International Development

ISSN 1470-2320

Working paper Series 2013

No.13-145

"Is History repeating itself?
A critical discourse analysis of the representation of women in climate change campaigns"

Catherine Flanagan

Published: January 2013

Development Studies Institute

London School of Economics and Political Science

Houghton Street **Tel: +44 (020) 7955 7425/6252**

London **Fax: +44 (020) 7955-6844**

WC2A 2AE UK **Email: d.daley@lse.ac.uk**

Web site: www.lse.ac.uk/depts/ID

Abstract

Throughout the 1980's and early 1990's, the discourse of ecofeminism was the predominant way in which to explain the relationship between women and the environment. This dissertation will utilise the idiom of coproduction to historicise ecofeminist discourse, concluding that its prominence reflected the social context in which it emerged, opposed to its ability to provide an accurate explanation of the relationship between women and the environment. The central aim of the paper is to determine whether contemporary representations of women in climate change campaigns repeat these ecofeminist discourses using the methods of both content and critical discourse analysis. This will reveal that despite extensive critique and a period of dormancy in the late 1990's, ecofeminist discourses are re-emerging as the dominant way in which women are represented in climate change campaigns.

Contents

Abstract 2
Acronyms 4
Introduction 5
Theoretical Framework and Critical Literature Review 7
Theoretical Framework of Coproduction 7
Critical Literature Review: The Origins of Ecofeminist Discourse and the Women, Environment and Development Framework 9
The Strategic Merging of Ecofeminism into the WED paradigm 14
The Case: Representations of women in climate change campaigns 19
Methodology 20
Content Analysis 20
Critical Discourse Analysis 23
Conclusion 31
Bibliography 32
Appendix 40

Acronyms

CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CW^2	Climate Wise Women
GAD	Gender and Development
SOTP	Sisters on the Planet
WED	Women, Environment and Development
WEN	Women's Environmental Network
WID	Women in Development

Introduction

There is extensive literature analysing the discourses permeating climate change policy, with research identifying technocratic and scientific themes dominating (see O'Neill et al.,2010). However, with the climate justice movement gaining momentum (Mohai et al., 2009), and the continued prevalence of gender mainstreaming within development, gender is becoming a more salient topic within the field of climate research and policy. Resurreccion (2011) therefore contends that researchers concerned with gender and climate change should not be content with lobbying for the inclusion of gender perspectives within the fields of climate research and policy, but concern themselves with *how* women are being represented. This, according to Resurreccion (2011), will ensure that the discourses prevalent in the latter decades of the twentieth century, namely ecofeminism and the 'Women, Environment and Development' (WED) perspectives, which insufficiently explain the relationship between women and the environment, are not repeated. Using this recommendation for inspiration, this dissertation will examine and evaluate the representation of women in three climate change campaigns. The central research question may be summarised as: 'do representations of women in climate change campaigns repeat ecofeminist discourses?' To fully evaluate the discourses in the contemporary climate campaigns, the history of the ecofeminist position must be analysed to understand how it became prominent in the late 1980's and early 1990's despite extensive criticism. The critical literature review will therefore answer the question '*why* did the ecofeminist discourse become the dominant explanation by which to explain the relationship between gender and the environment?' To answer this question, the theoretical framework of coproduction is utilised to establish how ecofeminism was adopted as a discourse because of its strategic use to various actors at a certain point in time.

This topic is an important area to study in relation to development and climate change. There is increasing recognition that climate change will affect the poorest regions of the earth hardest, and that the most marginalised groups will again be increasingly vulnerable to adverse consequences of climate change (Oxfam International, 2007). Whilst essential to recognise that women are often the most socially and politically marginalised, which results

in women being increasingly vulnerable to climate change (Neumayer and Pluemper, 2007), it is imperative that women are not homogenised or treated as an undifferentiated group. The topic of this dissertation therefore represents an original contribution to the area of research because, as highlighted by Resurreccion (2011) there is increasing pressure on policymakers and researchers to include a gender perspective within environmental policy and development projects (see Skinner, 2011), but a lack of research on *how* women are to be most accurately represented within these campaigns and policies.

This dissertation's structure is as follows; firstly, the theoretical framework of coproduction will be outlined. Secondly, this theory will be applied to the popularisation of the ecofeminist discourse to explain why this specific discourse became widespread. The methods of content and critical discourse analysis (CDA) will be utilised to determine how women are represented within contemporary climate change campaigns, and if these representations mimic ecofeminist discourses. The methods of content analysis and CDA are complimentary to my theoretical framework of coproduction, as both are aligned with post-structuralist schools of thought, seeing language and representations not as a mirror reflection of reality, but as socially constructed and reflecting discourses (Elgert, 2011). Finally, the framework of coproduction will be used to briefly examine potential reasons why ecofeminist discourses persist despite being widely criticised. The concluding comments of the paper will summarise these findings.

Theoretical Framework and Critical Literature Review

Theoretical Framework of Coproduction

The idiom[1] of coproduction will be utilised as a theoretical framework to historicise the discourse of ecofeminism and reveal how its prominence on the development agenda was primarily a result of its strategic use to many actors at one time.

Coproduction considers knowledge not as a reflection of reality, but as embedded within the social and political context in which it is produced (Jasanoff, 2004). Knowledge is created, framed and disseminated through social interactions and then further impacts on social change (Forsyth, 2003). The idiom of coproduction therefore sees the creation of knowledge as dynamically interacting with the social, opposed to a linear process (Jasanoff, 2004). Examining the changing status of the African elephant from endangered to manageable using the coproduction's framework, for example, shows this change had little to do with actual increases in the number of elephants, but instead reflected the emergence of a Pan-African identity that sought to prove its capability of managing projects (Thompson, 2004).

Coproduction has been deployed extensively to question the dominance of scientific expertise within environmental policy, standing in contention with positivist traditions which draw hard lines between the objective/subjective and nature/science (Corburn, 2007). For example, a coproductionist framework questions the construction of nature itself, with Forsyth (2003) identifying the emergence of environmentalism in America in the 1960's as not a reaction to an actual loss of wilderness, but rather a perceived loss of wilderness resulting from increasing industrialisation and modernisation. Furthermore, since coproduced knowledge evolves dynamically with social change, the emergence of environmentalism further impacted scientific processes and the study of nature. It is important to note however, that adopting a coproductionist stance does not entail a rejection of real environmental problems, as some positivists have implied (Sokal and Bricmont, 1998). Rather, it acknowledges that

[1] Co-production is an idiom opposed to a methodology, encouraging critical questions to be asked regarding knowledge opposed to dictating strict guidelines of investigation (Corburn, 2007).

these problems are not divorced from social contexts (Jasanoff, 2004), as although all objects are real, they require social interaction and discourse to give them meaning (Hall, 2003).

Discourse is central in the coproduction framework, constituting the means through which international organisations define and give precedence to certain environmental problems, inevitably involving issues of oversimplification (Jasanoff, 2004). Discourse is a term most readily associated with the work of Foucault (1979), and is defined as a collection of concepts and ideas through which meaning is given to specific phenomena (Hajer, 1995). The study and practice of discourse analysis has been used extensively and fruitfully within environmental studies, emphasising how environmental problems are legitimated through discourse (Feindt and Oels, 2005).

Despite coproduction's predominance in the critique of positivism, coproduction has been utilised successfully within the social sciences in relation to environmental policy processes (Thompson, 2004). Coproduction can be therefore used to historicise the emergence of environmental problems, explaining why some become salient within the development agenda despite opposing evidence (Jasanoff, 2004). Subsequently, the critical literature review will focus specifically on the question of the emergence of ecofeminist discourses and the reasons this discourse regarding women's relationship with the environment became prominent.

Critical Literature Review: The Origins of Ecofeminist Discourse and the Women, Environment and Development Framework

This critical literature review will utilise the theoretical framework of coproduction to examine the social context which saw the rise of the ecofeminist discourse, and how the premise that women are inherently closer to nature became accepted knowledge within development agendas despite extensive critiques, which this paper will also outline.

The term ecofeminism was coined in 1984 (Twine, 2001), but has its roots in the environmental and feminist movements of the 1960's, and was a common discourse in the 1980's and 1990's. The Women, Environment and Development (WED) framework was popularised in the 1980's, and calls attention to the connections between the environment problems and women, and has its roots in the Women in Development (WID) paradigm that was prominent in the 1970's.

