

Striving towards excellence in development practice:

Integrating a gender perspective

Natasha Primo

30 November 2009

Social justice advocates and international development scholars argue that “good” development practice must of necessity be gender-aware and transformative. This paper outlines the evolution of arguments by feminist and sustainable and human development advocates to focus on rights-based development and for integrating a feminist perspective in development practice - where by “feminism,” we mean the belief that women should not be disadvantaged because of their sex, and that their human dignity should be recognized as equal to that of men.

The paper starts by tracing the outlines of the feminist debate on women, gender and development and shows the intersection of these debates with approaches to development from the 1970s to the 2000s. It outlines the contours of 2 conversations: one among feminists in which they interrogate the capacity of existing theories to explain the lived realities of women in different countries and social contexts and helps to deepen the analysis of gender inequality and gender injustice around the world, bringing in ever more diverse voices and experiences to inform the debate, and the second one in which feminists provide critical comment on the impact of mainstream development approaches on women and “gender relations”, highlighting how mainstream “development” can go hand-in-hand with the violation of women’s rights - and can even be predicated on it and promoting more gender-aware development policy and practice at the local, national and international levels and

The paper continues by reviewing arguments by alternative development theorists like Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum that development must seek to increase the capabilities of all men and women so that they may live a life of dignity, and that development must be about “human development” and go beyond the limited goal of “economic growth.” For it to have lasting impact, development practice must not only bring more women to participate in development projects but also build the potential to change unequal social/gender relations and empower women to have more control over their lives.

This paper is not a mini-manual on “how-to” integrate a gender perspective into development projects. Its focussed on the feminist debates about gender discrimination , and also offers an insight into feminist critiques of how mainstream development has then gone about integrating - and diluting - feminist ideals in development practice. As such it offers a “why you should integrate gender” argument as well as providing insight into how the political process can impact on transformational “gender agenda.”

The paper is organised into three sections outlining (i) the key concepts, (iii) the evolution of the feminist debate on gender and development as well as a brief look at some of the different frameworks for conducting gender analysis, and (iii) reviewing the argument for a human development approach and its potential for advancing gender justice.

Clarifying the key concepts

What is “gender”? The concept of gender refers to the social and cultural constructions that individuals, communities and societies assign to behaviours, characteristics and values belonging to men and women, and that are often reinforced by symbols, laws and regulations, institutions, and subjectivity. As racial differences have historically been used to construct racism and racial discrimination, sex differences are transformed into social, economical and political inequities where these constructed “male characteristics” and activities are perceived as superior to women's. Their resilience resides in the notion that they are considered natural and immutable, when in fact they are shaped by ideological, historical, religious, ethnic, economic and cultural determinants. Because of the way gender identities are interwoven with cultural, ethnic and other identities in communities, both men and women often actively police these dominant

constructions of what it means to be a man or woman - as well as how men and women interrelate - in their specific communities.

Weaknesses of a growth strategy

growth may not occur, especially in very poor countries where the physical infrastructure (like roads and electricity) and the pool of economically valuable skills are weakest;

while there may be growth, the number of jobs created may be few;

growth and employment may both increase but the kind of the jobs that are created may be insecure and hazardous to human health and welfare;

growth may lead to irreversible environmental damage;

the kind of economic adjustments historically advocated by the IFIs reduces the role of the state in the provision of social services and places the burden of survival on the poor, but especially on poor women.

The concept of gender refers neither to “man” or “woman” but rather to the relations between men and women, and to the social constructions of “femininity” and “masculinity.” It gained currency following a critique of development practice that target “women” for development inputs without also attending to unequal power relations that women occupy vis-a-vis men. Thus, “gender” became a category that has to do with *relations* between men and women as well as with *politics* because gender attributions are oppressive and rigid both for men and for women (although historically it is women who have lost in this relation). In its original conception, the “gender” agenda was a radical concept that drew attention to unequal power between men and women and called for transformation of these into a social system with more *just* relations between women and men.

Critical evaluation of how “gender” has been integrated in “development” discourse and practice - by government, NGOs and multilateral agencies like the United Nations bodies - shows that the meaning of “gender” has become more ambiguous and a catch-all for different and sometimes contradictory things like - for example - collecting gender-disaggregated data and strategies for “empowering women.” For many feminist analysts, the very rise of the concept of gender seems - with hindsight - to be tied to its use as a softer option for talking about rights and power. Hence, people with very different political agendas - conservative and transformative - could all comfortably call for an integration of “gender” into development practice.¹ One consequence of this conceptual fuzziness has been the dilution of work that challenges gender oppressive social practices.

While the battle for attention to gender injustice is won and there is increased donor and governments’ support for ‘doing gender,’ some feminist analysts are calling for a new engagement with development practice, one that restores a focus on rights and “women’s empowerment” because “[i]t offers the prospect of re-politicising and reinvigorating a “gender agenda” that is concerned with making visible and transforming inequitable power relations. It creates the space to talk once more of rights and power, and to highlight the discrimination against and persistent material, social and political disadvantages faced by women.”²

A women’s “rights” discourse asserts women’s *entitlement* to access her human rights, where the content of these rights is provided by the various international (like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), regional (like the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights) and national human rights instruments developed over the years which governments have signed on to. Feminists further highlight

1 See Andrea Cornwall, 2007, “Revisiting the Gender Agenda” in IDS Bulletin Vol 28 No 2, p69-78.

2 Cornwall *ibid*, p71.

the importance of women realising their rights instead of these rights only existing in international protocols and national laws. Thus, they recognise the struggle for women's rights as also a struggle for "women's empowerment," where women enter the political process and develop the capacities to challenge and transform existing discriminatory power relations with a view to replacing them with new social and gender relations based on equity and that recognises the human dignity for all.

"The term empowerment refers to a range of activities from individual self-assertion to collective resistance, protest and mobilization that challenge basic power relations. [snip] Empowerment, therefore, is a process aimed at changing the nature and direction of systemic forces that marginalize women and

Gender-aware development is critical because:

taining gender justice for women and men in the household, communities and societies at large, and for not further disadvantaging women and men; without it, development is flawed as it ignores the needs and aspirations of more than half the population in society and, consequently, its long term effectiveness, sustainability and impact will be limited; not taking account of the potential (economic) contributions of women, squanders the creativity and knowledge of more than half the population

other disadvantaged sectors in a given context."³

Women's empowerment is thus seen to be multidimensional, combining different elements. It can equally be about opening access to decision-making as well as about people becoming aware of themselves as being able to make decisions, it can be about making choices and being able to shape what choices are on the table, or about women challenging the existing powers structures that shape women into subservient beings.⁴

Similarly, the meaning of "development" has been the subject of critical debates for some time. Are we to understand it as increasing the wealth of country? Or is it something more intractable, like increasing the happiness and well-being of the majority of a national or global population?

Historically, the dominant notion of development favoured *economic growth* - increases in national wealth - as the primary means for measuring development. Concomitantly, the dominant framework for evaluating the success of economic policy was - and largely remains - that of "*economic efficiency*" and maximising an output (based on consumer choice), while ignoring the distribution of purchasing power (and hence also the distribution of income and wealth) within a national population. Advocates of this approach to development - called the neo-liberal approach - argue that the state should not interfere in

3 Miller et al, p.34

4 Zoe Ozaal with Sally Baden, 1997, Gender and empowerment: definitions, approaches and implications for policy.

the economy. Instead, private companies and individuals should drive the economy as they are considered more efficient and best equipped to stimulate economic growth and employment. It is argued that this growth and employment will - over-and-above the profits of private companies and individuals - generate incomes for many individuals and families, and that the benefits of this economic growth would “trickle down” to the poor through increased job opportunities and access to income.

