

PN-AAX-960

IAN-51525

WOMEN AND THE FAMILY:
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON DEVELOPMENT

by

Sally Bould
University of Delaware

November 1982

Working Paper #13

Abstract: The traditional development model has been severely and effectively criticized by those who emphasize growth-with-equity as well as those who emphasize women-in-development. Both approaches aim to achieve greater equality; but in the former it is overall equality, and in the latter it is equality between men and women. This paper argues that the success of either approach depends upon the success of the other and that both require an appropriate family theory. The family, in its critical role in the articulation of the individual and the economy, must be fully understood in policy planning and program implementation. An appropriate family theory as well as an effective family policy is a necessary ingredient for the achievement of both kinds of equality. Previous development policies with inappropriate or no family theory have resulted in severe problems for families and, especially, for women and children. Past mistakes may require immediate attention to women who head families alone, but future policy should examine effective alternatives that bind men together with women in the task of providing for children.

About the Author: Sally Bould is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Delaware. Her major research interests are in the areas of social policy, poverty and the family. She is an associate editor of the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science and has published in that journal as well as the Journal of Marriage and the Family, the Journal of Applied Social Science and the American Journal of Economics and Sociology, among others.

- 1 -

WOMEN AND THE FAMILY: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON DEVELOPMENT

The traditional development model with its emphasis upon economic growth has, in the past decade, been severely criticized with respect to its negative effects upon the poor as well as its negative impact upon women. The first and second development decades not only have failed to achieve "economic take off," but have also failed to provide that improvement in the status of women which modernization is reputed to induce (Bussen, 1975). The push for growth and modernization in the Third World may have led to a deterioration of the economic position of women as well as a deterioration in the absolute economic situation of at least the poorer third of the population (Adelman, 1975; Griffin, 1978). Furthermore, evidence suggests that the poorest of the poor are disproportionately women heads of households and families (Buvinic and Youssef, 1978). One result of this negative impact of the development process has been a refocus of attention in development policy upon the poor (World Bank, 1975) as well as a mandate in the "Percy Amendment" to the Foreign Aid Act of 1976 to integrate women in the development process. Nevertheless, this new emphasis upon "women in development" suffers from a flaw similar to that of the traditional development model. Each treats the family only in a superficial way: the first because of naive assumptions concerning women in the family; the second by treating women independently of the family constellation.

TRADITIONAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY

The traditional development theory referred to here is that of growth based upon a Keynesian economic model involving state and private cooperation in the investment of capital aimed at the highest profit. While there are a number of technical economic presentations of this theory, the most popular and influential statement (Brookfield, 1975: 43) was by W. W. Rostow in his The Stages of Economic Growth (1961). More than any other early statement he discusses the non-technical implications of growth, yet he refers to women only once in a parenthetical remark about their full time duties in child care (1961: 91). His reference to the family occurs where he is discussing man's economic motivation and indicates that he is also "...concerned with his family...." (ibid., p. 149). Traditional development theory, then, when it dealt with the family at all, dealt with it under the assumptions of the idealized family model of Western industrialized societies, especially the United States during the 1950s.

This popular model of the 1950s involved a division of labor in which the wife in her expressive role was responsible for child care, cooking, housekeeping, and general nurturance while the husband in his instrumental role took responsibility for providing economic security. This division of labor within the family was assumed to be universal, and ethnographic research was interpreted to support the argument of universality (Zelditch, 1955). Hence, the traditional model of development included an implicit assumption that women in developing societies would be provided for by men. Often it was only men who were included in labor supply models. The traditional development theory, however, did indicate

an additional role for the wife: that of consumer (deWilde, 1967: 211). This was viewed as essential to the development of internal markets. Harnessing the economic motives and family responsibilities of men and linking them to consumer training among women was to provide the incentives for increased production and consumption that growth was thought to require (UNZALPI, 1970 cited in Rogers, 1980: 159). Matrilineal systems were viewed as violating this essential thrust of development and deliberate efforts were made to suppress them (Rogers, 1980: 125ff). Even the more recent emphasis on women in development has led to "women's projects" that in effect try to teach poor women in developing countries how to be better homemakers (ibid., p. 79ff). Such programs often appear to attract elite women who are interested in learning to make "proper wedding-type cakes" (Kromberg and Carr cited in Rogers, 1980: 92).

