tensions and contradictions than these commonalities might suggest. While feminist critiques of participatory approaches chastise their users for their lack of attention to issues of gender, critics of GAD might argue that while it offers useful

* Many thanks to Jo Doezema and Naomi Hossain for their research assistance. I would like to thank Karen Brock, Robert Chambers, John Gaventa, Anne-Marie Goetz, Irene Guijt, Naila Kabeer and Shahra Razavi for conversations and comments that helped me clarify some of the ideas that are expressed here. This paper builds substantially on an earlier and longer background paper, commissioned by UNRISD for the Copenhagen Plus Five conference in Geneva, 2000, published as an IDS discussion paper and in Shahra Razavi's (ed.) *Shifting Burdens: Gender and Agrarian Change under Neoliberalism* (Kumarian Press, May, 2002). Final revision accepted: 4 February 2003.

tools for thought, it is rather thinner on tools for action (Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998). The practice of GAD is often rather top-down, superimposing particular (culturally specific, some might suggest) frames of reference and barely allowing for broader participation in agenda setting or implementation. A simplifying worldview is thus projected onto diverse development situations, whether by superimposing essentialized images of “woman-as-victim” and “man-as-problem” or ignoring the lot of marginal men (Chant, 2000; Cornwall & White, 2000).

Problematizing the way in which “gender” is used is essential for addressing the transformative goals of participatory development. The practical equivalence between “gender” and “women’s issues,” and the narrow focus of “gender relations” on particular kinds of male–female relations, obscure the analytic importance of gender as a constitutive element of all social relationships and as signifying a relationship of power (Scott, 1989; Wieringa, 1998). Points of tension between participatory and “gender-aware” approaches to development arise from—and produce—rather different ways of engaging with issues of gendered power. In this article, I explore dimensions of “participation” and “gender” in development, highlighting paradoxes of “gender-aware” and participatory development interventions. I begin by exploring discourses and practices of GAD and participation in development. Through an analysis of a series of situated case studies of participation in projects, planning and policy from Africa and Asia, I explore some of the challenges and contradictions that arise in practice. I conclude by drawing attention to the possibilities for more productive connections and alliances in the struggle to transform inequitable gendered power relations.

2. PARALLEL WORLDS, PARTIAL CONNECTIONS? GENDER AND PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT

The parallels between efforts to promote participation and gender equality in development have a number of dimensions. Contemporary GAD emerged as an alternative to liberal Women in Development (WID). This largely sought to give women a place within existing structures and paradigms, rather than confront and seek to transform gendered in-

equities more directly (Jackson & Pearson, 1998; Razavi & Miller, 1995). “Participatory development” has generally, like WID, pursued the liberal project of inserting participatory practices of various kinds into conventional development activities, mostly taking the shape of enlistment in consultation and implementation (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980; Cornwall, 2000a). Alternative approaches from “people’s self-development” (Rahman, 1995) to a more recent focus on people’s participation in development as “makers and shapers” rather than “users and choosers” of development initiatives affecting their lives (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001), focus, like GAD, rather more on issues of power, voice, agency and rights.

(a) *Commonalities and differences*

Both WID and participatory development are about inclusion, but on terms and within the parameters set by prevailing constructions of development assistance. Both lent—and continue to lend—themselves to congruence with neoliberal development agendas in which fundamental questions of structural, intersubjective and personal power remain unaddressed. GAD and “participation in development” contain elements that recuperate more radical alternative development discourses of the 1970s and their explicit concern with power, voice and rights (Freire, 1972). They also connect with, and provide the prospect of realizing in a more sustained way, some of the lessons that have been learnt over the course of three decades of participation in development and feminist organizing (Cornwall, 2000a; Jackson & Pearson, 1998).

Feminist and participatory research methodologies share epistemological, ethical and political principles (Maguire, 1987). From a common concern with the relationship between the knower and the known, to a recognition of the ways in which claims to “objectivity” and “truth” can render some people’s knowledge and experience ignorance, both value an ethic of commitment to social transformation (Gaventa, 1993; Mies, 1983). These shared principles are mirrored by common experiences in the development domain. As White notes, for both participation and gender: “what began as a political issue is translated into a technical problem which the development enterprise can accommodate with barely a falter in its stride” (1996, p. 7). Just as efficiency arguments were used to make a case for increasing women’s

access to development institutions, so participatory development gained currency through arguments about the cost-effectiveness of engaging “primary stakeholders” in development projects. In addition; just as mainstreaming gender led to dilution of its political dimension (Goetz, 1994), so too has the rapid spread of participatory approaches led to their use by powerful international institutions to lend their prescriptions authenticity and legitimacy, submerging the more radical dimensions of participatory practice (Cornwall, 2002; Tandon, 2002).

While broad family resemblances hold together the practices associated with participation and GAD, it is important not to overlook differences within each of these categories. Although Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) has often come to be equated—confused, as well as conflated (see, for example, Cooke & Kothari, 2001)—with “participation,” efforts to bring about participation in development have a longer history, embracing a range of contrasting perspectives and methods (Cornwall, 2000a). These have quite different implications for how participation and participants come to be constructed, as well as for the part participation is held to play in the development process (see Table 1; Gaventa & Valderrama, 2001; White, 1996).¹ Salient here are the differences between rhetoric, which is replete with grand-sounding promises of empowerment of the marginalized, and what mainstream agencies actually do, which often takes the shape of enlisting people in pre-determined ventures and securing their compliance with pre-shaped development agendas (Cooke & Kothari, 2001; White, 1996). Distinguishing between forms of participation that work through enlistment and those that genuinely open up the possibilities for participants to realize their rights and

exercise voice is therefore important, for these differences are something that blanket critiques of participation tend to disregard.

There are equally significant differences between interpretations of GAD, whether in terms of theoretical underpinnings or operational models (Jackson & Pearson, 1998; Moser, 1993; Wieringa, 1998). Sophisticated analyses of issues of gendered power inform and distinguish GAD from WID and give rise to differences of emphasis and analysis (Jackson & Pearson, 1998; Razavi & Miller, 1995). The models that are used in practice, however, lack many of the nuances of the analyses from which they are derived. “Doing gender” is often, as a result, quite different from what GAD theorists might have had in mind when they penned the foundational feminist fables on which operational models came to be built. In the process, the concerns and projections of a particular variant of Western feminism come to be translated into development practice (Mohanty, 1987).

These differences in interpretation and emphasis further complicate any analysis of commonalities and tensions between approaches to gender and participation in development. There are those, for example, within the arena of participatory development who are just as critical of the gender blindness of many applications of participation in development as those from the GAD arena (Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998; Maguire, 1987; Mayoux, 1995). The issues are familiar: subsuming “women” under “the community” masks the distinctiveness of women’s experiences, and claims to inclusiveness wobble once questions are asked about who participates, decides and benefits from “participatory” interventions. Equally, there are those who work on gender who would contend that for all the talk about gender *relations*, much gender work actually focuses on

Table 1. *Modes of participation*

Mode of participation	Associated with ...	Why invite/involve?	Participants viewed as ...
Functional	Beneficiary participation	To enlist people in projects or processes, so as to secure compliance, minimize dissent, lend legitimacy	Objects
Instrumental	Community participation	To make projects or interventions run more efficiently, by enlisting contributions, delegating responsibilities	Instruments
Consultative	Stakeholder participation	To get in tune with public views and values, to garner good ideas, to defuse opposition, to enhance responsiveness	Actors
Transformative	Citizen participation	To build political capabilities, critical consciousness and confidence; to enable to demand rights; to enhance accountability	Agents

women, obscuring other gendered dimensions of exclusion and failing to make sense of the complexities of gender and power (Cornwall, 1998; Kandiyoti, 1998; Peters, 1995).