Within the literature on gender and environment, the ecofeminist and WED frameworks are often discussed as synecdochic of each other (Sturgeon, 1997). This tendency misrepresents ecofeminism, often making a straw woman of ecofeminism, critiquing more biologically deterministic types, ignoring the extensive variation of positions within the ecofeminist movement (Sturgeon, 1997). Although the ecofeminist framework did become fully integrated into the WED framework in the late 1980's, the two positions have different origins which must be analysed separately to appreciate the social context in which both arose, and became integrated, allowing the knowledge that women are closer to the environment to become widely accepted within development (Braidotti et al., 1994).

It is, however, first necessary to give a more thorough definition of ecofeminism. Utilising Plumwood's (1993) distinction, ecofeminism will be broadly split into categories of cultural and social ecofeminism. Both formations of ecofeminism share three common tenants (Eaton and Lorentzen, 2003). Firstly, epistemological; claiming that woman have superior knowledge of the environment. Secondly, asserting an empirical link between women and the environment, in that they are more likely to be negatively affected by environmental problems. The third point regards the conceptual link between women and the environment, articulated as a 'special' connection, and also emphasises that women are inherently environmentally virtuous.

It is through this third tenant where cultural and social ecofeminism diverge (Twine, 2001). Cultural ecofeminism, expressed in the work of Mies and Shiva (1990), sees women's special relationship with nature as biologically rooted. It is this biological connection that gives women superior knowledge of the environment and ties them to nature, making women increasingly vulnerable to environmental harm (Twine, 2001).

Social ecofeminism, chiefly associated with Carolyn Merchant's (1990) work, strays from biological determinism, instead historicising the relationship between women and the environment (Nhanenge, 2011). Social ecofeminism asserts that the oppression of both women and nature coincides with the advent of Western, patriarchal institutions such as capitalism. This mutual oppression supposedly endows women with superior standpoint knowledge of environmental degradation (Van der Hombergh, 1993). However, unlike cultural ecofeminism, which similarly criticises patriarchal institutions (Shiva, 1988), social ecofeminism recognises the oppression of other social groups, such as the poor and people of colour (Plumwood, 1993). Social ecofeminism therefore recognises that gender may intersect with other social divisions to alter an individual's relationship with nature. In Nepal, for example, water pumps were placed further from lower caste homes than those of upper caste people who held greater sway over decisions made in the community (Regami and Fawcett, 1999). However, despite this recognition, social ecofeminist's maintain that women's social position as caregivers transcends barriers of class, race and other social categories to engender a vested interest in environmental protection (Reed, 2000).

Regarding the criticisms of essentialism so frequently cited in reference to ecofeminism, social ecofeminism does not escape, as it still interprets the harmonious relationship between women and nature as universal (Leach, 2007). Cultural ecofeminism has been subject to more extensive charges of essentialism, with Leach (2007) asserting that painting women as intrinsically linked to nature through their biology homogenises women, ignoring individual motivations that may impact environmental actions. For example, women may only remove dead wood from trees not because it will ensure the survival of the tree, but because dead wood is lighter to carry (Jackson, 1995). This example highlights the danger of assuming women's essentially harmonious relationship with the environment, emphasising that if this relationship is assumed, then alternative motivations may be ignored, leading to an incomplete picture of women's relationship with the environment.

The accusations of essentialism have themselves been subject to criticism, with Sturgeon (1997) arguing that anti-essentialism fails to offer any improvement to theories of gender and the environment, failing to add substance to the debate. The critiques expressed in this paper will therefore not expand further on anti-essentialism arguments, but focus on the adverse consequences for women that emerge from assuming that women are universally closer and more environmentally virtuous. Moore (2008) suggests that in place of accusations of essentialism, there should be a debate regarding *how* and *why* essentialisms are deployed, which this literature review now will aim to achieve through the use of the idiom of coproduction.

Ecofeminism has its roots in both the ecocentric environmental movements and in certain strands of second wave feminism in the 1970's (Jackson, 1995), in which the concept of 'sisterhood' became dominant, with the common oppression of women by patriarchy emphasised (Naghibi, 2007). The 1970's also saw a turn towards spiritualism and the revalorisation of the feminine, with motherhood and a return to Goddess worship being advocated by some writers (Rich, 1976). These trends in Western feminism emphasised not only women's shared oppression, but also women's apparent shared nature, which comprised traits such as women being more peaceful, caring and nurturing than men (Braidotti et al., 1994). The emphasis on sisterhood has been criticised for emphasising commonalities amongst women, but disregarding difference (Naghibi, 2007).

Ecofeminism's origins are still apparent in its most recent formations, with not only women of the global South represented as intrinsically tied to nature through shared oppression or biology, but also women globally (Mellor, 2003). Again, this treats women as homogenous, and fails to differentiate between the different relationships women may have with the environment. For example, Jackson (1995) emphasises that women have been documented degrading the environment, and during times of scarcity, woman are just as likely to fell a tree than to plant one. Furthermore, it also erases differences in the environmental behaviours of women of the North and South, with women in the North consuming more and often engaging in more environmentally destructive behaviours than women in the South (Sturgeon, 2009).

Ecofeminism, however, cannot be purely reduced to its feminist origins, with ecofeminism representing the merging of ideologies from both feminism and ecology (van der Hombergh, 1993). Ecofeminism shares many commonalities with ecocentric environmental movements

that emerged in the 1960's (Jackson, 1993b), specifically Deep Ecology, which emphasises the interconnectedness between humans and nature (Mathews, 1992). The commonalities between ecofeminism and deep ecology are evident in light of this previous statement, with ecofeminism also stressing the natural connections between women and nature, with both social (Merchant, 1990) and cultural (Shiva, 1987) ecofeminism valorising past eras where women and nature were seen as one (van der Hombergh, 1993).

Ecocentrics favour small-scale communities and indigenous life styles using local environmental knowledge (Mathews, 1992). Consequently, deep ecologists homogenise the local, disregarding the potential for conflict in small-scale societies (Jackson, 1993a). These themes of deep ecology are again present in ecofeminist writings, finding resonance in the work of Mies and Shiva (1990) who call for a turn away from Western capitalism and a return to the subsistence principle. Living according to this principle involves a small scale, democratic, non-patriarchal and self-sufficient society (Twine, 2001).

Although these principles appear to be universally appealing, closer inspection reveals that a society governed by the rules of this principle will not be beneficial, and may even be detrimental to the lives of women. Firstly, many societies have become increasingly egalitarian through the process of development (Jewitt, 2002). The industrialisation of some countries has led to large numbers of women gaining employment, often affording them a higher living standard (Acker, 2004), although questions remain whether a greater female workforce culminates in increased rights (Bricknell and Chant, 2010). Ecocentrics and ecofeminists alike retain an idealised view of the days before capitalism and industrialisation, where people lived in harmony with nature (Jackson, 1995). However, there is little evidence to support the idea of a romantic pre-colonial society free from exploitation; rather, evidence suggests pre-colonial societies were based on a stark division of labour, with women wholly responsible for sustenance (Coquery-Vidrovitch, 1997). Scientific advancement and development has often been beneficial for societies, with grain mills and water pumps being especially beneficial for women in reducing work burdens (Jackson, 1995).

These previous paragraphs highlight how ecofeminist roots in Western feminism and ecocentric views of nature. Jackson (1995) argues that these origins result in ecofeminism being removed from the lived realities of women, producing ecofeminist prescriptions which may be detrimental to the position of women within society. The theoretical framework of coproduction allows to critical evaluation the origins of ecofeminism, allowing us to see that

the theory does not offer an accurate depiction of the relationship between women and nature, but rather emerges from a specific social context in which the second wave feminist movements and ecocentrism were prominent, both influencing the emergence of ecofeminism.

The WED approach popularised in the 1980's, emphasised the connections between environmental problems and the role of women in development (Nhanenge, 2011). When evaluating the rise of the WED perspective using the lens of coproduction, it becomes evident that the rise of WED was a product of a specific social context.

Firstly, events in the late 1970's and early 1980's encouraged the view that environmental problems had a global reach, and that environmental problems felt in developing countries could have adverse affects globally. The oil crisis of 1973 and the frequency of droughts and food shortages in the Sahel prompted development agencies to recognise the relevance of environmental problems to development and poverty alleviation (Nhanenge,2011), apparent in the establishment of the UNEP in 1972 (Braidotti et al., 1994). The 1970's and early 1980's also saw increased attention to the potential global impact environmental problems in the South could have globally, as illustrated by publication of works such as 'Limits to Growth' (Meadows and Meadows, 1972). This factor, coupled with increasingly negative images of people in the Global South with too many children degrading the environment, led to women being increasingly the target of population programmes.