Traditional development theory, then, contained some very ethnocentric and naive assumptions. The first assumption was the viability of the family form where the man was the sole economic provider and the woman was the nurturer and homemaker, an assumption which feminist critics have effectively questioned for developed societies (Bernard, 1972; Chapman, 1976). The second assumption was that this division of labor between husband and wife was both natural and universal. Historical research suggests, however, that this division of labor within the family was true for a majority of Western families only for the post-war decades of prosperity and, of course, never among poor families.¹ A behavioral norm that prevailed for a few decades in the developed capitalist world can hardly be classified as natural or universal. The assumption was that where such a natural family form obviously did not exist, such as was the case among matrilineal societies, change could be superimposed, and the "right" family form created.

CRITICS OF TRADITIONAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY

The task of developing a more appropriate family theory is essential to the success of development policy, yet both the feminist and non-feminist critics of the traditional development theory have yet to develop one. The feminist critics have successfully attacked the Western ideology of the family, especially its assumptions that justified discrimination against women. The non-feminist critics have successfully attacked the ideology of growth, especially as it affects the poor. The former argue for a reduction of inequality between men and women, while the latter argue for a reduction of inequality in one of the "growth-with-equity" models.² While both approaches call attention to the importance of social factors in development (Dixon, 1978; Weaver, et al., 1978), the former often treats women as independent of the family³ while the latter virtually ignores it.⁴

The growth-with-equity approach, while presenting extensive documentation of growing poverty and inequality, fails to recognize that it is women who are alone with their minor dependents who are disproportionately the poorest of the poor. In contrast, the feminist approach has been criticized by Third World women at the 1975 World Conference held in

Mexico City during the International Women's Year (Nash and Safa, 1980) for ignoring critical problems of overall inequality. It is important that these two critical approaches join together to develop a combined attack upon the still-powerful traditional model and its assumptions. But they can do so only with a better developed theory of the family because it is the family that brings together the issues of inequality and the role of women.

The success of one of these new approaches depends inevitably upon the success of the other. In an effective policy of anti-discrimination, women would have equal access to the more secure non-agricultural jobs that guarantee some level of financial security: jobs in the primary labor market, steady jobs in the secondary labor market or government service. The implementation of such a policy, however, given that such jobs are not plentiful in developing countries, could lead to an increase in inequality because of the impact of the family. From the literature on successful job search, especially for blue collar jobs in the developed countries with loosely organized labor markets, the good job is found through friends and relatives already on the job (Doeringer, 1969). It is likely that men, who have these good jobs, would successfully recommend their wives, daughters, mothers and sisters to such posts. Some families, then, would be able to dramatically improve their standard of living, while other families could find their opportunities even more limited. Women who head families without men would be less likely to obtain these jobs. The anti-discrimination approach in the setting of inequality, high unemployment, and a scarcity of good jobs would still leave many women and their families among the poorest of the poor.

A highly successful growth with equity strategy would require a six percent growth rate and a radical redistribution so that the poorest twenty percent of families received more than ten percent of the total income (Griffin, 1978: 158). It would still fail to achieve equity between men and women, however, if that bottom twenty percent were predominantly women who were the sole support of their children. Even with equal wages, the inequality between men and women would remain due to the fact that women would still have to bear the disproportionate burden of the economic responsibility for children, not to mention the non-economic responsibilities.

TOWARD AN APPROPRIATE FAMILY THEORY

The development of an appropriate family theory is necessary for the success of both the women-in-development and the growth-with-equity approaches. An adequate family theory could serve to effectively integrate these two approaches. Such a theory is necessary to provide a basis for a family policy essential for overall development planning as well as for specific development projects. For the latter, specific family policies must be developed and designed by on-site investigation of the family in each location and/or ethnic group. While it is not possible here to lay out the entire spectrum of possibilities, it is necessary to present some theoretical generalizations that would indicate issues which need to be examined.

The literature available in the area of the family is large, diverse, and often contradictory. It appears necessary, however, to proceed toward developing generalizations that can be incorporated into a more adequate family theory. The focus will be on families in pre-industrial societies and families whose principal occupation is agricultural, since these families more closely approximate the traditional situation before the intrusion of modern western ideology.

The initial elements of a definition of the pre-industrial family would include "reciprocal economic obligations" and the "rights and duties of parenthood" (Stephens, 1963: 8). This definition must be modified to include the possibilities of economic obligations of a male kin and a non-biological parent. Families are the institution by which men and women are bound together to contribute labor toward the maintenance of the household and the children. In pre-industrial societies this bond of reciprocal economic obligations tends to derive its primary strength from the need of each sex for the productive labor of the other under a system of sex segregation. For example, in one area of rural Panama, the men grow the rice and the women process it for home consumption (Gudeman, 1978). The division of labor is such that a man needs a wife to process his rice just as she needs a husband to provide the raw agricultural produce for processing. These reciprocal needs and obligations create a balance between the need of the husband for the productive labor of his wife and the need of the wife for the productive labor of her husband; it is inappropriate for women to do men's work as well as for men to do women's work (Murdock, 1937; Levi-Strauss, 1956).

