Introduction

Studying Women, Families, and Policies Globally

Esther Ngan-ling Chow and Catherine White Berheide

The global persistence of gender inequality and concern regarding the future of the family in a rapidly changing world have inspired in scholars and lay people alike a new interest in how state policies affect the status of women and families during the process of economic development. To explore this issue, one must address several central questions: How do particular political economies around the world transform gender and household relations? How do state policies attempt to deal with these political economic realities? How do women and their households both initiate and respond to state policies? What are the policy implications of women's and households' survival strategies?

This book explores the intricate relationships among changes in women's positions, family structures, socioeconomic development, and social policies from a global perspective. By focusing on the interconnections among gender, the economy, the family, and the state, it examines how state policies affect gender and household relationships in countries with various types of political economies and under different historical and cultural contexts. The state operates differently in socialist or capitalist economies and in democratic or authoritarian regimes, as well as at various stages of economic development. The state as a form of public patriarchy is intimately related to the family as a form of private patriarchy. Both interact with the economy to produce policies that have significant effects on women and families. As a result, state policies differ in their degree of sensitivity to women's

issues and have produced (directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally) mixed outcomes for women and their families. In turn, the ways in which individuals and their families respond to particular state policies may transform them.

For example, Sweden is the only society in the world that has as an official goal the equal participation of fathers and mothers in childcare (Hass 1992). It also has the oldest and most generous paid parental leave policy. Yet Acker shows how some of these same progressive Swedish policies which have women's interests at their center, while benefitting women to some extent, still reinforce gender inequality in both private and public contexts. Sagot shows how low-income women in Costa Rica reacted to the limited government policy by becoming politically active, which resulted not only in helping to meet their families' basic housing needs, but also empowered these women and eventually altered state policies on housing.

We also examine the interaction of the family, the economy, and the state with gender, as these multiple forces (the "quadruple overlap" as Blumberg puts it) affect policy formation and household relationships in countries at various stages of political and economic development. We neither subscribe to a particular theory nor a typology of developmental stages. To enhance our understanding of the diversity of social life, we do not classify countries according to a hegemonic hierarchy such as the world system to study variations in their political economies. Instead, we seek to understand how gender and household relationships are socially constructed as they are shaped by a multiplicity of macro- and micro-forces at different times and places. We do offer a general analytical framework by delineating different arguments from the studies presented in this book and by highlighting the common threads that link various theoretical analyses into an integrated whole.

Our analytical framework is inspired by and derived from feminist and Third World perspectives in three specialized fields of study—sociology of the family, women and development, and gender and the state. Rather than treating feminist thought as a monolithic approach or seeing the Third World as a homogeneous group, we have recognized contributions of various feminist perspectives from different parts of the world.[1] The collection of studies that we include here reflects a broad spectrum of Third World experiences and contexts.[2] Before we delineate the linkages in our analytical framework, we first discuss the development of these three specialized fields and highlight the major ideas in each that have led to their theoretical convergence.

The Convergence of the Sociology of the Family, Women and Development, and Gender and the State

As the women's movement has expanded throughout the world, feminists have challenged mainstream scholarship in many different disciplines by legitimizing gender as a distinct principle of social organization and by critiquing conventional theories. Sociology of the family, women and development, and gender and the state have developed independently of each other. In contrast to the relatively long historical tradition of family studies, studies of women and development and of gender and the state emerged in the 1970s and 1980s as changes in the global political economy unfolded. These changes had particularly wrenching consequences for women, although the consequences were ignored in both the mainstream development and political economy literatures.

The women and development field has given exclusive attention to the effect of economic development on women's changing status. A recent theoretical shift redefines development to incorporate its social dimensions, paying more heed to micro-level gender relations and household analysis while at the same time addressing broader questions about gender inequality (Beneria and Roldan 1987; Dwyer and Bruce 1988; Tinker 1990). In the early 1980s, renewed interest in "bringing the state back in" led scholars to reconsider the state, the role of policy in economic development, and its subsequent effects on women and their households (Charlton, Everett, and Staudt 1989; Staudt 1990). Studies on gender and comparative politics in the past few years have revealed how the politicization and empowerment of women, individually and collectively, have shaped state policies (Bunch and Carrillo 1990; Everett 1989; Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991).

This book celebrates the contribution of feminist thought, method, and praxis by integrating studies, especially those from the Third World, in these three specialized fields. Their theoretical convergence shapes the analytical framework of this book, which examines the interlocking effects of patriarchy, economic development, and the state in transforming gender relations in the family as well as in the larger society. Thus, we begin by examining how these fields have developed and intersected.

