WID, WAD, GAD: Trends in Research and Practice

EVA M. RATHGEBER

During the past two decades, the term "women in development" has become common currency both inside and outside academic settings. But while "women in development," or "WID," is understood to mean the integration of women into global processes of economic, political, and social growth and change, there often is confusion about the meanings of two more recent acronyms, "WAD" (women and development) and "GAD" (gender and development). This paper will begin with an examination of meanings and assumptions embedded in "WID," "WAD," and "GAD" and then will look at the extent to which differing views of the relationship between gender and development have influenced research, policymaking, and international agency thinking since the mid-1960s. It is suggested that each term has been associated with a varying set of underlying assumptions and has led to the formulation of different strategies for the participation of women in development processes.

It should be noted at the outset that the intent of this essay is neither to provide a comprehensive overview of the literature within the three different perspectives, nor even to critique at length particular classics within these perspectives. Instead, the objective is to show the linkages between theory and practice and to illustrate the different types of development projects that may be associated with these theoretical perspectives. Too frequently development practitioners lose sight of the theory underlying their work. This essay attempts to illustrate the extent to which all development projects are situated within specific theoretical and political frameworks and to examine in a critical manner the implications of such linkages.

The paper begins with an examination of the origins of WID, WAD, and GAD. A section considering the translation of each of these theories

---

Coordinator, Gender and Development, International Development Research Center (IDRC), Ottawa, Canada. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of IDRC. This paper originally was presented at the meetings of the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women held in Quebec City, November 1988. The author is indebted to Patricia Stamp of York University and Jeanne Kirk Laux of the University of Ottawa for comments on earlier versions of the paper.

THE JOURNAL OF DEVELOPING AREAS

WID, WAD, GAD: Trends in Research and Practice

Author(s): Eva M. Rathgeber

Source: *The Journal of Developing Areas*, Jul., 1990, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Jul., 1990), pp. 489-502

Published by: College of Business, Tennessee State University

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4191904

The Journal of Developing Areas 24 (July 1990) 489–502

WID, WAD, GAD: Trends in Research and Practice

EVA M. RATHGEBER

During the past two decades, the term "women in development" has become common currency both inside and outside academic settings. But while "women in development," or "WID," is understood to mean the integration of women into global processes of economic, political, and social growth and change, there often is confusion about the meanings of two more recent acronyms, "WAD" (women and development) and "GAD" (gender and development). This paper will begin with an examination of meanings and assumptions embedded in "WID," "WAD," and "GAD" and then will look at the extent to which differing views of the relationship between gender and development have influenced research, policymaking, and international agency thinking since the mid-1960s. It is suggested that each term has been associated with a varying set of underlying assumptions and has led to the formulation of different strategies for the participation of women in development processes.

It should be noted at the outset that the intent of this essay is neither to provide a comprehensive overview of the literature within the three different perspectives, nor even to critique at length particular classics within these perspectives. Instead, the objective is to show the linkages between theory and practice and to illustrate the different types of development projects that may be associated with these theoretical perspectives. Too frequently development practitioners lose sight of the theory underlying their work. This essay attempts to illustrate the extent to which all development projects are situated within specific theoretical and political frameworks and to examine in a critical manner the implications of such linkages.

The paper begins with an examination of the origins of WID, WAD, and GAD. A section considering the translation of each of these theories

---

Coordinator, Gender and Development, International Development Research Center (IDRC), Ottawa, Canada. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of IDRC. This paper originally was presented at the meetings of the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women held in Quebec City, November 1988. The author is indebted to Patricia Stamp of York University and Jeanne Kirk Laux of the University of Ottawa for comments on earlier versions of the paper.

into practice follows. A final section focuses on the more effective implementation of GAD.