Women had become legitimate targets for development programmes in the 1970's with the emergence of the 'Women in Development' approach, which provides the WED framework with its theoretical basis, with both perspectives sharing commonalities (Leach, 2007). The WID approach emerged in the early 1970's with the publication of Boserup's seminal work 'Women's Role in Economic Development' (1970). The WID approach acknowledges women's significant contribution in production, specifically regarding agriculture (Razavi and Miller, 1995). This legacy resulted in women being increasingly targeted in programmes regarding the environment, as the WID paradigm had instigated extensive fieldwork that had revealed women's role in natural resource management and subsistence agriculture. Women were targeted in their roles as providers of sustenance, and the WED framework represented women as resourceful actors with extensive knowledge of environmental systems (Sturgeon, 1997).

This brief history of the rise of WED shows it was an outcome both of the increasing awareness of environmental problems and of the legacy of WID. Following the previously stated definition of coproduction, the WED perspective was not only a product of a certain social context, significantly impacted on how women and the environment were seen, with increasing emphasis within development focussing on women's role as natural resource management (Braidotti et al., 1994).

The next paragraphs aim to show how the ecofeminist discourses were strategically integrated into the WED approach, which reflected the social context at the end of the 1980's, as well as reinforcing the trend in WED that emphasised women's subsistence role (Leach, 2007). This lead to the role of women as environmental managers being naturalised within development policies, showing that the theoretical underpinnings of ecofeminism have practical implications for policy and programme implementation in developing countries.

The Strategic Merging of Ecofeminism into the WED paradigm

Ecofeminism became fully integrated into the WED approach in the late 1980's, with the two perspectives being fully intertwined in the early 1990's. This section of the literature review will argue, using the framework of coproduction, that ecofeminism[2] was adopted by many development actors to conform to new ideals of what 'development' constitutes, which included an emphasis on the inclusion of women, participation and overarching aims of NGO's and civil society groups to forge an alternative to dominant development discourse (Sturgeon, 1997). Furthermore, the rise of ecofeminist discourses within the WED framework impacted on policies and how women were involved in policies relating to the environment, which on the whole only served to entrench the gendered division of labour (Jewitt, 2002).

The late 1980's saw the term 'sustainable development', commonly understood as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the needs of the future (Lele, 1991), come to prominence and was seen as a form of development a variety of actors could be involved in, from states to NGO's to grassroots movements (Sturgeon, 1997). The rise of the term sustainable development represented mounting criticism of the dominant development discourses, specifically ecological modernisation (Braidotti et al., 1994) and at a

[2] The characteristics of ecofeminism which were integrated into wider development agendas are common to both social and cultural ecofeminism, so a distinction will only be made when a specific feature of cultural or social ecofeminism was adopted into the development agenda.

time of increasing criticism of global solutions to environmental problems, with growing calls for the 'local' and grassroots movements to be integrated into solutions to environmental problems (Taylor and Buttel, 1992).

The integration of ecofeminism into the WED perspective is evident throughout the late 1980's, with Shiva speaking at numerous conferences (Sturgeon, 1997), but the pre-eminence of the ecofeminist movement within the WED and development agenda was most evident at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, more commonly known as the Earth Summit in 1992. Sustainable development incorporated not only NGO's, but businesses, UN departments and corporations which all had vastly differing agendas (Lele, 1991). Key to the sustainable development discourse was a shift towards participatory development (Jasanoff and Martello, 2004), evident in the document Agenda 21, which emphasises inclusion of grassroots movements and alternative, indigenous approaches to development (Jasanoff and Martello, 2004). Ecofeminism, emphasising grassroots movements and women's indigenous knowledge, represented a stark departure from top-down and technocratic approaches to development, as demonstrated by Shiva's use of the term mal-development as opposed to development (Shiva, 1988). Ecofeminism therefore represented at this point in time not only a radical departure away from the dominant development discourse but also a perspective which overtly encouraged the inclusion of the local into development (Nhanenge, 2011).

There is evidence to suggest that women do have extensive knowledge of nature because if their subsistence activities, which may be useful in development projects (Sultana, 2010). However, it does not follow that this knowledge is universal, and is not a result of socially embedded conditions that are influenced by social, cultural and historical factors (Jewitt, 2002). For example, James (1996) found that women in South Africa often collected excessive amounts of bark from trees, causing their death and calling into question ecofeminists unwavering faith in women's knowledge and inherent environmental altruism. However, ecofeminists question the roots of Western science and expertise, with Enlightenment thinking often attributed with devaluing the female/nature dichotomy, and privileging the male/science dichotomy (Merchant, 1990; Buckingham-Hatfield, 2000). However, rather than offering an alternative to dualistic Western scientific thinking, ecofeminism merely reverses the dualisms between local/global and male/female, without subjecting their own history, which this essay has shown is rooted in Western thought itself, to any level of scrutiny (Nanda, 1991). This tendency within ecofeminism has been

vehemently criticised by other feminists, who further state that ecofeminism reinforces the female/nature dichotomy that feminists have been trying to eradicate for decades (Nanda, 1991).

Forsyth (2001) states that when the 'local' or grassroots movements are integrated into development, their knowledge is not subjected scrutiny. However, it must be recognised that the local may be integrated strategically into development agendas to support pre-existing discourses opposed to providing alternative discourses (Forsyth, 2003).

Possibly the most famous example of a grassroots movements cited as supporting ecofeminist notions is the Chipko Movement, which is described by Shiva (1988) as a group of women who, understanding the importance of forests because of their subsistence duties, protested against unsustainable logging practices in India. The Chipko movement gained a significant amount of attention in the 1980's and was often cited as an example supporting ecofeminist assertions that women were closer to the environment than men (Jewitt, 2002). However, the interpretation of the Chipko movement by ecofeminists is controversial, with Jewitt (2002) explaining that women only took part sporadically, with men being the main instigators of the protests. The example of Chipko shows that rather than being integrated in a depoliticised way, the local may be incorporated in such a way as to support pre-existing discourses. The Chipko movement can therefore be seen as reflecting wider discourses of ecofeminism, which interpreted the movement as ecofeminist despite contrary evidence (Jewitt, 2002). The proceeding paragraphs will further explain why the ecofeminist discourse was strategic for a number of actors at one time.

Hausler (1997) states that sustainable development's emphasis on the involvement of women and the integration of local knowledge constitutes lip service, where development agencies, corporations and businesses wanting to present themselves as environmentally friendly aligned themselves with grassroots organisations and adopted an alternative development languages without a significant change in behaviour, maintaining the status-quo.

Following Hausler's (1997) arguments, although the rise of ecofeminism within development did promote women working together and collaborating, these alliances signify the formation of a discourse coalition opposed to an advocacy coalition. An advocacy coalition is defined by Sabatier (1983) as a collection of individuals and groups who share a set of beliefs and collaborate in order to bring about change. The benefits are commonly cited as they allow local Southern voices that are often marginalised within development to be heard (Bose,

2005). However, there has been much criticism of the advocacy coalition framework which mainly centres around its ignorance of the influence of politics and discourse, which may influence *what* voices are integrated into the public sphere (Fenger and Klok, 2001).

The discourse coalition framework, developed by Hajer (1995), accounts for the political and social aspects of *why* certain knowledges are integrated into policies opposed to others. Hajer (1995) emphasises that which storylines are integrated into public spheres is largely influenced by political interests. The discourse coalition framework emphasises how larger NGO's may only incorporate issues that will protect them from threats to their legitimacy and to pay lip service to a call to incorporate alternative voices (Florini and Senta,2000). The idiom of coproduction is compatible to the discourse coalition framework because it illustrates how alternative voices may be used strategically to reproduce and support existing structures (for an example of coproduction applied specifically to the inclusion of grassroots movements, please see Forsyth, 2001).

Using this framework, it becomes apparent that ecofeminist discourses were adopted into the agendas of different actors to allow these groups to integrate many concerns of development at the time, such as local knowledge, into their perspective. Hajer (1995) states that groups are not held together through shared interests, but by discourses, in this case ecofeminist discourses, which are simplified in order to appeal to various groups with different interests. Following the coproduction framework, this represents how the social context of the time, namely the emphasis on engaging women, the 'local' and indigenous knowledge into development, meant that ecofeminism was adopted by many groups in order to conform to these new requisites of development. Further, the previous definition of coproduction states that not only does the social context impact on how knowledge is created, but that this knowledge further impacts on social change (Forsyth, 2003). This holds true when examining the history of ecofeminism, which when integrated into the WED framework, heavily influenced policy, the impacts of which will now be briefly discussed.

Leach (2007) has emphasised that the merging of ecofeminist discourse into the WED perspective has meant the reinforcement of the knowledge that women are inherently close to the environment, naturalising women's role within the domestic sphere and in subsistence roles. This tendency is not only a result of ecofeminism, but also a consequence of the roots of WED being situated in the WID framework, which in seeing women's oppression as rooted in their economic exclusion, attempts to improve women's status by integrating them

in the economic sphere (Moser, 1993). However, the WID framework has been criticised for instumentalising women, as the needs of women are often seen as secondary to the benefits their labour creates for development (Razavi and Miller, 1995).