In response to this mainstream neo-classical argument, international development scholars and practitioners have long argued that a growth-oriented strategy is inadequate for measuring development and that the experiences in many developing countries show that growth-oriented development is an imperfect strategy with many weaknesses. Evidence from the 1980s and 1990s also showed that because of the economic adjustment measures demanded by international financial institutions (IFIs) like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), developing country governments became less able to actively pursue development strategies that aid human development.⁵ One of the consequences was that women’s lives worsened as they took on more unpaid care work and bore the brunt of problems generated by developing countries’ implementation of these economic structural adjustment programmes.⁶

Over the last 15 years, the mainstream discourse on what constitutes “development” has shifted. This is reflected in the United Nations emphasis on the need for “human development” by which they include among others increases in life expectancy, increased adult literacy as well as increases in average income. The 1996 *Human Development Report* opens with the fundamental statement that “human development is the end - economic growth a means.” The report notes that “economic growth, if not properly managed, can be jobless, voiceless, ruthless, rootless and futureless, and thus detrimental to human development. The quality of growth is therefore as important as its quantity; for poverty reduction, human development and sustainability.”⁷ Evidence of the growing influence of the critique of the neo-classical approach is that even its bastions - like the World Bank - are now also looking for strategies that go beyond economic development and will foster more sustainable development outcomes.⁸

What is a gender-aware approach to development practice and why do we need it?

5 After consistent opposition and critique, the World Bank now acknowledges that the structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) implemented in the 1980s and 1990s were ill-suited to the development needs of developing countries. They agree that governments must play a role in meeting social needs like primary education and primary health.

6 Vickers, J. 1991, “Impact of Structural Adjustment on Women,” in *Women and the World Economic Crisis*, pp15-42.

7 See *Human Development Report* 1996, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1996/>

8 See World Bank 2000, *Beyond Economic Growth: Meeting the Challenges of Global Development*. Available at <http://www.worldbank.org/depweb/beyond/beyond.htm>

What does it mean to have a gender perspective or to conduct gender-aware development practice? In the simplest terms, having a gender perspective means that one is sensitive to the ways in which women's and men's social roles may differ, and how social programmes may have different consequences for men and women in society. It involves a commitment to understand and clarify how it is - in various spheres of life - that women and girls are disadvantaged in relation to men and boys. In the context of devising development strategies to benefit the poor, having a gender perspective means that one recognises that women play a central role in both the

What is a gender-aware approach?

Gender-aware approaches to policy-making and development practice assist decision makers, development practitioners and community members to conduct their work in such a way that both women and men are considered in the process – both as part of the processes as well as in considering the impact of decisions made. In contrast, *gender-blind* approaches treat men and women as if equal and not would lead do development interventions that take no account of the impact on women or gender relations of the people impacted by the project.

economy and the household, that women are both the income-earners and the carers who tend to the young, the sick and the elderly, and that placing their needs at the centre of a development strategy will impact positively on both economic growth and human well-being. From a feminist perspective, it is a process of analysing and understanding more deeply the systemic way in which women are discriminated against, and can also include the implementation of activities and longer term strategies that advance women's empowerment and their demand for recognition of their human rights.

Gender-analysis is a key analytical tool for understanding the gendered relations within a social setting or society at large and - where conducted - provides the bases for formulating gender-aware - and hopefully feminist - development policies and interventions. A World Bank study that found that "projects with gender components to be more effective overall, [and] also recognises that such projects may also reflect better identification of the target population, design and implementation"⁹.

In practice, gender analysis involves the systematic gathering and examination of information on gender differences and social relations in the home, community, workplace and other social institutions in order to identify, understand and redress gender-based inequities. Gender analysis can be practically implemented across the phases of a project life-cycle - including implementation, monitoring and evaluation - as well as to build donors', government actors' and community members' awareness of gender-based discrimination and a commitment to gender-aware development planning and practice.

9 See Chamberlain, 2002.

There exists a number of different frameworks for conducting gender analysis. These include the Harvard Analytical Framework (or, gender roles framework), the Moser Gender Planning Framework (that distinguishes between practical and strategic gender needs), the Sarah Longwe Women's Empowerment Framework, and Naila Kabeer's Social Relations Framework.¹⁰

The methodologies and components of gender analysis are shaped by how gender issues are understood in the institutions concerned. Each framework has its strengths and weak-

ness and their value-add depends on the scope of a particular project and what gendered impacts it seeks to achieve. However, it stands to reason that if we want to advance gender justice, more complex approaches that allow us to monitor and address gender discrimination in various/multiple spheres will deepen our understanding of the prevailing gender dynamics in a social setting and allow for more finely tuned development projects.

Southern women's perspectives provide us with good principles on which to assess the development process and suggest some of the outcomes we should demand from development processes in different countries and globally. These principles include the firm belief that (i) the development process should facilitate access to resources like work, productive resources (like land, water) and affordable reproductive resources (like health care, education) that are necessary to care for human beings, (ii) that such care and the development of human potential should drive the pursuit of economic growth, and (iii) that class/gender/race/ethnic inequalities should improve as a consequence of the development process, or a specific development intervention for that matter.¹¹

The Gender Roles framework- for example - focuses on describing women's and men's roles and their relative access to and control over resources. The analysis aims to anticipate the impacts of projects on both productive and reproductive roles. It takes the household as the unit of analysis and does not look at the state or markets where gender equalities are reinforced. The framework has been critiqued for an assumption that women are a homogeneous group, and are subject to the similar gender-roles across time and cultures. It was critiqued for being strong on gender roles but light on gender relations as it

Gender analysis:

- * examines the differences in women's and men's lives, including those which lead to social and economic inequity for women, and applies this understanding to policy development and service delivery
- * is concerned with the underlying causes of these inequities
- * aims to achieve positive change for women

¹⁰ See <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/asro/mdtmanila/training/unit1/plngaps1.htm>

¹¹ Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era, 1995. *Markers on the Way: The DAWN Debates on Alternative Development*, p14.

does not deepen understanding of the social processes through which women experience subordination and poverty. It was further critiqued by the empowerment approach for its hierarchisation of strategic over practical gender needs, and the dismissal of concerns with practical gender needs as being less feminist. [The empowerment approach rehabilitated the importance of practical/basic needs - like food, shelter, land, etc - as part of the third world woman's feminist struggle for freedom from oppression.]

In turn, the Social Relations approach seeks to expose the gendered power relations that perpetuate inequities. Drawing on the experiences of southern women, this analysis moves beyond the household to include the community, market, and state institutions and thus involves collecting data at all these levels. It also seeks to uncover differences between women, divided by other dimensions of social differentiation such as class, race and ethnicity. The Social Relations approach requires that the data on gender differences are collected cover a range of social institutions, while also analysing data about different “kinds” of women in a social setting. The Social Relations framework tries to respond to the feminist call for transformative development practice that is system-wide, and that recognises redressing rights and power differentials as key components of a strategy to bring about gender justice for women.