Origins

Women in Development. The term "women in development" came into use in the early 1970s, after the publication of Ester Boserup's *Women's Role in Economic Development.*[1] Boserup was the first to delineate systematically on a global level the sexual division of labor that existed in agrarian economies. She analyzed the changes in traditional agricultural practices as societies modernized and examined the differential impact of those changes on the work done by men and women. Boserup concluded that in sparsely populated regions where shifting agriculture is practiced, women tend to do the majority of agricultural work. In more densely populated regions, where plows and other simple technologies are used, men do more of the agricultural work. Finally, in areas of intensive, irrigation-based cultivation, both men and women share in agricultural tasks. Boserup's work was remarkable in that it was based on an examination of data and evidence that had long been available to social scientists and development planners, but she was the first systematically to use gender as a variable in her analysis. Boserup's research was later criticized for its oversimplification of the nature of women's work and roles, but it was seminal in focusing scholarly attention on the sexual division of labor and the differential impact by gender of development and modernization strategies.[2]

The term "WID" was initially used by the Women's Committee of the Washington, DC, chapter of the Society for International Development as part of a deliberate strategy to bring the new evidence generated by Boserup and others to the attention of American policymakers.[3] A set of common concerns, loosely labeled "women in development," or WID, began to be articulated by American liberal feminists, who advocated legal and administrative changes to ensure that women would be better integrated into economic systems.[4] They placed primary emphasis on egalitarianism and on the development of strategies and action programs aimed at minimizing the disadvantages of women in the productive sector and ending discrimination against them.

The WID perspective was closely linked with the modernization paradigm that dominated mainstream thinking on international development from the 1950s into the 1970s. In that period, conventional wisdom decreed that "modernization," which usually equated with industrialization, would improve the standard of living in developing countries. It was argued that through massive expansion of education systems a stock of well-trained workers and managers would emerge; this in turn would enable the evolution of static, essentially agrarian societies into industrialized and modernized ones. With the growth of the economies of these countries, the benefits of modernization, i.e., better living conditions, wages, and education as well as adequate health services and the like, would "trickle down" to all segments of the society. The policy prescription for this view, which was further supported by the "human capital" approach of theorists such as the American economist Theodore Schultz, was to invest heavily in the establishment of education systems and to develop strong

cores of workers and managers.[5] Women rarely, if ever, were considered as a separate unit of analysis in the modernization literature of this period. It was assumed that the norm of the male experience was generalizable to females and that all would benefit equally as societies increasingly became modernized.

By the 1970s, this view of modernization was being questioned by many researchers. It was argued that the relative position of women had, in fact, improved very little over the previous two decades. There was even evidence suggesting that the position of women in some sectors had declined.[6] For example, in the formal industrial sector women often were relegated to the lowest-paying, most monotonous, and sometimes health-impairing jobs, a condition owing in part to their low levels of education, but also the result of the role assigned to them as supplementary rather than principal wage earners.[7] In agriculture, research in the 1970s confirmed Boserup's earlier findings—as new technologies were introduced they usually were directed at men rather than women.[8] In general, women were less likely to benefit from the surge of educational expansion. Enrollment figures, especially at the secondary and tertiary level, tended to be lower for females.

Under the rubric of WID, the recognition that women's experience of development and of societal change differed from that of men was institutionalized and it became legitimate for research to focus specifically on women's experiences and perceptions. Nonetheless, the WID approach was based on several assumptions that were at odds with critical trends in social sciences research in the 1970s.

First, the women-in-development approach, as adopted by international agencies, was solidly grounded in traditional modernization theory. It became an acceptable area of focus because it was seen as growing out of modernization theory and the notion of development as a process of slow but steady linear progress. Statistics were beginning to show that women had fared less well from development efforts of the 1960s; therefore, a new strategy was required. By the mid-1970s, donor agencies were beginning to implement intervention programs to adjust the imbalance of development "pay-off." For the most part, the solutions adopted were within the realm of the "technological fix" with attention given to the transfer of technology, the provision of extension services and credit facilities, or the development of so-called appropriate technologies that would lighten women's workloads.[9]

Second, and related to the point just made, the WID approach began from an acceptance of existing social structures. Rather than examine why women had fared less well from development strategies during the past decade, the WID approach focused only on how women could better be integrated into ongoing development initiatives. This nonconfrontational approach avoided questioning the sources and nature of women's subordination and oppression and focused instead on advocacy for more equal participation in education, employment, and other spheres of society.[10] Moreover, because the women-in-development approach was rooted in modernization theory, it did not recognize the contribution of more radical or critical perspectives such as dependency theory or Marxist and neo-Marxist analyses. The WID approach also tended to be ahistorical

and overlooked the impact and influence of class, race, and culture.[11] It focused on women or gender as a unit of analysis without recognizing the important divisions and relations of exploitation that exist among women. Nor did it recognize that exploitation as being in itself a component of a global system of capital accumulation.[12] As such, the women-in-development approach provided only a crude set of analytical tools that did not benefit from the insights of much of the critical thinking in the social sciences during the 1970s.

