Complementing Gender Analysis Methods

Anant Kumar

Published online: 05 May 2015.

Submit your article to this journal ⬈

Article views: 60

View related articles ⬈

View Crossmark data ⬈

Complementing Gender Analysis Methods

Anant Kumar

Department of Rural Management, Xavier Institute of Social Service,
Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

The existing gender analysis frameworks start with a premise that men and women are equal and should be treated equally. These frameworks give emphasis on equal distribution of resources between men and women and believe that this will bring equality which is not always true. Despite equal distribution of resources, women tend to suffer and experience discrimination in many areas of their lives such as the power to control resources within social relationships, and the need for emotional security and reproductive rights within interpersonal relationships. These frameworks believe that patriarchy as an institution plays an important role in women's oppression, exploitation, and it is a barrier in their empowerment and rights. Thus, some think that by ensuring equal distribution of resources and empowering women economically, institutions like patriarchy can be challenged. These frameworks are based on proposed equality principle which puts men and women in competing roles. Thus, the real equality will never be achieved. Contrary to the existing gender analysis frameworks, the Complementing Gender Analysis framework proposed by the author provides a new approach toward gender analysis which not only recognizes the role of economic empowerment and equal distribution of resources but suggests to incorporate the concept and role of social capital, equity, and doing gender in gender analysis which is based on perceived equity principle, putting men and women in complementing roles that may lead to equality. In this article the author reviews the mainstream gender theories in development from the viewpoint of the complementary roles of gender. This alternative view is argued based on existing literature and an anecdote of observations made by the author. While criticizing the equality theory, the author offers equity theory in resolving the gender conflict by using the concept of social and psychological capital.

Keywords: Gender, equality, equity, framework, analysis, development, feminism

Gender[1] analysis is a tool to examine differences in women's and men's lives and the ways in which those differences, whether real or perceived, have been valued, used, and relied upon in assigning roles and responsibilities to them. The existing gender analysis frameworks[2] help in understanding the social and economic conditions, gender gaps, and inequalities affecting men and women. The aim of these frameworks is to provide methods and tools to collect and use sex-disaggregated and gender related data and information to inform development interventions at various stages, from project/program conception and design through to evaluation (Warren, 2007). Most of these gender analysis frameworks such as the Harvard Analytical Framework or the Gender Roles Framework (Overholt, Anderson, Cloud, & Auston, 1985; Rao, Anderson, & Overholt, 1991), the Moser Gender Planning Framework (Moser, 1993), the Gender Analysis Matrix (Parker, 1993), the Women's Empowerment Framework (Longwe, 1995; Williams, Janet, & Adelina, 1995), and Social Relations Framework[3] developed at the Institute of Development Studies in Sussex, UK, by

Address correspondence to Anant Kumar, Department of Rural Management, Xavier Institute of Social Service, Dr. Camil Bulcke Path, Ranchi, Jharkhand, 834 001 India. E-mail: pandeyanant@hotmail.com

Naila Kabeer (Kabeer, 1994; Earl, Carden, & Smutylo, 2001; Mukhopadhyay & Wong, 2007) are developed in the context of developmental programs and policies and how they affect, influence, or are influenced by development through various programs and policies (Batliwala & Pittman, 2010). The prime focus of these gender analysis frameworks is to find: (1) how gender relations affect the achievement of sustainable results; and (2) how proposed results affect the relative status of men and women. However, very few frameworks or approaches tell us about how changes happen or how gender relations have been altered (Batliwala & Pittman, 2010). Most of these frameworks measure performance rather than impact or change. These analyses provided by most of these frameworks are driven, implicitly or explicitly, by categories (such as productive,[4] reproductive,[5] community management[6] roles, etc.) that can facilitate the nongovernment organizations (NGOs) development intervention funded by the donor agencies rather than focusing on social and cultural fabric of the society. However, we are yet to design a framework or approach that will provide a larger picture of gender dynamics and build collective power and deeper change. The existing frameworks look at development in isolation, and are very much guided by the capitalist market forces, limiting themselves to distribution of material resources, economic empowerment, and its sustenance while missing the social aspects of man and woman relationship such as social capital[7] and social systems (such as institutions like patriarchy) which is essential for the survival of any society or civilization. Development[8] should benefit the larger society or a nation. Thus, development cannot be seen as an isolated phenomenon. Unless we understand the gender roles, mediating agencies (such as patriarchy), and the relationship between men and women in a wider framework, talking about development and taking its benefit to men and women will hardly make any difference. Naila Kabeer (2005) argues that gender equality and women empowerment certainly have the potential to bring about positive changes in women's lives, but, it is the social relationships that govern access to the resource in question that will determine the extent to which this potential is realized.