Sociology of the Family: From Micro- to Macro-levels

Sociologists approach the family analytically as an important institution in society. In documenting the historical development of the field,

Adams (1986) divides scientific family studies into four major periods; we add a fifth. During the "Social Darwinist" period, from 1860–1890, scholars such as Marx and Engels, using historical and cross-cultural approaches, attempted to discover the origin of the family and how it evolved into its current form. During the "Social Reform" period, from 1890–1920, scholars concerned with problems families faced as a result of industrialization and urbanization, particularly in the United States and Western Europe, produced policy-oriented family research. The "Scientific Study" period, from 1920–1950, saw a proliferation of research on family behavior, resulting in a large body of empirical data. During the "Attention to Family Theory" period, from 1950–1970, Adams (1986) and Christensen (1964) both argue that family scholars engaged in systematic theory building, while at the same time continuing to produce a considerable amount of empirical research. Some of the new theories, especially the more macro-sociological ones, demanded a return to comparative research.

From the early 1970s to the present, family studies has entered what we call the "Family Diversity" period. Although scholars have often considered the family as women's domain, feminists have criticized the sociology of the family for its androcentric nature reflecting primarily a white, male, and middle-class bias (Bernard 1987; Thorne and Yalom 1992). These critics argue for making women the central focus of analysis to explicate both their objective social conditions and their subjective experience (Hartsock 1987; Smith 1979 and 1987). Recent studies that look at families from the standpoint of women have brought to public attention new issues, such as control of sexuality and reproduction, housework as unpaid labor, and several forms of the victimization of women, revealing hidden problems and providing new insight into old issues about the family as a social institution.

Feminist critiques also point to the ethnocentric nature of family sociology, which tends to ignore the diversity of family patterns in the United States as well as in other countries (Beneria and Roldan 1987; Collins 1991; Baca Zinn 1990). Challenging sexist, racist, and class-biased assumptions, women of color scholars unravelled the myths of monolithic, static, undifferentiated, and consensus-based family patterns (Baca Zinn and Eitzen 1988; Dill 1988; Jones 1985; Thorne and Yalom 1992). By incorporating race, class, gender, and culture into the study of families, these scholars provide a fuller understanding of the diversity of family forms, of the historical and cross-cultural development of these variations, and of their close linkage to forms of social inequality. Systematically integrating hierarchies of race and class into the reconstruction of a more inclusive family theory remains a challenge faced by scholars today.

Feminists relate diversity in family patterns to macro-social forces, leading scholars to look outside the boundaries of the family as a social institution. First, the interconnectedness between the family and other social institutions needs to be studied from a historical perspective. As Tilly and Scott (1978) have argued, the United States' shift from a subsistence-agriculture, family-based economy to an industrial, family-wage and family-consumer economy has had profound effects on family structure and women's work, which belie the general belief that the spheres of family and work are separate ones. Feminists, after scrutinizing the nature of women's work, have redefined the concept of work to include unpaid household labor, volunteer work, and emotional labor. They are also reexamining the nature of home-based production and uncovering other "hidden" work (Bose, Feldberg, and Sokoloff 1987; Christensen 1987; Daniels 1987; Hochschild 1983). These analyses relate both the visible and invisible work associated in the family to gender stratification and the capitalist mode of production outside the family.

Scholars have begun to develop analyses that transcend divisions such as "family and work" and "private and public spheres." We have identified three theoretical models which describe the relationship between family and work: a "separate sphere" model, a "spillover effects" model, and a "system interdependence" model (Chow and Berheide 1988). The separate sphere model regards family and work as separate systems, seeing the family as a domestic haven in which women are primarily homemakers who provide expressive and emotional support and work as a public arena in which men are the primary breadwinners who fulfill material family needs (Parsons and Bales 1955). Recognizing permeability between the work and family systems and the simultaneous membership of individuals in both, the spillover effects model often stresses asymmetrically the effects of work on family life rather than the reverse influence of family on work life, especially in the case of employed women (Crouter 1984).

The third model emphasizes the mutual interdependence of the family and work systems, viewing each system as having independent as well as joint effects, directly and indirectly, on the other and its members (Ferree 1990; Gerstel and Gross 1987; Jones 1985; Kanter 1977; Pleck 1977; Sokoloff 1980). Failure to see this interconnectedness results from "functionalist fixation" reflected in the separate sphere and spillover effects models, which clearly translate gender into two distinct terrains, roles, and sets of sex-typed characteristics, one for men and one for women. A "separate but not equal" principle implicit in these two models gives primacy to work over family, to production over reproduction, and to instrumentality over expressiveness; conse-

quently, both models serve as ideological supports maintaining the existing patriarchal system. Overall family research and theory has moved away from the separate sphere and spillover models to the system interdependence model for it offers a more profound understanding of the complexity of social realities in the United States as well as in the Third World.

Critical of family sociology at both the individual and the societal levels, feminist analyses underscore the importance of understanding linkages between micro-interaction within families and macro-structural forces by showing how both relate to social inequality. Feminists question various forms of inequalities between men and women, such as: the distribution of power and resources; control of sexuality and reproduction; and responsibility for household labor, childcare, and productive activities in the formal and informal economies. Rather than taking such inequalities for granted, recent feminist analyses challenge traditional family theories by explaining how social institutions (including the family, the economy, the state, education, and religion) maintain the ideological and material bases for patriarchy, thereby perpetuating gender inequality (Andersen 1993; Chafetz 1990; Hartmann 1981; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1988).