(b) “*Gender-aware*” participatory development: tensions and opportunities

The ways in which the terms “gender” and “participation” are used in practice cannot be taken for granted; “gender-aware” participatory practice may take different shades depending on where the practitioner or implementing agency situate themselves. Tensions, commonalities and complementarities between approaches to gender and participation complicate any analysis of the gender dimensions of participatory development. Yet it is these very differences and similarities that provoke food for thought and provide entry points for the emergence of new hybrids, new alliances and new tactics for transforming existing practices.

One of the most significant lines of tension runs across—rather than between—approaches to gender and participation. Some participatory approaches, such as Participatory Action Research (PAR, see Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991) emphasize the structural dimensions of power, echoing the focus of some versions of GAD. These approaches seek to question “naturalized” assumptions, whether discursive or ideological. With the goal of confronting and transforming inequalities, they introduce particular ideas about power and difference, either to create new spaces or transform existing ones. Applying structural models may serve to essentialize gender identities and relations. This can equally produce institutions that “misbehave” (Harrison, 1997), giving voice to elite women who may have little interest in their “sisters” and deepening the gendered exclusion of others—notably, younger, poorer men (Cornwall & White, 2000). They can thus serve to reproduce existing relations of inequality between “women” or “men” (cf. Moore, 1994; Peters, 1995) and strengthen compacts between particular kinds of women and their menfolk (Harrison, 1997), rather than build the basis for more equitable gender relations.

Other schools of thought, such as PRA, emphasize the importance of tuning into and building on people’s own experiences, concepts and categories. Rather than importing concepts from elsewhere, they focus on enabling local people to articulate and analyze their own sit-

uations, in their own terms, and focus more on individual agency than on structural analysis. This opens up the potential for a more nuanced and less essentialist approach to issues of power and difference. By seeking to ground analysis and planning in local discourses and institutions, however, PRA-based participatory practices appear to offer the facilitator little scope for challenging aspects of the status quo that feminist practitioners would find objectionable. Local people are presumed to know best, even if they advocate the chastisement of younger women who step out of line or indeed the repression of women considered to be “loose” (Overs, Doezema, & Shivdas, 2002). With their emphasis on consensus, the institutions created as part of participatory development initiatives—whether committees, user groups, community action planning groups and so on—can exacerbate existing forms of exclusion, silencing dissidence and masking dissent (Mosse, 1995; Mouffe, 1992). The voices of the more marginal may barely be raised, let alone heard, in these spaces.

Turning to examine some concrete instances from development practice, further dilemmas arise. In the following sections, I begin by exploring *women’s* participation in participatory development projects. I do so to raise a set of issues pertinent to questions of gender, and aware of the dangers of the slippage between “women” and “gender” that are so much part of prevailing discourses on GAD. I then turn to projects which take a more explicit *gender* focus, raising concerns about the dissonance between perspectives on change, and in order to explore further the tensions I draw attention to here between approaches to participation and to gender. Finally, I explore attempts to address issues of gender in policy advocacy and research, drawing attention to the multiplicity of ways of conceiving of “gender” and implications for practice, and picking up earlier concerns with essentialism and with the strategic importance of advocacy. Through this analysis, I draw out assumptions, contradictions and challenges, reflecting on entry points for transformatory practice.

3. WOMEN’S PARTICIPATION IN PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The question of *who* participates and *who* benefits raises awkward questions for partici-

partory development. The very projects that appear so transformative can turn out to be supportive of a status quo that is highly inequitable for *women*. While seeking to avoid the pervasive slippage between “women” and “gender” in development, it is important to emphasize that the marginalization or exclusion of women from participatory projects remains an issue (Mayoux, 1995). Women’s involvement is often limited to implementation, where essentialisms about women’s caring roles and naïve assumptions about “the community” come into play (Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998; Lind, 1997). The means by which women are excluded, equally, may echo and reinforce hegemonic gender norms, as well as replicate patterns of gendered exclusion that have wider resonance. In this section, I look first at a classic mainstream “participatory” initiative, to explore barriers to participation faced by women and ways they might be overcome. I then turn to a second project that highlights some of the dilemmas that arise in efforts not just to engage women’s participation, but to make participatory projects more “gender sensitive.”

(a) *Engaging participation, excluding women*

Joint Forest Management (JFM) is in many ways a classic example of participatory development. It involves creating or adapting existing community-based institutions in order to devolve (some) opportunities for local people to participate in sectoral governance, as “partners,” “stakeholders” and “owners” (Leach, Mearns, & Scoones, 1997; Poffenberger & McGeen, 1996). At a time when JFM was being lauded for its prowess with participation, feminist researchers revealed quite a different story (Agarwal, 1997; Sarin, 1998). Their analyses highlighted the shortcomings of JFM, as “gender exclusionary and highly inequitable” (Agarwal, 1997, p. 1374). Not only were women losing out of benefits from JFM and suffering higher workloads as a result of the difficulties in collecting fuelwood. “To be labeled ‘offenders’ and forest destroyers into the bargain,” Sarin charges, “is making a parody of participatory forest management” (1998, p. 128).

Women’s opportunities to influence decision making in forest protection committees rest not simply on getting women onto these committees, but on how and whether women represent women’s interests, whether they raise their

voices and, when they do, whether anyone listens. Mohanty (2002) suggests that, in Uttaraanchal, although there is an emphasis on a certain percentage of women being on the committee, much depends on the good will of its head, who is usually a man, and the forest bureaucrat, also usually a man. “In the lack of any institutional mechanism to ensure this participation, it remains piecemeal, a gesture of benevolence on the part of male members in the committee and the forest bureaucracy” (Mohanty, 2002, p. 1). Voice, she reminds us, does not automatically translate into influence. Sarin and Agarwal both document the consequences of lack of voice and of influence. Their studies show that, unable to exert influence over the rules for forest protection, women were effectively denied the usufruct rights that they formerly had.

These rules were formulated by men without either involving the women in framing them or proposing any viable alternatives for how the women could carry out their gendered responsibility of meeting household firewood requirements following forest closure (Sarin, 1998, p. 127).

By allocating places on committees to households and assuming equitable intra-household distribution of benefits, JFM institutions largely tended to reproduce existing structures and dynamics of gendered power and exclusion. As such, they served to exemplify “the problem of treating ‘communities’ as ungendered units and ‘community participation’ as an unambiguous step toward enhanced equality” (Agarwal, 1997, p. 1374; Sarin & SAARTHI, 1996). While those women who did participate in these new spaces gained new opportunities for leadership and for learning (Mohanty, 2002), those women who were effectively excluded from decision making exercised their agency elsewhere, resisting, rebelling and breaking the rules (Sarin, 1998).

Two sets of issues arise here. First, the very real barriers to women’s participation in decision making are worth highlighting. Agarwal (1997) draws attention to familiar constraints: time; official male bias; social constraints about women’s capabilities and roles; the absence of a “critical mass” of women; and lack of public speaking experience. She cites a female member of a forest membership group: “I went to three or four meetings. . . No one ever listened to my suggestions. They were uninterested” (Britt, 1993, cited in Agarwal, 1997, p. 1375). As

Mohanty (2002) points out, women end up taking on the burden of implementation instead, patrolling the forests at night and getting even less rest. What solutions does Agarwal suggest? Practical adjustments to meeting times and membership rules would, she argues, be easily enough addressed with gender-aware planning, although this alone would not enable women to exercise decision making. Strategies to increase women's confidence and awareness of their rights are needed, in order for them to be more assertive in joining committees. For this, she suggests, the presence of a gender-progressive nongovernment organization (NGO) or women's organization is a major factor: membership makes women more self-confident, assertive and vocal in mixed gatherings. *Other* spaces outside the officialized public space of the committees thus gain importance as sites for confidence—as well as alliance-building (cf. Kohn, 2000).