The existing frameworks have a major thrust toward measuring, monitoring, and evaluating the success of development projects and programs from a gender perspective and are guided by the service oriented supply side of the intervention focusing on equal distribution of resources and power between men and women irrespective of the individual perceived needs. This is influenced by the *proposed equality principle* which is based on the premise that women and men are equal and should be treated in the same way (equally). This view upholds the stand of radical feminists that men and women are equal[9] and the root cause of women's inequality is patriarchy and all relationships are social constructs. John Stuart Mill (1984) was the first philosopher who contributed positively to an analysis of the issue surrounding women's position in society and advocated gender equality as one of the main principles of social justice (Szapuova, 2006). He was against women's subordination and advocated equal treatment. However, his suggestion of *equal treatment* was misunderstood by many that *men and women are equal*. Because of this false notion, even after years of women's struggling for equality, equality-based policies have failed. Eva Feder Kittay (1999) argues that:

> Equality-based policies have failed women in the public arena as well as in the private sphere, neither achieving their goal in representation in political office nor in sharing of domestic cores and childrearing responsibilities. Despite liberal commitments to the ideal, equality continues to elude us [women]. (p. 3)

Here, we need to understand that this belief (that men and women are equal) is an outcome of a wrong roadmap provided and taught to us. We do not see what exists in reality but are prone to, dependent on, and guided by the maps provided (through the teaching of dominant prevalent ideologies and beliefs). E. F. Schumacher (1978) in his book *The Guide for the Perplexed* mentions an incident during his visit to Leningrad in August 1968. He writes:

> On a visit to Leningrad, I consulted a map to find out where I was, but I could not make it out. I could see several enormous churches, yet there was no trace of them on my map. When finally an interpreter came

to help me, he said: "We don't show churches on our maps." Contradicting him, I pointed to one that was very clearly marked. "This is a museum," he said, "not what we call a *living church*. It is only the *living churches* we don't show." (p. 9)

This incident of 1968 is still relevant. It shows how the dominant ideologies shape our understanding of the world where we start looking and believing the world as shown to us without questioning it. This belief that men and women are equal is so pronounced that we accept it, without questioning it. As Barbara and Allan Pease (2001) write in their book, *Why Men Don't Listen and Women Can't Read Maps* and argue that:

Men and women are different. Not better or worse—just different. Scientists, anthropologists, and social-biologists have known this for years, but they have also been painfully aware that to express this knowledge publicly in such a politically correct world could turn them into social pariahs. Society today is determined to believe that men and women possess exactly the same skills, aptitudes, and potentials—just as science, ironically, is beginning to prove they are completely different. (pp. 15–16)

Not only that, we also accept a host of other related ideologies such as "equality will lead to equity" and "economic empowerment will bring changes in other spheres of women's life." In reality, many a time, it disempowers women. In a study by Nirantar,[10] an NGO, found that the more successful the program is in raising women's income level, the more likely male earners in the household's shift responsibility for the household's economic security onto women, who at times earn less and work less regularly, while also taking control of women's income. Even women themselves report increased violence as a result of tensions around their newfound economic power.[11]

These roadmaps provided and taught, also lead us to believe and advocate that patriarchy as an institution is a barrier to women's empowerment, equality, and rights which needs careful re-examination. In December 2012, after the rape of Nirbhaya, a young Indian woman gang-raped and murdered in Delhi, thousands of males and females participated in a protest march demanding justice and legislation to protect women's rights and dignity. The presence of men standing shoulder to shoulder with women in public protest is clear evidence and indication that feminist scholar activists' understanding of patriarchy as an agency or institution of oppression is biased considering that all men participating in the protest march were not feminist men. If that is the case, it means patriarchy as an institution is breathing its last. We need to recognize and realize that patriarchy as an institution or a structure is a system developed in this very society by the people (including women) for better functioning of the community, society, or a nation. It is a dynamic institution (characterized by constant change, activity, or progress) which changes with time. Society is changing. Men's and women's relationships and their roles are also changing. Thus, it is required to revisit the definition of patriarchy. According to Oxford English Dictionary, the etymological definition of patriarchy is a system of society or government in which men hold the power and women are largely excluded from it. The focus of the present definition is one-sided, emphasizing the supremacy of the father in the family or the role played by the male patron in the family, where women and children are powerless and oppressed. Women are not powerless under all conditions in a society. There is need to redefine the concept of patriarchy. In real practice, "patriarchy is all about power. It is a power to protect, power to provide, the power to dominate and control" (Elam, 2010). Though patriarchy is largely dependent on gender roles (men or women); it is a power relation (shared by men and women) in a family or society and this (share of) power relation varies from family to family. It is difficult to find a family where men or women have complete power over others. Thus, it would be wrong to assume that patriarchy is an oppressive, static institution that continues to oppress women and will oppress women in the future too. Such interpretations display a tendency toward ahistoricism[12] and universalism.[13] For these reasons, there is a growing consensus that patriarchy should be abandoned as an explanatory concept or theory (Pilcher & Whelehan, 2004) and it is suggested that patriarchy should only be used as an adjective, to understand human (men and women) relations and their dynamics.

