UNIT 5: RESOURCES, AGENCY, AND ACHIEVEMENTS: REFLECTIONS ON THE MEASUREMENT OF WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT - PART 1
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5.1 INTRODUCTION
The Unit titled “Resources, Agency, and achievements: reflections on the measurement of women’s empowerment by Naila Kabeer starts with conceptualizing empowerment. In that section she discusses the attempt of different GAD scholars to define the term empowerment. The next section, the author discusses the dimensions of empowerment which contains resources, agency and achievement. Each aspects discusses in details with suitable examples. When we measure the empowerment, one has to consider equality, inequality and achievements. This is discussed in further sections.

5.2 OBJECTIVES
After studying this Unit, you would be able to

- Define and conceptualize empowerment;
- Discuss the issues related measuring the empowerment;
- Discuss the significance of resources and agency in empowerment; and
• Analyse the dimensions of empowerment.

5.3 CONCEPTUALIZING EMPOWERMENT

Advocacy on behalf of women which builds on claimed synergies between feminist goals and official development priorities has made greater inroads into the mainstream development agenda than advocacy which argues for these goals on intrinsic grounds. There is an understandable logic to this. In a situation of limited resources, where policymakers have to adjudicate between competing claims (Razavi, 1997), advocacy for feminist goals in intrinsic terms takes policymakers out of their familiar conceptual territory of welfare, poverty and efficiency into the nebulous territory of power and social injustice. There is also a political logic in that those who stand to gain most from such advocacy viz. women, particularly women from poorer households, carry little clout with those who set the agendas in major policy making institutions.

Consequently, as long as women’s empowerment was argued for as an end in itself, it tended to be heard in policy circles as a ‘zero-sum’ game with politically weak winners and powerful losers. By contrast, instrumentalist forms of advocacy which combine the argument for gender equality/women’s empowerment with demonstrations of a broad set of desirable multiplier effects offer policymakers the possibility of achieving familiar and approved goals, albeit by unfamiliar means. The persuasiveness of claims that women’s empowerment has important policy payoffs in the field of fertility behaviour and demographic transition, children’s welfare and infant mortality, economic growth and poverty alleviation has given rise to some unlikely advocates for women’s empowerment in the field of international development, including the World Bank, the major UN agencies and the OECD-DC group.
However, the success of instrumentalist forms of advocacy has costs. It requires the translation of feminist insights into the techniques discourse of policy, a process in which some of the original political edge of feminism has been sacrificed. Quantification is one aspect of this process of translation. Measurement is, of course, a major preoccupation in the policy domain, reflecting a justifiable concern with the cost/benefit calculus of competing claims for scarce resources in the policy domain. And given that the very idea of women’s empowerment epitomizes for many policy makers the unwarranted intrusion of metaphysical concepts into the concrete and practical world of development policy, quantifying empowerment appears to put the concept on more solid and objectively verifiable grounds. There has consequently been a proliferation of studies attempting to measure empowerment, some seeking to facilitate comparisons between locations or over time, some to demonstrate the impact of specific interventions on women’s empowerment and others to demonstrate the implications of women’s empowerment for desired policy objectives.

However, not everyone accepts that empowerment can be clearly defined, let alone measured. For many feminists, the value of the concept lies precisely in its ‘fuzziness’. As an NGO activist cited in Batliwala (1993) put it: ‘I like the term empowerment because no one has defined it clearly yet; so it gives us a breathing space to work it out in action terms before we have to pin ourselves down to what it means. I will continue using it until I am sure it does not describe what we are doing.’ This Unit offers a critical assessment of the various measures of women’s empowerment evident in the burgeoning literature on this topic. It uses this assessment to reflect on the implications of attempting to measure what is not easily measureable and of replacing intrinsic arguments for feminist goals with instrumentalist ones. However, given the contested nature of the concept, it is important to clarify at the outset how it will be used in this Unit, since
this will influence how the various measurement attempts are evaluated. This is attempted in the rest of this block. In subsequent Units, I will be reviewing various measures of women’s empowerment, the extent to which they mean what they are intended to mean, the values they embody and the appropriateness of these values in capturing the idea of empowerment.

5.4 CONCEPTUALIZING EMPOWERMENT: RESOURCES, AGENCY AND ACHIEVEMENT

One way of thinking about power is in terms of the ability to make choices: to be disempowered, therefore, implies to be denied choice\(^1\). My understanding of the notion of empowerment is that it is inescapably bound up with the condition of disempowerment and refers to the processes by which those who have been denied the ability to make choices acquire such an ability. In other words, empowerment entails a process of change. People who exercise a great deal of choice in their lives may be very powerful, but they are not empowered in the sense in which I am using the word, because they were never disempowered in the first place.