On issues that do affect women-in-general, such as access to fuelwood, it is important that women *qua* women are given space to articulate their concerns. Gender-progressive institutions can enable women to challenge their exclusion. Yet here a second issue arises: the extent to which the participation of *particular* women should be taken as representative of (both in the sense of speaking about and speaking for) women-in-general. Caution may be needed in moving beyond particular concerns that are clearly shared, to identifying female representation with enhancing the position of *all* women (Phillips, 1991). The essentialisms that lurk behind well-intentioned efforts to increase women's participation *as* women are dangerous as well as wrong-headed: these can deepen exclusion while providing reassurance that gender inequality has been addressed. Moreover, as Mohanty contends, "the mere presence of women in the decision making committees without a voice can be counter-productive in the sense that it can be used to legitimise a decision which is taken by the male members" (2002, p. 1).

Increasing the numbers of women involved may serve instrumental goals, but will not necessarily address more fundamental issues of power. There is no reason to suppose that women, by virtue of their sex, are any more open to sharing power and control than men. Those who represent "women's concerns" may reinforce the exclusionary effects of *other* dimensions of difference (Mohanty, 1987; Moore, 1994; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981). Installing

women on committees may be necessary to open up space for women's voice, but is not sufficient: it may simply serve as a legitimating device, and may even shore up and perpetuate inequitable "gender relations" *between* women. Female participants may not identify themselves primarily, or even at all, with other women; their concerns may lie more with their sons and their kin.² To assume female solidarity masks women's agency in the pursuit of their own projects that may be based on other lines of connectedness and difference.³

More controversially, what if, when women raise their voices, they do so to affirm ideals of femaleness that feminists might think of as "gender oppressive"? What if the "needs" women profess are connected with fulfilling their duties as wives and mothers? This cuts to the heart of the tension between the feminist agenda of GAD and the emphasis in participation on democratizing decision making and supporting people's rights to make and shape the decisions affecting their lives, as the next case so vividly illustrates.

(b) *The dilemmas of choice*

As a gender-progressive NGO, Oxfam sought to address women's inclusion as part of their support to the Kebkabiya food security project in North Darfur, Sudan (Strachan & Peters, 1997). Oxfam was concerned to avoid increasing workloads, alienating women from the community and causing a backlash from men in the name of empowerment. Men appeared to make all community decisions, and women's involvement was initially limited to helping to build seed banks. In the process of handing the project over to community management, almost all women decided on separate committees. Oxfam responded by supporting these women-only spaces, but also by hiring two female women's co-ordinators charged with the task of increasing women's participation in the project and representing women's concerns on the management committee. As the women gained confidence in these spaces and began to think about the need to be heard by men for things to change, Oxfam worked to persuade men of the value of women's involvement in the project. Eventually most committees merged.

The tactics used here are typical ones. Working with women's groups separately, then seeking to integrate them with the "main," male-run committees is a well-worn route to

addressing the issues Agarwal (1997) raises of “critical mass” and the confidence to speak out. Importantly, however, the Kebkabiya case raises other critical questions. Village women asked for practical help with things like handicrafts and poultry raising. The women’s co-ordinators thought these projects should be supported—this, after all, was what women wanted. Oxfam worried that supporting traditional gender roles would reinforce women’s inequality rather than empowering them. Instead, the Project Co-ordinator secured a special fund to support those women’s projects he regarded as in line with project aims, as a means to securing women’s involvement in the main project.

The village women in Kebkabiya were quite explicit about what they wanted. What is significant is that the NGO hesitated. Despite commitment to participatory decision making, those with the power to allocate resources withheld support and then gave it piecemeal, with other objectives in mind. They believed that it would be in women’s interests—even if the women themselves did not see it this way—to participate in the main project. This encapsulates a familiar, but unresolved debate in feminist circles over “objective” and “subjective” interests (Jonasdottir, 1988; Molyneux, 1985).

If women prefer interventions that appear to reinforce their subordination, what does the gender-aware participatory development practitioner do? Fierlbeck’s (1997) analysis of the concept of “consent” as used in liberal theory addresses this dilemma. Choices cannot be simply argued away with reference to “false consciousness.” Nor can arguing about the restricted contexts of choice be sustained, for it breaks down once we examine women’s choices in other settings. But her conclusion fails to offer succor: “we must be willing to probe and to query the choices and decisions of ‘autonomous’ agents,” for consent is “in itself not only a moral construct but, more tangible, a potentially political device for ensuring obedience” (1997, p. 43). This rather begs the very questions of agency that she seeks to answer.

Overt compliance may be a strategy enabling subordinates room to maneuver: the “hidden transcripts” (Scott, 1990) of those Sudanese women might provide a different perspective. It might well be that the women complied with how the development project sought to construct their interests as “women” to secure goals that remained consonant with their own

projects. Compliance might have given them room for maneuver whilst maintaining important relationships with men (Arce, Villarreal, & de Vries, 1994; Villarreal, 1990). In any case

... women’s attachment to and stake in certain forms of patriarchal arrangements may derive neither from false consciousness, nor from conscious collusion but from an actual stake in certain positions of power available to them (Kandiyoti, 1998, p. 143).

Seemingly benign intervention may undermine the strategies of those for whom “actual stakes” in current arrangements may involve more than initially meets the outsiders’ eye. Inviting “the community” to design their own interventions runs the risk, however, of reinforcing stakes that maintain a status quo that the marginal have *tactics* to grapple with, but no possibility of realizing *strategies* for change because they lack the power and agency to do so (cf. de Certeau, 1984). These dilemmas are most apparent in contexts where participatory approaches are used to enable “the community” to engage more directly in the development process. It is to this, and the implications for what kinds of development projects emerge, that I now turn.

4. FROM APPRAISAL TO ACTION: GENDER IN PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

Just as the nominal inclusion of women appears to satisfy “gender” goals, so too the use of participatory methods in planning processes may be tokenistic rather than transformative. Participation in planning ranges from more sustained and deliberative processes of engagement to one-off performances: all the way down Arnstein’s (1971) ladder of participation from tokenism to delegated control. PRA is a widely used participatory technology that has become particularly popular as a tool for planning over the last decade, either through use to identify priorities or to construct community action plans. PRA is often conflated with “doing participation.” The aim of this section is not to suggest that participatory planning can be reduced to the use of PRA. Rather, my focus on PRA here is both to enable me to further explore some of the tensions raised earlier in this paper and to engage with it as an approach that has gained such remarkable popularity in development work.

PRA would seem to promise a lot for work on gender. Its principles emphasize enabling unheard voices to be heard. PRA processes can create spaces where new rules for engagement provide new opportunities for voice and influence (Chambers, 1997; Jones & Speech, 2001). But a focus on gender is not implicit in the methodology, nor is it often an explicit element of PRA practice (Cornwall, 1998; Crawley, 1998; Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998). Where gender has been paid attention, it is often through deliberate emphasis on difference (Welbourn, 1991) or through other tools alongside PRA (Guijt, 1994; Humble, 1998; Kindon, 1998). The examples given below show that PRA can be used in processes that provide opportunities for poor women to empower themselves. Yet, used by facilitators who lack a concern with process, power and difference, it can exacerbate exclusion and cement existing relations of inequality.

(a) *Missing women, masking dissent*

Mosse's (1995) insightful account of the early project planning stages of the Kribhco Indo-British Rainfed Farming Project (KRIBP) in India is one of the earliest, and best known, critiques of PRA from a gender perspective. Yet while it is often read as a generalized critique of PRA, it is actually rather more situated. The KRIBP project aimed to identify women's perspectives on farming systems, strengthen their roles in natural resource management and "open new opportunities for women's involvement in household and community decision making and resource control" (1995, p. 4). "PRAs" were used to do so. These activities consisted of three days in villages using visual techniques and interviews with groups, before a plenary village meeting.⁴

As public events, Mosse argues, these "PRAs" did not permit sufficient articulation of dissent to allow marginal women a voice. Women's participation was minimal. The public location of activities made it difficult for women to attend, let alone participate. The decision to time these one-off events to capture seasonal migrants reflected a concern with maximizing male participation with little regard for women's availability.⁵ By effectively creating public performances, the team failed to recognize the extent to which the powerful might take control of the public arena, and the implications for the inclusion of other voices. Concluding that the public "PRAs" he wit-

nessed "tend to emphasize formal knowledge and activities, and reinforce the invisibility of women's roles" (1995, p. 21), Mosse contends that, "women's agreement with projections of community or household interests will be tacitly assumed, and the notion of distinctive perspectives overlooked" (1995, p. 21).