The desire to eliminate barriers to all forms of equality leads feminists to translate their theories into collective action. Except in the welfare and poverty fields, policy research in the United States has just begun to focus on the role of the state and its relation to gender and the family (Diamond 1983; Hyde and Essex 1991; Piven 1984). Recent research in the United States has examined the role of the government in collaboration with corporations in shaping family policies such as the Child Care and Development Block Grant legislation that Congress finally passed in 1990, as well as the Family and Medical Leave Act that Congress passed and President Clinton signed in 1993 after President Bush vetoed it twice. This book examines the implications of family research for social policy.

Women and Development: From Macro- to Micro-levels

At the outset, women and development focused on changing the priorities and practices of development assistance agencies and gradually became incorporated into research and university curricula (Tinker 1990). After two decades, this field now encompasses the ideas and goals of advocates, practitioners, and scholars from the developing countries of the South and the industrialized countries of the North, who work together to influence government policies, to design

programs, and to advance knowledge that benefits women worldwide.[3]

Fernandez Kelly (1989) identified several major perspectives in economic development. Based on neo-classical economics and mainstream sociology, modernization theorists argue that poor countries need to adopt the economic, political, and cultural patterns of the industrialized countries to become "developed." This theory was attacked in the 1960s for implying Third World "backwardness" and for failing to indicate the deleterious effects of colonialism and imperialism. Neo-Marxist critics, among others, denounced modernization for ignoring the exploitation of "less developed" countries by industrialized ones.

The proponents of "dependency" theory articulate the "longstanding 'unequal exchanges' between advanced and less-developed nations" (Fernandez Kelly 1989, p. 614). Its critics point out that it tends to see Third World countries as homogeneous entities without much differentiation in economic growth and standards of living among and within them. This theory also tends to view these countries as influenced by a monolith of imperialist and advanced industrialized nations. World-system theorists tend to over-simplify the positions of countries in the global economy by using the taxonomic divisions of "core," "periphery," and "semi-periphery." Finally, the latest approach to development focuses on the new international division of labor, examining the movement of capital investments of multinational corporations throughout the global economy.

Feminist critiques have made specific contributions to the field of women and development. First, their analyses question the concept of development itself as one shaped by the primary value Western thought places on rationality and by the capitalist notion of linear progress in economic development. Boserup (1970) challenges the assumption that societies following the path of Western industrialization will improve their standards of living and thus benefit women.

Various studies have documented how the gendered nature of the development process and practices limits their positive effects on women's lives. The issue, as Rogers (1983) explains, involves "problems of perception" when Western male experts regard women as merely mothers/wives and fail to see them as participants in economic sectors, thus excluding them from the development process. "While [women] represent 50 percent of the world population and one-third of the official labor force, they [account] for nearly two-thirds of all working hours, receive only one-tenth of the world income and own less than one percent of world property" (United Nations 1980, p. 5). Women throughout the world consistently work harder and longer hours than men (United Nations 1991).

Studies document the marginalization of women's position from conditions inherent in colonialism and in capitalism (Mies 1986; Mohanty et al. 1991; Ollenburger and Moore 1992). For example, Boserup (1970) points out how the expansion of cash cropping and the use of agricultural technology tends to benefit men rather than women, who often shoulder a greater burden in the family and in production as casual or seasonal workers. Other research, including Acosta-Belen and Bose (1990), Beneria (1982), Berheide and Segal (this volume), and Kandiyoti (1985), also show how the division of labor by gender increases as men move into technologically advanced production, leaving labor-intensive work in the subsistence economy to women.

Furthermore, development theory and policies tend to overemphasize economic growth, with the expectation that this growth will eventually trickle down to the poor. This theory tends to measure societal progress only in economic terms, ignoring the importance of other human needs. Since women's economic activities are often invisible, feminist researchers challenge this theory's definition of work and its methods of gathering data on women's work. They point out that women's labor is still not considered crucial for the maintenance of society in a purely economic sense.

In addition, women's informal micro-enterprises and home-based industries are largely regarded as family or individual activities that are an extension of domestic responsibilities rather than as contributions to the economy. Tinker (1987) is particularly critical of the U.N.'s International Labor Office (ILO) and others who dismiss micro-entrepreneurs such as street vendors and market sellers as unworthy of support simply because they do not reinvest or generate employment. Tinker (1990, p. 97) argues ardently for the practice of human economy, saying that "investing money in an enterprise instead of one's children is not an overriding priority for most women entrepreneurs. . . . Women should not be penalized for questioning the primacy of the profit motive; rather programs should be redesigned to accommodate this different world view."