However, to be made relevant to the analysis of power, the notion of choice has to be qualified in a number of ways. First of all, choice necessarily implies alternatives, the ability to have chosen otherwise. There is a logical association between poverty and disempowerment because an insufficiency of the means for meeting one’s basic needs often rules out the ability to exercise

\(^1\) Choice has strong neo-liberal connotations but some notion of choice is also implicit in the Marxist distinction between the ‘realm of necessity’ and the ‘realm of freedom’. I hope that the qualifications offered to the concept of choice in the course of this paper will help to steer it away from its roots in methodological individualism and to give it a more post-structuralist interpretation.
meaningful choice. However, even when survival imperatives are longer dominant, there is still the problem that not all choices are equally relevant to the definition of power. Some choices have greater significance than others in terms of their consequences for people’s lives. We therefore have to make a distinction between first and second order choices where first order choices are those strategic life choices, such as choice of livelihood, where to live, whether to marry, who to marry whether to have children, how many children to have, freedom of movement and choice of friends, which are critical for people to live the lives they want. These strategic life choices help to frame other, second-order and less consequential choices which may be important for the quality of one’s life but do not constitute its defining parameters.

Empowerment thus refers to the expansion in people’s ability to make strategic life choices in a context where this ability was previously denied to them.

Changes in the ability to exercise choice can be thought of in terms of changes in three interrelated dimensions which make up choice: resources, which form the conditions under which choices are made; agency which is at the heart of the process by which choices are made; and achievements, which are the outcomes of choices. These dimensions are inter-dependent because changes in each contributes to, and benefits from, changes in the others. Thus, the achievements of a particular moment are translated into enhanced resources or agency, and hence capacity for making choices, at a later moment in time.
Resources can be material, social or human. In other words, they refer not only to conventional economic resources, such as land, equipment, finance, working capital etc. but also to the various human and social resources which serve to enhance the ability to exercise choice. Human resources are embodied in the individual and encompasses his or her knowledge, skills, creativity, imagination and so on. Social resources, on the other hand, are made up of the claims, obligations and expectations which inherent in the relationships, networks and connections which prevail in different spheres of life and which enable people to improve their situation and life chances beyond what would be possible through their individual efforts alone. Resources are distributed through a variety of different institutions and processes and access to resources will be determined by the rules, norms and practices which prevail in different institutional domains (eg. familial norms, patron-client relationships, informal wage agreements, formal contractual transactions, public sector entitlements). These rules, norms and practices give some actors authority over others in determining the principles of distribution and exchange within that sphere. Consequently, the distribution of ‘allocative’ resources tends to be embedded within the distribution of ‘authoritative resources’ (Giddens, 1979), the ability to define priorities and enforce claims. Heads of households, chiefs of tribes, directors of firms, managers of
organizations, elites within a community are all endowed with decision-making authority within particular institutional contexts by virtue of their positioning within those institutions.

The terms on which people gain access to resources are as important as the resources themselves when the issue of empowerment is being considered. Access may be conditional on highly clientilist forms of dependency relationships or extremely exploitative conditions of work or it may be achieved in ways which offer dignity and a sense of self-worth. Empowerment entails a change in the terms on which resources are acquired as much as an increase in access to resources.

The second dimension of power relates to agency, the ability to define one’s goals and act upon them. Agency is about more than observable action; it also encompasses the meaning, motivation and purpose which individuals bring to their activity, their sense of agency, or ‘the power within’. While agency often tends to be operationalized as ‘individual decision making’, particularly in the mainstream economic literature, in reality, it encompasses a much wider range of purposive actions, including bargaining, negotiation, deception, manipulation, subversion, resistance and protest as well as the more intangible, cognitive processes of reflection and analysis. Agency also encompasses collective, as well as individual, reflection and action.