Mosse's subsequent critique of what appear to be inherent limitations of PRA illustrates a rather different point. PRA methods in themselves are largely gender-neutral. Powerful examples exist of PRA methods being used to facilitate gender awareness, such as Bilgi's (1998) use of daily time routines to enable men to explore and challenge their prejudices. Yet their appealing simplicity allows PRA methods to slot easily into the repertoire of technical methods fieldworkers already use. As Goetz notes of GAD.

The search for simple formulae and tools to integrate gender-sensitive data and practices to projects and policies implies faith that technique can override forms of prejudice embedded in organizational cognitive systems and work cultures (1997, p. 4).

If prejudice about whose knowledge counts and what counts as knowledge structures the use of these methods, then it is not surprising to find these assumptions in the outcomes of these PRAs. Mosse draws attention to the "aesthetic bias" (1995, p. 24) of PRA techniques, suggesting that their formality marks out their use "as the province of men" (1995, p. 19). But the team was not made up of anthropologists who would relish unstructured conversations. They were technicians. It is hardly surprising that they preferred neat charts. Moreover, most were men who might have been predisposed to paying more attention to what men had to say. PRA methods are treated as the source of the problem, but it seems more likely that the composition of the team conditioned their use of these methods and their reactions to what emerged from them. The standardization and rapidity of these PRAs, their public nature, the lack of female staff and the failure to anticipate these challenges effectively excluded women in early planning activities of the KRIBP. Clearly, institutional and personal as well as methodological issues played a part here.

How might women's perspectives have been voiced in this context? One barrier to women's participation is time. Holding sessions at times that women suggest as convenient at least allows the option to participate. Where time is

needed most, however, is in building women's capacity to speak and to act. Rushed incursions into communities and hastily cobbled together action plans inevitably fail to address this. Consideration also needs to be given to locating PRA sessions in places where women feel comfortable. Mosse suggests that using PRA in nonpublic contexts would address exclusion from "formal," public spaces. But public places are not necessarily less desirable places to hold discussions with women, as Hinton (1995) found in work with Bhutanese refugees in Nepal: women preferred not to have discussions in their own homes, as they were more likely to be interrupted or overheard. Even within the public domain, space can be made for those who are more marginal by structuring the process to include them. One tactic is to work with separate groups, each of whom presents their analysis in turn in open sessions. These strategies can make a difference and provide an important lever for change precisely *because* they are public. The challenge is to expand beyond the liminal performative domain of the PRA exercise to the everyday fora in which community decision making takes place (Kesby, 1999).

As the KRIBP experience demonstrates, one of the most powerful barriers to women's inclusion is entrenched attitudes and taken-for-granted assumptions among fieldworkers themselves (Chambers, 1997; Parpart, 1999). Requiring teams to work with women as well as men, younger as well as older people, has helped create awareness among fieldworkers of dimensions of difference (Jonfa, Tebeje, Dessalegn, Halala, & Cornwall, 1991; Welbourn, 1991).⁶ Whether this effectively addresses *gender* issues remains open to question. Just as handing over control to a highly inequitable "community" is hardly a recipe for transformation, simply enabling women to speak, as Parpart notes, is not necessarily empowering, and "can disempower if it removes the ability to control the dissemination of knowledge" (1999, p. 263). What happens, then, when deliberate efforts *are* made not simply to "include women" but to institutionalize measures to address gender equity? It is to another well-known example of this that I now turn.

(b) *Making space for difference*

Redd Barna Uganda's experience with participatory development projects illustrates how attention to difference can be combined with

community-wide participatory planning (Guijt, 1997; Guijt, Kisadha, & Mukasa, 1998; Mukasa, 2000). Aware that plans made at the "community" level often avoid contentious gender issues, Redd Barna created spaces in which gender- and generation-specific issues could be tackled within a broader participatory planning process. High-level institutional commitment enabled RBU to work with an approach that made gender and age differences explicit (Mukasa, 2000) and emphasized addressing women's subordination directly.

Initial work focused on creating spaces for older and younger men, women and children to analyze their own situations as the basis for a community action plan (Guijt, Kisadha, & Fuglesang, 1994). Priorities were then discussed at a community meeting that shared the groups' findings. This was a significant innovation, but, as RBU found, dividing up communities and then bringing people together to create a single "community action plan" created the space for younger women and children to speak, but not necessarily for them to be listened to. This suggested the need for a longer process of engagement rooted firmly in local ownership. RBU developed a five-stage planning process: from preparation, initial immersion, analysis of "intra-communal difference," planning, and implementation with monitoring/evaluation (Guijt *et al.*, 1998). Working with partner organizations, and relating closely to government, RBU supported this process with skills training, making the time to give plans solid foundations and addressed inclusion through advocacy and conflict-resolution (Mukasa, 2000; Sewagudde, Mugisha, Ochen, & Mukasa, 1997). Within this process, each group generated its own priorities and engaged in active deliberation on the issues raised by others before deciding which priorities to bring forward, allowing groups to consider the priorities of others without defending their own. Analysis at community level identified shared or group-specific priorities to be taken forward into community or group action plans, creating a layered action planning process whereby major shared concerns could be addressed at a community-wide level, while groups were supported to devise and implement their own plans.

Inevitably, conflicts emerged. Mukasa's (2000) insightful account of how issues of difference emerged in the village of Nataloke reveals the very real threats that such a process opens up. She gives an account of a community meeting, that brought together peer groups of

women and men of different generations, in which meeting conventions had been addressed to make space for the less powerful to speak. And speak they did. Older women chose a song to convey their views, one that condemned husbands who spent women's hard-earned money on alcohol, gambling and women. Mukasa reports a tense silence, broken by the voice of a respected elder:

The women have actually raised real issues although it is in a wrong forum . . . they have raised issues which we usually settle at 3.00 am [deep in the night]. The women have talked! YES, they have talked! They have brought out the issues that are a taboo in a public forum like this. In front of the visitors! But since what they have talked is the undeniable truth, for me I appeal to fellow men that we should not become angry, instead we should say we are SORRY and begin afresh (Muzee Mukama, cited in Mukasa, 2000, p. 13).

Younger women began to speak out against domestic violence and control over their movements. Men fought back:

The response which came entirely from older men was sharply critical of their issues and insisting that they were to blame for their plight. They accused them of being frivolous, lazy and unreliable as wives. The men defended themselves on polygamy using quotations from the Bible. They again accused them [the younger women] of washing their dirty linen in public by mentioning issues that are strictly private (Mukasa, 2000, p. 13).

In a review eight months later, women declared their pride at gaining greater access to legal representation for cases of domestic violence, maintenance of children and inheritance. Men, however, spoke of women's violation of cultural taboos by bringing "private" issues into public fora. There had been a backlash and younger wives had taken the brunt (Guijt, 1997; Mukasa, 2000). Women had been beaten as a direct result of spending their time in PRA meetings rather than on domestic work. The divorce rate was up as a consequence.

What was needed, RBU realized, was more of a focus on advocacy work with men; sensitivity to the timing and duration of meetings was equally a concern. A realization also emerged of the limitations of treating "women" as a single group. Older women were giving younger women chores to do to prevent them from going out to meetings, for example, and enjoining them to behave themselves. Mukasa's account highlights the importance of disaggre-

gating "gender" and paying attention to the "differences within:" in this case, barriers to participation faced by the younger women as a consequence of intrahousehold relations with older women. Again, the need for advocacy for the right to participate emerged from this experience; it also highlighted the importance of promoting not only an awareness of difference, but respect for the priorities of others as having equal value—what Cornell (1992) terms "equivalence" as opposed to "equality." The implications for equity are spelled out by Kabeer:

. . . creating "access" is not enough. Equity requires that poorer women and other excluded groups are not just able to take advantage of such success but do so on terms which respect and promote their ability to exercise choice (1999, p. 76).