While the balanced nature of this reciprocity has been investigated by numerous observers since Arensberg (1937), Bossen (1975, 1982) has carried out a detailed economic analysis of the balance between the sexes in terms of hours of work, labor productivity, and cash values for the Maya-Quiche Indians of Guatemala. This balance may exist in interpersonal contexts ranging from husband-wife antagonism to cooperation and mutual respect; traditional systems, however, generally attach sufficient value to the wife's labor to provide for her effective bargaining in the relationship. Johnson and Johnson's analysis suggests that it is only where the woman's economic role is isolated from both her husband's role and other women's roles that sexual inequality is extreme (1975: 646). Even in a culture of male dominance such as that of the European peasant, the dominance of men is more myth than fact where the productive activity of the woman is essential. Rogers concludes that:

The two sex groups, in effect, operate with partially divergent systems of perceived advantages, values, and prestige, so that the members of each group see themselves as "winners" in respect to the other. Neither men nor women believe that the myth is an accurate reflection of the actual situation. However, each sex group believes (or appears to believe, so avoiding confrontation) that the opposite sex perceives the myth as reality with the result that each is actively engaged in maintaining the illusion that males are, in fact, dominant (1975: 729).

The result is a balance between the husband and wife roles and a stable family system operating within the context of the myth of male dominance.

Even in traditional systems with high divorce rates, reciprocal economic obligations require remarriage and a new bond between husband and wife. Economic obligations between kin and in-laws through complex marriage systems, involving a brideprice for example, provide the woman with alternative rights and obligations in the household of her male kin. This situation is found in Augila where one out of four marriages ends in divorce (Mason, 1975). In other cases of high divorce rates such as among the North Alaskan Eskimo (Burch, 1971) and the Kanuri (Cohen, 1971), the children are taken care of by a new husband-wife team although it may involve neither the biological parents, as among the Eskimo, or only the father and his new wife, as among the Kanuri.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF DEVELOPMENT

Under the ideological and economic pressures of development the reciprocal economic bonds give way. This is often a direct result of development projects that disrupt the traditional balance between the husband and wife. Rogers points to several instances where hostility and antagonism between the sexes were increased as the result of development projects favoring one sex over the other (1980: 101, 173-176). It is usually the man who gains due to the higher cash value of his labor as compared with his wife's labor. In other cases the balance is upset through increasing the wife's total work load and/or its difficulty relative to her husband's. The most severe case cited was one in which violence erupted between husbands and wives because the wives were doing more than half of the work but receiving only a very limited amount of the cash return (Scoullar cited in Rogers, 1980: 181).

If a man no longer needs a wife's labor or a woman her husband's, then the bond between them becomes more one of individual choice on the basis of companionship, love, and emotional ties to children. Parsons saw modern families becoming specialists in human relations management since economic production took place outside the family (Parsons and Fox, 1953). The basis for family stability and parental motivation shifted to romantic love (Parsons, 1949: 187-189). Parsons, as well as later observers such as Goode (1959), were generally optimistic about the success of marriages based on love. Other commentators have been much more pessimistic as to the effective nature of the love bond (Mowrer, 1927; Burgess and Locke, 1953). As Van den Haag (1974: 141) puts it:

Marriage was to cement the family by tying people together...in the face of the fickleness of their emotions.... The idea that marriage must be synchronous with love or even affection nullified it altogether. (That affection should coincide with marriage is, of course, desirable, though it does not always happen.)

In most traditional cultures marriage is not expected to be based on love (Stephens, 1963: 206). The cement of marriage was reliably provided by economic ties.

The Western ideology of the male head as the primary provider not only denies the actual or potential contribution of women, but also inhibits the development of new norms of reciprocal economic obligations appropriate to the new conditions. Men may become contemptuous of women's work (Rogers, 1980: 176) and deny its importance. The effect of this ideology is most negative where men expect that they ought to be the principal provider but are in a structural situation where they are unable to fulfill this expectation. Under these circumstances, women's work becomes a compensation for male inadequacy, and status is attached to having a non-working wife. This creates fertile ground for the proliferation of women-headed families.

