

# Missing Men?

## *Reflections on Men, Masculinities and Gender in GAD*

**Andrea Cornwall**

Amidst spiralling media interest, and set against a backdrop of a decade in which an initial trickle of self-help literature for men turned into a cascade of writing on male identities, a concern with men and masculinities has belatedly emerged onto the Gender and Development (GAD) agenda. Posing challenges that strike at the core of what GAD claims to be about or for, this newly discovered interest in men provides an entry point for reflection on some of the basic tenets and tendencies of GAD in theory and practice. By opening up space for reflection on taken-for-granted assumptions about women and men, gender relations and indeed the concept of gender itself, recent work on men also offers the opportunity to begin to move beyond the static stereotypes that continue to pervade the field.

GAD discourse is peppered with the promise of a new focus, beyond the narrow concern of Women in Development (WID) with women alone. It came into being as an approach that sought to tackle women's subordination through an explicit emphasis on socially and historically constructed relations between women and men (Young *et al.* 1981; Moser 1993; Kabeer 1995; Razavi and Miller 1995).<sup>1</sup> This entailed, as Moser has argued, an approach that would look 'not only at the category "women" – since that is only half of the story – but at women in relation to men, and the way in which relations between these categories are socially constructed' (1993:3). This formulation is indicative of some of the issues at stake in bringing men and masculinities into the picture. By implication, the 'other half of the story' does not invite a parallel focus on men and their identities, 'roles' or relations, but on women in relation to men. Men as men remain absent from this picture. It is with those missing men that this article is concerned.

### **1 Missing Men**

Men, in all their diversity, have until recently been largely missing from GAD discourse. Their occasional appearances tend to be in the guise of Man the Oppressor, as custodians and perpetrators of male domination and as obstacles to equitable development. Representations of men in relation to women often portray men as figures women struggle with, fear, resist or resent. Rarely if ever are men depicted as people – sons, lovers, husbands, fathers

– with whom women might have shared interests and concerns, let alone love and cherish. Nor is the range of subject positions actual men may occupy in different kinds of relationships with women, or indeed men, brought into the frame. Rather, ‘men’ emerge as a potent, homogeneous category that is invariably treated as problematic.

Men as men are equally missing from mainstream development. Here, stereotypes of a different order pervade the assumptions on which policies, projects and programmes continue to be based. Yet the ‘male bias’ (see Elson (ed.) 1991) that many feminists have pointed out as part of what Pearson (this issue) terms ‘main(male)stream development’ is not only biased against women. Unproblematic importations of Western constructs and assumptions sustain a different set of male stereotypes. In the African context, for example, the vestiges of the colonial past live on in the ways men are characterised in mainstream development. The focus on male breadwinners and heads of households valorises a particular kind of masculinity that the colonial powers worked so hard to create (see Lindsay 1996) and that socio-economic changes have so rapidly undermined (see Chant, this issue), missing men who occupy more marginal positions within households and communities. Work with male community leaders not only sustains the ‘myth of community’ that Guijt and Kaul Shah (1998) so rightly criticise, but also echoes the collusion of colonial powers with male elders to maintain the subordination of younger men and women (see, for example, Schmidt 1991). The relational issues so powerfully highlighted by feminist work dissolve in the attempts that are made to deal with the ‘variable’ of gender difference through disaggregation by sex; gender, in all its complexity, remains missing from the picture.

Men are also largely missing from institutional efforts to operationalise and promote GAD. Their absence continues to inscribe ‘gender’ as the domain and the concern of women. The extent to which men are actually missed by women working in GAD remains an open question: certainly there are some for whom the relative absence of men in this sphere is seen as entirely positive and unproblematic. Yet, as has become so very evident in recent years, changing inequitable gender relations can hardly proceed without working with men. ‘Male

involvement’ is now the flavour of the month in some circles, notably sexual and reproductive health (see Greene, this issue). Yet quite how that involvement is cast, and quite how ‘men’ are represented in these initiatives, remains in itself something that we need to examine more closely. For current attempts to involve men may continue to miss them, precisely because of the ways in which their interests and concerns are represented.