For the existence of patriarchy (notion and exercise of power), institutions or any form of social relationships, such as family, is a must. We should not forget that these institutions also provide us certain norms, values, system, structure, authority, and security. Although, the nature of family varies across cultures; power between members changes and plays an important role in shaping gender roles, norms, etc. These norms and values such as trust, accountability, commitment, concern and respect for others, cooperation, sacrifice, etc., are a must for the survival of any society or civilization. Patriarchy is not only dominated by men but women are also an inherent part of it, strengthening its notion and character. Anthropologist Margaret Mead in her book *Male and Female* (1949) argues and criticizes the notion of a male conspiracy to keep women in their place. She argues that:

> this is a world made not by men alone, in which women are unwilling and helpless dupes and fools or else powerful schemers hiding their power under their ruffled petticoats, but a world made by mankind for human beings of both sexes. (pp. 299–300)

Philosopher Christina Sommers (1994) in her book *Who Stole Feminism* argues that "how a group of feminists, claiming to speak for all women, are promoting a dangerous new agenda that threatens our most cherished ideals and sets women against men in all spheres of life" (p. B [2 of 322]). She shows how these extremists have propped up their arguments with highly questionable but well-funded research to perpetuate a view of women as victims of patriarchy. Thus, criticizing and rejecting patriarchy will not lead us anywhere. Rejecting patriarchy may lead to chaos in the society and as a result, there would be more exploitation and oppression, having negative consequences for both the sexes. The family as an institution is guided by norms, values, and power relation (patriarchy). In the absence of these norms, values, and patriarchy, institutions like the family will collapse and will lead to the supremacy of powerful (man or woman) without considering the welfare of the powerless. In such a situation, it is immaterial whose exploitation is greater. Besides, these criticisms have hardly provided a new framework to seek solutions outside a patriarchal understanding.

The existing frameworks fail to recognize that equal treatment will not produce equitable results, because women and men have different life experiences and needs (Friedl, 1975). Most of these frameworks are based on an assumption (or on evidences from various studies) that all women are in a subordinate position and subdued by men rather than complementing each other by taking different roles based on their perceived needs. These assumptions are individual experiences and reflections of a few individual writers and scholars struggling for their own identities. They deny the people's preference which is thought to be fundamental for democracy. Christina Sommers (1994) argues that the gender feminists who claim to represent the true interests of women are convinced that they profoundly understand the situation and so they are in an exceptional position to know the true interests. In practice, this means that they are prepared to dismiss popular preferences in an illiberal way. Thus, generalizing their experience and reflection needs to be re-examined carefully.

These existing frameworks are also influenced by the economic development model and analyse gender relations by examining the division of labor, access to and control over resources, participation in decision making, autonomy, and distribution of power among men and women. These frameworks do not consider the human elements of the gender relation such as love,[14] trust, respect, and mutual interdependence. The reason behind this non-consideration is their belief (arising from feminist literature) that these (love, trust, etc.) are the root of women's exploitation and their subordination, which is debatable. Whereas, just contrary to it, many young women (and men) see such feminist positions as a threat to loving relationship between men and women or as an anti-male obstacle to gender equality (Bryson, 1999).

Here, it is important to understand what is the ultimate goal of an institution like family and, by extension, life itself. Is it happiness (as subjective experience), concern for the welfare and happiness of self and others, or the equal distribution and control over the resources (which is

considered objective and measurable)? It is not necessary that equal distribution and control over resources will give happiness. The existing frameworks examine the gender roles mechanically by measuring the equal distribution and control over resources (which is capital.[15]) denying the social capital.[16] Thus, the focus is on capital rather than on social, psychological, and cultural capital (etiquette, language, knowledge, etc.). We need to understand that the basics of human relations are human interactions and inter-dependence on each other (for protection, security, survival, love/emotion, procreation); and capital is a by-product of human relation and interactions. It is observed that generally men and women who follow traditional gender roles (doing gender influenced by the social, psychological, and cultural capital) in their marriage or other relationships are happier than those who do not follow or undo gender (Risman, 2009). Although gender experts may not accept it and argue that women who value their relationships with male partners and relations more than their autonomy are suffering from "false consciousness" about the nature of their oppression (El-Bushra, 2000a). The gender model of marriage predicts that marriages that are strongly gendered make women happier and make men more likely to engage in marital emotion work (Risman, 2009). Although one may argue that it comes with a whole set of other kinds of compromises, in all relationships (including marriage) there is some kind of compromise (Scanzoni, 1968).