These criticisms can be applied to the WED perspective, in which the needs of the environment and the needs of women are often seen as identical (Jackson, 1993a). This resulted in 'win-win' policies being implemented by the World Bank, with conservation programmes being interpreted as mutually beneficial to women, the environment and poverty reduction (Jackson, 1993a). However, many of these policies resulted women's' work burden's increasing, with no policies addressing the question of land reform and women's rights to land (Jackson, 1993a). Furthermore, these policies additionally assumed the inherent altruism of women, so were often only involved with projects which benefitted the whole community, such as forestry projects, and veered away from projects that could benefit individual women such as the selling of fuel wood for profit (Leach, 1992).

This criticism can be expanded by utilising Molyneux's (1985) distinction between practical and strategic gender needs. Development programmes focussing on practical gender needs address issues relating to women's immediate needs that emerge from their position within society, often targeting women in their roles as carers and providers of subsistence (Regami and Fawcett, 1999). This is often the case with WED projects that are anchored in ecofeminist discourse, for example water projects may mean women have to walk shorter distances to collect water, but do not question the gendered division of labour which dictates that women are often the exclusive collectors of water (Regami and Fawcett, 1999). Conversely, projects which tackle strategic gender needs call in to question the very gendered division of labour which places women as the primary care givers and providers of subsistence within the household, seeing the role of women in subsistence roles as socially constructed rather, like ecofeminism claims, intrinsic and static across time and place (Regami and Fawcett, 1999).

The perspective that has been one of the foremost critics of ecofeminism is the Gender, Environment and Development (GED)[3] perspective, which is the application of the Gender and Development perspective to the environment (Leach, 2007). By the early to mid 1990's, the 'Gender and Development' perspective rose in prominence, and represented an alternative

[3] Although there have been numerous theories proposed as an alternative to ecofeminism, such as feminist environmentalism (Agarwal, 1997), the GED framework was chosen to be discussed as the predominant response to ecofeminism as this is the framework discussed most widely in the literature.

to the widely criticised perspectives that focussed solely on women (Razavi and Miller, 1995). GED perspectives, expressed in the work of theorists such as Leach (1992), interprets gender as a social construction and recognises the intersections between gender and other social categories including race and class in determining social positions and access to natural resources (Visvanathan, 1997). GED perspectives acknowledge the relationship men have with the environment, not divorcing them from nature as some ecofeminists do, (Buckingham-Hatfield, 2000) and acknowledge that men may have knowledge of natural resources, as evidence from South Africa demonstrates, men may partake in activities such as animal rearing which link them to natural resources such as water (Babugura, 2010). Furthermore, a GED perspective acknowledges that gender roles, being socially constructed, vary over location and time, especially in relatively recent times where climate change has made weather more unpredictable and resources scarce in some areas, men may have to migrate to other areas, meaning women often become heads of households, partaking in responsibilities outside their traditional roles (Cleaver, 2000).

The literature review has established, using the framework of coproduction, that ecofeminism emerges from a social context of Western feminism and ecocentrism, and was accepted into development agendas because it was strategic for many groups at one time. Despite ecofeminism and WED being widespread in the early 1990's, by latter half of the decade issues of women and the environment had been sidelined within development, with feminists addressing issues of reproduction, health and sexuality more than environmental issues (Harcourt, 2008). However, with the growing prominence of the environmental justice movements, the issue of gender and the environment is re-emerging within development debates. This dissertation, through the methods of content and CDA, will attempt to discover how women are currently being represented within climate change campaigns.

The Case: Representations of women in climate change campaigns

This paper will utilise the methodological tools of both Content Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in order to investigate the central research question of 'how are women represented in climate change campaigns.' The three texts[4] that will be analysed are 'Sisters on the Planet' (SOTP), an Oxfam campaign; 'Climate Wise Women' (CW^2), a campaign launched by The Earth Institute, and The Women's Environmental Network's (WEN, 2007) 'Climate Change Manifesto'. For an explanation as to why these campaigns were specifically chosen for analysis, and an outline of the drawbacks to the research, please see the Appendix.

Methodology

Content analysis is a research method that allows for the systematic description of manifest content of texts, allowing for large data sets to be analysed reliably (Rose, 2001), although it can miss subtleties in the text (Bauer and Gaskell, 2000). Content analysis can therefore potentially increase the reliability of CDA, often criticised as subjective and unreliable (Antaki, 2008). However, whereas content analysis only describes the manifest content of texts, CDA goes deeper in examining the meaning of texts in relation to wider social contexts and power relations (Krippendorff, 2004). Using both methods therefore achieves "analytical enrichment" (Deacon et al., 2007:140), with results providing both an overview of themes present in the content, and analysing the social meaning of these themes.

Content Analysis

Formulation of the coding framework[5], where content is organised under one framework (Bauer and Gaskell, 2000), drew from the set research question, seeking to identify common

[4] Following Parker (1992), the term 'text' is not used exclusively to mean communication via the written word, but includes any form of communication that humans can impose meaning onto, including images and videos.
[5] Coding framework for each individual text available in request.

tenants of ecofeminism[6] throughout the texts and followed guidelines outlined by Kripenndorff (2004).

The first task of the content analysis was to determine whose voice was present in the campaigns. This was thought to be an appropriate way to test for ecofeminist discourses as ecofeminism, as demonstrated by the literature review, tends to exclusively highlight the voices of women, excluding those of men (Reed, 2000). Women are the focus of all twelve texts, with eight (67%) of the texts focussing on women from the South, three (25%) texts focussing on women from the North, and one text (8%) focussing on women from both the North and South. This indicates a return to ecofeminist representations, as like ecofeminism, only the stories of women are included, men never being the exclusive focus of any of the texts. On the five (42%) occasions that men are referred to, one (20%) was defined as neutral, and was a passing comment, two (40%) were negative, and two (40%) were positive. This illustrates a slight deviation away from ecofeminist representations, as ecofeminism typically portrays men as divorced from nature and a force of environmental destruction (Buckingham-Hatfield, 2000), whereas the campaigns analysed give a more balanced view. However, overall, the texts overwhelmingly focus on women.

All campaigns were coded for instances of gender analysis, defined as representation or discussion of the relations between men or women, or reference to gender equality. Out of all 12 texts analysed, there are only three instances (25%) where gender relations were referred to. This again shows that the campaigns reflect a return to ecofeminism, although the mention of gender relations may signify an increasing recognition of the significance of gender relations, a point that will be expanded upon in the CDA.

One of the common tenants of the ecofeminist position is the emphasis on women as the primary victims of environmental degradation (Arora-Jonsson, 2011). The texts were therefore coded according to which, if any, social group were portrayed as more vulnerable to climate change. This was determined by how many instances a particular social group are represented as being involved in a disaster, or if any group was exclusively referred to as victims of climate change. Out of the ten texts (83%) that reference the adverse consequences of climate change such as increasing food insecurity, drought and rising sea levels, only three

[6] The term ecofeminism will be used almost exclusively from this point, as the literature review established that the WED framework came to reflect exclusively ecofeminist discourse (Sturgeon, 1997).

(30%) represent women as the primary victims of these disasters. The community was cited as most at risk, with six texts (60%) referring to the danger the whole community faced opposed to one social group.

Although this result separates the campaigns from repeating ecofeminist representations, there is debate around the representation of women as victims of environmental degradation within the literature. Whereas Arora-Jonsson (2011) claims the discourse of women as victims permeates ecofeminism, authors such as Mellor (2003) argue that ecofeminism represents a post-victimhood stance; women are victims of environmental degradation but are represented as active agents who mobilise to protect the environment. When taking this reading of ecofeminism, it appears that the campaigns match much more closely to the ecofeminist presentation of women as transitioning from victim to agent.

This is evident in the campaigns, where out of the twelve texts, women are only shown as being passive in one text, with eleven out of twelve texts (92%) analysed showing women as active agents, with all of these active women being portrayed as environmentally virtuous. Out of the eleven texts that represented women as active, seven (64%) had formed community groups in order to adapt to climate change. Of these seven, a significant number of four out of seven (57%) were all female community groups, which are often seen as indicative of ecofeminist inspired programmes (Regami and Fawcett, 1999). To expand on themes of grassroots movements as the solution to environmental problems, the texts were further coded to determine what was suggested to reduce the impacts of climate change. The suggestions were wide ranging from the total of nine out of twelve (75%) texts that specified required action. Two (17%) stated a need for increased human rights, a further two texts (17%) called upon their home states to do more, one text (8%) stressed the whole community coming together to take action against climate change, whilst two texts (17%) stated a need for women specifically coming together. Interestingly, and conforming to features of ecofeminist discourse, no text refers to the answer to mitigating climate change as foreign aid or assistance, with one text (Constance's Story) even discussing past aid in negative terms (Climate Wise Women, 2011). However, although these patterns indicate the repetition of ecofeminist discourses, the emphasis on indigenous knowledge and local practices may merely be part of a larger trend within development towards recognition of the local and the increasing emphasis on participation.