That said, Juliet Hunt¹² (2004) sets out some key steps for “doing gender analysis” - using any of the analytical framework - as follows:

1. Collect sex disaggregated household, workplace and community data/information relevant to the program/project for each area below.
2. Assess how the gender division of labour and patterns of decision-making affects the program/project, and how the program/project affects the gender division of labour and decision making.
3. Assess who has access to and control over resources, assets and benefits, including program/project benefits.
4. Understand women's/girls' and men's/boys' different needs, priorities and strengths.
5. Understand the complexity of gender relations in the context of social relations, and how this constrains or provides opportunities for addressing gender inequality.
6. Assess the barriers and constraints to women and men participating and benefiting equally from the program/project.
7. Develop strategies to address barriers and constraints, include these strategies in program/project design and implementation, and ensure that they are adequately resourced.

12 Hunt, J, 2004. 'Introduction to gender analysis concepts and steps', Development Bulletin, no. 64, pp. 100-106. Available at http://devnet.anu.edu.au/GenderPacific/pdfs/23_gen_mainstream_hunt.pdf

8. Assess counterpart/partner capacity for gender sensitive planning, implementation and monitoring, and develop strategies to strengthen capacity.
9. Assess the potential of the program/project to empower women, address strategic gender interests and transform gender relations.
10. Develop gender-sensitive indicators to monitor participation, benefits, the effectiveness of gender equality strategies, and changes in gender relations.
11. Apply the above information and analysis throughout the program/project cycle.

The interpretation one brings to the data collected through gender analysis turns on one's values and political beliefs - whether liberal, traditionalist, marxist-feminist, socialist, etc - and will shape the strategies recommended for bringing change. These steps can be followed as a mechanical process by the researcher or development practitioners in relative isolation with very little political engagement with the communities concerned. Alternatively – if one takes seriously gender justice and the recognition of women's human rights - the data and analysis can be developed collaboratively with men and women in the communities concerned, and provide an opportunity for collective empowerment of the community and of that members concerned, involving both the process of making meaning through research to opportunities to collectively demand their rights.

Evolution of feminist analyses of development discourse and practice

Since the 1970s, there has been ongoing engagement by feminists and women's rights activists with the prevailing development approaches, providing both critical comment of the dominant development approaches and promoting alternative development approaches that would advance social justice, and specifically gender justice. As more women's rights activists and feminists join this dialogue - including historically marginalised, rural women, and women from/in the global south - the critiques of dominant development approaches and the proposals for development alternative have become more diverse and nuanced.

The evolution of feminist discourse around women, gender and development has two - often interwoven - strands: it is both (i) a conversation among feminists - the so-called intra-feminist disputes - to deepen the analysis of gender inequality and gender injustice around the world, bringing in ever more diverse voices and experiences to inform the debate and broaden our understanding of the forms and shapes of oppressions, and (ii) a critical voice that seeks to highlight the impact of mainstream development approaches on women and gender relations, with a view to promoting more gender-aware development

policy and practice at the local, national and international levels.

The intra-feminist conversation: from WID, WAD, GAD, to WCD

For the duration of the colonial period until the mid-1970s development policies and programmes primarily addressed women in their reproductive role. Within male-dominated western development agencies, the notion of the ideal woman – centred on a role as wife and mother – framed the welfare strategies targeted at Third World women living in poverty. The *welfare* approach targeted development aid at bringing improved homemaking, nutrition, and family planning practices.

The first feminist critiques of the dominant modernization development emerged in the 1970s. It was a confluence of two influences: the dominant discourse and practice of modernization, and an upsurge of feminism – the second wave - in the West.¹³

It critiqued the prevailing aid approaches for its western-centrism, for treating women as passive beneficiaries of development, locked into reproductive roles without any production responsibilities. The *Women in Development* (WID) critique drew on the seminal 1970s work of Ester Boserup¹⁴ in which she argues that women are left out development - in their capacity as producers - because of planners' ignorance about and the invisibility of women's economic roles. Proponents of the WID approach highlighted the propensity of the dominant modernisation approach to perpetuate the existing gender roles within the patriarchal state and the family -instead of promoting individual woman's autonomy. While WID was uncritical of the concept of "development" as "modernization," it was still considered threatening and unpopular by many governments and the development aid organisations of the day. Its main concern was to maximise "third world" women's access to the modern sector.

As early as the mid-1970s, the WID approach was critiqued by both neo-marxist feminists as well as third world (or southern) feminists. The Women and Development (WAD) approach emerged as a neo-marxist critique by arguing that third world women have always been integrated into development - not excluded, but rather exploited by global capitalism. WAD proponents added a class analysis to the feminist debate on development, noting also that both southern men and women are exploited by global

13 "First-wave feminism refers to a period of feminist activity during the nineteenth and early twentieth century in the United Kingdom and the United States. It focused on legal inequalities, and primarily on gaining women's right to vote. The term first-wave was coined retroactively in the 1970s. The women's movement then, focusing as much on fighting lived (unofficial) inequalities as legal ones, acknowledged its predecessors by calling itself second-wave feminism." See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First-wave_feminism

14 See Boserup (1970) *Women's Role in Economic Development*.

capital.

Both the WID and WAD approaches were critiqued by proponents of the *gender and development* (GAD) approach. To start, it criticized the WID approach (i) for homogenizing and stereotyping 'Third World' women as poor, illiterate and subordinate to and uniformly exploited by men, (ii) for not problematizing "modernisation as development," (iii) for failing to take account of class and nations hierarchies, (iv) for failing to account of difference between western and TW women and assuming an un-problematized notion of global sisterhood, and (v) for centring sex equality as "development." GAD called not only for women to be integrated into development but for development initiatives to transform unequal gender/social relations and empower women – and to not reinforce existing inequalities.

The GAD critique of the women and development approach (WAD) approach centred on their privileging class over gender in its explanation of women's

exploitation by global capitalism while it skirts over women's exploitation under patriarchy, and failing to acknowledge that (southern) men also exploit and benefit from women's domestic labour. GAD calls for a socialist state to take on the burden of social reproduction (historically carried by women) but acknowledges that its success hinges on receptivity of development institutions to participatory planning and gender transformation. Thus, the GAD analyses sets the stage for the emergence of "gender mainstreaming" as an approach to development practice.

Most recently - since about 2000 - the inclusion of more feminist voices from the global south raised awareness of an underlying assumption in earlier gender and development discourses that the "third world woman" is a perpetual victim of "culture." Instead, the emergence of the *women, culture and development* (WCD) approach has resurrected the possibility of women's agency by promoting an approach to culture (and gender relations) as "lived experience." Informed by scholarship in cultural studies, its adherents sees culture as subject to challenge, negotiation and change instead of being a set of immutable social relations between men and women. Culture as lived experience allows focus on the interlinkages between production and reproduction and allows for new avenues for development - and gender relations to emerge. It also makes visible women's ability to affect change - that is, women are seen as having agency.

What is poverty?

There are three different views on what constitutes poverty. From the *income perspective*, a person is poor only when her income falls below that which is necessary to buy a specific amount of food. This income level is usually specified. From the *basic needs perspective*, a person is poor when she is deprived of the basic elements that will allow her to fulfil her human needs like food, clothing, employment, health and education, and so forth. From the *capability perspective*, a person is poor when she lacks the basic capabilities to function, including physical needs like clothing, food, health, and shelter as well as social aspects like the ability to participate in community decision-making, for example.

The WCD approach is non-western in origin and focus. "Development" seen as a colonial and post-colonial cultural imposition. Drawing on 'post-development' thought, feminists located in the WCD framework, fault WID, WAD and GAD adherents for not taking culture seriously, and always seeing southern women as victims of their cultures and without agency. WCD proponents argue the need to take seriously the voices of grassroots women activists and third world scholars, and to mainstream a focus on culture in gender and development analysis and practice.