Agency has both positive and negative meanings in relation to power\(^2\). In the positive sense of the ‘power to’, it refers to people’s capacity to define their own life-choices and to pursue their

\(^2\) The concepts of positive and negative agency echoes the distinction between positive and negative freedom made by Sen. Negative freedom corresponds to freedom from the effects of the negative agency of others or their use of ‘the power over’. Positive freedom, which corresponds closely to the way in which I am defining positive agency, refers to the ability to live as one chooses, to have the effective power to achieve chosen results (Sen A.K, 1985).
own goals, even in the face of opposition from others. Agency can also be exercised in the more negative sense of ‘power over’, in other words, the capacity of an actor or category of actors to over-ride the agency of others, for instance, through the use of violence, coercion and threat. However, power can also operate in the absence of any explicit agency. The norms and rules governing social behaviour tend to ensure that certain outcomes are reproduced without any apparent exercise of agency. Where these outcomes bear on the strategic life choices noted earlier, they testify to the exercise of power as ‘non-decision-making’ (Lukes, 1974). The norms of marriage in South Asia, for instance, invest parents with the authority for choosing their children’s partners, but are unlikely to be experienced as a form of power – unless such authority is questioned.

Resources and agency together constitute what Sen refers to as capabilities, the potential that people have for living the lives they want, of achieving valued ways of ‘being and doing’. Sen uses the idea of ‘functioning’s’ to refer to all the possible ways of ‘being and doing’ which are valued by people in a given context and of ‘functioning achievements’ to refer to the particular ways of being and doing which are realized by different individuals. These realized achievements, or the failure to do so, constitute our third dimension of power. Clearly, where the failure to achieve valued ways of ‘being and doing’ can be traced to laziness, incompetence or some other reason particular to an individual, then the issue of power is not relevant. When, however, the failure to achieve reflects asymmetries in the underlying distribution of capabilities, it can be taken as a manifestation of disempowerment.
Check Your Progress Exercise 1

Note: i. Use this space given below to answer the question.
    ii. Compare your answer with the one given at the end of this Unit

1. What are the dimensions of Empowerment?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

5.5 QUALIFYING CHOICE: DIFFERENCE VERSUS INEQUALITY

However, a concern with ‘achievements’ in the measurement of empowerment draws attention to the necessity for further qualifications to our understanding of choice. As far as empowerment is concerned, we are interested in possible inequalities in people’s capacity to make choices rather than in differences in the choices they make. An observed lack of uniformity in functioning achievements cannot be automatically interpreted as evidence of inequality because it is highly unlikely that all members of a given society will give equal value to different possible ways of ‘being and doing’. Consequently, where gender differentials in functioning achievements exist, we have to disentangle differentials which reflect differences in preferences and priorities from those which embody a denial of choice.³

³A discussion by Folbre offers a pithy example of the distinction I am trying to make here: she points to the very differing implications of a model of gender equality which seeks to achieve
One way of getting around the problem for measurement purposes would be to focus on certain universally-shared functioning’s, those which relate to the basic fundamentals of survival and well-being, regardless of context. For instance, it is generally agreed that proper nourishment, good health, adequate shelter, reasonable clothing and clean water all constitute primary functioning’s which tend to be universally valued. If there are systematic gender differences in these very basic functioning achievements, they can be taken as evidence of inequalities in underlying capabilities rather than differences in preferences. This, for instance, is the strategy adopted by Sen (1990). However, focusing on basic needs achievements addresses one aspect of the problem but raises others. Inequalities in basic functioning are generally tend to occur in situations of extreme scarcity. Confining the analysis of gender inequality to these achievements alone serves to convey the impression that women’s disempowerment is largely a matter of poverty. This is misleading for two reasons.

On the one hand, it misses forms of gender disadvantage which are more likely to characterize better-off sections of society. Prosperity within a society may help to reduce gender inequalities in basic well-being, but intensify other social restrictions on women’s ability to make choices (Razavi, 1992). On the other, it misses out on those dimensions of gender disadvantage among the poor which do not take the form of basic functioning failures. For instance, marked gender differentials in life expectancy and children’s nutrition, two widely used indicators of gender discrimination in basic wellbeing, do not appear to be as widespread in the context of sub-Saharan Africa as they do in South Asia. This is usually attributed to the greater economic equal of participation by women and men in the labour market as its indicator of achievement and one which seeks to equality of leisure.
contributions that women are able to make in the former context compared to the latter and to the cultural rules and norms which have evolved in recognition of their contribution. However, this does not rule out the possibility that gender disadvantage can take other forms in these contexts. Shaffer (1998), for instance, found little evidence of income or consumption disadvantage between male- and female-headed households in Guinea. However, both men and women in his study recognized women’s far heavier workloads as well as male domination in private and public decision-making as manifestations of gender inequality within their community.