Reflecting on RBU's experience, Guijt *et al.* (1998) note that while their focus on age and gender has proven a powerful way to initiate change, it also masked other differences, notably economic differences. Kabeer's point about the terms on which exclusion is addressed is significant. Just as dividing communities along externally-defined axes of difference can obscure the intersections between these and *other* differences, it may take for granted forms of commonality that fail to match with people's own concerns, connections and agendas. This raises questions about the salience of a focus on particular axes of difference, such as gender, rather than on dimensions and positions of powerlessness. I will return to this point.

Nevertheless, the Redd Barna case powerfully illustrates how PRA can help address the exclusion of women's voices, raise issues of gendered power, and destabilize "common sense" notions about sexual difference. As Kabeer's (1999) analysis of "empowerment" makes clear, however, it is only when analysis moves beyond the everyday materialities of people's lives to explore issues of gendered power that other choices become imaginable. To do so requires moving beyond the comfort of consensus. It also requires institutional commitment to supporting a longer-term process of social change rather than "quick fix" development solutions. Participation in policy paradoxically offers both prospects of more lasting change and the domain in which "quick fix" participation has been most evident in recent years. It is to this that I now turn.

5. LENDING VOICE? PARTICIPATION, GENDER AND POLICY

Over the course of the 1990s, growing awareness of the limited scope of participatory “islands of success” projects led to the use of participatory methods and processes to influence policy processes. This chimed with shifts in mainstream development discourse that saw a greater recognition of the need to engage with the state, and a convergence of elements of the good governance agenda with a focus on *citizen participation* (Cornwall, 2000a; Gaventa, 2002). A panoply of methods and approaches that seek to enhance public involvement in the policy process have been popularized in recent years, informed by competing versions of the benefits of public involvement and assumptions about what it might be good for (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001; Holmes & Scoones, 2000).

Popularized by the World Bank and supported by bilateral agencies and INGOs, Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPAs) gained ascendancy in the 1990s as a means of tapping into poor people concerns and representing their “voices” to policy makers (Booth, Holland, Hentschel, Lanjouw, & Herbert, 1998; Brock, 2002; Norton & Stephens, 1995; Robb, 1999). In some cases, PPAs have simply involved the short-cut use of rapid qualitative techniques. In others there have been more active efforts to bridge the gap between policy makers and those whom policies affect by engaging a diversity of actors in the research process. “New generation” PPAs have tended to be more inventive and strategic, opening up spaces for engagement by local government officials and NGOs, “street-level bureaucrats” who play vital, often unacknowledged, roles in shaping policy (Grindle & Thomas, 1991; Lipsky, 1980). Perhaps the best known and most successful of these efforts, the Consultations with the Poor project (Narayan, Chambers, Shah, & Petesch, 2001), captured the limelight through its use of sound-bites gleaned through rapid PRA-style encounters with “the poor” (Brock, 2002; Rademacher & Patel, 2002). While the extent to which these processes deserve the label “participatory” remains a moot point, they are especially interesting sites in which to examine some of the assumptions, tensions and challenges of addressing gender.

Two salient issues arise from earlier discussions. First, participatory processes tend to be as “gender sensitive” as those who facilitate them. Second, gender work tends to make the

presumption that when women participate they become the flag-bearers for “gender issues;” GAD discourse is peppered with gender myths about female solidarity and general community-minded selflessness. Robb claims that “PPAs are responding to the challenge of inclusion by directly representing the views of the poor to policy makers” (1999, p. xii). Yet to claim that the “views of the poor” are *directly* represented in these documents would be disingenuous. The “politics of the encounter” (Jonfa *et al.*, 1991) and the processes of editing and editorializing PPA reports are hardly unmarked by the positionality and perspectives of PPA facilitators. Whether and how gender issues are raised, then, would seem to depend on the agency of those who shape this process and on their understanding of “gender.” It is with this that this section is concerned.

(a) *Gender in participatory poverty assessment and poverty reduction strategies*

Conventional approaches to poverty assessment often obscure important gender dimensions, not least the distinctive ways in which women and men experience poverty (Jackson, 1996; Kabeer, 1997; Razavi, 1998). To what extent do PPAs highlight the gender dimensions of well-being and deprivation and bring about gender-sensitive policy change? Participatory poverty research has highlighted “intangible” aspects of poverty and given vivid accounts of the differences in poor women’s and men’s experiences. The UNDP Shinyanga PPA (UNDP/IDS, 1998) raised a range of issues, from domestic violence to the impact of male alcohol consumption on household wellbeing. The Zambia PPA (Milimo & Norton, 1993) provided compelling arguments for the disaggregation of the category of “female-headed household,” which the Ugandan Participatory Poverty Process (UPPAP, 1999) has taken up. The South Africa PPA focused directly on women’s experiences in heterosexual relationships and on a definition of poverty as powerlessness (May, 1998). Domestic violence, marital instability, tensions within family relations, lack of legal rights for women (particularly over property), insecurity and concerns about personal safety all emerge, as they do in the “Consultations with the Poor” project (Narayan *et al.*, 2001).

Whether these findings emerge in the framing of policy, however, depends on how gender is interpreted, something about which there appears to be little consistency (Whitehead &

Lockwood, 1998). If “gender” means “ask the women too,” then the product of PPAs will likely be gender-disaggregated data that have been “gathered” with little attention to gender dynamics, gender relations or the contexts in which the data were produced. If, as is most frequently the case, “gender” refers to “women’s issues,” it would not be surprising to see findings concerning women’s access to resources, perhaps some dimensions of institutionalized disprivilege, and suggestions regarding interventions like women’s groups or the provision of credit.

Razavi and Miller argue that “the situation of women cannot be improved simply by ‘asking the women themselves’ what their interests are” (1995, p. 38). The deliberative potential of PPAs is under realized, exacerbated by the tensions between eliciting local versions and engaging in critical reflection. As Kandiyoti argues:

Taking “naturalized” categories at face value may enhance adequate communication and promote so-called “bottom-up” approaches to development which are sensitive to local constructions of gender, but it does not necessarily further the goal of putting them into question (1998, p. 146).

What is evident from the treatment of gender in many PPAs is that these “naturalized” categories remain largely unquestioned. The dilemmas of the Kebkabiya project have particular resonance here, as the versions produced in these consultative exercises may go no further than reaffirming normative constructions. It might be wondered to what extent more marginal women would risk speaking out in brief encounters that generally last no more than a few days: it is easy to seek out “women’s voices” and hear only the more prominent among them. The depth of insight gained in the process is questionable, especially without the contextual knowledge to situate who speaks and what they speak about. And the agency of the facilitator is obscured by the pervasive imagery in PPAs of neutral facilitators simply listening and recording poor people’s voices. As in the KRIBP project, Lebrun’s (1998) study of the UNDP-funded Shinyanga PPA demonstrates the extent to which fieldworkers’ conduct influences what emerges. Her work highlights the limitations of pervasive assumptions of gender-based solidarity between female fieldworkers and local women:

By being an urban-dweller, working in the formal sector, educated, and from a middle-class background, the female fieldworker had good reason to

feel closer to her male colleagues, rather than to village women . . . it is also a better move in terms of personal career development to express solidarity with a male colleague, rather than entering into conflict with them on gender issues, especially if the woman holds a lower position than her male colleagues in the hierarchy of the district bureaucracy (1998, p. 26).