Intersection of a feminist critique and approaches to development

In this section we briefly list the different approaches to development and how mainstream development incorporated elements of the feminist critiques of development.

Combatting poverty

Anti-poverty approaches were implemented from the mid-1970s onwards. This approach was implemented in response to critiques of the assumption that development will trickle-down to the poor with increased modernization of developing country economies. This critique prompted a shift to a "basic needs" approach to development, with the debate focussed on what constitutes a basic need.

The basic needs approach concentrated only on productive roles of women, and development inputs were focussed on supporting skills development for women - with a view to increase their productivity - increase their income-generating capacity. Few governments supported this approach and it was left to NGOs to implement with their limited resources. The emphasis on assisting poor women meet their practical gender needs - food, shelter, etc - by earning an income through small-scale income-generating projects.

Improving efficiency

In the late 1970s and 1980s, feminists argued for the inclusion of gender perspective in development policy-making and practice on the basis that it would enhance *efficiency* in the deployment of human (economic) resources. As women constitute roughly half the population in most countries, any development policy and intervention that ignores the potential contributions women can make to development is likely to undermine efforts to grow the national economy. Thus, the argument goes, for developing countries and their economies to grow, women's economic contribution is needed. This

approach defined equity in economic terms, and women's participation in the economy was seen as gender equity. Its major shortcoming is that it ignores that women can be - and often are – integrated into the economy on highly unequal terms. In a period of economic stabilization and structural adjustment in the 1970s, governments relied on women's triple roles - as producers, providing care in the home, and participation in community development - and assumed an elasticity of women's time where it would fill the care gaps left by declining social services. The efficiency argument remained firmly rooted within the neoliberal model of development and offered no critique of the conception of development as economic growth.

In the 1970s a number of developed and developing country governments created women's ministries or focal points - often reporting directly to presidential offices - to ensure that women benefit from development projects and have better access to development inputs like land and (micro-)credit schemes and the like. These initiatives were trying to respond to the evidence that women had little to no access to production inputs - like land, credit, etc - and that their poverty became progressively feminised. Globally, third world women had become the face of poverty.

Mainstreaming gender

The 1970s strategies of integrating women into development by establishing separate women's units or women's programmes within state and development institutions had made slow progress by the mid-1980s. Hence, development organisations and government identified the need for system-wide institutional change in order to address unequal gender relations and advance towards gender justice.

In the period post-1985, more international development agencies and local organisations took on the challenge to *systematically* bring a gender perspective to all aspects of the institutions' policies and activities, through building gender capacity and accountability. Thus responsibility for the implementation of gender policies and programming became diffused across the organisational structure, rather than being concentrated in a small central unit.

Gender mainstreaming emerges from the GAD project to understand the (re)production of gender ideologies and unequal power relations in all spheres and levels of the development sector, and to design strategies that would mitigate the (unconscious) reproduction of gender-based discrimination - both within development institutions and the way they practice development. This shift created a widespread need for gender training, the introduction of incentive structures to reward efforts on gender, and the development of gender-specific operational checklists and guidelines. While gender mainstreaming

initially found limited support, some governments eventually declared their intentions to mainstream a gender perspective into the national policies and programmes. Technically, *everyone* became responsible for ensuring a gender perspective was integrated into all development programmes.

With the benefit of hindsight, critiques of gender mainstreaming emerged, noting that the emphasis on mainstreaming took away funds and resources for gender focal points and advisors and gender-specific projects, and led to a disappearance of gender issues and concerns in many organizations. The main conclusion was that integrating a gender perspective must have the support and involvement of senior management, who must also be accountable for the results of their development initiatives.

Gender budgeting

In stressing the politics of development and who controls it, feminist advocates helped bring pressure and influence for governments to include women's constituencies in participatory planning and budgeting processes, with the view that it would lead to more gender-aware budgets in the different departments, at all levels of government. Gender-aware budgets would, it was hoped, generate practices where public spending would consider the impact on budgeting decisions on gender-relations and not (in)advertently reinforce gender inequalities. However, while gender budgeting could potentially have advanced the practice of democracy and more equitable redistribution of state resources to social programme, it has ended up as technical exercises performed with the participation of gender experts within government and little political engagement with women and men in civil society. As a consequence, gender budgeting has not had any particularly profound social outcomes.

Advancing a human development approach: Seeing development as freedom, agency of women

The feminist critique shows how mainstream development discourse and practice responded positively to a gender agenda - sometimes by only paying lip service and appropriating the languages of change - and yet diluted its capacity for deeper and more profound social transformation. Many argued that feminism became conscripted into and diluted by neo-liberal discourse and that the feminist struggle - as one against unequal gender relations - was diluted and lost its political bite. Behind this dilution is the growing gap between "gender" and "feminism," and the proliferation of statements like "I am a gender expert but not a feminist." The growth of "gender training" is identified as one of the key culprits in the de-politicisation of gender mainstreaming. The post-Beijing era, with its need for reporting led to the professionalisation and bureaucratisation of the gender equality struggle, creating many "gender experts", "gender specialists" and "gender consultants," swallowing up any notion of a "gender activist"

under the de-politicised rubric of “expert” and “consultant.” On the other hand, the use and proliferation of gender concepts also placed strain and pressure on old patriarchal norms and values, and today larger numbers of people are confronted by questions about discriminatory social practices, gender identity and gender inequality.¹⁵

The feminist debate and critique of how “gender” has been domesticated within mainstream development discourse and practice has led some feminists to calling for the return to a rights-based approach to development and a call for “women’s rights” and “women’s empowerment.”

In the post-2000 period the works of Nobel Laureate economist Amartya Sen has led to a re-visioning of the concept of development as “human development,” in which “economic growth” becomes its servant. The human development approach has become the leading alternative to the conventional economic frameworks for thinking about poverty, inequality, social justice and human development. Human development is regarded as synonymous with the increased capabilities of what people can be and they can do in order to live a “good life” From a gender perspective, the human development approach stresses the enhanced capabilities and agency of women. The expansion of women's capabilities - especially the increased ability to claim rights (or “entitlements”) from the state as well as other actors like family members - enhances women's own freedom and well-being as well as the lives of others. Women is seen to have the greatest stake in advancing human development.

Feminist philosopher Martha Nussbaum embraces the human development approach and takes a strong stand for gender justice within the family, which is seen as a key source of gender oppression. However, in the interest of gender equity, she insists on the importance of specifying the list of capabilities that would constitute a good life and that would be the human development goals.

The main success of the human development approach is its adoption by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the design and use of the Human Development Index (HDI) to annually rate governments’ and nations’ progress in advancing human development in their countries. These HDI ratings are increasingly influencing governments responses to the development needs of their respective populations.