Although the majority of women are active, the breakdown of the more specific activities women engage in leads to a more complicated picture. Although all women who are active engage in activities at a community level, which was defined in the coding framework as heading a community group or leading events which involved other people from the community, only women from the North are represented changing behaviours on a community and individual level, which was defined as changes in personal behaviour such as recycling or altering consumption patterns. This again raises questions regarding how the campaigns, although stressing women's environmental altruism, hides divisions between women, a question which will be looked at in more detail in the CDA.

To establish how the campaigns conceptualise the relationship between women and the environment, texts were coded according to motivation of environmental concern; were individuals engaging in adaptation strategies to protect their children, their community or for other reasons? Out of the twelve texts analysed, a significant eight (67%) explicitly represent women as mothers. Of these eight, seven make explicit reference to their motivations for engaging in actions that protect the environment. From these results it appears that the texts put significant emphasis on the role of women as mothers. However, it should be noted that only one text (Helen's story) makes reference to more biological roots of ecofeminism, indicating that the texts reflect variants of social ecofeminism opposed to cultural ecofeminism.

Overall, the content analysis demonstrates that overall ecofeminist discourses remain prevalent within the climate change campaigns analysed. The method of CDA will now be employed to look closer at these discourses, how they are organised and how they relate to wider social factors.

Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is a messy method, having no predefined or strict guidelines and acting as an umbrella term for many different approaches (Fairclough, 1992). It can be broadly defined as a

"careful, close reading that moves between text and co-text to examine the content, organisation and functions of discourse" (Gill, 2000: 188). The predominant aim of the discourse analyst is therefore to identify how social meaning is reproduced through texts (Gill, 2000). The method of CDA is compatible with the framework of coproduction as both are situated in post-structuralist schools of thought, recognising the discursive content of language (Elgert, 2011) and how meaning is created through discourse (Jasanoff, 2004).

The CDA analysis employed does not replicate a set framework used by other authors as no framework could be found that fit the research question, and following Tonkiss (1998), a CDA should fit the texts analysed opposed to following a textbook formula. Therefore, the CDA will follow Parkers (1992) guidelines on how to recognise discourse, and more specifically follow instructions set out by Tonkiss (1998). Lastly, it will be briefly explored through secondary literature why ecofeminist themes are re-emerging, and what social structures these discourses may reproduce.

Tonkiss (1998) states that when analysing discourse, it is important to recognise the key themes that dominant and key characteristics that are emphasised at the expense of invisibilising others. As the content analysis demonstrated, all the women featured in the texts are represented as being environmentally virtuous. Further, a key theme that emerged within the texts was that women's motivation for environmental action emerged from their role as a mother. This is demonstrated through the words of Helen, who states that climate change is about *"the future of children and women essentially know that because we are the life-givers"* (Oxfam, 2012). Although this quote represents women, reminiscent of cultural ecofeminism, as having an understanding of nature through the biological act of giving birth, the majority of texts emphasise women's caring roles not just with children, but also as the leaders of the community.

This is most evident in the Muriel's video which is featured in the SOTP campaign (Oxfam, 2012), which states that women, *"as supporters of their families ... are the anchor of the territory. Break this stability and all we'll have left are shattered societies."* This quote illustrates that although women are represented in the texts as being active community leaders, their role within the home and as mothers is still valorised. Furthermore, this quote raises questions regarding the roles women are expected to fulfil within society. The quote implies that women not only *are* the supporters of families, but that they *should* be supporters

of families, as the quote implies that society would be destabilised without women within the home.

Although women are portrayed as community leaders, the motivation of women partaking in these activities is attributed motherhood, with Ulamila, (Climate Wise Women, 2011), citing her motivation for action as "*my children and my children's children.*" So, although we see women stepping out of their traditional roles within the home, ecofeminist discourses are upheld as women are represented as having a more extensive knowledge and understanding of environmental problems *because* they are mothers. These criticisms are not intended to devalue the role of mothers within society, as especially in developing countries, this may be one of the few roles in which women feel that they are not challenged or questioned (Safa, 1990). However, it does not follow from the significance of the role of mother that all women and mothers are environmentally virtuous. For example, Reed (2000) found that mothering behaviours in Vancouver Island led to environmentally harmful behaviours, with mothers wishing to maintain traditional logging practices and the traditions of the logging community.

Braidotti et al (1994) state that although development programmes rooted in a ecofeminist perspective encourage women to be actors and manage natural resources, this does not constitute empowerment because women are still assumed to be inherently virtuous, so activities outside the home still exists within predefined limits of femininity. These projects serve to instrumentalise women's behaviour and further entrench gendered divisions of labour (Braidotti et al., 1994). Following Parkers (1992) statement that discourses within society relate to and mutually reinforce one another, the tendencies of the campaigns to present women in exclusively positive and virtuous terms can be interpreted as supported by wider discourses of female altruism (Brickell and Chant, 2010), which often leads to the instrumentalisation of women's labour.

Brickell and Chant (2010) state that women's labour and role within the home is often exploited by development projects that assume female altruism, with projects rarely questioning the gendered division of labour, and failing to recognise that women may have to act in self-sacrificing ways because of the failures of others. Therefore, evidence suggesting that women's behaviours are more environmentally friendly than that of men, for example citing their use of public transport and smaller carbon footprint (European Institute for Gender Equality, 2012), should not be presumed, rather we should question *why* women engage in these behaviours and how these behaviours are socially constructed (Arora-

Jonsson, 2012). For example, women in the North may be more likely to use public transport or travel by bicycle not because they are inherently environmentally conscious, but because they cannot afford a car (Arora-Jonsson, 2011)

The assumption of women's altruism is apparent in the WEN (2007) text, where it is stated that there needs to be a greater representation of women within governments in order to "*address climate change issues from a woman's perspective"* (2007:4). This again assumes not only that women are inherently altruistic, but that there is an inherently 'female' perspective on climate change, ignoring, as the ecofeminist position also does, that women, depending on their social location, may have different experiences of climate change. This quote also supports the claim that Bradotti et al. (1994) make regarding the instrumentalisation of women's labour, with women's representation in government bodies seen as a means to achieve a certain perspective rather than an end in itself. These selected extracts from the texts illustrate not only how women are presented as being exclusively environmentally virtuous and altruistic, but in failing to question the gendered division of labour, reinforce and naturalise women's domestic roles.

Parker (1992) emphasises that when analysing discourses, attention should not exclusively be paid to the objects of the discourse, in this case the representation of women in the texts, but also to the subjects of discourse, meaning the individuals who interact with texts. This is especially relevant as this paper analyses campaigns, which specifically aim to draw subjects in as consumers and citizens (Manzo, 2009). To analyse discourses in this way, we must ask what role subjects are required to adopt when interacting with the text (Parker,1992).

It is in this respect that the texts analysed diverge from previously stated criticisms of often aimed at campaigns featuring individuals from the third world, which are often accused of being negative and disempowering (Lidchi, 1999). Rather than being represented as objects of pity, women featured in the texts are all self-determining. Far from being paternalistic, the campaigns draw subjects in as equals, and subjects are encouraged to come together as one to protect the planet, as evident in Muriel's story, in which she implores viewers to "n*ot just stand by and do nothing*" (Oxfam, 2012).

It is not unreasonable to infer from the texts that the campaigns are targeted at women, with women exclusively featured and often appealed to in the fight against climate change. This is evident in Helen's video, featured in the SOTP campaign (Oxfam,2012), in which she states that her biggest wish for the future is that *"women will stand together and we will say no."*

This sentiment is reminiscent of ecofeminist discourses, which see all women, despite their differing social locations, as inherently closer to nature (Mellor, 2003). Again, this recruitment of female subjects into climate action campaigns can be seen as not only repeating ecofeminist discourses, but also as further entrenching the gender stereotypes found the discourses, as engaging only female subjects in the campaigns assumes again that women are inherently more virtuous than men towards the environment (Arora-Jonsson, 2011), again failing to question *why* women are often primarily responsible for activities within the household and domestic spheres.