The existing frameworks try to promote gender equality by assessing and ensuring that resources are distributed equally among men and women. But at the same time, these frameworks are also promoting "undoing gender" (Butler, 2004; Deutsch, 2007) because they believe that "doing gender"[17] (West & Zimmerman, 1987) promotes inequality and inequity between men and women. They argue that doing gender will maintain patriarchy, women's exploitation, and oppression by men and it is a hurdle in access to equal resources and rights to women. Thus, they believe in undoing gender which has its roots in feminist ideology and theory and believes that gender roles are male dominated and guided by agencies like patriarchy. Undoing gender is guided by individualism and independence where it sees a woman as complete in herself, whereas doing gender believes in collectivism and interdependence. Here, we need to understand that men and women live in a society and thus are interdependent for their various needs such as safety needs, physical needs, emotional needs, etc. This interdependence is guided by collectivism to achieve the common goal (happiness) based on an individual's contribution based on their potential and capabilities (capacities) in achieving the common goal. Here, gender roles are shaped by the society in which men and women both play a (different) equal role.

Although born equal,[18] men and women are (two) different entities having different biological, physiological, psychological, emotional, social, sexual needs, and experiences[19] (Gray, 1992; Pease & Pease, 2001; Umberson, Chen, House, Hopkins, & Slaten, 1996). Thus, they need the other sex in realizing their self and achieving developmental goals—*complementing role*. This mutual interdependence is based on human needs of love, affection, and self-actualization. Here, men and women play a complementary role rather than the role of oppressor in each other's development. The existing frameworks of gender analysis which are influenced by feminist ideologies and capital (resource, power, and control) are somehow putting the male and female against each other—putting them in *competing roles*—leading to competition between men and women over capital rather than a complementary approach and joint ownership of capital.

The existing frameworks, undoubtedly, help in understanding the different roles undertaken by and assigned to men and women. However, the major concerns with these frameworks are their overemphasis on and demand for equal roles and control which puts men and women as competitors rather than complementors. Hence, the author proposes a gender analysis framework based on the complementarity principle where men and women decide and accept the gender roles as per the perceived needs: *perceived equity principle*. Perceived gender equity principle takes into consideration the differences in women's and men's lives and recognizes that different approaches may be needed to produce outcomes that are equitable.

COMPLEMENTING GENDER ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

The Complementing Gender Analysis (CGA) Framework supplements the other existing gender analysis frameworks in understanding gender roles. CGA is based on dynamic and interchanging gender roles as per the perceived needs and does not consider the fixed gender roles assigned to men and women (See Table 1). The main postulates of CGA frameworks are the following:

(1) Men and women take different changing roles irrespective of their sex based on need and their capabilities.
(2) Men and women take the assigned roles and responsibilities based on complementarity principle rather than competing principle.
(3) The framework focuses on perceived equity principle rather than proposed equality principle.
(4) The framework recognizes the role of social, psychological, and cultural capital and human elements of love, trust, respect, and compassion in deciding gender roles.

In principle, CGA framework complements the existing frameworks. The existing frameworks believe that men and women are equal and should have equal access and rights based on the proposed equality principle whereas CGA framework recognizes and suggests that men and women have different needs and life experiences and should have access to rights and resources based on perceived equity principle. Secondly, existing frameworks believe that equality will lead to equity[20] whereas CGA suggests that equity will lead to equality.[21] Thirdly, the existing frameworks do not recognize the human elements of love, trust, respect, and mutual interdependence whereas CGA recognizes and is based on the human elements of love, trust, respect, and mutual interdependence. Fourthly, existing frameworks constructs gender gap using equality principles whereas CGA deconstructs gender gap using equity principles. And as an outcome, existing frameworks are leading to competition. Thus, the proposed equality will never be achieved whereas CGA framework believes in complementarity principle which may lead to equal rights based on equity.

Men and women take interchanging (often similar) roles based on perceived needs irrespective of their sex which differs according to context, culture, space, and society (Friedl, 1975). Feminist geographers have shown that they (men and women) interact differently with place and that many of the gender relations are "stretched over" space, that is, they are essentially spatial in nature

TABLE 1
Comparison between CGA Framework and Existing Gender Analysis Frameworks

	Gender Analysis Frameworks[a]	*CGA Framework*
Principles	Men and women are equal and should have equal access and rights based on proposed equality principle	Men and women have different needs and life experiences and should have access to rights and resources based on perceived equity principle
	Equality will lead to equity	Equity will lead to equality
	Not based on the human elements of love, trust, respect and mutual interdependence	Based on human elements of love, trust, respect and mutual interdependence
	Constructs gender gap using equality principles	Deconstructs gender gap using equity principles
Outcomes	Leads to competition and the proposed equality will never be realized	Leads to complement each other which will lead to equal rights based on equity

Note. [a]Gender Roles Framework (Overholt et al., 1985), Moser Gender Planning Framework (Moser, 1993), Gender Analysis Matrix (Parker, 1993), Women's Empowerment Framework (Williams, 1995), and Social Relations Approach (Kabeer, 1994).