In attempting to broaden development theories, feminist thought has analyzed how capitalism and patriarchy interact to ensure men's control of economic resources and of women's labor both in the wage economy and in the household. Like family sociologists, scholars in women and development are critical of the public–private sphere theory, arguing that these spheres should not be treated as dichotomies but rather as interpenetrating points along a continuum (Tiano 1984).

On the one hand, a growing body of literature has recognized the value of women's work, the pervasiveness of labor segregation by gen-

der, and how wage differentials between men and women workers relate to macro-economic policies. As multinational corporations have increasingly set up factories in developing countries for offshore production, the processes of global capitalist accumulation, industrial restructuring, and the new international division of labor have had substantial effects on women's work. While some scholars point out that the new international division of labor has exploited women as a source of cheap labor (Leacock and Safa 1986; Nash and Fernandez Kelly 1983), others argue that it has expanded their job opportunities (Lim 1983). On the other hand, recent studies resemble family sociology in emphasizing intrahousehold dynamics (such as division of labor by gender, social relations within the family, and survival strategies by class) and their connection with wider socioeconomic processes (Blumberg this volume; Rogers 1983; Tinker 1987). In-depth analyses of who controls economic resources (Blumberg 1991; Dwyer and Bruce 1988) focus on intrahousehold dynamics, where women and development scholars clearly cross theoretical paths with family sociologists.

Finally, feminist analyses in women and development, like those in family sociology, see gender inequality as deeply rooted in the division of labor and perpetuated by structural domination based on class, gender, and race/ethnicity. Those three bases are "irreducible categories that designate specific relations of economic, political, and ideological domination" (Fernandez Kelly 1989, p. 624). Other scholars have added the dimensions of culture and nationality to this triple oppression (Mohanty et al. 1991; Sen and Grown 1987). Understanding the interlocking of race, class, gender, culture, and nation is central to dismantling all forms of inequality.

To eliminate all forms of inequality, to combat male dominance in patriarchal systems, and to build egalitarian societies, scholars, practitioners, and advocates in the women and development field are attempting to influence policy formation and project development. Women and development critically examines the relationship between theory and practice by studying the impact of state policies, by reassessing the efficiency of development programs and projects (e.g., in credit, training, technology, employment, housing, nutrition, and family planning), and by transforming feminist thought into action. Hence, convergence of the two fields has occurred as family sociologists have paid increasing attention to relating micro family issues to macro forces and as researchers in women and development have begun to study gender and intrahousehold dynamics in economic development and their implications for state policy.

Gender and the State: The Top-Down Approach vs. the Bottom-Up Approach

Clearly, the state has great power to control the shape of policies that eventually affect the lives of women and their families. Generally speaking, policy analyses tend to employ a top-down approach in examining the role of the state, the relevance of its development policies to women's needs, its sensitivity toward women's interests, its placement of women in specific development projects, and its subsequent effects on women's lives. Recent feminist analyses indicate that development assistance programs, even those directly targeted to benefit women, tend to isolate and marginalize them. Therefore, researchers advise that "new projects for women should be embedded in regular sectoral programs organizationally and should be part of the original design, not added on as a `women's component'" (Tinker 1990, p. 43). Although some programs seeking to respond to women's basic needs may have helped them to survive, even those programs have done very little to change the structural conditions that perpetuate women's subordination and gender inequality (Everett 1989).

Debt crises that crippled economies in many world regions during the 1980s resulted in a policy de-emphasizing basic needs in favor of "structural adjustment" programs designed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. These policies had devastating effects on the world's poor, especially women (Sen and Grown 1987). Militarization diverted resources that could have been used to meet basic needs. In view of the adverse effects on women, most recent feminist critiques focus on how sensitive the state is toward the strategic and practical interests of women in the formation of development policies (Afshar 1987; Charlton et al. 1989; Molyneux 1985; Staudt 1990).

Critical of the overemphasis on economic development, recent work explores alternative ways of empowering women. From the late 1970s into the 1980s, reports from several groups and international meetings proposed the empowerment of women in the political process as one of the paramount goals of development to remove both ideological and structural forms of oppression (APCWD 1979; IWTC 1980; CEPAL 1983; Sen and Grown 1987). The essential point these reports make is that the oppression of women is rooted in political and economic systems based on gender, race, and class. If development programs are to affect women's lives, they must take into account not only women's practical but also their strategic interests, including their emancipation and empowerment (Molyneux 1985). Moser (1987) demonstrates how housing programs for poor women could either satisfy a practical need for shelter or fulfill a strategic need for change if

women were permitted to house themselves. Departing from the welfarist approach to women's basic needs, new policies need to include consciousness raising, mobilization for political participation, and other legal and structural changes (CEPAL 1983). Multifaceted strategies in areas of political, economic, educational, and cultural empowerment are used to link research with collective action (Everett 1989).