In the next section we examine more closely the human development approach - and specifically the capabilities notion - and the extent to which it may or may not be a development approach that advances

15 See Josephine Ahikire, 2008, “Vulnerabilities of Feminist Engagement and the Challenge of Developmentalism in the South: What Alternatives?” in IDS Bulletin 39, No 6, pp28-32

A human development approach: Building people's capabilities

Speaking in Cape Town in 2001, feminist economist Diane Elson argued for a shift in approaches to measuring economic policy success away from the pro-occupation with “optimality” - that is, maximising output - to one that is more directly focussed on *distribution* and people's *access* to the things that constitute “a good life.” She made a plea “For an Emancipatory Socio-Economics,” noting:

As is now abundantly clear, neither the project of national development nor the neoliberal project of global consumer choice has adequately fulfilled the hope for the substantial reduction of poverty and inequality. There is accumulating evidence that things got worse in the neoliberal era of the 80s and 90s, compared to the 50s, 60s, and 70s. Growth rates were lower and inequality widened. But even in the golden age, wealth and power were concentrated in the hands of a few; women were treated as dependents of men; and indigenous people were marginalised.”¹⁶

Elson argues for a fundamental rethink of “the economy” to include the social reproductive aspects of life – the reproduction of life itself – which conventional economic frameworks routinely take for granted while they focus on production and how to “measure it, increase it, optimise it.”¹⁷ In essence, what Elson and other feminist economists call for is a gendered approach to understanding the way the economy works, one that takes proper account of the interlinkages between reproductive spaces of unpaid work - e.g. in the home where women take care of children and the elderly, and the community work - and that of the productive space where work is paid - and where men predominate and women's work is undervalued. A proper account is important for two reasons:

The first is that the inputs of unpaid work and outputs of care are very important for human well-being. Too much unpaid work and too little care both jeopardise the possibility of living a good life. The second is that though the unpaid care economy is outside the production boundary, its operation has implications for what goes on inside the production boundary. Its operations affect the quantity and quality of labour supplied to production and the quantity and quality of goods demanded from production. Its operations affect the stability of the social framework in which market and state are embedded.”

¹⁶ Elson, D, 2001, “For an Emancipatory Socio-Economics,” Draft paper prepared for the discussion at the UNRISD meeting on **The Need to Rethink Development Economics**, 7-8 September 2001, Cape Tow, South Africa, p4.

¹⁷ Elson 2001, *ibid*, p5.

From diverse contexts, development experience shows that **not** taking account of the role and impact of gender will most likely produce economic and social policies - and shape development strategies and practices - with the undesired effect of reinforcing existing unequal gender relations.

Drawing on human development and feminist approaches, Elson argues for a *different* development project, one less focused on the abstract idea of the “national economy” or even the “household” and instead more concerned with the “individual” and his/her rights . This different development project should be about the “emancipation of individual human beings from the constraints that prevent them from living a 'good life.'”¹⁸ Fundamentally then, such a different development project would be alert to the impact on women as well as the relations between men and women, taking care to not reinforce existing inequalities between men and women - including in the home - and preventing women from “living a good life.”

The guiding principle of human development is that *people come first*. A human development approach is therefore, by extension, a gender-aware approach to development practice. Proponents of this approach recognise that women are historically the most disadvantaged and have the strongest stake in human development. Thus, only when the lives of poor women - predominantly in the global South - has improved significantly can we judge human development as adequate.

Further, as noted earlier, economic growth must become a means for achieving human development. Economic growth should be in the interest of furthering human development, and not the kind of growth that serves the rich and further impoverishes the poor.¹⁹

Thus, the key principles of human development are that it:

- must develop people’s capabilities to lead creative and fulfilling lives;
- should be the primary goal for economic growth processes;
- must transform gender, class, race and other power relations that pose barriers to the human development of all people;
- must not damage the environment; and
- must ensure adequate and sustainable livelihoods for the poor, especially women.

¹⁸ Elson, *ibid*.

¹⁹ United Nations Development Programme, 1997, “Human development to eradicate poverty,” in Human Development Report 1997, pp2-12.

From “human rights” to entitlements” and “capabilities”

Advocates of the human development approach stress the need to develop human capabilities and empower people to use those capabilities to participate fully in the development process. Human development covers all aspects of human need, from production processes and the need to create jobs, to political freedoms and the ability to participate in the political process and methods of government, to basic and non-basic human needs, and applied as much to people in developing and developed countries - or, the global south and north - respectively.

Amartya Sen's capabilities framework has become the leading alternative to the conventional economic frameworks for thinking about poverty, inequality, social justice and human development.²⁰ Social justice is understood to mean the achievement of a “fair” society where past injustices, rights violations and social inequalities are redressed. However, the women's movement and feminists argue that social justice struggles have often overlooked the specific and wider gender injustice or discrimination faced by women. They highlight the need ensure that efforts to address injustice - through human rights measures, or economic and social policies - are informed by an understanding of gender inequalities.

At the core of the capabilities approach is the argument that people have fundamental entitlements – or human rights. In Sen's formulation, these rights are comprehensive and covers both claims against the state as well as legally sanctioned claims against fellow citizens, including (i) rights to inherited and acquired assets (like health, strength, skills, and property), (ii) rights to use these assets to produce for one's own consumption or for sale, and (iii) the rights to goods, services and financial transfers from the state.²¹

Entitlements are the bundle of goods a person can end up with, depending on how he/she exercise his/her rights. Entitlements are independent of what people may express as their (life-style) preferences, as life style “preferences” can be adaptive preferences or choices that people settle for within the context of unequal social conditions. In too many cases, women's life-style “preferences” are distorted expressions that result from living in socially unjust circumstances - households, communities, societies - and where women have learnt to downscale their expectations. Hence, human rights entitlements provide better bases for social justice claims, including claims for gender equality.

20 Sen's ideas have their conceptual roots in varying places, among others: in Adam Smith's notions of “necessities,” Marx's preoccupation with human freedom and emancipation, as well as in Aristotle's analysis of “human flourishing.” See David Clarke 2006.

21 Elson *ibid*, p.11.

Sen's notion of "entitlement failure" allows one to grasp the factors that may impede people's claims to entitlements (which would have increased their capabilities). Thus "entitlement failure" occurs when people cannot gather the resources necessary to live a well-functioning human life because they could neither produce it for themselves or buy it from the market, nor exercise a claim against their families and communities or - fundamentally - against the state to provide the resources they need.²²

The capabilities approach challenges us to help create environments that build people's capabilities – that is, their opportunities to lead the lives of their choice and elevate their functionings (or, what they can be and can do (including exercise claims against the state) - as a development goal. It allows us to examine the individuals' capacity for exercising choice - of what to do and how to be - within a context of real or substantive choice. This approach also recognises people as active agents in shaping their ideas of a good quality life, and claiming that as a right. In recognising people's agency, Sen does not endorse a particular list of capabilities, arguing instead that through democratic deliberation, citizens should decide the core capabilities that would for them constitute a dignified life and just society:

"The problem is not with listing important capabilities, but with insisting on one predetermined canonical list of capabilities, chosen by theorists without any general social discussion or public reasoning. To have such a fixed list, emanating entirely from pure theory, is to deny the possibility of fruitful public participation on what should be included."^{23 24}

Gender equality, social justice and the capabilities approach

Feminist philosopher Martha Nussbaum argues that Sen's approach does not go far enough²⁵ and that - if we are serious about advancing social justice and gender justice - we must set out what these

22 Capabilities can refer both to a person's ability to achieve a particular "functioning" - where a "functioning" is described as an achievement of that person or what he/she manages to do or be - and, more broadly, to indicate the combination or collection of achievements that a person can realise in a lifetime. Thus "a functioning is an achievement, and a capability is the ability to achieve. Thus, the functionings are directly related to the kind of life people actually lead, whereas capabilities are the opportunities people have to lead lives of their choosing." See Nanak Kakwani (2006) "What is Poverty?" UNDP International Poverty Centre. Available at <http://www.undp-povertycentre.org/pub/IPCOnePager22.pdf>

23 Sen 2004: 77, quoted in Clarke 2006.

24 Clark (2003) applied the approach to investigate perceptions of well-being - a good life - among the urban and rural poor in South Africa. These studies showed that most people have a common vision of a good life that correlates with that proposed by Nussbaum and - indirectly - by Sen.