The way subjects are brought in as equals is reminiscent of the ecofeminist movement in the early 1990's, where women from the North and South congregated at various conferences, most notably at Planeta Femea, a conference ran parallel to the Earth Summit (Braidotti et al., 1994). Sturgeon (1997) emphasises that instances such as these employ strategic universalisms, stressing women's similarities above their differences, which Sturgeon (1997) argues is justified in order to garner attention for issues related to both women and the environment. The campaigns analysed also employ strategic essentialisms, emphasising women's similarities, as is evident through the persistent and sustained use across the texts of phrases which speak of women as an undifferentiated group. This is particularly evident in the WEN text, where "*what women want...In our homes...For us and our children"* (WEN, 2007:4-6) is described as if all women have identical needs and wants, and also excludes the views of women, for example described by Reed (2000), that may not demonstrate a particular desire to care for the environment.

Furthermore, the strategic universalisms employed in the texts and throughout the history of ecofeminism (Sturgeon, 1997) have been criticised for disregarding the differences between women (Braidotti et al., 1994). For example, at the Planeta Femea conference, some black feminist groups expressed concerns that issues of race were overlooked due to the emphasis commonalities between women (Braidotti et al., 1994). These criticisms could be applied to the texts analysed and their disregard for differences between women in order to emphasise commonalities. However, a close reading of the text demonstrates that there are differences between the women featured, which are revealed when comparing different behaviours engaged in by women from the North and South.

The content analysis revealed that women from the South who were engaging in activities to tackle climate change were involved in community based activities exclusively, for example

being a leader of a woman's group. However, women from the North were engaged in community based behaviours as well as changing their behaviour on an individual level, as the WEN (2007) text demonstrates, encouraging "*clear labelling so consumers know the food miles and carbon footprint of the goods they buy*" (WEN, 2007:5). Sturgeon (2009) states that this division between women in the North and South is frequently drawn upon, with women in the North being targeted as consumers, and women in the South being integrated as producers. This example highlights the hidden divisions between women globally that are evaded in the campaigns. However, these issues need to be addressed, as Arora-Jonsson (2011) states that ecofeminism discourses, by treating women as a homogenous group, paradoxically reinforces divisions between the North and South. This is evident again in the WEN document, which recommends for developing countries *"avoidance of exporting Western values and consumerism"* (WEN, 2007:7). This demonstrates that although women throughout the text are represented as homogenous and equally virtuous, the text simultaneously legitimises consumerism as a green option for women in the North, but dismisses it as a viable response to climate change for women in the South, again reinforcing and highlighting divisions between women globally.

Tonkiss (1998) and Parker (1992) both highlight the importance of recognising inconsistencies or contradictions within texts. One of the potential disruptions of the ecofeminist discourse within the texts is references to gender relations, which the ecofeminist discourse often omits. This perhaps indicates a transition from the ecofeminist discourses to a GAD perspective, which as the literature review demonstrate is often cited as being a superior framework through which to improve the status of women.

However, as the GAD framework has become thoroughly integrated into development agendas since the mid-1990's (Reeves and Baden,2000), it has been subject to increasing critique regarding how its transformative aspects have been dulled (Cornwall et al., 2008). Many critiques highlight how gender is often utilised within development as a descriptive opposed to an analytical term (Cornwall, 2007) with the phrase gender frequently used synonymously with 'women' (MacGregor, 2010). The SOTP (Oxfam, 2012) text featured the story of Sahena addresses gender relations, with Sahena stating, *"My husband and brother tried to stop me. Even some women caused me problems,*" calling attention not only to relations between men and women but also adverse relations between women, frequently invisibilised within development programmes (Cornwall et al., 2008).

However, on closer reading it becomes evident that the majority of texts only confront issues of gender on a superficial level. For example, the CW^2 (2011) website declares climate change as a gender equality issue, but fails to include the voices of men in the texts, or discuss gender relations in the stories featured. The exclusion of men may cause negative consequences for the success of development programmes when translated into policies, as Cornwall and White (2000) state that men are always involved in and influence the lives of women. For example, the establishment of women's-only community groups may anger men in the community, which may result in men not supporting the project, potentially limiting its effectiveness (Cornwall and White, 2000).

The WEN text (2007) does mention gender equality, stating that women in the developing world suffer disproportionately from climate related disasters because of their inferior social standing in relation to men (supported by Neumayer and Plumper, 2007). However, these instances are the full extent to which gender relations are discussed, meaning that again women's position as "change agents" (WEN, 2007:2) within the home is never questioned and the gendered division of labour is once again reinforced. When the term gender is examined more closely in the WEN document, there is limited discussion of actual relations between men and women, with most texts only drawing comparisons between men and women, such as the proclamation that women are "more concerned about environmental issues than men" (WEN, 2007:2). Throughout the WEN text, women are targeted predominately as consumers within domestic roles, with the document encouraging increased purchasing of green products such as disposable nappies and "car-free school runs for women and children" (2007:2). However, the questions of *why* women are predominant in roles associated with the care of children and domestic responsibilities are again never confronted, and women's role in the household is naturalised.

This evidence therefore shows that despite the presence of terms such as gender, ecofeminist discourses still remain within climate change campaigns, although these results remain preliminary due to the small sample size, and more research is encouraged. Despite the extensive critiques of ecofeminism that have been put forward in this paper, it is not the intention to discourage the representation of women within climate change campaigns and policies, as many authors have encouraged the renewed emphasis on the issue of gender and the environment (Macgregor, 2010), which is especially difficult within the field of climate change research that is overtly technocratic (O'Neill, 2010). However, caution should be

exercised in campaigners haste to put gender issues onto the climate change agenda, as this paper has emphasised the potentially negative effects of adopting an ecofeminist position.

Whilst the primary aim of this paper to establish *how* women are represented in climate change campaigns, the use of secondary literature provides insight into *why* the discourses of ecofeminism are still prevalent despite extensive critique of the position. However, the comments put forward are only preliminary, as the literature on the subject remains relatively scarce.

When attempting to explain the inclusion, or analytical absence, or gender analyses in development, the concept of coproduction can again be useful. Since coproduction stresses how the creation of knowledge reflects social context, it should follow that the prominence of the GAD framework results in a change in how the relationship between gender and the environment is conceptualised, and we would witness a departure from ecofeminist discourses that dominate the 1980's and early 1990's. However, this paper and others (Resurreccion, 2011) have highlighted the prevalence of the WED framework.

As stated previously, the GAD framework has become institutionalised within development, although within development policies and programmes, the distinction between GAD programmes and those rooted in the WID perspective are often impossible to distinguish (Visvanathan, 1997). The integration of feminist perspectives and frameworks such as GAD often result in the production of development myths, which whilst not necessarily being false, represent over-simplified and sloganised versions of the truth (Cornwall et al., 2008). Ecofeminism is described by Leach (2007) as a development myth, giving, as this paper has demonstrated, only a partial and simplified explanation of the relationship between gender and the environment. As previously stated, the GAD framework is inherently complex and challenging, and is not easily sloganised (Cornwall et al., 2008). Conversely, images of women carrying loads of wood on their heads and being the primary providers of sustenance are common and easily recognisable to the public (Leach, 2007). Therefore, it may be reasonable to assume that representations of women reflect ecofeminist discourses because they are most recognisable to the public. This claim is supported by Thompson (2004) who states that once a discourse, in this case ecofeminism, has been coproduced it becomes extremely resilient and can re-emerge at later stages. Furthermore, Jasanoff (2004) argues that familiar representations are often repeated and simplified identities re-emerge in times of uncertainty, and function to restore order. The re-emergence of the ecofeminist discourses,

from this evidence, therefore can be interpreted as a response to uncertainty surrounding climate change and the appropriate way in which to respond to it (O'Neill et al., 2010).

The concept of coproduction therefore allows us to look critically at terms such as 'gender' and 'local', and recognise the social context from which they emerge. Therefore, although this paper has not advocated a specific perspective that fully appreciates the complex relationship between gender and the environment (see Leach, 2007 for an overview of different positions), it has demonstrated how the idiom of coproduction can aid us in fully evaluating the claims of knowledge that emerge within development.

Conclusion

This dissertation demonstrated in the literature review that ecofeminism was coproduced with Western feminism and environmentalism, and was integrated into development agendas so

readily because it was strategic for many actors who wished to adopt the language of sustainable development in the late 1980's and early 1990's. The literature review also highlighted the many criticisms directed towards ecofeminism, highlighting its failure in providing nuanced and accurate accounts of the relationship between gender and the environment. In order to establish whether ecofeminist discourses were still prevalent in development agendas, three climate change campaigns were analysed using content and CDA. The content analysis revealed that ecofeminist discourses were still present in the campaigns. The CDA expanded on these claims, and although a CDA can never achieve ultimate claims to truth, only persuasion (Parker, 1992), the CDA attempted to show how ecofeminist discourses, by homogenising women, entrenches the division of labour and naturalises women's domestic roles.