Both Blumberg and Garcia (1977) and Santos (1976-1977) argue that where women can work and earn as much as the men in their class, the result will be a high proportion of women-headed families. The fear is that equality between the sexes leads to a disintegration of marital bonds. Adrienne Germain calls this fear a myth (1976-1977: 166). This analysis suggests, however, that equal access to resources creates no problem as long as there are reciprocal economic obligations. Could not two poor incomes add up to twice as much as one? Problems arise where the economic obligations for the family fall entirely on the man in a situation where low wages and unemployment prevent their fulfillment. This serves to explain the high incidence of women-headed families in areas like the Caribbean, where Western family ideology has been strongly imposed but unemployment and low wages are rampant (Moses, 1977).⁵

An appropriate family policy for development would be one in which reciprocal economic obligations are stressed. Western cultural ideals of romantic love and of the male role as sole provider must be avoided because they undermine these reciprocal economic ties. Furthermore, reciprocity requires a balance between husbands and wives in terms of work load and labor productivity.

According to Lasch (1979: 36), the effect of the "industrialization of production and the bureaucratization of welfare" on the family was to "undermine the family's capacity to manipulate economic rewards...." While Lasch was concerned with the family's ability to control the children, his point relates well to the control of the wife over her husband. The process of development has undermined each spouse's capacity to manipulate economic rewards for the unity and economic well-being of the family. In addition to the disruption of the traditional reciprocal relationships, development has thus far introduced a profound disruptive effect in bringing about the deterioration of the family's economic position. Adelman (1975) estimates that 40 to 60 percent of the population in the poorest countries have become poorer in absolute terms.

ECONOMICS OF DEVELOPMENT

Buvinic and Youssef's analysis suggests that it is "poverty with development" that triggers the breakdown of stable family systems and an increase in woman-headed families (1978: 82). Evidence collected by Rogers (1980) and Dixon (1980) as well as ethnographic studies by Bossen (1982) and Clignet (1970: 281) also show that even where family systems continue to involve men and women, development leads to the lowering of the woman's socioeconomic status within the household. In many cases, this decrease is a result of discrimination against women under the ideological assumption that men are the primary providers. In these situations, the man obtains the opportunity to provide, through access to better non-agricultural jobs or technical advice and equipment for agricultural work. In other cases, however, the reduction in the woman's status is a direct or indirect consequence of the emphasis on growth by developing cash economies and making production decisions on the basis of maximum profit. It is this emphasis on growth alone that has been implicated in the increase in poverty and inequality (Adelman and Morris, 1973; Griffin, 1978; Brookfield, 1975).

The traditional development approach, first directed toward the industrial sector and later toward the agricultural sector, assumed that the benefits of growth would "trickle down" to the poorest. The results of the first development decade, however, showed that the implementation of the traditional model led to severe problems of employment generation and unequal income distribution (Brookfield, 1975: 85).

The reason that this occurs is not that one part of the population is backward and the other part modern, but that in capitalist development the greatest growth is in areas of greatest profit. These areas drain less profitable activities and enterprises of land and capital. This process has most recently been analyzed in terms of the agricultural sector. Given the critical role of this sector in preventing absolute poverty, as well as the important productive role of women in it, the discussion that follows will focus on the situation in agriculture.

A recent publication of the Agricultural Development Council has concluded that "in the poorest countries, capitalist farming may bring some additional output, but it may also create unemployment and income inequality" (Hemmi and Atsumi, 1981: 9). Solon Barraclough, Director of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, has reviewed the studies on the Green Revolution and concluded that the "emergence of a more capital intensive higher technology farming..." creates a crisis in the:

accelerating dissolution of self-provisioning agriculture both as a major element in peasant farming and as a subsistence base for the poorer rural strata.... The food systems that have maintained humankind throughout most of its history are disintegrating before other forms of economic activity are able to offer alternative means of livelihood to the displaced peasantry (Barraclough, 1980: vii).

The effect of this kind of development, especially for families on the wrong side of the uneven development, is at best a relative decline in their economic position as the new entrepreneurs move ahead. Inflationary pressures resulting from development mean that such households must now purchase commodities at higher prices created by the new international market without themselves being in a position to benefit from those markets in terms of higher prices for their labor or products. Other development changes can remove traditional access to land for subsistence production as land becomes a commodity to be bought and sold.⁶ Thus, what would have normally been provided through household production must be purchased in the marketplace, again at prices inflated by the pressures of developing international markets. Households increasingly have to compete in international markets for food exports and imports in developing countries (Burbach and Flynn, 1980: 105). Even families that are able to preserve traditional self-provisioning in agriculture may experience relative deprivation as new markets offer new commodities which they cannot buy and those few items which they must buy become too expensive.