As this example shows, getting an awareness of gender into the process of generating knowledge for policy is more complex than getting people to use the right tools to gather information. Issues of subjectivity and positionality may have just as much influence on what emerges. Influencing policy, in any case, depends on more than simply feeding information to policy makers (Keeley & Scoones, 1999); getting data on gender issues will not ensure that these issues find their way onto the poverty-alleviation agenda. Goetz’s (1994) analysis of the ways in which information about women is taken up in development bureaucracies underlines the point that what policy makers *want to know* tends to determine how information is used.

Whitehead and Lockwood’s (1998) analysis of six World Bank Poverty Assessments (PAs), four with a PPA component, is a powerful example of the limited influence of gender-relevant insights on the shaping of policy recommendations. At every stage, gender issues slipped off the policy agenda. When it came to policy recommendations, gender barely made an appearance.⁷ As has become evident in recent reviews of gender in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), this is a tendency that has not gone away despite all the bluster about participation that has accompanied PRSP processes. The attrition of gender issues with the move into policy becomes evident from other recent studies of PRSPs (McGee, Levene, & Hughes, 2002; World Bank, 2001, 2002; Zuckerman, 2002). Zuckerman argues that “the majority of PRSPs produced to date weakly apply an obsolete WID approach—mentioning a few female problems in isolation such as girls not attending school and women’s reproductive health problems” (2002, p. 2). One reason for the lack of attention to gender, she suggests, is the presumption that participatory processes would feed into the PRSPs.

These analyses reinforce the point that what is needed is not simply good tools or good analysis, but advocacy, persistence and influence to accompany the process all the way through to the writing stage. Zuckerman (2002) contends that in UPPAP, regarded by many as

a very participatory process, the efforts made to address gender were undone at the final synthesis stage. By the time it came to the PRSP, gender had gone missing. In the contrasting example of Rwanda, she argues, advocacy at every stage of the process made the difference.⁸ The Rwandan Ministry of Gender and the Promotion of Women played an instrumental role, employing tactics such as co-sponsoring a workshop with the Ministry of Economics and Finance at which a wide range of stakeholders applied gender analysis tools to formulate recommendations on integrating gender into the PRSP, and establishing an inter-agency “PRSP engendering [sic.] committee” which included the PRSP writing team director.

Whitehead and Lockwood (1998) and Zuckerman (2002) draw attention to the role that those who write PPA reports and the PRSPs play in framing the “voices” they claim to represent. Their analysis makes clear—once again—that without an explicit focus on gender issues, they can simply disappear from view. While Zuckerman’s analysis focuses more on tactics for advocacy for gender issues, Whitehead and Lockwood argue that what is needed to make a difference is a gender-focused conceptual lens through which to “read” empirical findings about the differential effects of poverty on men and women.

(b) *Making a difference?*

What difference, then, would a more explicit conceptual framework characteristic of current models of gender analysis and advocacy on gender issues make? The South Africa PPA (May, 1998) provides a good example. Focusing on gendered powerlessness, the South Africa PPA report speaks of women’s powerlessness in the face of male violence, and of their strategic uses of available power in “manipulating” men to hand over their wages. What is striking is its focus on the more intimate dimensions of heterosexual relationships between women and men, going well beyond the gender-disaggregated picture that emerges from other PPA work, to home in on the dynamics of heterosexual relationships. The policy recommendations that emerged were inflected with a concern that women’s well-being would not be left out of the picture.

What made this PPA different? Arguably, the accretion of experience in PPAs was drawn on to make it methodologically superior to others. NGOs with longer-term relationships with

communities were key actors, high level officials were brought into the process. Innovative methods ensured that sound evidence could be produced for policy advocacy. The quality of outputs was high. But empirical evidence alone cannot ensure that gender issues make it into reports or policy recommendations. The SA-PPA field team was different in that it included feminist researchers and NGO workers who kept gender on the agenda (Attwood & May, 1998). The participatory dimensions of the SA PPA helped to open up the space for strategic advocacy on women’s concerns; this, coupled with the use of gender analysis to guide fieldwork and analysis, seems to have made the difference. Equally, with the Rwandan PRSP process, advocacy coupled with connections with those at the heart of the writing team ensured that gender made it through into the PRS.

But there is a twist in the tale. The voices of marginal men, and their gender issues and gender concerns, tend to be absent from participatory as from conventional PAs and strategies. “Men have become marginalized through unemployment, social institutions and the absence of alternative opportunities” (1998, p. 18), the SA PPA authors note. But the perspectives of these marginal men are missing. They are regarded instead as the problem: “as a result, [men] pose an economic and physical threat to women and children” (1998, p. 18). Rosemary McGee (personal communication) reports that in the UPPAP (which subsequently served to “feed” the PRSP process) some young men spoke about their gendered vulnerabilities. Unable to afford education, with no land or jobs, young men are economically alienated. Some move in with older women as their “concubines” as a way to manage, which leaves them in an insecure and vulnerable position. As long as policy narratives on gender are framed as being about women, the voices of young men like these all too easily become submerged within the generic category “the poor”.

6. CONCLUSION: MAKING MORE OF DIFFERENCE

Unless efforts are made to enable marginal voices to be raised and heard, claims to inclusiveness made on behalf of participatory development will appear rather empty. Requiring the representation of women on committees or ensuring women are consulted are necessary but not sufficient. Working with difference

requires skills that have been under-emphasized in much recent participatory development work: conflict resolution, assertiveness training (Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998; Mosse, 1995; Welbourn, 1996). The need for advocacy on gender issues is evident, at every level. Yet there is perhaps a more fundamental obstacle in the quest for equitable development. The ethic of participatory development and of GAD is ultimately about challenging and changing relations of power that objectify and subjugate people. Yet “gender” is framed in both participatory and “gender-aware” development initiatives in ways that continue to provide stumbling blocks to transforming power relations.

Kandiyoti notes “the blinkering and distortion that may result from the importation of Western feminist concerns and units of analysis into gender and development writing” (1998, p. 146). She argues for the need to “remain agnostic” over the value of “gender” if it obscures the diversity of social life and the contexts within which social categories have meaning. Where “addressing gender” simply involves gathering and presenting sex-disaggregated data, then, gender-blindness may be replaced with *gender-blinkeredness*. This does nobody any good. Yet the category “gender” remains useful, precisely because it signifies an aspect of all social relationships and a relation of power (Scott, 1989). What is at issue here is the slippage between “gender” and “women” and the ways in which “gender relations” come to be understood.

Making a difference calls for an approach that can deal with the diversity of experiences and interactions that are part of everyday life, rather than imposing categories and concepts from conventional “gender” approaches. To do so calls for strategies that are sensitive to local dynamics of difference and that build on the “gender issues” that men as well as women can identify with and mobilize around—like gender violence, safe motherhood—rather than essentializing sexual difference (Cornwall, 2000b; Greig, 2000). In this, I follow Mouffe (1992), in suggesting that identities are always contingent and depend on specific forms of identification. Rather than presupposing some kind of homogeneous identity, then, looking at the ways

in which people identify themselves with others or with particular issues can provide a more effective basis for advocacy and for action.

The challenge is to hold together—rather than dispense with, or completely erase—a politics of difference that is premised on the contingent, situational identity claims that make an identification with “women’s issues” possible, with a politics in which identifications provide the basis for action on commonly held concerns. This would not preclude a direct focus on issues that women-in-general might commonly identify with, for example, property rights. But it would go beyond the assumption that all women identify with “gender issues” and that bringing about change is a zero sum game in which women-in-general are pitted against men-in-general. It would recognize that some men may also be affronted by the exclusion of women and may prove important allies. Moreover it would tackle some of the consequences of defining interventions in terms that fail to embrace the needs of people who fall outside the boundaries created by assumptions about “women’s needs.”