Although it is beyond the scope of this essay to provide an alternative explanation for the relationship between gender and the environment, the theory of coproduction was put forward as a concept which allows for the questioning of knowledge claims, such as the ecofeminist notion that women are inherently close to the environment, are a product of a specific social context, and may not be an reflection of the truth. This paper, since few texts were analysed, acts as a starting point for further research into how women are increasingly represented in climate change campaigns and policies, as although there is haste to achieve the recognition of climate change as a gender issue, there must be caution to ensure that ecofeminist discourses are not repeated.

Bibliography

Acker, J. (2004) 'Gender, Capitalism and Globalisation,' *Critical Sociology,* 30(1), pp. 17-41

Agarwal, B (1997) 'Environmental Action, Gender Equity and Women's Participation', *Development and Change*, 28, (1): 1-44

Antaki, C. (2008) 'Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis' in Alasuutari, P., Bickman, L and Brannen, J. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods,* SAGE Publications: London. pp: 431-447

Arora-Jonsson, S. (2011) 'Virtue and Vulnerability: Discourses on women, gender and climate change' *Global Environmental Change* Vol. 21: 744-751

Babugura, A. (2010) *Gender and Climate Change: South Africa Case Study*, Cape Town: Heinrich Böll Stiftung Southern Africa.

Bauer, M and Gaskell, G. (2000) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound* London: SAGE

Bose, P.S (2005) 'Advocacy Coalitions' in Forsyth, T. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of International Development* London:Routledge pp. 5-6

Boserup, E. (1970) *Women's Role in Economic Development*, New York: St. Martin's Press

Braidotti, R., Charkiewicz, E., Hausler, S. and Wieringa, S. (1994) *Women, the Environment and Sustainable Development,* London: Zed Books

Brickell, K and Chant, S. (2010) '"The Unbearable Heaviness of Being": reflections on female altruism in Cambodia, Philippines, The Gambia and Costa Rica' *Progress in Development Studies* Vol. 10 (2): 145-159

Buckingham-Hatfield, S. (2000) *Gender and Environment*, New York: Routledge

Cleaver, F. (2000) 'Community Natural Resource Management: Negotiation, Lifecources and Social Inclusion' *IDS Bulletin* Vol. 30 (2): 60-68

Climate Wise Women (2011) http://climatewisewomen.org/. (Accessed May 21st 2012)

Coquery-Vidrovitch, C. (1997) *African Women: A Modern History.* Boulder, CO : Westview Press

Corburn, J. (2007) 'Community Knowledge in Environmental Health Science: Co-producing Policy Expertise' *Environmental Science and Policy,* Vol. 10: 150-161

Cornwall, A. (2007) 'Revisiting the "Gender Agenda"' *IDS Bulletin* Vol. 38 (2):69-78

Cornwall, J., Harrison, E and Whitehead, A. (2008) *Gender Myths and Feminist Fables: The Struggle for interpretive Power in Gender and Development.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Cornwall, A and White, S. (2000) 'Men, Masculinities and Development: Politics, Policies and Practice' *IDS Bulletin* Vol. 31 (2): 1-7

Deacon, D., Pickering, M., Golding, P and Murdock, G. (2007) *Researching Communications: A Practical Guide to Methods in Media and Cultural Analysis* London: Oxford University Press

Eaton, H and Lorentzen, L.A. (2003) *Ecofeminism and Globalisation: Exploring Culture, Context and Religion* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Elgert, L. (2011) *The Politics of Evidence: Towards critical deliberative governance in sustainable development,* Ph.D thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

European Institute for Gender Equality (2012) *Review of the Implementation in the EU of area K of the Beijing Platform for Action: Women and the Environment Gender Equality and Climate Change,* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Feindt, P and Oels, A. (2005) 'Does Discourse Matter? Discourse Analysis in Environmental Policy Making' *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* Vol. 7 (3): 161-173

Fenger, M and Klok, P. (2001) 'Interdependency, beliefs and coalition behaviour: A contribution to the advocacy coalition framework' *Policy Sciences* Vol. 34 (2): 157-170

Florini, A. and Senta, N. (2000) *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society* Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange

Forsyth, T. (2001) 'Environmental social movements in Thailand: How Important is class?' *Asian Journal of Social Science,* Vol. 29 (1): 35-51

Forsyth, T. (2003) *Critical Political Ecology: The Politics of Environmental Science* New York: Routledge

Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish,* New York: Vintage Books

Gill, R. (2000) 'Discourse Analysis' in Bauer, M and Gaskell, G. (eds.) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound* London: SAGE, pp:172-190

Hall, S. (2003) *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices.* London: SAGE

Hajer, M.A. (1995)*The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process,* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Harcourt, W. (2008) 'Editorial: Whatever Happened to Women, Environment and Development?' *Development* Vol. 51 (2): 173-175

Hausler, S (1997) 'Women and the Politics of Sustainable Development' in Harcourt, W (ed.) *Feminist Perspectives on Sustainable Development,* London: Zed Books

Jackson, C. (1993a) 'Doing what comes Naturally? Women and Environment in Development', *World Development* Vol. 12 (12): 1947-1963

Jackson, C. (1993b) 'Women/nature or gender/history? A critique of ecofeminist 'development'' *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 20 (3): 389-418

Jackson, C (1995) 'Radical Environmental Myths: A Gender Perspective' *New Left Review* Vol. 210: 124-140

James, B (1996) 'Is Ecofeminism Relevant' in *Agenda* Vol.29:8-21

Jasanoff, S. (2004) *States of Knowledge: The co-production of science and social order.* New York: Routledge

Jasanoff, S and Martello, M.L. (2004) *Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Pres

Jewitt, S. (2002) *Environment, Knowledge and Gender: Local Development in India's Jharkhand.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company

Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology,* London: SAGE

Leach, M (1992): Gender and the environment: Traps and opportunities, *Development in Practice,* Vol. 2 (1):12-22

Leach, M. (2007.) Earth Mother Myths and other Ecofeminist Fable: How a Strategic Notion Rose and Fell, in *Development and Change*, 38(1): 67-85.

Lele, S.M. (1991) 'Sustainable Development: A Critical Review' *World Development,* Vol. 19 (6):607-621

Lidchi, H. (1999) 'Finding the Right Image: British Development NGO's and the Regulation of Imagery' in Skelton, T and Allen, T (eds.) *Culture and Global Change,* London: Routledge, pp:87-102

MacGregor, S. (2010) "Gender and climate change: from impacts to discourses." *Journal of*

the Indian Ocean Region, 6(2): 223–238

Manzo, K. (2009) 'Imaging Vulnerability: The Iconography of Climate Change' in *Area* 10: 1475-4762

Mathews, F. (1992) "Relating to Nature," in Harding, R (ed.) *Ecopolitics* V *Proceedings,* Centre for Liberal and General Studies, University of New South Wales, Kensington, New South Wales,
Australia, pp: 489-96.

Meadows, D.H and Meadows, D.L (1972) *The Limits of Growth,* New York: New American Library

Mellor, M. (2003) 'Gender and the Environment' in Eaton, H and Lorentzen, L.A. (eds.) *Ecofeminism and Globalisation: Exploring Culture, Context and Religion* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc. pp: 11-23

Merchant, C (1990) '*Ecofeminism and Feminist Theory*' in Diamond, I and Orenstein, G (eds.) *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* pp. 100-107 San Francisco : Sierra Club Books

Mies, M and Shiva, V. (1990) *Ecofeminism* Halifax, N.S : Fernwood

Mohai, P., D. Pellow, and J. T. Roberts. (2009) "Environmental Justice." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* Vol. 34(1):405-30.

Molyneux, M. (1985) 'Mobilization without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State and Revolution in Nicaragua' *Feminist Studies* 11: 227-54

Moore, N. (2008) The Rise and Rise of Ecofeminism as a Development Fable: A Response to Melissa Leach's 'Earth Mothers and Other Ecofeminist Fables: How a Strategic Notion Rose and Fell' *Development and Change* 39(3): 461–475.

Moser, C. (1993) *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training,*

London: Routledge

Naghibi, N. (2007) *Rethinking Global Sisterhood: Western Feminism and Iran.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Nanda, M. (1991) 'Is Modern Science a Western Patriarchal Myth? A Critique of the Populist Orthodoxy' *South Asia Bulletin* Vol. XI: pp. 36-61

Nhanenge, J. (2011) *Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the Concerns of Women, Poor People, and Nature into Development.*

Neumayer, E and Plümper, T (2007) 'The gendered nature of natural disasters: the impact of catastrophic events on the gender gap in life expectancy, 1981–2002' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 97 (3). pp. 551-566.