(Raju & Lahiri-Dutt, 2011). Margaret Mead (1935, 1949) in her study of three cultures of Papua New Guinea found that gender roles and identities are largely culturally constructed and vary across time and space. Mead also demonstrated how culture shapes the men and women in different societies. The author in his observational study of three villages in Jharkhand found that despite the socially assigned roles and responsibilities for men and women, these roles are not identical and change according to time, space, and context. For example, it was observed that in the first village men were fetching drinking water, in the second village it was fetched by women and in the third village, it was fetched by men and women both, whereas traditionally fetching water is considered as women's role and responsibility. In most cultures, women are primarily responsible for the use and management of water resources, sanitation, and health at the household level, while men are rarely expected to perform such tasks. In urban areas, it is commonly observed that gender roles are mixed-up and boundaries of (fixed, traditional) gender roles are changing (breaking) fast at home and at the workplace. In many families, men are taking care of children and doing household work which is traditionally assigned as women's role and responsibility. This shows that gender roles are changing and are guided by the complementarity principle.

We need to understand that earlier gender roles (traditional gender roles) were guided by the complementarity principle. In pre-historic period, men and women were equal and the concept of subordination did not exist. The relations between men and women were guided by the perceived need and complementarity principle. As Warren Farrell (2012) argues that although these roles were not good from today's standards but they were good for the survival of the species. Human beings moved from nomadic life to settled life which required men to go out for hunting and women to take care of the home, children, and livestock. Anthropologists and biologically oriented scholars believe that these roles were shaped and guided by the sexual dimorphism (the existence of two forms of individual within the same animal species, independent of sex differences) in homo sapiens such as men on the average are larger than women, and can muster greater spurts of muscular energy; than woman's pelvic anatomy, adapted for child bearing, prevents them from running as fast as men, etc. (Friedl, 1975). Thus, these roles were not assigned or imposed and taken by men and women based on their convenience. Later, these gender roles were institutionalized where women were regarded as lesser human beings, considered inferior to men physically, intellectually, and morally with dominant ideas such as "biology is destiny." These traditional roles continued for long and thus gradually got institutionalized due to male dominance and a strong patriarchal system which led to the suppression and exploitation of women in many societies. The idea of women being lesser human beings was guided by the concept of power and how it was perceived in the context of men and women relationship and gender roles. In this context, traditional gender roles were guided by the notion that men and women are two different entities and thus they believed in complementing each other where power was a positive sum game which can be understood using Talcott Parson's (1963) analysis of power where power is the resource of the whole community that the members use collectively and effectively to achieve their objectives based on equity/equality principle. Whereas modern gender roles are concerned, it is guided by the notion that men and women are equal; thus they can compete with each other over resources where power is a zero sum game which can be understood using Max Weber's (1978) analysis of power where a person or group gains it only when another person or group loses it. It is based on inequity/inequality principle. Today, we believe that traditional gender roles are breaking down due to women's empowerment and feminist movements but in reality the (new) gender roles are changing, mostly due to changing perceptions, how men and women are putting themselves against each other (in complementary or competing role), world economies, market forces, globalization, changing family structure, and other influencers which demand men and women to complement each other rather than to compete with each other.

The CGA framework is based on a complementing role approach and perceived equity principle and helps in building trust and interdependence among men and women and subsequent decisions

about the roles undertaken and assigned to them, in a specific social and economic environment. In contrast to other frameworks, the CGA framework also recognizes the role of social capital and human elements of love, trust, respect, and compassion in gender roles. Most of the existing frameworks give little attention to the role of social capital and psychological capital[22] such as hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and self-resilience (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2006) in shaping gender relations.

In relationships between men and women, their gender roles and development, and the role of social capital plays an important role which cannot be ignored. Thus, incorporating the role of social capital in gender analysis and in understanding gender roles is a must. Serageldin (1997) argues that:

> There is growing empirical evidence that social capital contributes significantly to sustainable development . . . . Social capital refers to the internal social and cultural coherence of society, the norms and values that govern interactions among people and the institutions in which they are embedded. Social capital is the glue that hold societies together and without which there can be no economic growth or human well being. Without social capital, society at large will collapse, and today's world presents some very sad example of this. (p. 2)

We need to understand that the gender roles are shaped and influenced by social systems and structures, values, and norms and without having in-depth understanding of these, any gender analysis will not be complete and biased. Thus, in any gender analysis framework, the role of social, psychological, and cultural capital and influences must be considered.