25 Other critics of the CA argue that Sen goes too far in insisting that certain capabilities are core rights or entitlements in light of disagreement on what constitutes a "good life," and the potential for differences at the interpersonal level in the weighting of one capability against another. Further, the information requirements of the capability approach is high and in some cases the data/indicators will not be available.

fundamental entitlements and freedoms may contain. She sets out a list of 10 capabilities that she regards as central to "living a good life" and asserts that any society that does not guarantee all its citizens these minimum capabilities, cannot claim to be a fully just society, irrespective of its level of material wealth. She further argues for a *hierarchy* of freedoms,²⁶ as some freedoms - like the freedom of industry to pollute the environment - will need to be constrained for the greater good. She sees public participation and deliberation as important for setting out a central list in *more precise terms*, and for deciding a strategy for *implementation* of such a list in specific national contexts, societies or social groupings:

"I shall argue, however, that the capabilities approach will supply definite and useful guidance, and prove an ally in the pursuit of sex equality, only if we formulate a definite list of the most central capabilities, even one that is tentative and revisable, using capabilities so defined to elaborate a partial account of social justice, a set of basic entitlements without which no society can lay claim to justice" (2003:36).

For Nussbaum, the capabilities approach is superior to other approaches to social justice - including the rights-based development approaches - particularly when one considers the problem of addressing gender-based inequalities. Adherents of the capability approach argue that while the human rights and capabilities approaches are closely related, the capabilities approach takes a firmer stand about how rights can be secured for people - rather than seeing an abstract right that might be recognised but is not implemented.

Adherents of the capabilities approach highlight its focus on the state as well as the private, non-state

26 Nussbaum(2000: 17-18) sets out a list of 10 capabilities which she regards as central requirements for a life lived with dignity:

1. Life - being able to the end of the expected length of a human life;
2. Bodily health - being able to have good health;
3. Bodily integrity - being able to move freely from place to place without the threat of violence, and have opportunities for sexual pleasure;
4. Senses, imagination and thought - being able to imagine, reason and think with freedom of expression and religious exercise guaranteed;
5. Emotions - being able to have attachments to people and things, to love those who love and care for us, without fear and anxiety;
6. Practical reason - being able to engage in critical reflection and conceptualise what is good ;
7. Affiliation - being able to engage in social interactions, live with others, form friendships, and being treated with dignity and regarded as a human being of equal worth to others;
8. Other species - being able to express a concern for nature;
9. Play - being able to laugh and enjoy recreation;
10. Political and material control over one's environment - being able to exercise political choice, being able to hold property, and seek employment on an equal basis as others.

spheres, which is especially pertinent for advancing gender justice and equality between the sexes in contexts where women may suffer discrimination within the family as well as within (cultural and religious) communities. For Harcourt, the capabilities approach gives deeper insight into what is needed for women to build their fundamental capabilities within the family, community formations and society at large:

“The capability of poor women to function requires not only individual freedom to act and to know and to seek justice, but also the supportive social, cultural and political environment. Conversely, it is this environment that determines the capacity to act. Well-being for women is only possible if all conditions of combined capabilities are met, within themselves, the family the community and the larger environment” (2001:4).

Nevertheless, while it has historically neglected the private sphere from scrutiny, the human rights discourse continues to play an important role as: (i) it asserts that we have justified claims to be treated with dignity and respect (especially where we have not been); (ii) that such claims are based on a call for justice and may be especially pertinent where some individuals do not have a political voice; and (iii) it highlights the individual's right to independence and freedom of choice.

Conclusion

The review of the feminist debates on development is clear on the need to include a gender perspective and - more importantly - to implement development programmes that recognise - and draw on - women's agency to develop solutions to address the inequalities they face. Rather than treating women merely as victims in need of assistance, women (and men) must also be subjects who participate actively in bringing about social change and gender equality. Women's agency and their increased capacities to claim their rights is key to any strategy to advance social justice and gender equality.

While the feminist critique laments the dilution of a gender *transformation* agenda there is nevertheless evidence that some gains having been made as a consequence of the increased exposure to gender-related concepts. Internationally, there is increased recognition of:

- the centrality of gender equality to development
- women's rights as human rights
- gender violence as a human rights issue

These issues gained recognition in large measure as a consequence of being raised by feminists in debates about the development process and exchanges about what constitutes development from a feminist perspective. However, what the feminist critiques of the engagement with development discourses also makes clear, is that the scope for more profound social transformation is huge and largely unmet still.

Development projects no matter how large or small are challenged to not only address the gender agenda as a category for data collection and analysis, but to also press forward on the political issues of gender inequality and social practices that are oppressive not only to women but also the men (who often enforce them). As both the human development and feminist advocates insist, development must be about bringing about transformed societies in which men and women have increased capacities - to live a life of dignity and one in which they have higher capacities in what they can do and what they can be, including being empowered to claim their rights from the state as well as their more immediate communities and household members.

Appendix 1: Matrix on theoretical and policy approaches to gender and development²⁷

Approach	Period	Basic elements	Critique/comment	Feminist critique
Welfare	Colonial period-1975	Bring women into development as better mothers, their most important role. Emphasis on reproductive role, improved homemaking, nutrition, family planning.	Women as passive beneficiaries of development; focus on reproductive role. Often inappropriately western-centric. The welfare approach was an extension of liberal ideologies of relief aid and addressed the needs of extremely vulnerable groups. Within male dominated western development agencies, the notion of the ideal woman – centred on a role as wife and mother – framed the welfare strategies targeted at Third World women living in poverty.	Criticized by WID adherents in the 1970s for its paternalistic perpetuation of existing gender roles, the patriarchal state and family, rather than the individual woman's autonomy.
Women in Development (WID) (Equity)	1975-1985	Argues that women are left out of development because of planners' ignorance and invisibility of women's economic roles. Influence of Ester Boserup, <i>Women's Role in Economic Development</i> (1970). If full information available (e.g. sex-disaggregated data), then policy makers will correct omissions and women will become active participants in development. Development seen as something all can benefit from. Household level of analysis;	WID was informed by two currents in the 1970s: the dominant discourse and practice of modernization, and an upsurge of feminism – the first wave - in the West. Based on state top-down intervention giving women political and economic autonomy by reducing inequality with men. Its main concern was to maximise "third world" women's access to the modern sector. Uncritical of the concept of "development" as "modernization" yet considered threatening and unpopular by many governments and development aid organisations.	WID was developed by liberal feminists. Drawing on a liberal political paradigm, it assumes formal equity (through legal rights and women's inclusion in development projects) would lead to better quality of life for – or "development" of - women. Was roundly criticized for (i) homogenizing and stereotyping 'Third World' women as poor, illiterate and subordinate to and exploited by men, (ii) for not problematizing the integration of women in development, and (iii) failing to take account of class and nations hierarchies, (iv) failing to account for difference between western and TW women and assuming an un-problematized notion of global sisterhood, and (v) for centring sex equality as "development"

²⁷ This framework was first development by Nancy Hafkin and Ineke Buskens in November 2007 and then expanded/updated by Natasha Primo in Feb 2009.