O'Neill, S.J., Hulme, M., Turnpenny, J and Screen, J.A. (2010) 'Disciplines, Geography, and Gender in the Framing of Climate Change' *American Meteorological Society* 91 (8) pp. 997–1002

Oxfam International [Kate Raworth] (2007) Adapting to Climate Change: What's Needed in Poor Countries and Who Should Pay? Oxfam Briefing Paper 104. Pp. 1-47

Oxfam International (2012) *Sisters on the Planet: Women Fighting Against Climate Change,* http://www.oxfam.org/en/campaigns/climatechange/sisters-planet. (Accessed 12th June 2012)

Parker, P. (1992) *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology,* New York: Routledge

Plumwood, V (1993) *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* London; New York : Routledge

Razavi, S and Miller, C. (1995) *From WID to GAD: Conceptual Shifts in the Women and Development Discourse.* Occasional Paper No. 1. Geneva: UNRISD.

Reed, M (2000) 'Taking Stands: A feminist perspective on 'other' women's activism in forestry communities of northern Vancouver Island' *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geo*graphy, Vol. (7) 4: 363-387

Reeves, H. and S. Baden (2000) *Gender and development: concepts and definitions,* Bridge Report No. 55, Brighton: Institute for Development Studies.

Regami, S.C. and Fawcett, B. (1999) 'Integrating Gender Needs into Drinking-Water Projects in Nepal.' *Gender and Development*, Vol. 7(3): 62-72

Resurreccion, B. (2011) *The Gender and Climate Debate: More of the Same or New Pathways of Thinking and Doing?* Asia Security Initiative Policy Series No. 10, Singapore: RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

Rich, A.C. (1976) *Of Woman Born, Motherhood as Experience and Institution,* New York: W.W. Norton

Rose, G. (2001) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to The Interpretation of Visual Materials,* London: SAGE

Sabatier, P.A. (1993). 'Policy change over a decade or more,' in P.A. Sabatier and H.C. Jenkins-Smith, (eds.), *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach.* Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 13-19

Safa, H.I. (1990) 'Women's Social Movements in Latin America' *Gender and Society*, Vol. 4 (3): 354-369

Shiva, V. (1988) *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development.* New York: Zed Books

Skinner, E (2011) *Gender and Climate Change: An Overview Report.* BRIDGE Cutting Edge Report. Sussex: University of Sussex

Sokal, A. and Bricmont, J. (1998) *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science,* New York: Picador

Sturgeon, N. (1997) *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, feminist Theory and Political Action.* New York: Routledge

Sturgeon, N. (2009) *Environmentalism in Popular Culture: Gender, Race, Sexuality and the Politics of Nature,* Tucson: University of Arizona Press

Sultana, F. (2010) 'Living in Hazardous Waterscapes: Gendered vulnerabilities and experiences of floods and disasters' *Environmental Hazards* 9: 43-53

Taylor, P.J. and Buttel, F.H. (1992) 'How do we Know we have Global Environmental Problems? Science and Globalisation of Environmental Discourse' *Geoforum* 23 (3): 405-416

Thompson, C. (2004) 'Co-producing CITES and the African Elephant' in Jasanoff, S. (ed.) *States of Knowledge: The co-production of science and social order.* New York: Routledge, pp: 67-87

Tonkiss, F.(1998) 'Analysing Discourse' in Seale, C (ed.) *Researching Society and Culture.* London: SAGE,pp: 245-261

Twine, R. (2001). 'Ecofeminism in Process' *Ecofeminism e-journal.* Retrieved on June 18th, 2012, from http://www.monocien.org/wordpress/wpcontent/uploads/2011/01/ecofem2001.pdf/

Van der Hombergh, H. (1993) *Gender, Environment and Development: a Guide to the Literature,* Utrecht: International Books for the Institute of Development Research

Visvanathan, N. (2011) *The Women, Gender and Development Reader.* London; New York: Zed Books

Women's Environmental Network and the National Federation of Women's Institutes, (2007), *Women's Manifesto on Climate Change.* Online at: http://www.wen.org.uk/general_pages/ reports/manifesto.pdf

Appendix

SOTP is a campaign launched by Oxfam International in 2008 to illustrate the impact of climate change on women's individual lives. The campaign consists of six videos, each documenting the story of one woman's experience of climate change. The second campaign to be analysed is 'Climate Wise Women' (henceforth CW^2), a project of the Earth Island Institute, a non-profit organisation that promotes and supports environmental grassroots organisations (Climate Wise Women, 2011). The campaign on the CW^2 website (2011), similarly to the SOTP campaign, features the individual stories of women from around the world and their experiences of, and reactions to, climate change. The final text is the Women's Environmental Networks (henceforth WEN) Women's Manifesto on Climate Change (2007). Although the latter is a public document available through WEN's website opposed to an actual campaign, this document was chosen as it offers a comprehensive overview to the work and motivations of the WEN group, which was thought to allow a more representative and fruitful analysis of discourses. Furthermore, many of the campaigns launched by the WEN are predominately comprised of materials offering advice on behavioural change and green consumer choices, whereas the manifesto serves as a backdrop to these campaigns, stating explicitly the reasons *why* climate change and gender are related.

Campaigns were chosen according to the subject of analysis as they have an important role to play in the creation and dissemination of knowledge (Manzo, 2009). Policy documents were not chosen to be the subject of analysis as research pertaining to this area has already been explored (Arora-Jonsson, 2011). It should also be noted that the campaigns analysed should not be considered as having no influence on the policymaking process. For example, representatives of CW^2 are often present at UN conferences and were present at the Rio +20 Summit, a key forum for environmental policymaking (Climate Wise Women, 2011). Further, as has been lamented by many authors (Skinner, 2011; Arora-Jonsson,2011), the differentiated impact climate change has on women, is often a mere add on to much environmental and climate change policy. It was therefore decided in the stages of preliminary research to focus analysis on texts which deal directly with the question of gender and climate change. Although this limited the number of texts analysed, it allowed for increased focus on the set question and a greater depth of analysis at the CDA stage.

Finally, there is much literature pertaining to the issue of gender within formal climate change adaptation and mitigation methods such as the flexible mechanisms implemented in the Kyoto Agreement (see Skinner, 2001), whereas there has been less literature on the

impact campaigns can have on knowledge creation and the reinforcement of specific discourses. This represents a significant gap in the literature, as campaigns often escape critique and are portrayed in exclusively positive lights (Forsyth, 2003). However, campaigns must be critiqued and their representations held up to analysis as they too may repeat wider discourses and stereotypical representations.

There are numerous drawbacks to the methodology in this dissertation. Firstly, only a small amount of texts were analysed, with the final number of texts amounting to twelve. This is because the different 'stories' of women featured in the CW^2 and SOTP campaigns were analysed separately, as they represented women in vastly different ways . Although this is a relatively small number, Tonkiss (1998) emphasises that it is not the number of texts analysed that is important, but that the texts analysed offer enriching answers to the set research question. This is possible with these texts as none of them have been previously subject to a content analysis or CDA. The SOTP campaign was subject to a semiotic analysis, but this was concerned with the representation of danger rather than how the relationship between gender and the environment was presented (Manzo, 2009).

The sampling technique utilised in this paper was relevance sampling, where texts are chosen if it is thought they will contribute to the answering of the set research question (Krippendorff, 2004). As many authors have noted (see Skinner, 2011 for an example), gender in relation to climate change remains an issue still at the periphery, so only a small number of campaigns could be found that would provide answers to the set research question.

It should be noted at this point that all three campaigns are concerned with women and climate change. This differs slightly from some ecofeminists, the concern of whom lay primarily in environmental problems such as forestry (Jewitt,2002). For example, Shiva's (1988) primary focus was the green revolution in India. However, this inconsistency was not seen to have a detrimental effect on the analysis as the main subject of interest pertains to the conceptualisation of the relationship between women and the environment, rather than any particular resource or disaster. The term climate change, as utilised in all three texts, is an umbrella term opposed to a precisely defined concept, and therefore many environmental problems are described in the three texts, ranging from disasters such as floods, food insecurity, forestry and carbon footprints, and therefore overlaps with some of the concerns of earlier ecofeminists.

Finally, interviews were not conducted as this paper acts as an exploratory study into how women are represented in climate change, and only addresses questions of why women are represented in this way very briefly using secondary literature. However, interviews of individuals involved in the campaigns would be an interesting avenue for further research.