Furthermore, as Bunch and Carrillo (1990, p. 77) succinctly explain, "Power for women was seen as essential, not in its traditional patriarchal definition as domination over others but as a sense of internal strength, as the right to determine one's choices in life, and the right to influence the direction of social change." Therefore, feminism is defined as global, providing a political basis for this new consciousness for diverse kinds of women, for cultural resistance to all forms of domination, and for collective solidarity of women in different parts of the world.

A Third World women's group called DAWN (Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era) formed to define the issues of development from the vantage point of women and to advocate alternative development processes. DAWN emphasizes that a movement for change needs to draw its ethical basis from women's daily lives by rejecting the competitive and aggressive nature of the male-dominated system and by advocating a system that derives "a sense of responsibility, nurturance, openness, and rejection of hierarchy" out of feminist vision. Sen and Grown (1987, p. 79) point out the importance of a unified "commitment to breaking down the structures of gender subordination and a vision of women as full and equal participants with men at all levels of societal life."

In sociology, a recent upsurge of interest in bringing "the state back in" has occurred in comparative-historical studies over the past decade (Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol 1985). This trend has brought about a paradigmatic shift moving from the "society-centered" or "grand theory" approach advocated by structural-functionalists and Marxists to the "state-centered" or "middle range" approach suggested by the comparative social scientists. Reconceptualizing the state as an autonomous actor, Evans and others (1985) examine how states affect social processes through their policies and their relationships with groups in the world-economic, geopolitical, and transnational settings. However, studies about the formation of state policies need to take gender into account. Skocpol (Evans et al. 1985, p. 30) specifically cited Charrad's work (related to the chapter in this book) as a prime example illustrating how state formation in Tunisia resulted in policies that expanded women's legal rights while perpetuating gender inequality.

Moving beyond the focus on the economic transformation of

gender relations, recent in-depth analyses by feminist scholars have reconceptualized the state and studied the effects of the state's role in capital accumulation and industrialization on gender relations (Afshar 1987; Charlton et al. 1989; MacKinnon 1989; Peterson 1992; Staudt 1990). Defining the state as a set of institutions, Charlton and others (1989) see state-gender relations as one dimension of state-society relations interconnected with other dimensions (including class, race, and religion), all of which are tied closely to various forms of structural inequality. For the most part, these analyses contend, the state has helped to reproduce gendered power relationships and to maintain women's subordination in society through the influence of state elites, the nature of state policies, and the political discourse shaped by state institutions.

Throughout the world, women have employed various types of household strategies, used collective forms of resistance, and shown a considerable degree of empowerment as women's community groups have become politicized at the grass-roots level to ensure family survival. These responses from women, their families, and their communities, though traditionally perceived as relatively insignificant, may in fact affect state policies and eventually lead to policy changes (Bookman and Morgen 1988; Charlton et al. 1989; Mohanty et al. 1991). Recent feminist analyses suggest that this bottom-up approach in which women and their grass-roots organizations exert control in the development process, provide input to policy-makers at different levels, and influence national politics has enhanced women's interests. The connection between state policy at the macro-level of politics and of the economy and women's lives at the micro-level of the individual and of the household needs further analysis.

Family, Development, and the State: An Emergent Analytical Framework

Over the past two decades, feminist thought in family sociology, women and development, and the state has contributed to the theoretical convergence of these three fields. The commonalities of these fields have advanced global analysis of macro- and micro-linkages between the individual and society and between the family and other social institutions. They have transformed our understanding of how gender, the family, the economy, and the state interact.

The unifying theme of this book is how the interlocking of families, economies, and states perpetuate gender inequality within and outside of the family, shaping women's life experiences globally. Rep-

resenting a range of scholarly interests and theoretical perspectives, the contributors offer original empirical research, especially from various Third World settings, that reveal how women and their families respond to state policy as they struggle to meet basic needs and to deal with the interface of work and family life. This book represents only a beginning point for addressing the complementarity of the three fields and for systematic discussion of their theoretical convergence.

The Global Approach to Studying Women and the Family

Global feminism, as embodied in theory, research, and practice, has legitimized gender as a general principle of social organization and has increased our understanding of the diversity of family patterns. Increasing sensitivity to gender, race, class, cultural, and national differences characterizes the fields of family sociology and of women and development (Baca Zinn 1990; Beneria and Roldan 1987; Fernandez Kelly 1989; Mohanty et al. 1991). A comparative approach provides a means for testing generalizations developed in a single society in other cultural settings. Cross-cultural comparisons help illuminate the causes and consequences of family patterns in particular countries.

For example, women's status and family patterns vary according to the structural conditions that prevail in a society at different points in time. The form, extent, and significance of household work vary according to a society's stage of economic transformation. In subsistence economies, household and nonhousehold production are so closely linked that it is hard to distinguish them. In agricultural societies, the proportion of production for the household's own consumption is higher than in societies where a large proportion of home production has become commoditized. As Berheide and Segal show in their chapter, domestic and agricultural work contribute most to subsistence needs in farming areas. By contrast, in industrialized urban societies, the burden of subsistence falls upon the wage; domestic work transforms the wage into use values consumed in the household (Beneria and Sen 1981, pp. 292–293). Thus incorporating women and development research into the study of the family broadens the perspective of family sociology to encompass macro-forces affecting households globally.