A deterioration of the relative or absolute economic situation of families puts new and heavy stress on family relationships. One or both marital partners is likely to be blamed for failure to meet economic obligations. Since it is the man, however, who has been given most of the opportunities for more capital-intensive, higher technology farming and the woman who has been responsible for a large proportion of the subsistence production for household use, it is more likely that she will fail in meeting her economic obligations. Her access to land becomes more and more restricted as economic development involving cash economies and the introduction of efficiency criteria and modern agricultural methods tend to squeeze out marginal subsistence production. Furthermore, this process is often abetted by land reform because it allows the new owner, most often the man, to sell the land (Rogers, 1980: 138-141). With uneven development, poorer farmers and small landholders come under pressure from the market to sell their land to larger landholders. This process removes from women their traditional means of subsistence production while they retain the responsibility for subsistence consumption. Their inability to make their customary contribution to the household economy generally lowers their relative status in the household. Thus, in both economic and non-economic terms, women are more likely to see their household position deteriorate further than men's under the process of uneven development.

The introduction of relatively more cash into the household economy, moreover, is likely to create the illusion of surplus. Under traditional assumptions, significant amounts of cash often reflected a real surplus that could be spent for non-subsistence items. The introduction of cash in lieu of subsistence products often means that the family suffers for economic necessities. The disposition of the cash "surplus," moreover, is most likely to fall to the male, through his own individual wages or earnings from cash crops. The disposition of cash in the hands of men, thus, may very well not benefit the "family" but only the male head who

wishes to purchase luxury items such as radios or other status items. And such expenditures may be made even to the neglect of the purchase of necessities; cash in the hands of a man may be defined as "surplus" even where, for example, cash crops replace subsistence crops as the main agricultural products. The woman loses because she is failing in her economic obligations and there is no normative basis for the man to assume the role of provider.

In other situations, the woman may still fulfill those obligations but the process of agricultural development has made the work required of her either more difficult or more time consuming, or both. John deWilde generalizes this situation for much of Africa:

The fact that the man in much of Africa keeps the income from cash crops usually causes the woman, who has the responsibility for feeding the family [through subsistence production] to insist all the more tenaciously on producing all the family's food needs (1967: 22).

Clearly women strive to fulfill their obligations even if it takes a greater input of their labor. Time budgets for rural women suggest that in many cases they are working over ten hours a day in subsistence production (Rogers, 1980: 157).

It is clear that in these cases in Africa and Asia there is no basis for the assumption that men will provide for women and children. There is also no basis for the more recent Western feminist emphasis on shared roles and pooled resources. In both cases, the Western models assume that resources will be allocated toward family needs. These needs may reflect a joint decision-making pattern or one where the man alone makes the decision guided by the needs of the family. Families whose traditional division of labor segregates the sexes into separate spheres for production and consumption, however, have no experience of joint decision-making or even decision-making on the part of the male head to meet the overall family needs. Moreover, there is no tradition of the family's pooling its resources.⁷ Under sex segregation, each sex provided those resources for which it was traditionally responsible. Under these conditions the introduction of more cash in the hands of men is not likely to be spent for family needs, especially where those needs were traditionally defined as the responsibility of women. The woman has no claim to her husband's support in those areas of family consumption for which she is responsible; yet, the development process may make her less able to fulfill those consumption needs herself.

One proposed solution popular among feminist critics is to provide women, whose economic roles are being displaced, with an alternative role through direct involvement in the cash economy by the provision of jobs. This solution, although apparently simple, ignores the fact that "economic relationships are embedded in social and cultural relationships" (Long and Roberts, 1973: 320). To provide jobs for women without a full understanding of family relationships and the need for a balance between

men and women could create antagonism between husbands and wives as well as a situation of overwork for women, who have taken on additional burdens but have not been released from traditional obligations. Furthermore, if the customary division of labor in the household was one where the women engaged in subsistence production while men were involved in production for the cash economy through production of cash crops or labor market activity, then the normal expectation is that men control the disposition of cash (Dixon, 1980; Rogers, 1980) and that this control extends as well to cash earned by women (Rogers, 1980). This control is most likely to occur in cultures with a tradition of male dominance. Thus, without new norms regarding the division of labor in the household and/or pooling family resources, the women and their children are less likely to benefit from their productive activities.

The most severe consequences of economic development for women lies in the combination of economic pressures together with a breakdown of traditional reciprocity and a potential increase in hostility. These processes, singularly or together, result in a situation where women are increasingly left with the primary, if not sole, economic responsibility for children. In rural areas, families headed by women alone are most likely to be the consequence of male out-migration. Young men are more likely to migrate when their own position is deteriorating and they see opportunities elsewhere. This process is, of course, exacerbated by uneven development whereby certain regions and sectors of the economy are better developed and offer more opportunity. Women and children are thus left behind in the less developed regions. In this situation men may succeed in improving their economic position, but there can be no assumption that the family will benefit. Women do not necessarily obtain support from men, especially where norms relating to the division of labor and resources have never covered the possibility that a man with a distant residence and a pay check should share that check with his wife and children back home. Under these circumstances it is more likely that the women will be left with the sole responsibility for the family, both economically and emotionally, with very limited opportunities to fulfill these responsibilities, especially the economic ones (Chaney and Lewis, 1980; Rogers, 1980: 170; Mueller, 1977).