CGA METHODS

Most gender analysis frameworks propose to use existing compartmentalized gender roles assigned to men and women. In such gender analysis, institutionalized traditional gender roles or modern expected gender roles are used for analysis rather than finding the real existing gender roles in a specific society or culture being studied. In contrast, CGA framework proposes that a researcher/ social scientist should go to the field with an open mind, without having any compartmentalized gender roles. During gender analysis, researchers should find the perceived gender roles and gender analysis that should be done accordingly in specific contexts and environment; which requires significant cultural competencies on the part of the researcher (Purkayastha, Subramaniam, Desai, & Bose, 2003). The CGA framework primarily focuses on the use of participatory and qualitative research methods although quantitative methods may be used. This framework also helps in understanding and studying the existing gender relations, linkages, and factors among men and women in a larger social, economic, political, and environmental context. The framework helps in establishing a balanced relationship between men and women and will help in formulating gender neutral policies. CGA framework can be used for transformative change process rather than interventionist process; in understanding different aspects of the program planning, implementation, and review; and as an integral approach toward social analysis of programs and their sustainability.

DISCUSSION

The existing gender analysis frameworks are highly influenced by the Western development models, agencies, institutions, and donors and their ideologies are guided by interventionist approach, market, capital, their institutional vision, and the Western understanding of gender and feminism[23] rather than focusing on making a gender-just society where men and women can live and lead better (happier) lives. In this context, the proposition coined by feminist scholars of "unpaid family labor" (Hay, Sudarshan, & Mendez, 2012) is critical and needs careful analysis.

This proposition degrades the concept of family and the role played by men and women and proposes to see and define men and women's relation in economic terms taking the focus away from the notion of social capital and social empowerment. The overemphasis by donors and development agencies for evaluation and quantification to ensure accountability and generate an evidence base has diluted the whole purpose of gender analysis. We need to understand that objectivity and quantification will not necessarily yield the required information and results. For example, it is generally assumed that economic empowerment will lead to social empowerment and will affect other spheres of life (El-Bushra, 2000b). In many studies, it emerged that these assumptions are not true because their focus was more on measurable indicators rather than on other factors of social change and transformation. Thus, despite the fact that existing frameworks provide valuable information for planning and program design, these frameworks fail to provide a holistic picture and intervening factors in the relationships between men and women. The author believes that CGA framework will complement the existing gender analysis framework in better understanding of the relationships between men and women and gender roles.

CONCLUSION

Most of the available gender analysis frameworks are developed in the North (the West: the countries of [originally] Europe and [now including] North America and South America) guided by feminist ideologies with interventionist approach. These frameworks have the inherent conceptual problem of biases toward men and their strong belief that men and male dominated institutions (such as patriarchy) are at the root of women's suppression and subjugation. Thus, these frameworks see men's and women's roles as competitive (where one will lose and another will win) based on proposed equality principle. Contrary to this proposition, the author believes that men and women are two entities and they cannot compete and proposes CGA framework where men and women complement each other and gender roles are guided by the perceived equity principle, and social and psychological capital. The author believes that CGA framework will help in better understanding the man–woman relationship and in bringing them closer in the development of the self, and the society.

GLOSSARY

1. *Doing gender* refers to creating the difference between sexes (men and women) that are not natural, essential, or biological. Once the differences have been constructed, they are used to reinforce the "essentialness" of gender (West and Zimmerman, 1987) for example, compliance of gender performances.
2. *Undoing gender* refers to social interactions that reduce gender difference.
3. *Social capital* refers to those features of social organizations—such as trust, norms, networks, etc.—that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions (Putnam, Leonardi, & Nanetti, 1993). It is a network of social connections that exist between people, and their shared values and norms of behavior, which enable and encourage mutually advantageous social cooperation (Collins English Dictionary, Harper Collins Publishers, 2003)
4. *Psychological capital* refers to an individual's positive psychological state of development that is characterized by having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2006).

5. *Equality* refers to having one measure; the same in magnitude, quantity, degree, worth, etc. (Oxford English Dictionary, 2003 edition).

6. *Equity* refers to impartial justice, fairness (equitable: uniform in treatment; fair). (Oxford English Dictionary, 2003 edition).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

1. Social and cultural roles assigned and adopted by men and women. In other words, "gender" conveys what individuals would conceive of their roles as males and females, roles that are largely sanctioned and ascribed by society (Raju & Lahiri-Dutt, 2011). Gender refers to the socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for men and women.