However, scholars from both fields have different concepts of what the family is. Critical of family as a Western concept, women in development scholars point out that worldwide variations in household and kinship relations exist (e.g., extended or fictive kin, female-headed households). Even in the United States, female-headed house-

holds outnumber the traditional nuclear family composed of a breadwinning father, homemaking mother, and children, as the former constitute 17.6 percent of all households while the latter constitute only 13.6 percent (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1992). Women and development researchers prefer to use the term "household" rather than "family." "Household" generally refers to a residential unit in which members live in close proximity and which forms the locus of a set of activities that maintain these members' daily lives.

Critiquing the global economy approach, however, Bourque and Warren (1987) note that using the household as a unit of analysis downplays competing interests within the family. Challenging the view of the household as a harmonious unit with a single decisionmaker, women and development scholars analyze the household as an arena of conflict over resource allocation that tends to serve patriarchal or kinship interests, to reinforce women's subjugation within the family, and to shape different household arrangements (Chow 1993; Dwyer and Bruce 1988; Papanek 1990). When Third World women are able to control their own income and to set allocation priorities, they negotiate, bargain, and trade to improve their families' positions. Blumberg (1991 and also in this volume) suggests that gender-differentiated control of economic resources within the household matters for the family's well-being, for the relative status of women, and for the success of development projects. She explains how development planning in Africa ignores the "internal economy" of households, thus reducing women's opportunities in food production and contributing to the food crises in that region.

In this book, we use family and household interchangeably. We prefer to use the term "family" partly because it embodies a richer and broader meaning than "household" and partly because some users limit "household" to a merely economic term. We define family as a socioeconomic unit that includes household and as a system of interacting personalities which offers a cultural context in which the material relations of the household take place and are normatively regulated. Family is also linked to kinship, which describes the structured network in which the boundaries of several households intersect.

The Role of Patriarchy and the Family

Patriarchy is generally defined as the principle of male dominance that forms both a structural and ideological system of domination in which men control women. It consists of "a set of social relations between men that have a material base and which, though hierarchical, estab-

lish interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women" (Hartmann 1976, p. 138). However, patriarchy is not a monolithic conception of male domination; men and women of various backgrounds have different places in the patriarchy. In different historical periods and in different countries, the specific forms of women's subjugation to male dominance vary by class, race, and age. For example, Kandiyoti (1988) identifies two distinct systems of patriarchy which exert a powerful influence on women's gendered subjectivity, determine the nature of gender ideology, and affect women's forms of resistance in the face of oppression under different cultural contexts. Women in sub-Saharan Africa gain autonomy through protest against patriarchal practices that reduce their status, whereas women from North Africa, the Muslim Middle East, and South and East Asia show subservience while using manipulation to maintain their status within classic patriarchy.

Patriarchy's chief institution is the family, within which men hold the power to determine the privileges, statuses, and roles of women and children. Such a structure is buttressed by traditional gender-role ideology and is further institutionalized and reproduced in gendered power relationships throughout society, contributing to the perpetuation of gender inequality. In particular, Hartmann (1976) points out that patriarchy, as an independent system of domination preceding capitalism, influences the particular forms the sexual division of labor takes in the family as well as in the waged labor economy. Household work, childcare, emotional labor, and home-based production are examples of how the family serves as locus of control and how men benefit from women's labor, paid or unpaid, at home.

Feminist debates about whether patriarchy is an inherently ahistorical concept and whether control over children should be placed under the same rubric as control over women led to a distinction between "private" and "public" patriarchy and between different historical stages of patriarchy to clarify the changing relationship between gender- and age-based inequality (Boris and Bardaglio 1987; Brown 1981; Walby 1990). At different stages of capitalist development, Ferguson (1984) explains how "father patriarchy" (men's economic benefits from and power over their children and wives) was changed to "husband patriarchy" (men's control over women) due to child labor laws and public education requirements that directly limit paternal control over children and replace the economic benefits of having children with economic costs, which women pay.

"Private" patriarchy becomes a "public" one when the power of fathers is replaced by the power of men who use the state to dictate laws, to control scarce resources, and to shape gender ideology (Folbre

1987). With the development of capitalism, patriarchal control of unpaid domestic labor in household production extends to the labor market, as the gender-segregated occupational structure clearly indicates (Hartmann 1981; Reskin and Roos 1990; Sokoloff 1980). Furthermore, patriarchal control of unpaid work extends to the labor market extracting surplus values from women volunteers, such as those in Australia (see Baldock's chapter in this volume). The following sections will discuss further how the interlocking of patriarchy, modes of production (e.g., capitalist or socialist), and the state form a system of domination that shapes the lived experience of women.