A second way out of the problem might be to go beyond the concern with basic survival-related achievements to certain other functioning achievements which would be considered to be of social value in most contexts. This is the strategy adopted in the UNDP’s gender-disaggregated Human Development Index as well as its Gender Empowerment Measure. Such aggregated measures play a useful role in monitoring differences in achievements across regions and over time, drawing attention to problematic disparities. However, while there are sound reasons to move the measurement of achievements beyond very basic functioning’s, such as life expectancy and nutritional status, to more complex achievements, such as education and political representation, we have to keep in mind that such measurements, quite apart from their empirical shortcomings, entail the movement away from the criteria of women’s choices, or even the values of the communities in which they live, to a definition of ‘achievement’ which represents the values of those who are doing the measuring. We will return at a later section to the problems that external values can raise in the analysis of women’s empowerment.

5.6 QUALIFYING CHOICE: ‘CHOOSING NOT TO CHOOSE’
The use of achievements to measure empowerment draws attention to a second problem of interpretation deriving from the central place given to choice in our definition of power. There is an intuitive plausibility to the equation between power and choice as long as what is chosen appears to contribute to the welfare of those making the choice. In situations where we find evidence of striking gender inequalities in basic well-being achievements, the equation between choice and power would suggest quite plausibly that such inequalities signal the operation of power: either as an absence of choice on the part of women as the subordinate group or as active discrimination by men as the dominant group. However, the equation between power and choice finds it far more difficult to accommodate forms of gender inequality when these appear to have been chosen by women themselves. This problem plays out in the literature on gender and wellbeing in the form of behaviour on the part of women which suggests that they have internalized their social status as persons of lesser value. Such behaviour can have adverse implications for their own wellbeing as well as for the wellbeing for other female members of the family. Women’s acceptance of their secondary claims on household resources, their acquiescence to violence at the hands of their husbands, their willingness to bear children to the detriment of their own health and survival to satisfy their own or their husband’s preference for sons, are all examples of behaviour by women which undermine their own wellbeing.

It is worth noting, for instance, that in Shaffer’s study from West Africa cited earlier, both women and men recognized the existence of gender inequalities in terms of women’s heavier workloads and men’s dominance in decision-making, but neither considered these inequalities *unjust*.

In addition, women’s adherence to social norms and practices associated with son preference, discriminating against daughters in the allocation of food and basic health care to the extent to
compromising the survival chances of the girl child, promotion of the practice of female circumcision, the oppressive exercise of authority by mothers-in-law over their daughters-in-law, a problem often identified in the South Asian context, are examples of behaviour in which women’s internalization of their own lesser status in society leads them to discriminate against other females in that society.

While these forms of behaviour could be said to reflect ‘choice’, they are also choices which stem from, and serve to reinforce, women’s subordinate status. They remind us that power relations are expressed not only through the exercise of agency and choice, but also through the kinds of choices people make. This notion of power is a controversial one because it allows for the possibility that power and dominance can operate through consent and complicity as well as through coercion and conflict.

The vocabulary of false consciousness is not a particularly useful description here, implying as it does the need to distinguish between false and authentic consciousness, between illusion and reality. The consciousness we are talking about is not ‘false’ as such, since how people perceive their needs and interests is shaped by their individual histories and everyday realities, by the material and social context of their experiences and by the vantage point for reflexivity which this provides. In any situation, some needs and interests are self-evident, emerging out of the routine practices of daily life and differentiated by gender in as much as the responsibilities and routines of daily life are gender differentiated. However, there are other needs and interests which do not have this self-evident nature because they derive from a ‘deeper’ level of reality, one which is not evident in everyday life because it is inscribed in the taken-for-granted rules, norms and customs within which everyday life is conducted.
One way of conceptualizing this deeper reality is to be found in Bourdieu’s idea of ‘doxa’, the aspects of tradition and culture which are so taken-for-granted that they have become naturalized. Doxa refers to traditions and belief which exist beyond discourse or argumentation, ‘discussed, unnamed, admitted without argument or scrutiny’ (Bourdieu, 1977). The idea of doxa is helpful here because it shifts our attention away from the dichotomy between false and authentic consciousness to a concern with differing levels of reality and the practical and strategic interests which they give rise to. Bourdieu suggests that as long as the subjective assessments of social actors are largely congruent with the objectively organized possibilities available to them, the world of doxa remains intact. The passage from ‘doxa’ to discourse, a more critical consciousness, only becomes possible when competing ways of ‘being and doing’ become available as material and cultural possibilities, so that ‘common sense’ propositions of culture begin to lose their ‘naturalized’ character, revealing the underlying arbitrariness of the given social order.