2. Frameworks are the broad conceptual structures that attempt to pull together a set of ideas about how a change intervention should be tracked and how its effects should be measured or assessed.

3. Although the Social Relations Framework accepts the "interconnectedness" of men's and women's roles, it misses to incorporate concept and role of social capital.

4. Roles or tasks those are monetarily reimbursed.

5. Roles or tasks that are associated with child rearing/raising and care taking of the home (e.g., cooking/cleaning).

6. Role and work that supports collective consumption and maintenance of community resources (e.g., local government, irrigation system management, and education, etc.).

7. Social and cultural capital arises from relationships between individuals, families, groups, or communities that provide access to valuable benefits and/or resources.

8. Development is a process of bringing positive change and wellbeing in one's life.

9. Although there is no written evidence in feminist literature, it is prominently argued by the feminist scholars that men and women are equal. They may deny this statement but this very fact is the basis of equal demand and treatment.

10. Nirantar Qualitative Study of SHGs and Empowerment, First Edition, February, 2007. Available at http://www.nirantar. net/docs/SHG_%20qual_%20eng.pdf

11. This is just a fact coming out of the study. This should not lead to the argument that because of this woman should not work.

12. Failure to acknowledge or account for historical variations in gender relations.

13. Failure to recognize cultural variations in relations between women and men, and that relations between women and men are the same the world over.

14. According to Warren Farrell, a woman calls it love when a man is a good provider and protector. He calls it love if she is beautiful and takes care of the home and the children. Love means a division of labor and that division of labor leads to a division of different male and female interests. Love can mean common interests, common values. Love's definition therefore is in transition.

15. Financial and physical resources.

16. Here, social capital means social resources derived from social interactions such as love, trust, and mutual respect and by extension to it, the concepts of norms, values, and networks which influence human relations and social interactions (see the works of Putnam et al., 1993; Coleman, 1988; Fukuyama, 1995; Bourdieu, 1986).

17. According to West and Zimmerman (1987), "Doing gender involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micro-political activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine natures".

18. In terms of process of conception and birth.

19. It may appear that this statement (according to available feminist literature and theories) is extremely narrow, heteronormative, and represents a traditional perspective, but in reality, it is not.

20. Gender equity is not necessarily achieved by guaranteeing men and women equal rights through established laws, or dealing with groups as a collective entity (Gotschi, Njuki, & Delve, 2008).

21. *Gender equity* refers to fairness and justice in the distribution of responsibilities and benefits between men and women whereas *gender equality* refers to the absence of discrimination on the basis of a person's sex in opportunities, the allocation of resources or benefits, or in access to services. Thus, *gender equity* should be the first step toward the goal of *gender equality*.

22. *Psychological capital* refers to the collection of values, norms, perceptions, cognitive elements, and affective or emotional factors embedded in a person that can be expected to influence happiness and earnings. Psychological capital also includes an individual's inner feelings such as love, trust, and belief.

23. In general understanding, feminism is a set of social (and political) movements dedicated to ending the subordination of women (Jaggar, 1994). Here, it is important to understand that feminism as an ideology was developed in the West and there is no Indian feminism which is important because of political, social, and cultural differences between India and the West. Although India has very old history of feminism in literature and epics, it was not further developed. For example, in the Mahabharata, when the Pandavas lost Draupdi in *Choupar* (type of game/gamble in which you put something which you have to lose, if you are defeated in the game), Draupdi questioned Pandavas that how they put her for gamble without consulting her.

REFERENCES

Batliwala, S., & Pittman, A. (2010). *Capturing change in women's realities: A critical overview of current monitoring and evaluation frameworks and approaches*. Toronto, ON, Canada: Association for Women's Rights in Development.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Bryson, V. (1999). *Feminist debates: Issues of theory and political practice* (p. 2). Hong Kong: Macmillan.

Butler, J. P. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, S95–S120. doi:10.1086/228943

Deutsch, F. M. (2007). Undoing gender. *Gender and Society*, *21*, 106–127. doi:10.1177/0891243206293577

Earl, S., Carden, F., & Smutylo, T. (2001). *Outcome mapping. Building learning and reflection into development programs*. Ottawa, ON, Canada: IDRC.

Elam, P. (2010). *Patriarchy for dummies*. *The spearhead*. Retrieved from http://www.the-spearhead.com/2010/07/25/patriarchy-for-dummies/

El-Bushra, J. (2000a). Rethinking gender and development practice for the twenty-first century. *Gender and Development*, *8*, 55–62. doi:10.1080/741923413; PMid:12349639.