The Interplay of Patriarchy and the Economy on Family and Work

As "private" patriarchy becomes "public," its interaction with the economy creates another dimension of domination that affects the relationship between work and family. Socialist feminists clearly link capitalism and patriarchy to the productive and reproductive roles of women in society (Beneria and Roldan 1987, p. 9; Hartmann 1981). The literature on the international division of labor has also documented how capitalist accumulation on a world scale interacts with patriarchal family structures in shaping women's place in the division of labor in the global economy and in the household (Beneria and Stimpson 1987; Leacock and Safa 1986; Mies 1986; Nash and Fernandez Kelly 1983).

One theme that integrates many chapters in this book is the interconnectedness between family and work in the lives of the world's women. The three theoretical models—separate spheres, spillover effects, and system interdependence respectively—represent conflicting world views concerning the roles of men and women. In various modes of economic production, whether capitalist or socialist, the separate spheres model is an ideological support for existing patriarchal arrangements. Bourque and Warren (1979) argue specifically that men use separate sphere arguments to justify continued male dominance and female subordination because men have a stake in asserting that women are incapable of doing men's work and thus of sharing men's power even when women do "men's work." This underlying ideology often contradicts public policy related specifically to women and helps perpetuate gender inequality. The patriarchal ideology implicit in the one-child family-planning policy in the People's Republic of China is a case in point, as the chapter by Chow and Chen in this book shows.

Family and work or private and public spheres are analytically distinct only at a theoretical level, and they are, in fact, empirically interrelated in women's lives. Beneria and Sen (1981, p. 293) assert that

a clear separation between domestic and commodity production exists only in modern industrialized societies. Tiano (1984) is critical of the split Marxist feminist theories posit between the public sphere of commodity production and the private sphere of reproduction and consumption, especially when applied to Third World women's work. Some Marxist scholars even contend that production vs. reproduction is a false dichotomy and suggest reconceptualizing the two as alternative modes of production (Beechey 1979; Kusterer 1990).[4]

In this book, we argue that even in industrialized societies such as the United States, family and work are intertwined, with each system highly permeable as a result of individuals' simultaneous memberships in both (Chow and Berheide 1988). Using the interdependence model, we treat the work and family systems as analytically distinct at a conceptual level while examining their interconnectedness. As Beneria and Roldan (1987, p. 10) note, "The specificity of real life does not present itself in a dualistic manner but as an integrated whole, where multiple relations of domination/subordination—based on race, age, ethnicity, nationality, sexual preference—interact dialectically with class and gender relations."

The differential effects of the interaction between patriarchy and modes of production on family and work are gendered. Gender inequality is socially constituted through the differences in men's and women's work and family activities. On the one hand, the interplay of these social institutions has provided economic independence, means to meet basic family needs, and well-being for women. On the other hand, these institutions have promoted exploitation of women both as low-paid workers in the labor market and as unpaid workers in the home. Field research from Guatemala and Tanzania demonstrates that development, whether in capitalist or socialist economies, continues to marginalize women and to take their domestic contributions in the household for granted (Blumberg 1991; Ehler 1983). The fact that women perform household labor while men do not reflects the "essential nature" of each sex, adding a double shift to women's paid work in the economy (Hochschild 1989) and making a "triple day" for Third World women workers (Blumberg 1991; Parpart 1990; Sen and Grown 1987; Ward 1990).

The gendered nature of both work and family systems and its transformation is dialectical, producing contradictions at different historical times. As U.S. families increasingly depend on two incomes, "Reliance on wives' services at home [has] produced husbands who both resisted and encouraged their wives' employment and women who were ambivalent—not simply resentful—about their double burden" (Gerstel and Gross 1987, p. 8). Some women and development

scholars question whether the pursuit of paid work in the labor market (that is, in the public sphere with men) is the basis for building an egalitarian society. Whether such employment offers job opportunities which enable women to ensure family survival or whether it creates super-exploitation of Third World women epitomizes the dialectical nature of work-family connections. In this book, Yi's chapter shows the dilemmas that Chinese women face when combining work and family roles in Taiwan. The chapter by Tiano demonstrates that having children tends to create problems for women employed in the maquila factories at the southern U.S. border. Issues associated with the dialectic between work and family become complicated, yet theoretically interesting, when the role of the state is added to the framework of analysis.

Patriarchy, the Family, the Economy, and State Policy

This book seeks to understand the critical linkage between feminist theory and action by addressing how state policy relates to women and their families specifically and to structurally based inequality generally. It studies the relationships among a set of patriarchal social institutions in both private (the family) and public (the economy and the state) domains, forming a system of domination which affects women's lives and family well-being globally.