The availability of alternatives at the discursive level, of being able to at least imagine the possibility of having chosen differently, is thus crucial to the emergence of a critical consciousness, the process by which people move from a position of unquestioning acceptance of the social order to a critical perspective on it. This has an obvious bearing to our earlier discussion about functioning achievements as an aspect of empowerment. As I pointed out, the possibility that power operates not only through constraints on people’s ability to make choices, but also through their preferences and values and hence the choices that they may make, appeared to pose a serious challenge to the basic equation made in this Unit between power and choice. However, it is possible to retain the equation by a further qualification to our notion of ‘choice’, extending the idea of alternatives to encompass discursive alternatives. In other words,
in assessing whether or not an achievement embodies meaningful choice, we have to ask ourselves whether other choices were not only materially possible but whether they were conceived to be within the realms of possibility.\(^4\)

### 5.7 EMPOWERMENT: DIMENSIONS, LEVELS AND PROCESSES OF CHANGE

To sum up, the ability to choose has been made central to the concept of power which informs the analysis in this Unit. However, choice has been qualified in a number of ways to make it relevant to the analysis. Qualifications regarding the conditions of choice point to the need to distinguish choices made from the vantage point of real alternatives and choices which reflect their absence or punishingly high costs. Qualifications relating to the consequences of choice reflect the need to distinguish between strategic life choices, those which represent valued ways of ‘being and doing’, and the other more mundane choices which follow once these first-order choices have been made. The consequences of choice can be further evaluated in terms of their

\(^4\) The importance of alternatives, material as well as discursive, is common to a number of analyses of power. Lukes refers to the absence of actual or imagined alternatives as a factor explaining the absence of protest to the injustices of an unequal order. Geuss (1981) suggests that knowledge about social life and the self requires not only freedom from basic want but also the material and cultural possibility of experimentation, of trying out alternatives, the freedom to experience and to discuss the results of that experience. Shklar puts the question of alternatives eloquently when she declares, ‘Unless and until we can offer the injured and insulted victims of the most of the world’s traditional as well as revolutionary governments a genuine and practicable alternative to their present condition, we have no way of knowing whether they really enjoy their chains…’ (1964. Legalism).
transformatory significance, the extent to which the choices made have the potential for challenging and destabilizing social inequalities and the extent to which they merely express and reproduce these inequalities. Choices which express the fundamental inequalities of a society, which infringe the rights of others or which systematically devalue the self, are not compatible with the notion of ‘empowerment’ being put forward in this Unit.

These qualifications represent an attempt to incorporate the structural dimensions of choice into our analysis. Structures operate through the rules, norms and practices of different institutions to determine the resources, agency and achievement possibilities available to different groups of individuals in a society: our criteria of ‘alternatives’ (could they have chosen otherwise?) recognizes these larger constraints. However, the actions and choices of individuals and groups can in turn act on structural constraints, reinforcing, modifying and transforming them: our criteria of ‘consequences’ draws attention to these possibilities. Such a conceptualization of empowerment suggests that it can reflect change at a number of different possible levels (Figure 5.2).

**Figure 5.2. Levels of empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Deeper’ levels:</th>
<th>Structural relations of class/caste/gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate levels</td>
<td>Institutional rules and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate levels</td>
<td>Individual resources, agency and achievements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can reflect change at the level of individuals and groups, in their sense of selfhood and identity, in how they perceive their interests and in their capacity to act. It can occur at the intermediate level, in the rules and relationships which prevail in the personal, social, economic and political spheres of life. And it can occur in the deeper, hidden structures which shape the distribution of resources and power in a society and reproduce it over time. However, for any
such change to translate into meaningful and sustainable processes of empowerment, it must ultimately encompass both individual and structural levels. The institution of rights within the legal framework of a society is meaningless unless these rights have a real impact on the range of possibilities available to all individuals in that society. Equally, changes in the resources that individuals enjoy, but which leave intact the structures of inequality and discrimination may help to improve their economic welfare without necessarily empowering them.

In the part 2 in Unit 6, the writer will be reviewing a selection of studies which attempt to measure women’s empowerment drawn largely from the economic, the population and the gender literature in development studies. As we will see, there are some important differences in how these various studies deal with the idea of empowerment. They differ in the dimensions of empowerment which they choose to focus on and in whether they treat power as an attribute of individuals or a property of structures. They also differ in how social change is conceptualized.