Third, the WID approach tended to focus exclusively on the productive aspects of women's work, ignoring or minimizing the reproductive side of women's lives. Thus, WID projects typically have been income-generating activities where women are taught a particular skill or craft and sometimes are organized into marketing cooperatives. Frequently a welfare outlook is added to projects, and women are taught aspects of hygiene, literacy, or childcare at the same time.[13] Project planners and implementers often are well-intentioned volunteers with little or no previous experience. It is rare for feasibility studies to be undertaken in advance to ensure that a viable market exists for a skill or product, and it is equally rare for project planners to take serious note of the extent to which women already are overburdened with tasks and responsibilities. The common assumption is that access to income will be a sufficiently powerful stimulant to encourage women somehow to juggle their time in such a way as to participate in yet another activity. When women's income-generating projects do prove to be successful and become significant sources of revenue, they often are appropriated by men. The women-in-development/liberal-feminist approach has offered little defense against this reality because it does not challenge the basic social relations of gender. It is based on the assumption that gender relations will change of themselves as women become full economic partners in development.

Women and Development. The WAD, or neo-Marxist feminist approach, which emerged in the second half of the 1970s, grew out of a concern with the explanatory limitations of modernization theory and its proselytization of the idea that the exclusion of women from earlier development strategies had been an inadvertent oversight. It draws some of its theoretical base from dependency theory, although dependency theory, like Marxist analysis, for the most part has given remarkably little specific attention to issues of gender subordination.[14] In essence, the women-and-development approach begins from the position that women always have been part of development processes and that they did not suddenly appear in the early 1970s as the result of the insights and intervention strategies of a few scholars and agency personnel. Achola Okello Pala noted in the mid-1970s that the notion of "integrating women into development" was inextricably linked to the maintenance of the economic dependency of Third World and especially African countries on the industrialized countries.[15]

The WAD perspective focuses on the relationship between women and development processes rather than purely on strategies for the integration of women into development. Its point of departure is that women always have been important economic actors in their societies and that the work they do both inside and outside the household is central to

the maintenance of those societies, but that this integration serves primarily to sustain existing international structures of inequality. The women-and-development perspective recognizes that Third World men who do not have elite status also have been adversely affected by the structure of the inequalities within the international system, but it gives little analytical attention to the social relations of gender within classes. Consequently, the question of gender and cross-gender alliances and divisions within classes is not systematically addressed. At a theoretical level, the WAD perspective recognizes and indeed focuses strongly on the impact of class, but in practical project design and implementation terms, it tends, like WID, to group women together without taking strong analytical note of class, race, or ethnicity divisions, all of which may exercise a powerful influence on their actual social status.

WAD offers a more critical view of women's position than does WID, but it fails to undertake a full-scale analysis of the relationship between patriarchy, differing modes of production, and women's subordination and oppression. The WAD perspective implicitly assumes that women's position will improve if and when international structures become more equitable. In the meantime, the underrepresentation of women in economic, political, and social structures still is identified primarily as a problem that can be solved by carefully designed intervention strategies rather than by more fundamental shifts in the social relations of gender. Finally, it should be noted that there is a tension within the WAD perspective that discourages a strict analytical focus on the problems of women independent of those of men, since both sexes are seen to be disadvantaged within oppressive global structures based on class and capital. Since the WAD perspective does not give detailed attention to the overriding influence of the ideology of patriarchy, women's condition is seen primarily within the structure of international and class inequalities.

A second weakness common to the WID and WAD approaches is a singular preoccupation with the productive sector at the expense of the reproductive side of women's work and lives. WID/WAD intervention strategies therefore have tended to concentrate on the development of income-generating activities without taking into account the time burdens that such strategies place on women.[16] Development planners have tended to impose Western biases and assumptions on the South, and the tasks performed by women in the household, including those of social reproduction, are assigned no economic value. The labor invested in family maintenance, including childbearing and -rearing, housework, care of the ill and elderly, and the like, has been considered to belong to the "private" domain and outside the purview of development projects aimed at enhancing income-generating activities. In essence, this has been a reflection of the tendency of both modernization and dependency theorists to utilize exclusively economic or political-economy analyses and to discount the insights of the so-called "softer" social sciences.