El-Bushra, J. (2000b). Rethinking gender and development practice for the twenty-first century. In C. Sweetman (Ed.), *Gender in the 21st century* (pp. 55–62). Oxford, England: Oxfam.

Farrell, W. (2012). The myth of male power: Why men are the disposable sex, Part 1. *New Male Studies: An International Journal*, *1*, 4–33.

Friedl, E. (1975). *Women and men: An anthropologist's view*. NewYork, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. London, England: Hamish Hamilton.

Gotschi, E., Njuki, J., & Delve, R. (2008). Gender equity and social capital in smallholder farmer groups in Central Mozambique. *Development in Practice*, *18*, 650–657. doi:10.1080/09614520802181970

Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Hay, K., Sudarshan, R. M., & Mendez, E. (2012). Why a special issue on evaluating gender and equity? *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, *19*, 179–186. doi:10.1177/097152151201900201

Jaggar, A. (Ed.). (1994). Introduction: Living with contradictions: *Controversies in feminist social ethics* (pp. 1–12). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kabeer, N. (1994). *Reversed realities: Gender hierarchies in development thought*. London, England: Verso.

Kabeer, N. (2005). Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third millennium development goal 1. *Gender & Development*, *13*, 13–24. doi:10.1080/13552070512331332273

Kittay, E. F. (1999). *Love's labour: Essays on women, equality, and dependency*. New York, NY; and London, England: Routledge.

Longwe, S. (1995). Gender awareness: The missing element in the third world development program. In C. March & T. Wallace (Eds.), *Changing perception: New writings on gender and development*. Oxford, England: Oxfam.

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2006). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195187526.001.0001; PMid:16435945.

Mead, M. (1935). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies* (pp. 279–288). New York, NY: William Morrow.

Mead, M. (1949). *Male and female: A study of the sexes in a changing world*. New York, NY: William Morrow.

Mill, J. S. (1984). The subjection of women. In J. M. Robson (Ed.), *The collected works of John Stuart Mill, Vol. 21: Essays on equality, law and education*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Moser, C. (1993). *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice, and training*. London, England: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203411940

Mukhopadhyay, M., & Wong, F. (Eds.). (2007). *Revisiting gender training. The making and remaking of gender knowledge*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: KIT.

Overholt, C., Anderson, M. B., Cloud, K., & Austin, J. E. (Eds.). (1985). *Gender roles in development projects: A case book*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Parker, R. (1993). *Another Point of View: A Manual on Gender Analysis Training for Grassroots Workers*. New York, NY: UNIFEM.

Parsons, T. (1963). On the concept of political power. *Proceeding of the American Philosophical Society*, *107*, 232–262. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/985582

Pease, B., & Pease, A. (2001). *Why men don't listen and women can't read maps*. Mona Vale, NSW, Australia: Pease Training International.

Pilcher, J., & Whelehan, I. (2004). *Fifty key concepts in gender studies*. London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Purkayastha, B., Subramaniam, M., Desai, M., & Bose, S. (2003). The study of gender in India: A partial review. *Gender and Society*, *17*, 503–524. doi:10.1177/0891243203253793

Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Raju, S., & Lahiri-Dutt, K. (2011). *Doing gender, doing geography: Emerging reasearch in India*. New Delhi, India: Routledge.

Rao, A., Anderson, M. B., & Overholt, C. (1991). *Gender analysis in development planning: A case book*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Risman, B. J. (2009). From doing to undoing: gender as we know it. *Gender and Society*, *23*, 81–84. doi:10.1177/0891243208326874

Scanzoni, J. (1968). A social system analysis of dissolved and existing marriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *30*, 452–461. doi:10.2307/349915

Schumacher, E. F. (1978). *A guide for the perplexed. ABACUS edition*. London, England: Spheres Book Limited.

Serageldin, I. (1997). *Foreword to social capital initiatives, Working paper no. 2: The initiative on defining, monitoring and measuring social capital*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Sommers, C. H (1994). *Who stole feminism: How women have betrayed women*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Szapuova, M. (2006). Mill's liberal feminism: Its legacy and current criticism. *Prolegomena: časopis za filozofiju*, *5*, 179–191.

Umberson, D., Chen, M. D., House, J. S., Hopkins, K., & Slaten, E. (1996). The effect of social relationships on psychological well-being: Are men and women really so different? *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 837–857. doi:10.2307/2096456

Warren, H. (2007). Using gender analysis frameworks: Theoretical and practical reflections. *Gender and Development*, *15*, 187–198. doi:10.1080/13552070701391847

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, *1*, 125–151. doi:10.1177/0891243287001002002

Williams, S., Seed, J., & Mwau, A. (1995). *The Oxfam gender training manual*. Oxford, England: Oxfam.