In some cases, change in one dimension or level is presumed to lead to, or be symptomatic of, changes in others so that they confine themselves to indicators of that change. The UNDP’s Gender Empowerment Measure which focuses on women’s political representation or percentages of women in managerial posts is an example of this approach. It is assumed that such indicators tell us something important, if indirect, about women’s ability to make strategic choices in other aspects of their lives. Others adopt a linear cause-and-effect logic to model the relationship between changes in different dimensions or levels of empowerment. These tend to confine themselves to changes at the individual level, for instance, between changes in women’s access to income earning opportunities and their decision-making power within the household although a few have also sought to model the effects of changes at the
structural level for individual choice\textsuperscript{5}. What are understandably missing from the measurement literature are examples of the more processual model of social change subscribed to by many feminists and exemplified in the following quotes from Batliwala:

…the exercise of informed choice within an expanding framework of information, knowledge and analysis…a process which must enable women to discover new possibilities, new options…a growing repertoire of choices… to independently struggle for changes in their material conditions of existence, their personal lives and their treatment in the public sphere…The process of challenging existing power relations, and of gaining greater control over the sources of power… (Batliwala, 1993 and 1994).

A processual understanding of social change tends to treat it as open ended. It is premised on the unpredictability of human agency and on the diversity of circumstances under which such agency is exercised. While it may identify certain key elements of structure and agency as having a catalytic potential, it does not attempt to determine in advance how this potential will play out in practice. Consequently, empowerment is seen as a form of social change which is not easily captured by quantitative data.

**Check Your Progress Exercise 2**

**Note:**

i. Use this space given below to answer the question.

ii. Compare your answer with the one given at the end of this Unit

1. What are the levels of empowerment?

\textsuperscript{5} The study by Hodinott et al. on the reduction in married women’s suicide rates apparently as are result of changes in the divorce law in Canada is an example.
5.8 SUMMING UP
In this Unit, we have discussed the difficulties in defining empowerment and the dimensions of measuring empowerment. The Unit 6 and 7 further discusses the problems in measuring empowerment and the problems in providing value the empowerment.

5.9 GLOSSARY
Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM): The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) is a measure of inequalities between men's and women's opportunities in a country. It combines inequalities in three areas: political participation and decision making, economic participation and decision making, and power over economic resources. It is one of the five indicators used by the United Nations Development Programme in its annual Human Development Report.

Gender inequality index: The disadvantages facing women and girls are a major source of inequality. All too often, women and girls are discriminated against in health, education and the labour market — with negative repercussions for their freedoms. UNDP introduce a new measure of these inequalities built on the same framework as the HDI and the IHDI — to better expose differences in the distribution of achievements between women and men. Gender inequality varies tremendously across countries—the losses in achievement due to gender inequality (not directly comparable to total inequality losses because different variables are used) range from 4.5 percent to 74.7 percent. Countries with unequal distribution of human development also experience high inequality between women and men, and countries with high gender inequality also experience unequal distribution of human development.

5.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES
Check Your Progress Exercise 1
1. Resources, Agency and Achievements

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

1. The levels of empowerment are deeper levels: structural relations of class, caste and gender, intermediate levels: institutional rules and resources and immediate levels: individual resources, agency and achievements.

5.11 REFERENCES


Hoogenboezem, G. (1997) *Some men really are useless. The role of participation in a women’s project, empowerment and gender in the context of two Zimbabwean women’s organisations* Occasional paper No. 56, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Germany.


Jejheebhoy, S. (1995) *Women’s education, autonomy, and reproductive behaviour. Experience from developing countries*


Mahila Samakhya (1996) Beacons in the dark: a profile of Mahila Samakhya Karnataka Published by Mahila Samakhya, Bangalore, Karnataka


Naripokkho, 1998Domestic violence in the Bangladesh Research-in-progress


Pitt, M. and Khandker, S., 1995, ‘Household and intrahousehold impacts of the Grameen Bank and similar targeted credit programs in Bangladesh’, paper presented at workshop on “Credit programs for the poor: household and intrahousehold impacts and program sustainability” by the
Education and Social Policy Department, Washington and Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dhaka. Held at the Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies


Sender, J. and S-Smith (1990) Poverty, Class and Gender in rural Africa London: Routledge


5.12 QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION AND PRACTICE

1. Explain the issues involved in measuring the empowerment.
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