Gender and Development. The GAD, or gender-and-development, approach emerged in the 1980s as an alternative to the earlier WID focus. It finds its theorectical roots in socialist feminism and has bridged the gap left by the modernization theorists by linking the relations of production to the relations of reproduction and taking into account all aspects

of women's lives.[17] Socialist feminists have identified the social construction of production and reproduction as the basis of women's oppression and have focused attention on the social relations of gender, questioning the validity of roles that have been ascribed to both women and men in different societies. Although they have not trivialized the importance of greater female participation in all aspects of social, political, and economic life, their primary focus has been on an examination of *why* women systematically have been assigned to inferior and/or secondary roles. Socialist feminists have combined an analysis of the impact of patriarchy with some aspects of a more traditional Marxist approach in attempting to address this concern.

Kate Young has identified some of the key aspects of the GAD approach.[18] Perhaps most significantly, the GAD approach starts from a holistic perspective, looking at "the totality of social organization, economic and political life in order to understand the shaping of particular aspects of society."[19] GAD is not concerned with women *per se* but with the social construction of gender and the assignment of specific roles, responsibilities, and expectations to women and to men. In contrast to the emphasis on exclusively female solidarity that is highly prized by radical feminists, the GAD approach welcomes the potential contributions of men who share a concern for issues of equity and social justice.[20] The GAD approach does not focus singularly on productive or reproductive aspects of women's (and men's) lives to the exclusion of the other. It analyzes the nature of women's contribution within the context of work done both inside and outside the household, including noncommodity production, and rejects the public/private dichotomy that commonly has been used as a mechanism to undervalue family and household maintenance work performed by women. Both the socialist/feminist and GAD approaches give special attention to the oppression of women in the family and enter the so-called "private sphere" to analyze the assumptions upon which conjugal relationships are based. GAD also puts greater emphasis on the participation of the state in promoting women's emancipation, seeing it as the duty of the state to provide some of the social services that women in many countries have provided on a private and individual basis. This issue has become increasingly politicized in the 1980s, as many states that formerly had provided social services in areas such as childcare and healthcare, for example, have reduced or privatized them in the face of economic recession.

The GAD approach sees women as agents of change rather than as passive recipients of development assistance, and it stresses the need for women to organize themselves for a more effective political voice. It recognizes the importance of both class solidarities and class distinctions, but it argues that the ideology of patriarchy operates within and across classes to oppress women. Consequently, socialist feminists and researchers working within the GAD perspective are exploring both the connections among and the contradictions of gender, class, race, and development.[21] A key focus of research from a gender-and-development perspective is on the strengthening of women's legal rights, including the reform of inheritance and land laws. Research also is examining the

confusions created by the coexistence of customary and statutory legal systems in many countries and the tendency for these to have been manipulated by men to the disadvantage of women.

The GAD approach goes further than WID or WAD in questioning the underlying assumptions of current social, economic, and political structures. A gender-and-development perspective does not lead only to the design of intervention and affirmative action strategies to ensure that women are better integrated into ongoing development efforts. It leads, inevitably, to a fundamental reexamination of social structures and institutions and, ultimately, to the loss of power of entrenched elites, which will effect some women as well as men. At the level of practical programming and project development, this may be construed as a weakness. The GAD approach does not easily lend itself to integration into ongoing development strategies and programs. It demands a degree of commitment to structural change and power shifts that is unlikely to be found either in national or in international agencies. Experience has shown that even socialist states committed to the reform of the class structures of their societies have shown less interest in reforming gender biases.[22] Not surprisingly, a fully articulated GAD perspective is rarely found in the projects and activities of international development agencies although examples of partial GAD approaches can be identified.

From Theory to Practice

It is clear that the general notion of focusing on women separate from men in at least some projects has been accepted by a considerable number of Third World governments, national and international development agencies, and many nongovernmental organizations. To some extent, however, this is a reflection of political expediency and should not be interpreted as a sign of fundamental commitment to the improvement of the situation of women. As will be discussed later,. while the rhetoric of "integrating women into development" has been accepted by many institutions, the actual process of ensuring equity for women even within those same institutions is still far from complete.