Women and Mid-Development 1970's (WAD)	<p>Emerged as neo-Marxist critique of WID. Claimed that women were always an integral part of the development system, exploited by it.</p>	<p>Argues that women are integrated into development rather than excluded. It is exploited by global capitalism. It also draws the develops the parallel argument of the TW's underdevelopment within global capitalism.</p>	<p>WAD argued that the class interests and national alliances of WID proponents precluded them for seeing the “real” relationship of TW women to development. WAD inserted a class dimension into the feminist debates and noted also that global capitalism is also exploitative of Third World men.</p>
Gender and Mid-development 1970s on (GAD) (Social Relations)	<p>Critique of liberal focus of WID that tended to see women as separate and homogeneous. Focus on socially constructed basis of differences between women and men and emphasizes the need to challenge existing gender roles and relations. Stresses gendered power relations that perpetuate inequities. Gender relations are both conflictual and collaborative- involving bargaining and negotiation. Gender is embedded in a web of other relations (e.g. race, age, class, ethnicity). Women are subordinate in market-led production and distribution- thus bringing in market and the state. Women are not left out of development but integrated on unequal terms.</p>	<p>Challenged benign, universalistic WID vision of development. Attempted to locate gender relations and women's subordination within processes unleashed by market-led development. Implicit is need for redistribution of power and resources to meet goal of development (defined as human well being). GAD aims to not only integrate women into development but push for development initiatives to transform unequal gender/social relations and empower women – and to not reinforce existing inequalities. GAD calls for a socialist state to take on the burden of social reproduction (historically carried by women). Success hinges on receptivity of development institutions to participatory planning and gender transformation. GAD analyses sets the stage for the emergence of “gender mainstreaming” as an approach.</p>	<p>GAD proponents criticized WAD representatives of privileging class over gender though its explanation of women's exploitation into the workings of global capitalism (rather than patriarchy and failing to acknowledge that men also exploit and benefit from women's domestic labour).</p> <p>In turn, Third World – or Southern – feminists sees – and criticizes GAD proponents as continuing to work within a liberal framework and homogenizing women in developing countries – drawing on Western ethnocentric assumptions of the content of relations between men and women in other – non-Western – societies.</p>
Anti-poverty Post-1975	<p>Less emphasis on equity, more on growth and basic needs. Aim to ensure poor women increase their productivity. Women's poverty seen as a problem of underdevelopment, not subordination. Emphasis on practical gender needs, for women to earn an income particularly in small-scale income-generating projects.</p>	<p>Developed in line with a critique of the assumption that development will trickle-down to the poor with increased modernization of developing country economies. The critique led to shift to a “basic needs” approach to development, with the debate focussed on what constitutes a basic need.</p>	<p>Concentrated only on productive roles of women. Few governments supported it; thus it was left to NGOs with limited resources. Poor women were isolated as a category. The development inputs were concentrated on income-generation strategies and skills development for women</p>

Empowerment	Since 1975, recent resurgence	Arose out of failure of WID approach; based on Third World feminist writing and grassroots organizations. See women's subordination not only as generally male in origin, but also of colonial and neocolonial origins. Aim is to achieve strategic needs for women largely through bottom-up mobilization around practical gender needs.	Emphasis on Third World and women's self-reliance challenging to many donor governments. Led largely by voluntary organizations with limited funding.	Epitomised by the work of the DAWN collective, the empowerment approach centres the Third World woman, and her desire to be free of race, class, gender and national inequalities. It privileges the TW women's basic needs and basic rights. DAWN criticized the marginalisation of basic/practical needs - and the privileging of equality or strategic gender needs – that makes TW women's survival more difficult. It recognises diverse feminisms that are united against a common opposition to gender oppression. Feminist discourse analysts note the upsurge of post-structuralist analysis - emerging from western feminist anxiety about the centring of the Third World Woman in feminist development discourse, and the opening of the discourse to other forms of oppression
Efficiency	Mid 1980s	For developing countries to grow, women's economic contribution is needed. Defines equity in economic terms.	Approach favored by World Bank. Based also on WID assumptions, this development discourse held that economies and development would be more efficient if women's resources – especially their labour – are used to full potential (that is, if women are not excluded because of "backward" cultural/patriarchal norms.) Participation in the economy and equity was seen as synonymous. Rooted firmly within the neoliberal model of development. With no critique of how development is conceptualised.	In a period of economic stabilization and structural adjustment, relied on women's triple roles and elasticity of women's time to fill gaps left by declining social services. Women's labor is not inelastic!

Gender mainstreaming	Post 1985	An organizational strategy to bring a gender perspective to all aspects of an institution's policy and activities through building gender capacity and accountability.	Emphasis on mainstreaming took away funds and resources for gender focal points and advisors, led to a disappearance of gender issues and concerns in many organizations. Conclusion that gender and development must have the support and involvement of management, with accountability for results. <i>Key now seen as mainstreaming in the planning phase at project level.</i>	As a practice, gender mainstreaming emerged from the GAD project to understand the (re)production of gender ideologies and unequal power relations.
Gender Planning (Moser)	1989 on	Emphasis on women's triple roles: productive, reproductive, community-based. Women's practical vs. women's strategic needs. Schematization of policy approaches to women and development. Basic message: need to use development interventions to transform unequal gender relations.	Doesn't address institutions (e.g. market and state) that perpetuate gender inequality (household focus). Originally was based on development planning approach (top down) but more recently has been adapted to incorporate participatory gender planning.	Critiqued for being strong on gender roles but light on gender relations. Fails to provide an understanding of the social processes through which women experience subordination and poverty. Was critiqued by the empowerment approach for the hierarchisation of practical and strategic gender needs, and the dismissal of concerns with practical gender needs as being less feminist. The empowerment approach rehabilitated the importance of practical/basic needs as part of the TW woman's (feminist) struggle for freedom from oppression.
Feminist economics (non-neo-classical)	Post 1990	Redefine efficiency to include social reproduction and human maintenance (women's unpaid work). Emphasis on politics of development and who controls it. Importance of women's constituencies in promoting gender-aware development policy.	Major impact on development planning has been in pressure and influence to include women's constituencies in participatory planning.	

Gender, culture and development (multi-culturalism). Part of the "post-development" discourse	Since 2000	Non-western origins and focus. Development seen as a colonial and post-colonial largely cultural imposition. Western cultural domination leads to social dislocation and unsustainable development. Women had more power in pre-colonial era. Stress value of indigenous knowledge and tradition. Recognize, however, that not all traditions are good for women (e.g. FGM). Need to look at impact of race, colonialism, globalization and global inequities on women. Need to take voices of third world scholars, women's grassroots activists into account, to mainstream cultural and gender in development.	Technology variant is also a critique of modernization as cultural domination (Vandava Shiva): modern technology is inappropriate for the third world. Community-based technology and indigenous knowledge are preferred.	Drawing on 'post-development' thought, feminists located in the Women, Culture and Development frame, fault WID, WAD and GAD adherents for not taking culture seriously, and always seeing TW women as victims, without agency and seeing culture as a set of static relations without trying to understand culture as a more complex 'lived experience'.
Development Post as freedom, agency of women	2000	Based on writings of Nobel Laureate economist Amartya Sen, emphasis on agency of women, capabilities of women, women as most important element in development. Sen supports access to ICT for change agents. He sees women's leadership as a crucial element in development and notes that the expansion of women's capabilities not only enhances women's own freedom and well-being, but also has many other effects on the lives of all.	Martha Nussbaum, a close follower of Sen, emphasizes human capabilities, universal (not cultural) nature of patriarchy. She takes a strong stand for gender justice within the family, which is seen as a source of gender oppression.	