An exclusive focus upon "women in development" does make sense in dealing with the severe economic problems of households headed by women alone. In such households the woman would be more likely to retain control over her earnings and a concerted job-creation program that could utilize the labor of these women trapped in depressed rural areas does have a great deal of merit. The flaw in this type of program is that it only treats the effect, without doing anything about the cause. Certainly it could make these very poorest households better off while leaving intact the social, cultural and economic relationships that brought about the problem of women alone with children in the first place. Furthermore, the vulnerability of this labor force and its identification with "women's jobs" will mean that here, as elsewhere, the job will pay little and such pay will be unlikely to keep up with the inflation generated by the introduction of further integration into the national and international

economies. Moreover, the woman will be left with all of the problems of the single parent in developed countries in terms of a need for full-time child care and other support services that are not likely to be provided by state agencies. Thus, while jobs directed at poor female-headed families may provide some stopgap assistance, they are not likely to provide a woman with the economic and non-economic support she needs.

The entire problem of development, especially unequal development, as well as "women in development" needs to be reviewed because "economic relationships are embedded in social and cultural relationships." Furthermore, the most important social relationship for women and children is the family, including the economic and non-economic contributions of men. The traditional development model in practice disrupts the expected economic reciprocity between men and women in the context of a deteriorating household economic position. Many families do not survive this stress intact, and women suffer most through their inability to perform traditional economic functions, their lack of traditional claims upon cash generated or controlled by men, and their limited opportunities in the modern sector.

The problem of traditional development is that it is unequal not only with respect to overall economic opportunities and outcomes but also with respect to men and women in families; women are currently forced to bear disproportionately the costs of development. Through women, children too are forced to bear these costs. Women, having had the least power to begin with, are forced to pay the highest price and have the fewest resources available with which to negotiate (Gans, 1972). Clearly the developmental model imposed by Western nations must be censured for its treatment of women.

Substantial improvement in the position of women, however, requires more than attention "...to programs, projects and activities which tend to integrate women into the national economies."⁸ Radical changes are necessary in the way the overall benefits and costs of development are distributed. Integrating women into national economies with a high degree of inequality and poverty will still mean severe poverty for at least one-third of the women. Unless men and women are integrated into families where joint economic responsibilities are carried out, integration into the national economies will still leave many women with the primary economic burden of children. The success of the women-in-development approach depends on the success of the growth-with-equity approach and both jointly depend on an effective family policy that binds men together with women in their responsibilities for children.

It is unrealistic to assume, as traditional development models have, that family relationships can easily adapt unless attention is directed toward both male and female roles. A new division of labor is needed that can be the basis for new forms of reciprocity between men and women. This new division of labor would have to be built upon more traditional cultural expectations, while introducing changes that pay close attention to maintaining or enhancing the bargaining position of the woman.