There is no question that the majority of the projects for women that have emerged during the past two decades find their roots in the WID perspective.[23] In a 1984 analysis of the publications of various international development agencies that were beginning to focus on women, Patricia Maguire noted that they tended to identify the following constraints as being detrimental to the status of women in Third World societies:

—traditions, attitudes, and prejudices against women's participation in economic, political, and social processes;
—legal barriers;
—limited access to and use of formal education, resulting in high female illiteracy;
—time-consuming nature of women's "chores";
—lack of access to land, credit, and modern agricultural equipment, techniques, and extension services;

—health burden of frequent pregnancies and malnourishment;
—undermining of women's traditional position as economically contributing partners; and
—inadequate research and information on women that limited ability of development planners to create projects relevant to women.[24]

An examination of this list confirms the tendency of mainstream development agencies to identify problems within the context of existing socioeconomic structures, that is, within the WID/WAD perspective rather than within the GAD perspective. Each of the preceding problems conceivably could be "solved" through the application of a specific intervention strategy, be it community education, appropriate technology, the development of extension services and credit facilities, family planning, the compilation of further information and statistics, or the like. Each of the problems has been identified on the assumption of some level of culpability on the part of the developing countries and neutral disinterest on the part of the industrialized countries. None questions the fundamental inequities of an international system that perpetuates the dependency of the South on the North, and none questions the social construction of gender that has relegated women to the domestic realm in both North and South.[25]

An examination of the programs and projects oriented toward women that have been developed by bilateral and multilateral agencies since the mid-1970s confirms this tendency. In 1976 the International Labor Organization (ILO) articulated a Basic Needs Approach (BNA) designed to enable women to provide more effectively for their families' most fundamental human needs (food, clothing, shelter, etc.). At the same time it was intended as a strategy to ease women's work burdens, to enable them to become more independent economically, and to allow them to participate more actively in community development activities.[26] While BNA may have been based on a desire to ensure that the poor had some control over their own lives, and as such was an improvement on earlier strategies, it did not challenge existing patterns of inequality. It did not focus on issues of redistribution of land or wealth within societies, nor did it question the sexual division of labor within households. As such, it can be seen as another example of modernization-theory-derived development.

An analysis of the programs of many multilateral and bilateral development agencies reveals a similar pattern. Various strategies for the integration of women into ongoing programs and affirmative action to ensure greater representation of women in agency staff positions can be identified. For example, the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD has emphasized the necessity for member countries to establish formal WID strategies, to put aside special funds for activities related to women, to fund research on WID, and to advocate the employment of women in multilateral organizations and in development banks.[27] Bilateral agencies like the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) all have adopted strategies to ensure that

women in developing countries benefit directly from their programs and, to varying degrees, to try to ensure that female staff are represented in positions of power within their own organizations. Few strategies, however, have been developed that question or attempt to influence in a profound fashion the social relations of gender or that create conditions for more fundamental structural societal change.

There have been few in-depth analyses of the actual processes by which women and women-related concerns are integrated into the programs of donor agencies. A study of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) WID Office by Kathleen Staudt, however, revealed that these objectives had been pursued with varying degrees of interest and commitment.[28] Staudt's description of the establishment of the WID Office in 1974 is instructive. She notes that while each USAID policy paper must have a "woman impact" statement, such statements are usually no more than a paragraph and are often recycled from one document to another. In the early 1980s, the WID Office staff consisted of only five professionals, all female, in an agency that had an overwhelmingly male professional and female clerical staff. Staudt notes that "agency personnel freguently complain that WID is a 'women's lib' issue being used to export American ideas, rather than an issue grounded in development and/or equity justification."[29] The WID Office had a weak power base as a result of its small staff allocation, a small budget that necessitated dependency on the budgets of other bureaus within the agency, few allies in the technical areas, and a limited mandate that enabled the office to raise concerns but not to veto projects. Moreover, Staudt notes that despite efforts to increase the number of women benefiting from USAID grants, in the early 1980s the number of USAID-supported international trainees who were women was just 13 percent, up 4 percent from 1974, but only equal to what the number had been in the early 1960s. Staudt demonstrates quite clearly that there may exist a considerable gap between the articulation of official policy on the part of agencies and the development of support within the agencies for the implementation of such policies. Thus the existence of official WID policies cannot be judged as an accurate indicator of commitment to gender issues within an agency.