References

- Ahikire, M (2008) "Vulnerabilities of Feminist Engagement and the Challenge of Developmentalism in the South: What Alternatives?," IDS Bulletin Vol 39, Issue 6, p.28-33
- Boserup (1970), Women's Role in Economic Development. Earthscan Publications. Revised Edition 2007.
- Chakravarti, U (2008), Beyond the Mantra of Empowerment: Time to Return to Poverty, Violence and Struggle," IDS Bulletin Volume 39 Number 6 December 2008, p10-17.
- Clark, D. A. (2003), "Concepts and Perceptions of Human Well-Being: Some Evidence from South Africa," Oxford Development Studies, 31(2), 173-196.
- Clark, David A., (2006) "The Capability Approach: Its Development, Critiques and Recent Advances," Global Poverty Research Group, Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, UK. Available at <http://www.gprg.org/pubs/workingpapers/pdfs/gprg-wps-032.pdf>
- Cornwall A., J. Gideon, K. Wilson (2008) "Introduction: Reclaiming Feminism: Gender and Neoliberalism" IDS Bulletin Vol 39, Issue 6, pp 1-9.
- Cornwall, A (2007) "Revisiting the 'Gender Agenda,'" IDS Bulletin Volume 38 Number 2 March 2007, p69-78.
- Crocker, D. A. (1992), "Functioning and Capabilities: The Foundation of Sen's and Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era, (1995), Markers on the Way: The DAWN Debates on Alternative Development, p14.
- DFID (2007) Gender Equality at the Heart of Development, London: Department for International Development, www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/gender-equality.pdf (accessed 28 November 2009)
- Elson, D. (1992) 'Male Bias in Structural Adjustment', in H. Afshar and C. Dennis (eds), Women and Adjustment Policies in the Third World, New York: St Martin's.
- Elson, D. (2001), "For an Emancipatory Socio-Economics," Draft paper prepared for the discussion at the UNRISD meeting on The Need to Rethink Development Economics, 7-8 September 2001, Cape Town, South Africa. Available at <http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpPublications%29/03BA6A09BE6E42D8C1256BC900453D9B?OpenDocument>
- Global Development Research Centre, 'Gender Analysis Frameworks', <http://www.gdrc.org/gender/framework/framework.html> (Accessed 30 November 2009)
- Buskens, I & N. Hafkin (2007). "Theoretical/policy approaches to women/gender and development" Document produced as an input paper for the Acacia Gender Awareness Workshop held in Fez, Morocco on April 15-17. (unpublished paper).
- Harcourt, W (2001), "The capabilities approach for poor women: empowerment strategies towards gender equality, health and well-being," Available at <http://www.st-edmunds.cam.ac.uk/vhi/sen/papers/harcourt.pdf> (Accessed 30 November 2009).
- Huq Shireen P (2000), "Gender and Citizenship: What Does a Rights Framework Offer Women?" IDS Bulletin Vol 31 N 4, p74-82.

ILO/SEAPAT (nd), "Unit 1: A conceptual framework for gender analysis and planning," OnLine Gender Learning & Information Module" Available at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/asro/mdtmanila/training/unit1/plngaps1.htm> (Accessed 30 November 2009)

ILO/SEAPAT Online Gender Learning & Information Module, 'A conceptual framework for gender analysis and planning', <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/asro/mdtmanila/training/unit1/plngaps1.htm> (Accessed 30 November 2009)

International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 'Gender Analysis as a Development Research Tool', <http://www.gdrc.org/gender/framework/idrc-tool.html> (Accessed 30 November 2009)

Kakwani, N. (2006), " is poverty?" in One Pager No 22, UNDP International Poverty Centre, <http://www.undp-povertycentre.org/pub/IPCOnePager22.pdf> . (Accessed 30 November 2009)

Louise Chamberlain 2002, [Considerations for gender advocacy vis-à-vis ICT policy and strategy](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/ict2002/reports/Paper%20by%20Chamberlain.PDF). Paper prepared for Expert Group Meeting on "Information and communication technologies and their impact on and use as an instrument for the advancement and empowerment of women." Held in Republic of Korea, 11 - 14 November 2002. Available at <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/ict2002/reports/Paper%20by%20Chamberlain.PDF> (Accessed 30 November 2009)

Marianne Hill, (2003), "[Development As Empowerment](#)," [Feminist Economics](#), vol. 9(2-3), pages 117-135.

Miller V, L. VeneKlasen, L. and C. Clark (2005), "Rights-based Development: Linking Rights and Participation – Challenges in Thinking and Action," IDS Bulletin 36 Issue 1, p31-40.

Mohanty, A. Russo, and L. Torres (eds), *Third-world Women and the Politics of Feminism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mohanty, C. (1991) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', in C.T.

Moller Okin, S (1999) "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" Boston Review, <http://www.bostonreview.net/BR22.5/okin.html> (Accessed 30 November 2009)

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (1998), "My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post-Development, Reflexive Development" *Development and Change* Vol. 29 (1998), 343±373.

Nussbaum, M (2000), *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2003), "Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlement: Sen and Social Justice," *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3), 33-59.

Nussbaum, Martha C. (2000), *Women and Human Development: the Capabilities Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum's Development Ethic," *Political Theory*, 20(4), p584-612.

Overholt, Anderson, Cloud and Austin (1984) *Gender Roles in Development Projects: A Case Book*, 1984, Kumarian Press: Connecticut.

Parpart, Jane L., M. Patricia Connelly, and V. Eudine Barriteau (2000), Eds, Theoretical perspectives on Gender and Development. Ottawa: IDRC. Available at http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9419-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Robeyns, I. (2003), 'Sen's Capability Approach and Gender Inequality: Selecting Relevant Capabilities', *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3), 61-92.

Sen, A. (1981), *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sen, A. (1984), "The Right Not To be Hungry" in Fløistad, G. (ed) *Contemporary Philosophy: A New Survey*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Sen, A. K. (2004), "Capabilities, Lists and Public Reason: Continuing the Conversation," *Feminist Economics*, 10(3), pp77-80.

Sen, Amartya K. (1999), *Development As Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sen, G. (1996), "Gender, markets and states: a selective review and research agenda," *World Development* 24(5):pp. 821-9.

Sparr, P. (ed.) (1995) *Mortgaging Women's Lives: Feminist Critiques of Structural Adjustment*, London: Zed Books.

UNDP (1996), *Human Development Report 1996*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Development Programme (1997), "Human development to eradicate poverty," in *Human Development Report 1997*, pp2-12.

Vickers, J. (1991), "Impact of Structural Adjustment on Women," in *Women and the World Economic Crisis*, pp15-42.

Walters, B. (1995), "Engendering Macroeconomics: A Reconsideration of Growth Theory," *World Development* 23(11):pp. 1869-1882.

Warren, H. (2007) 'Using gender-analysis frameworks: theoretical and practical reflections' *Gender and Development* Vol. 15(2):187-198.

World Bank (2000), *Beyond Economic Growth: Meeting the Challenges of Global Development*. Available at <http://www.worldbank.org/depweb/beyond/beyond.htm>

World Bank Gender and Development Resources, 'Gender and Social Assessments/ Analyses', <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGENDER/0,,contentMDK:20260648~menuPK:489221~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:336868,00.html> (Accessed 9 Oct. 07)