Growth-with-equity advocates, their critics⁹ and women-in-development advocates all need to re-examine their efforts in terms of the family and its critical role in the articulation of the individual and the economy. The position of women cannot be cogently analyzed independently of family relationships involving men. Any development model that lacks an appropriate family theory, therefore, will fail to benefit men and women equally. Although areas where there are already a high proportion of women alone with children need very specific programs, these programs should be viewed as stopgap measures. Women are, on the average, better off embedded in family relationships where responsibilities for children, both economic and non-economic, can be shared with men. And families are better off where they are not subject to the deterioration of their economic position and their incomes are not far below the median income of the society.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a description of the various productive activities of married women in the United States after industrialization, see Smuts (1971).
2. A description of several growth-with-equity models can be found in Weaver et al. (1978). This paper will emphasize the approach which stresses the importance of a redistribution of income and assets (Adelman, 1975; Griffin, 1978) with an emphasis upon the agricultural sector (Mellor, 1976).
3. Relevant exceptions to this statement include Tinker, 1976; Olin, 1976; Blumberg and Garcia, 1977; Papenek, 1977. Although each examines the role of women in the family, especially their economic activity, none of them point to the importance of a family theory or family policy.
4. Adelman and Morris (1973) mention the family only in terms of family income and family size. Recent labor supply models such as Barnum and Squire (1979) assume that men and women have identical labor supply functions.
5. This obviously does not apply where the woman has access to economic resources only if the man has left such as is the case with Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) in the United States.
6. Economists stress the importance of developing a market for land which will increase efficiency in allocating resources (cf. Sen, 1966).
7. Evidence suggests that even fertility decisions are not joint decisions (Rogers, 1980: 113).
8. The "Percy Amendment" to the Foreign Aid Act of 1976.
9. Radical critics of the growth-with-equity approach argue that reform is impossible and revolution necessary in order to achieve equality. These critics must face the necessity for a family policy, however, even if its implementation is postponed until after the revolution.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, Irma
1975 "Growth, Income Distribution and Equity-Oriented Development Strategies." World Development 3(2-3): 67-76.
- _____ and Cynthia Taft Morris
1973 Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Arensberg, Conrad
1937 The Irish Countryman. New York: Macmillan.
- Barnum, Howard and Lyn Squire
1979 "An Econometric Application of the Theory of the Farm Household." Journal of Development Economics 6(1): 79-102.
- Barraclough, Solon L.
1980 "Preface." In Andrew Pearse, Seeds of Plenty, Seeds of Want. Oxford: Clarendon Press, vii-viii.
- Bernard, Jessie
1972 The Future of Marriage. New York: Bantam Books.
- Blumberg, Rae Lesser and Maria Pilar Garcia
1977 "The Political Economy of the Mother-Child Family." In Luis Lenero-Otero (ed.), Beyond the Nuclear Family Model. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 99-163.
- Bossen, Laurel
1982 "Sexual Stratification in Mesoamerica." In C. Kendall, J. Hawkins, and L. Bossen (eds.), Heritage of Conquest: 30 Years Later. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, forthcoming.
- 1975 "Women in Modernizing Societies." American Ethnologist, 2(4): 587-601.
- Brookfield, Harold
1975 Interdependent Development. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Burbach, Roger and Patricia Flynn
1980 Agribusiness in the Americas. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burch, Ernest S., Jr.
1971 "Marriage and Divorce Among the North Alaskan Eskimo." In Paul Bohannan (ed.), Divorce and After. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 171-204.

- Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey Locke
1953 The Family. New York: American Book.
- Buvinic, Mayra and Nadia H. Youssef
1978 Women Headed Household: The Ignored Factor in Development Planning. Washington, DC: International Center for Research on Women.
- Chaney, Elsa and Martha Lewis
1980 Women, Migration and the Decline of Smallholder Agriculture. Washington, DC: Office of Women in Development, USAID (October).
- Chapman, Jane Roberts, ed.
1976 Economic Independence for Women. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clignet, Remi
1970 Many Wives, Many Powers. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Cohen, Ronald
1971 "Brittle Marriage as a Stable System: The Kanuri Case." In Paul Bohannan (ed.), Divorce and After. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 205-239.
- deWilde, John C.
1967 Experiences with Agricultural Development in Tropical Africa. Vol. 1 The Synthesis. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dixon, Ruth B.
1980 Assessing the Impact of Development Projects on Women. Washington, DC: Office of Women in Development and Office of Evaluation, USAID (May).
- 1978 Rural Women at Work. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Doeringer, Peter B. (ed.)
1969 Programs to Employ the Disadvantaged. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gans, Herbert J.
1972 "The Positive Functions of Poverty." American Journal of Sociology 78(2): 275-289.
- Germain, Adrienne
1976-77 "Poor Rural Women: A Policy Perspective." Journal of International Affairs 30(2): 161-172.
- Goode, William J.
1959 "The Theoretical Importance of Love." American Sociological Review 24(1): 38-47.

- Griffin, Keith
1978 International Inequality and National Poverty. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Gudeman, Stephen
1978 The Demise of a Rural Economy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- Hemmi, Kenzo and Keiko Atsumi
1981 "Mechanization of Small-Scale Peasant Farming." Agricultural Development Council, Inc. Report No. 21 (February).
- Johnson, Orna R. and Allen Johnson
1975 "Male/Female Relations and the Organization of Work in a Machiguenga Community." American Ethnologist 2(4): 634-648.
- Lasch, Christopher
1979 Haven in a Heartless World. New York: Basic Books.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude
1956 "The Family." In H. L. Shapiro (ed.), Man, Culture and Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 142-170.
- Long, Norman and Bryan R. Roberts
1978 "Peasant Cooperation and Underdevelopment in Peru." In Norman Long and Bryan Roberts (eds.), Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru. Austin: University of Texas Press, 297-328.
- Mason, John P.
1975 "Sex and symbol in the treatment of women: the wedding rite in a Libyan oasis community." American Ethnologist 2(4): 649-661.
- Mellor, J.
1976 The New Economics of Growth. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moses, Yolanda T.
1977 "Female Status, the Family, and Male Dominance in a West Indian Community." Signs 3(1): 142-153.
- Mowrer, Ernest R.
1927 Family Disorganization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mueller, Martha
1977 "Women and Men, Power and Powerlessness in Lesotho." Signs 3(1): 154-166.