Agencies have taken different approaches with respect to the integration of gender issues into their programs.[30] For example, in the 1980s, CIDA was at the forefront of bilateral agencies attempting to incorporate gender concerns into their programs. It established a WID Directorate in 1984, and all CIDA professional staff systematically undergo training in gender analysis. The WID Directorate, however, has only a small budget at its disposal and must, like the WID Office in USAID, expend considerable time and effort in encouraging desk officers to support activities related to women. Given the climate of openness toward such activities in CIDA during the latter years of the 1980s (a situation coinciding with the administration of a female president), this task was not as difficult as might be anticipated; however, it meant that the directorate had relatively little scope to plan and implement its own programs. A major part of its work revolved around advocacy of gender issues rather than actual program development and implementation.

The experience of the European bilateral agencies is mixed.[31] Some,

such as SIDA, began to finance projects aimed specifically at women as early as the 1960s. Others, such as the British ODA, steadfastly refused to give special support to projects for women until the second half of the 1980s, claiming that to do so would be to impose the cultural biases of the North on the South.

Private organizations engaged in the support of research in developing countries, such as the Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations, all have chosen not to establish separate women's offices or programs, arguing that to do so would be to perpetuate the notion that "women's" issues are somehow separate from those of men. Despite the fact that they have not established WID offices, however, each of the three foundations has supported many women-related projects within the context of existing program structures. The Ford Foundation, moreover, has required all institutions requesting support to provide evidence that women participate in their projects. The foundation has long emphasized the importance of gender issues, and many of its program staff have made efforts to ensure that women are integrated into all aspects of programming.[32]

The World Bank has had an Advisor on Women in Development since the early 1970s, but in the mid-80s the bank expanded this office and gave it a higher profile. A major focus of the expanded office during the late 1980s was on "Safe Motherhood," based on the argument that "improving maternal health helps involve women more effectively in development."[33] The World Health Organization similarly made this issue a major focus. It can be argued that such initiatives, while of obvious and crucial importance, are based within a traditional view of women's roles.

In 1987, USAID carried out an evaluation of its experience with women in development between 1973 and 1985.[34] The agency identified three different kinds of projects: (1) integrated projects that require gender-sensitive designs to meet their objectives; (2) women-only projects that usually are small in scope and labor intensive for USAID staff; and (3) women's components in larger projects. It was found that those projects that had included a careful analysis of the sexual division of labor and responsibilities, and were designed in such a way as to realistically reflect the contexts within which men and women worked, ultimately were more efficient in meeting developmental goals. The evaluation also revealed that income-generating projects for women rarely were successful in improving the economic positions of participants. Moreover, job-training projects for women also usually failed, because women lacked capital to establish small businesses where they could utilize their new skills. Perhaps most disturbingly, however, the evaluation revealed that even in the 1980-84 period, by which time the WID Office had been established for several years, 40 percent of the projects evaluated made no mention at all of women. In the earlier period from 1972 to 1977, 64 percent of the projects analyzed had made no mention of women. Since the universe of projects analyzed was only 98, the numbers are too small for definitive conclusions. They do, however, reveal a trend that is in keeping with the attitudes reported by Staudt.[35] From a more positive perspective, however, the results of the evaluation suggest quite clearly that projects that take women into account from the very beginning, i.e., at

the design stage, have a higher efficiency level and are more likely to succeed. Within those agencies where equity arguments are not given great import, it is possible that efficiency arguments may be more convincing.

Toward the More Effective Implementation of GAD

As already noted, it is difficult to find examples of development projects that have been designed from a GAD perspective. One might speculate that such projects would be designed to empower women and to give them an equal voice by recognizing the full spectrum of their knowledge, experience, and activities, including both productive and reproductive labor. They would question traditional views of gender roles and responsibilities and point toward a more equitable definition of the very concept of "development" and of the contributions made by women and by men to the attainment of societal goals. GAD projects would examine not only the sexual division of labor, but also the *sexual division of responsibility*, and recognize that the burden carried by women is one not only of physical labor but also of psychological stress, for example, in being solely accountable for many aspects of family maintenance. Moreover, the number of households permanently or temporarily headed by females is steadily increasing in many parts of Africa and the Caribbean.