While the tensions outlined at the start of this paper continue to provide obstacles, they also present opportunities. Seeking to challenge and transform relations of power that turn difference into hierarchy is a common thread that can bring together feminist and participatory practitioners’ concerns with voice and choice. Participatory approaches have much to offer, but will only make a difference if they’re used with sensitivity to issues of difference. Rather than the “add women and stir” approach to addressing gender, what is needed is strategies and tactics that take account of the power effects of difference, combining advocacy to lever open spaces for voice with processes that enable people to recognize and use their agency. Whether by reconfiguring the rules of interactions in public spaces, enabling once silenced participants to exercise voice, or reaching out beyond the “usual suspects” to democratize decision making, such processes can help transform gender-blindness and gender-blinkeredness into the basis for more productive alliances to confront and address power and powerlessness.

NOTES

1. This typology draws on White’s (1996) insightful analysis, and on Pretty’s (1995) much-used typology of participatory development.

2. Molyneux (1985) makes the point that “women’s interests” and “women’s gender interests” are not always coincident, nor are “women’s interests” neces-

sarily based on identification as women. Unfortunately, much of the power of Molyneux's incisive account disappears in the conversion of "interests" into "needs" in Moser's (1993) elaboration of "practical" and "strategic" needs (see Wieringa, 1998).

3. Studies of women's groups in Africa, for example, suggest that elite women can make use of these fora to gain access to resources, and that a shared gender identity rarely serves as an important basis for alliances (Harrison, 1997; Von Bulow, 1995).

4. Versions of this 'PRA package' have become common fare the world over. See Pratt (2001) and Cornwall, Musyoki, and Pratt (2001).

5. Simply "asking the community" for a time convenient to them may have the same effect. In a Gambian case village men on behalf of "the community" picked a "suitable" time for a team of trainees to visit which

coincided with a major ceremonial event for village women (Kane, Bruce, & O'Reilly De Brun, 1998).

6. As Jonfa *et al.* (1991), for example, found in a setting where women were silent observers of a "community" resource mapping exercise, once women and children were *invited* to make their own maps they set to with enthusiasm.

7. This actually seemed to have little to do with any inherent limitations of PPAs, despite their charge to this effect. As they point out, the policy sections of these documents simply reflected current World Bank policy.

8. It remains rather unclear from Zuckerman's analysis what exactly "mainstreaming gender" involved, but it does seem that a major part was urging that women's perspectives, voices and needs would be solicited and included.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, B. (1997). Re-sounding the alert—gender, resources and community action. *World Development*, 25, 1373–1380.
- Arce, A., Villarreal, M., & de Vries, P. (1994). The social construction of rural development: discourses, practices and power. In D. Booth (Ed.), *Rethinking social development: theory: Research and practice*. London: Longman.
- Arnstein, S. (1971). A ladder of citizen's participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(7), 216–224.
- Attwood, H., & May, J. (1998). Kicking down doors and lighting fires: The South African PPA. In J. Holland, & J. Blackburn (Eds.), *Whose voice? Participatory research and policy change* (pp. 119–130). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Bilgi, M. (1998). Entering women's world through men's eyes. In I. Guijt, & M. Kaul Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 93–99). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Booth, D., Holland, J., Hentschel, J., Lanjouw, P., & Herbert, A. (1998). *Participation and combined methods in African poverty assessment: Renewing the agenda*. DFID, London, February.
- Brock, K. (2002). Introduction. *Knowing Poverty: Critical Reflections on Participatory Research and Policy* (pp. 1–13). London: Earthscan.
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Chant, S. (2000). From 'woman-blind' to 'man-kind': Should Men have more space in gender and development? *IDS Bulletin*, 31, 7–17.
- Cohen, J., & Uphoff, N. (1980). Participation's place in rural development: seeking clarity through specificity. *World Development*, 8, 213–235.
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2001). *The tyranny of participation*. London: Zed Books.
- Cornell, D. (1992). Gender, sex and equivalent rights. In J. Butler, & J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the politica* (pp. 280–296). London: Routledge.
- Cornwall, A. (1998). Gender, participation and the politics of difference. In I. Guijt, & M. Kaul Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 46–57). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Cornwall, A. (2000a). Beneficiary, consumer, citizen: changing perspectives on participation and poverty reduction. *Sida Studies* 2. Stockholm: SIDA.
- Cornwall, A. (2000b). Missing men? Reflections on men, masculinities and gender and development. *IDS Bulletin*, 31, 18–27.
- Cornwall, A. (2002). Making spaces, changing places: situating participation in development. IDS Working Paper no. 170. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Cornwall, A., & Gaventa, J. (2001). From users and choosers to makers and shapers: repositioning participation in social policy. IDS Working Paper no. 127. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Cornwall, A., & White, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Men, masculinities and development: politics, policies and practice*. *IDS Bulletin*, 31(2).
- Cornwall, A., Musyoki, S., & Pratt, G. (2001). In search of a new impetus: practitioners' reflections on PRA and participation in Kenya. IDS Working Paper no. 131. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

- Crawley, H. (1998). Living up to the empowerment claim? The potential of PRA. In I. Guijt, & M. K. Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 24–34). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fals-Borda, O., & Rahman, M. A. (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with Participatory Action Research*. New York: Apex Press.
- Fierlbeck, K. (1997). Getting representation right for women in development: accountability, consent and the articulation of women's interests. In A.-M. Goetz (Ed.), *Getting institutions right for women in development* (pp. 31–43). London: Zed Books.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin.
- Gaventa, J. (1993). The powerful, the powerless and the experts: knowledge struggles in an information age. In P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of change: Participatory research in the United States and Canada* (pp. 21–40). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Gaventa, J. (2002). Introduction: exploring citizenship, participation and accountability. *IDS Bulletin*, 33, 1–11.
- Gaventa, J., & Valderrama, C. (2001). Participation, citizenship and local governance in enhancing ownership and sustainability: a resource book on participation. IFAD, ANGOC and IIRR.
- Goetz, A.-M. (1994). From feminist knowledge to data for development: the bureaucratic management of information on women and development. *IDS Bulletin*, 25, 27–36.
- Greig, A. (2000). The spectacle of men fighting. *IDS Bulletin*, 31, 28–32.
- Grindle, M., & Thomas, J. (1991). *Public choices and policy change*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Guijt, I. (1994). Making a difference: integrating gender analysis into PRA. *RRA Notes*, 19, 49–55.
- Guijt, I. (1997). *Impacts and institutions, partners and principles: Third review of the development and use of participatory rural appraisal and planning*. Kampala: Redd Barna.
- Guijt, I., & Kaul Shah, M. (1998). Waking up to power, conflict and process. In I. Guijt, & M. Kaul Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Guijt, I., Kisadha, T., & Fuglesang, A. (Eds.). (1994). It is the young trees that make a thick forest. London and Kampala: IIED/RBU.
- Guijt, I., Kisadha, T., & Mukasa, G. (1998). Agreeing to disagree: dealing with age and gender in Redd Barna Uganda. In I. Guijt, & M. Kaul Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 228–242). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Harrison, E. (1997). Men in women's groups: interlopers or allies? *IDS Bulletin*, 28, 122–132.
- Hinton, R. (1995). Trades in different worlds: listening to refugee voices. *PLA Notes*, 24, 21–26.
- Holmes, T., & Scoones, I. (2000). Participatory environmental policy processes: experiences from north and south. IDS Working Paper no. 113. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Humble, M. (1998). Assessing PRA for implementing gender and development. In I. Guijt, & M. Kaul Shah (Eds.), *The Myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 35–45). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Jackson, C. (1996). Rescuing gender from the poverty trap. *World Development*, 24, 489–504.
- Jackson, C., & Pearson, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Feminist visions of development: Gender analysis and policy*. London: Routledge.
- Jonasdottir, A. K. (1988). On the concept of interest, women's interests and the limitations of interest theory. In K. B. Jones, & A. K. Jonasdottir (Eds.), *The political interests of gender*. London: Sage.
- Jones, E., & Speech (2001). Of other spaces: situating participatory practices a case study from southern India. IDS Working Paper no. 137. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Jonfa, E., Tebeje, H. M., Dessalegn, T., Halala, H., & Cornwall, A. (1991). Participatory modelling in North Omo, Ethiopia: investigating the perceptions of different groups through models. *RRA Notes*, 14, 24–25.
- Kabeer, N. (1997). Tactics and trade offs: revisiting the links between gender and poverty. *IDS Bulletin*, 28, 1–13.
- Kabeer, N. (1999). The conditions and consequences of choice: reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. Mimeo, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1998). Gender, power and contestation: rethinking bargaining with patriarchy. In C. Jackson, & R. Pearson (Eds.), *Feminist visions of development* (pp. 135–151). London: Routledge.
- Kane, E., Bruce, L., & O'Reilly De Brun, M. (1998). Designing the future together: PRA and education policy in The Gambia. In J. Holland, & J. Blackburn (Eds.), *Whose voice? participatory research and policy change* (pp. 31–43). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Keeley, J., & Scoones, I. (1999). Understanding environmental policy processes: a review. IDS Working Paper no. 89. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Kesby, M. (1999). Beyond the representational impasse? PRA praxis in the context of gender focused HIV research in rural Zimbabwe. Seminar presentation, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
- Kindon, S. (1998). Of mothers and men: questioning gender and community. In I. Guijt, & M. Kaul Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 131–140). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Kohn, M. (2000). Language, power and persuasion: toward a critique of deliberative democracy. *Constellations*, 7(3), 408–429.
- Lebrun, N. (1998). The politics of needs interpretation at the grassroots: the role of fieldworkers in addressing gender issues in the Tanzanian UNDP PPA, Shiny-