- Murdock, George Peter
1937 "Comparative Data on Division of Labor by Sex." Social Forces 15(4): 551-553.
- Nash, June and Helen Icken Safa
1980 "Introduction." In Nash and Safa (eds.), Sex and Class in Latin America. New York: J. F. Bergin Publishers, x-xi.
- Olin, Ulla
1976 "A Case for Women as Co-Managers: The Family as a General Model of Human Social Organization." In Irene Tinker and Michele B. Bramsen (eds.), Women and World Development. New York: Praeger Press, 105-128.
- Papenek, Hanna
1977 "Development Planning for Women." Signs 3(1): 14-21.
- Parsons, Talcott
1949 Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
and Renee C. Fox
1952 "Illness Therapy and the Modern Urban American Family," Journal of Social Issues 8(4): 31-44.
- Rogers, Barbara
1980 The Domestication of Women. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Rogers, Susan Carol
1975 "Female Forms of Power and the Myth of Male Dominance: A Model of Female/Male Interaction in Peasant Society." American Ethnologist 2(4): 727-756.
- Rostow, W. W.
1961 The Stages of Economic Growth. London: The Cambridge University Press.
- Santos, Fredricka Pickford
1976-77 "The Role of Women in the Development Process: Market Integration or Family Disintegration." Journal of International Affairs 30(2): 173-181.
- Sen, Amartya K.
1966 "Peasants and Dualism With or Without Surplus Labor." The Journal of Political Economy 74(5): 425-450.
- Smuts, Robert W.
1971 Women and Work in America. New York: Schocken Books.

Stephens, William N.

1953 The Family in Cross-Cultural Perspective. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tinker, Irene

1976 "Women in Developing Societies: Economic Independence Is Not Enough." In Jane Roberts Chapman (ed.), Economic Independence for Women. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 113-135.

Van den Haag, Ernest

1974 "Love or Marriage" In Rose Coser (ed.), The Family: Its Structures and Functions. New York: St. Martin's Press, 134-142.

Weaver, James H., Kenneth P. Jameson and Richard N. Blue

1978 "Growth and Equity: Can They Be Happy Together?" International Development Review 20(1): 20-27.

World Bank

1975 Rural Development. Washington, DC: World Bank

Zelditch, Morris

1955 "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study." In Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 307-351.

19

M I C H I G A N S T A T E U N I V E R S I T Y
WORKING PAPERS ON WOMEN IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Published by the Office of Women in International
Development at Michigan State University and
partially funded by the Ford Foundation and a Title
XII Strengthening Grant

EDITOR: Rita S. Gallin, Office of Women in International Development and
College of Nursing

EDITORIAL BOARD: Marilyn Aronoff, Department of Sociology
Peter Gladhart, Departments of Family and Child Ecology and
Resource Development
John Hinnant, Department of Anthropology
Mary Howard, Department of Anthropology
Susan Irwin, Department of Anthropology
Nalini Malhotra, Department of Sociology
Ann Millard, Department of Anthropology
Barbara Rylko-Bauer, Department of Anthropology
Judith Stallmann, Department of Agricultural Economics
Paul Strassmann, Department of Economics
Patricia Whittier, Department of Anthropology

MANAGING EDITOR: Margaret Graham, Office of Women in International Development

EDITORIAL POLICY: The series of Working Papers on Women in International Development publishes reports of empirical studies, theoretical analyses, and projects that are concerned with development issues affecting women in relation to social, political, and economic change. Its scope includes studies of women's historical and changing participation in political, economic, and religious spheres, traditional roles within and outside the family, gender identity, relations between the sexes, and alterations in the sexual division of labor.

MANUSCRIPTS (in duplicate) should be submitted to the editor, Rita S. Gallin, Ph.D., WID Publication Series, Office of WID, 202 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824. They should be double-spaced and include the following: (1) title page bearing the name, address, and institutional affiliation of the author(s); (2) one-paragraph abstract; (3) text; (4) notes; (5) references cited; and (6) tables and figures. To further the rapid dissemination of information, a timely schedule of manuscript review and publication is followed.

TO ORDER PUBLICATIONS OR RECEIVE A LISTING OF WORKING PAPERS, write to the Office of WID, 202 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.