Such projects are not often found in the programs of most mainstream development agencies, because they emphasize fundamental societal change, including an examination of the social relations of gender. For example, while development projects in many parts of the world have focused on the sexual division of labor in agriculture, they rarely move beyond the identification of differences in work done by men and women to actually implementing programs for change in gender relations. The more common strategy is to provide women (or men) with labor-saving technologies and to assume that women's burden will become sufficiently lightened to enable them to carry out their productive/reproductive responsibilities with less effort. This approach may have an important impact on the lives of individual women but it does little to break down existing stereotypes and male-oriented cultural patterns.

Ultimately, it may be easier to develop GAD projects in the realm of research rather than in the realm of development practice or implementation. To illustrate, it may be useful to examine a sample of research projects currently being undertaken by African researchers that are making a concerted attempt to view women as actors in development rather than as passive recipients of change.[36] For example, studies in Kenya, Tanzania, and Nigeria are looking at women's access to land within customary and statutory law and assessing the extent to which women's productivity has been negatively effected by legal systems that favor male ownership, and indeed sometimes even fail to recognize female ownership. The research begins from the recognition that women are primary producers of food and that denial of land rights has had deleterious consequences not only for them personally but also for households that are dependent on them. A project in Ghana is examining the impact of technological change on women farmers and analyzing alternative methods of income generation developed by female farmers after part of their land

had been appropriated for industrial purposes. A project in Burkina Faso is considering the impact of fuelwood shortages on women's agricultural practices and on family nutritional intakes. The researchers have discovered that as women are forced to spend longer periods of time searching for firewood, they have less time for agriculture. This in turn leads to lower crop yields and a reduced level of food for family consumption as well as a smaller surplus for sale in local markets. At the same time, women are cooking less frequently and serving their families cheap store-bought foods or food cooked several hours earlier and often stored under unhealthy or unsanitary conditions. Finally, a network project based in seven anglophone and francophone African countries is exploring women's indigenous knowledge with respect to natural resource management and examining household and community-level survival strategies they have developed in the face of increasing environmental degradation.

These projects share a common concern for the empowerment of women and for the legitimization of women's knowledge and experience. In essence, the researchers will document women's knowledge and then translate it into language that will be familiar and acceptable to policymakers. Through such strategies women's knowledge, views, and experience ultimately will become important components of national decision-making processes. The projects, however, do not go sufficiently far in addressing the issue of research utilization. The challenge of articulating the findings of such research projects into viable, broad-based societal development plans and programs still remains to be met. To achieve this end, there is a particularly strong need for more effective communication and interaction among researchers, national and international policymakers, and donor agency representatives.

NOTES

1. Ester Boserup, *Women's Role in Economic Development* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970).

2. For example, see Lourdes Beneria and Gita Sen, "Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role in Economic Development," *Signs* 7 (Winter 1981).

3. Patricia Maguire, *Women in Development: An Alternative Analysis* (Amherst, MA: Center for International Education, 1984).

4. Jane S. Jaquette, "Women and Modernization Theory: A Decade of Feminist Criticism," *World Politics* 34 (January 1982).

5. Theodore Schultz, "Investment in Human Capital," *American Economic Review* 51 (1961).

6. See, for example, Boserup, *Women's Role in Economic Development*; Irene Tinker and Michele B. Bramson, *Women and Development* (Washington, DC: Overseas Development Council, 1976); Elsie Boulding, *The Underside of History* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1976); and Gail P. Kelly and Carolyn Elliot, eds., *Women's Education in the Third World: Comparative Perspectives* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1982).

7. Linda Lim, "Women's Work in Multinational Electronics Factories," in *Women and Technological Change in Developing Countries*, ed. Roslyn Dauber and Melinda L. Cain (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1981).

8. For a good overview of women's work in agriculture, see Ruth Dixon-Mueller, *Women's Work in Third World Agriculture* (Geneva: International Labor Office [ILO], 1985). See also Olivia Muchena, *Women's Participation in the Rural Labour Force in Zimbabwe*, Southern African Team of Employment Promotion (SATEP) Working Papers (Lusaka: ILO, 1982). For a critical examination of African women's access to agricultural

technology, see Patricia Stamp, *Technology, Gender, and Power in Africa* (Ottawa: International Development Research Center, 1989).