Kamerman and Kahn (1978) note that the United States, unlike many European countries, does not have either explicit family policies or a comprehensive national policy.[5] Gerstel and Gross (1987) explain that the absence of a coherent national family policy in the U.S. is due to the lack of agreement on the meaning of being pro-family, the government's reluctance to legislate family relations, pluralism in family life, persistent variations from state to state, and the ideology of the family as a bastion of privacy. Reviewing maternity-leave, child-support, childcare, AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), and tax policies, Folbre (1987) shows how they have served the interests of men while disadvantaging women by failing to recognize mothering as work, by assigning disproportionate amounts of the cost of child-rearing to mothers, and by contributing significantly to the pauperization and dependency of mothers.

This book's framework of analysis shows how male dominance as manifested in the state has both ideological and material bases, collaborating with the economy and the family to shape policies that reinforce gender inequality. Afshar (1987, p. 2) points out that studies of many countries reveal that state policy (with some of its underlying ideological contradictions) influences private and personal lives, espe-

cially women's. She shows specifically how fear of women's sexuality and perception of women as "seditious" agents led to Iranian legislation supporting women's seclusion at home as the most important symbol of their honor and dignity, thereby justifying the benefits men receive by excluding women in the public domain and by controlling them within the household. The chapter by Chow and Chen reveals how Chinese state patriarchy reflected in the only-child policy tends to place a greater emphasis on child-centeredness ideology than on gender egalitarianism to increase women's responsibilities for childbearing and rearing, and potentially to limit their full participation in society, thus increasing rather than diminishing gender inequality.

Recent feminist analyses have begun to examine the role of the state and its relationship to public policies and state apparatuses which have significant effects on women's strategic and practical interests as well as on their families' well-being. Identifying three main approaches—liberal-pluralist, Marxist, and statist—to the state, Charlton et al. (1989) indicate that liberal-pluralist approaches typically view the state as a government or decision-making apparatus which serves as an arbitrator between competing interest groups. The state, which is presumed to be gender-blind, is largely responsible for resource allocation in meeting citizen demands. Marxist theory views the state as the apparatus through which the dominant capitalist class seeks to preserve its interests. Although Charlton et al. (1989, p. 4) recognize the utility of Marxist analysis in demonstrating how the patriarchal family and state are sustained through control of female labor, they argue that this approach does not take into account "the vitality of gender ideologies, conflict between men and women of the same class, the distinctiveness of women's organizations, or gender conflicts in socialist countries."

The statist approach views the state simultaneously as "a bureaucratic, coercive, legal, and normative order" (Charlton et al. 1989, p. 4). This approach does not treat gender as merely another interest group or as of secondary importance to class relations. More specifically, Charlton et al. (1989, p. 5) assert that "Institutionalized male privilege exists independently of the dominant class, and it means that women occupy a different, and subordinate, role in intergroup competition (when it exists). The challenge is to locate the boundaries that define state autonomy and to explain those forces that both enhance and limit autonomy, whether international or domestic."

Following a similar approach, Staudt and others (1990) discuss the contexts under which paternalism is manifested in statist apparatus, in bureaucratic structures and staff (such as those of the Commission on the Status of Women, the World Bank, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Swedish International Development Authority),

and in constituencies outside the official apparatus. State paternalism affects the women's groups that these apparatuses are supposed to serve. These scholars question whether more women inside bureaucracy will actually empower women outside of it and whether women will infuse a new sort of politics into male-oriented bureaucracy. Therefore, this book's emphasis on the connections among the family, the economy, and the state challenges the deterministic view of the economy as the only public domain by bringing the state and other organizations under scrutiny.

Studies included in this volume examine the conditions, structural and ideological, that produce policies that promote or limit women's interests and that enhance or impede their socioeconomic status. We identify three kinds of state policies—women-centered, women-sensitive, and women-peripheral—that vary in the degree to which they are inclusive of women's concerns and in the extent to which they intend to benefit women. Women-centered policies are those which are designed with concern for or the intention of benefitting women, such as Swedish welfare policies adopted to promote gender equality. Second, women-sensitive policies are ones which are formulated with other primary concerns (e.g., family planning or economic goals), but are also sensitive to women's interests, such as China's one-child policy. Lastly, women-peripheral policies are ones made for purposes ostensibly unrelated to women and pay little or no attention to women's interests. We argue for more women-centered or at least gender-sensitive policies to promote the wealth of nations, the well-being of women and their families, and equality for all people.

Conventionally, the term "politics" refers to the activities of public officials and the workings of the state, taking place exclusively in the public domain. The feminist principle that "the personal is political" embodies the understanding that a deep, direct relationship exists between politics and everyday life and between social change and women's practical and strategic interests. This reconceptualization of political terrains as existing in both personal and social life bridges the Marxist dichotomies of production vs. reproduction, interweaves the private and public spheres, and captures the dialectical connection as well as the tension between macro-structures of domination and the micro-level interaction of maintenance and resistance. For a full understanding of international politics, Enloe (1989) expands this feminist insight from "The Personal is Political" to "The Personal is International" to show how public life is constructed out of daily struggles in the private domain which define masculinity, femininity, and gender relationships in ways that bolster male-dominated political control globally.