- anga 1997–98, unpublished MPhil dissertation, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
- Leach, M., Mearns, R., & Scoones, I. (Eds.). (1997). *Community based sustainable development: consensus or conflict*. *IDS Bulletin*, 28(4), 12.
- Lind, A. (1997). Gender, development and urban social change: women's community action in global cities. *World Development*, 25, 1205–1223.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Maguire, P. (1987). Doing participatory research: A feminist approach. Amherst, MA: Centre for International Education.
- May, J. (1998). *Experience and perceptions of poverty in South Africa*. Durban: Praxis.
- Mayoux, L. (1995). Beyond naivet: women, gender inequality and participatory development. *Development and Change*, 26, 235–258.
- McGee, R., Levene, J., & Hughes, A. (2002). Assessing participation in poverty reduction strategy papers: a desk-based synthesis of experience in Sub-Saharan Africa. IDS Research Report no. 52. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In G. Bowles, & R. Duelli Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies*. London: Routledge.
- Milimo, J., & Norton, A. (1993). Zambia participatory poverty assessment: Synthesis report, Mimeo.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1987). Under western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 30, 61–88.
- Mohanty, R. (2002). Women's participation in JFM in uttaranchal villages, Mimeo.
- Molyneux, M. (1985). Mobilisation without emancipation? women's interests, the state and revolution in Nicaragua. *Feminist Studies*, 11, 227–254.
- Moore, H. (1994). *A passion for difference*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (1981). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Watertown, Massachusetts: Persephone Press.
- Moser, C. (1993). *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice and training*. London: Routledge.
- Mosse, D. (1995). Authority, gender and knowledge: theoretical reflections on the practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal. KRIBP Working Paper no. 2, Swansea: Centre for Development Studies.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler, & J. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political*. New York: Routledge.
- Mukasa, G. (2000). Gender and participation: the case of Redd Barna, Uganda, unpublished MA thesis, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
- Narayan, D., Chambers, R., Shah, M. K., & Patesch, P. (2001). *Voices of the poor: Crying out for change*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Norton, A., & Stephens, T. (1995). Participation in poverty assessments. Social Policy and Resettlement Division, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Overs, C., Doezema, J., & Shivdas, M. (2002). Just lip service? sex worker participation in sexual and reproductive health interventions. In A. Cornwall, & A. Welbourn (Eds.), *Realizing rights: Transforming approaches to sexual & reproductive well-being* (pp. 21–34). London: Zed Books.
- Parpart, J. (1999). Rethinking participation, empowerment and development from a gender perspective. In J. Freedman (Ed.), *Transforming development*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Peters, P. (1995). The use and abuse of the concept of “female-headed households” in research on agrarian transformation and policy. In D. Fahy Bryceson (Ed.), *Women wielding the hoe: Lessons from rural Africa for feminist theory and development* (pp. 93–108). Oxford: Berg.
- Phillips, A. (1991). *Engendering democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Poffenberger, M., & McGean, B. (1996). *Village voices, forest choices: Joint forest management in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Pratt, G. (2001). Practitioners' critical reflections on PRA and participation in Nepal. IDS Working Paper no. 122. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Pretty, J. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, 23, 1247–1263.
- Rademacher, A., & Patel, R. (2002). Retelling worlds of poverty: reflections on transforming participatory research for a global narrative. In K. Brock, & R. McGee (Eds.), *Knowing poverty: Critical reflections on participatory research and policy* (pp. 166–188). London: Earthscan Publications.
- Rahman, M. D. A. (1995). *People's self-development: Perspectives on Participatory Action Research*. London: Zed Books.
- Razavi, S. (1998). Gendered poverty and social change. Discussion Paper DP. 94, Geneva: UNRISD.
- Razavi, S., & Miller, C. (1995). From WID to GAD: Conceptual shifts in the women and development discourse. Occasional Paper no. 1, Geneva: UNRISD.
- Robb, C. (1999). *Can the poor influence policy? Participation in the World Bank's poverty assessments*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Sarin, M. (1998). Community forest management: Whose participation? In I. Guijt, & M. K. Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development* (pp. 121–130). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Sarin, M., & SAARTHI. (1996). The view from the ground: community perspectives on joint forest management in Gujarat, India. Forest Participation Series no. 4, London: IIED.
- Scott, J. (1989). Gender: a useful category of historical analysis. In E. Weed (Ed.), *Coming to terms*. London: Routledge.
- Scott, J. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance*. London: Yale University Press.
- Sewagudde, J., Mugisha, G., Ochen, R., & Mukasa, G. (1997). Mixing and matching methodologies in Redd Barna Uganda. *PLA Notes*, 28, 79–83.
- Strachan, P., & Peters, C. (1997). *Empowering communities: A casebook from Western Sudan*. Oxford: Oxfam.

- Tandon, R. (2002). Linking citizenship, participation and accountability: a perspective from PRIA. *IDS Bulletin*, 33, 59–64.
- UNDP/IDS (1998). Human development report: Shinyanga Region, Tanzania. New York/Brighton: UNDP/IDS.
- UPPAP (1999). Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment (draft). Ministry of Finance, Kampala, Uganda.
- Villarreal, M. (1990). A struggle over images: issues on power, gender and intervention in a Mexican village, unpublished MSc Thesis, University of Wageningen.
- Von Bulow, D. (1995). Power, prestige and respectability: women's groups in Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. Working Paper no. 11. Copenhagen: Centre for Development Research.
- Welbourn, A. (1996). *Stepping Stones: A training package on HIV/AIDS, communication and relationship skills*. Oxford: Strategies for Hope.
- Welbourn, A. (1991). RRA and the analysis of difference. *RRA Notes*, 14, 14–23.
- White, S. (1996). Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation. *Development in Practice*, 6, 6–15.
- Whitehead, A., & Lockwood, M. (1998). Gender in the World Bank's Poverty Assessments: six case studies from Sub-Saharan Africa. Mimeo, Geneva: UN-RISD.
- Wieringa, S. (1998). Rethinking gender planning: a critical discussion of the use of the concept of gender. Working Paper no. 279. The Hague: ISS.
- World Bank (2001). Gender in the PRSPs: a Stocktaking, Washington: PREM, World Bank.
- World Bank (2002). External assessment of participation in poverty reduction strategy papers: a synthesis. Participation and Civic Engagement Group, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Zuckerman, E. (2002). Poverty reduction strategy papers and gender. Background paper for the conference on Sustainable Poverty Reduction and PRSPs, Berlin, May 13–16.