9. See Stamp, *Technology, Gender, and Power in Africa.*

10. Marjorie Mbilinyi, "Research Priorities in Women's Studies in Eastern Africa," *Women's Studies International Forum* 7, no.4 (1984).

11. See Marjorie Mbilinyi, "'Women in Development' Ideology: The Promotion of Competition and Exploitation," *African Review* 11, no. 1 (1984); and Geertje Lycklama A. Nijeholt, "The Fallacy of Integration: The U.N. Strategy of Integrating Women into Development Revisited," *Netherlands Review of Development Studies* 1 (1987).

12. Beneria and Sen, "Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role in Economic Development."

13. Mayra Buvinic, "Projects for Women in the Third World: Explaining Their Misbehavior," *World Development* 14, no. 5 (1986).

14. See Jane L. Parpart and Kathleen A. Staudt, "Women and the State in Africa," in *Women and the State in Africa*, ed. idem (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1989).

15. Achola O. Pala, "Definitions of Women and Development: An African Perspective," in *Women and National Development: The Complexities of Change*, ed. Wellesley Editorial Committee (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

16. See Pepe Roberts, "The Integration of Women into the Development Process: Some Conceptual Problems," *IDS Bulletin* 10, no. 3 (1979); and Brenda Gael McSweeney and Marion Freedman, "Lack of Time As an Obstacle to Women's Education: The Case of Upper Volta," in *Women's Education in the Third World*, ed. Kelly and Elliot.

17. See Jaquette, "Women and Modernization Theory."

18. Kate Young, "Gender and Development," Notes for a Training Course on Gender and Development (Aga Khan Foundation, Toronto, 1987).

19. Ibid., p. 2.

20. Gita Sen and Caren Grown, *Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987).

21. Maguire, *Women in Development.*

22. Beneria and Sen, "Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role in Economic Development."

23. It should be emphasized that just as the WID/WAD/GAD perspectives are not entirely conceptually distinct, it often is not possible to place a development project squarely within a single theoretical framework.

24. Maguire, *Women in Development*, p. 13.

25. Barbara Rogers, *The Domestication of Women: Disorimination in Developing Societies* (London: Kogan Page, 1980).

26. Ingrid Palmer, "New Official Ideas on Women and Development," *IDS Bulletin* 10, no. 3 (1979). See also, Beneria and Sen, "Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role in Economic Development."

27. Eva M. Rathgeber, "Femmes et developpement: les initiatives de quelques organismes subventionnaries," *Recherches feministes* 1, no. 2 (1988).

28. Kathleen Staudt, *Women, Foreign Assistance, and Advocacy Administration* (New York: Praeger, 1985). See also, idem, "Bureaucratic Resistance to Women's Programs: The Case of Women in Development," in *Women, Power, and Policy*, ed. Ellen Boneparth (London: Pergamon Press, 1982).

29. Staudt, "Bureaucratic Resistance," p. 270.

30. Rathgeber, "Femmes et developpement."

31. Ibid.

32. For a detailed discussion of the debates in the Ford Foundation around the issue of women and development during the late 1970s and early 1980s, see Cornelia Butler Flora, "Incorporating Women into International Development Programs: The Political Phenomenology of a Private Foundation," in *Women in Developing Countries: A Policy Focus*, ed. Kathleen A. Staudt and Jane S. Jaquette (New York: Haworth, 1983.)

33. Barbara Herz and Anthony R. Measham, *The Safe Motherhood Initiative: Proposals for Action* (Washington, DC: World Bank, (1987).

34. United States Agency for International Development (USAID), *Women in Development: A.I.D.'s Experience, 1973–1985*, vol. 1: *Synthesis Paper*, USAID Program Evaluation Report No. 18 (Washington, DC: USAID, 1987).

35. Staudt, "Bureaucratic Resistance to Women's Programs."

36. All of the projects discussed subsequently are being supported by the International Development Research Center (IDRC). Owing to the author's familiarity with these projects, they are used as examples of projects attempting to incorporate a GAD perspective. It should be noted, however, that *research* projects with a GAD perspective have also been funded by numerous other agencies.