One thing is becoming evident. Whether or not efforts are made to involve men, and almost despite development efforts ‘targeted’ at women, evidence from some quarters (see Harrison 1997a; Goetz and Sen Gupta 1996) suggests that men are not necessarily missing out on the benefits of GAD interventions. While strategies for working directly with women remain important, interventions aimed solely at benefiting women often tend to demonstrate a peculiar myopia when it comes to men. On the one hand, they may implicitly presume that their ‘target group’ exists as an entity that lies outside the nexus of social relations in which individual members are embedded: from which, of course, men are rarely completely absent. On the other, by regarding benefits accruing to men as well as women or more direct male engagement in ‘women’s projects’ as project misbehaviour (Harrison 1997b), important opportunities to address issues of gender equity may be missed. For failing to recognise male involvement can serve to obscure the extent to which normative ideas about gender may simply be replicated in these contexts, such as where men are invited in as leaders to avert conflict between women or because women feel unable to manage such projects effectively alone. By missing men – missing men out and missing the men who find their way into interventions aimed at women – opportunities are missed for the kind of transformative development processes that can begin to address issues of power and powerlessness that lie at the heart of the GAD project.

This article offers some tentative reflections on these issues and the questions they raise. It seeks to explore some of the taken-for-granted assumptions that gird the polarities on which much of GAD discourse is based. My aim is not to undermine a form of practice that continues to have important strategic dimensions. Creating space for reflection and critique is a step towards beginning to rethink our

strategies, in the light of the manifest failure of much development work, including GAD, to make a real difference. It is this space that I wish both to enter, and perhaps open further. I begin by exploring the ways the terms 'gender' and 'gender relations' are used in GAD. I go on from this to examine in more depth how and why men as men are missing, and are being missed, in GAD. From this I draw some tentative conclusions for further reflection.

## 2 Engendering Generalities

As Razavi and Miller point out: "Gender" has become the panacea of those working in the field, yet few analyses exist of the way in which "gender" is being applied as a policy-making and planning tool' (1995:13). As they go on to point out, different actors in the policy process have 're-interpreted the concept of gender to suit their institutional needs' (1995:41). They suggest that: 'In some instances, "gender" has been used to side-step a focus on "women" and on the radical policy implications of overcoming their disprivilege' (1995:41). This focus on women is precisely what is perceived by some to be at stake in recent attempts to bring men into GAD. The associated fears of loss, of the dilution of a feminist agenda, and of the possibilities that men will simply swallow up jobs and resources, all arise from a marking out of the sphere of 'gender' as one that is fundamentally about 'women'. The validity of these fears remains an open question, and one around which there is intense debate (see Cornwall and White, Pearson, White, this issue). As I suggest here, it is important to begin to unpack the ways in which GAD discourse constructs those women, and these men, in order to explore further what exactly 'bringing men in' might entail.

Considerable emphasis is placed in GAD on the need to distinguish biological sex from socially constructed gender. Yet, as critics of the sex/gender distinction have convincingly demonstrated, 'sex' is no less socially constructed than 'gender' (Gatens 1983; Butler 1993). Indeed, the utility of this distinction becomes rather questionable when a closer look is taken at what is done with it in GAD. Nicholson argues that 'through the belief that sex identity represents that which is common across cultures, we frequently have falsely generalised matters specific to modern Western culture or to certain groups within it' (1994:82). As a cursory

glance at practice reveals, far from being superseded by the use of the term 'gender', biological foundationalism and many of these 'matters specific to modern Western culture' continue to be evident in the framing of GAD interventions. Differences are presupposed and indeed actively created through practices that define two static and oppositional categories: 'women' and 'men'. Differences within or between these categories, or indeed the intersection of gender with differences that may make more of a difference to the strategies and tactics particular men and women adopt, tend to be disregarded in the process (Cornwall 1998).

'Tackling gender issues' still so often boils down to involving members of the female sex in projects, irrespective of whether they themselves see themselves as a group with common interests. The myth of female solidarity lives on, and where it is not simply superimposed, efforts are made to create it through 'empowerment'. Western gender constructs and binaries are often simply imported into contexts where they have little place in the ways people think about or organise themselves (see, for example, Sudarkasa 1986; Strathern 1988). The complexities of the constructionist theories that are used to justify a focus on gender are conveniently brushed out of the picture. As a result, the generalising categories 'women' and 'men' are used to make blanket assumptions about needs, interests, rights and responsibilities.

As with 'gender', so with 'gender relations'. 'Gender relations' is used in GAD discourse not to signify any kinds of relations between women and men: relations between mothers and sons, brothers and sisters, and a female boss and a male employee, for example, do not feature in 'gender analysis'. Rather, 'gender relations' refer to particular kinds of relations, which are constructed in particular kinds of ways: oppressive relationships, exemplified by and premised on heterosexual relationships between men and women (Tcherzekoff 1993; Cornwall 1998). Those relationships, experiences and identities that fall outside the narrow frame set by oppressive heterosexual 'gender relations' tend to be disregarded. In the midst of all this, there is no space at all for men's experiences of powerlessness, love or dependency in their relationships with women, nor for relations between men that are equally inflected with gender.<sup>2</sup>

From these generalities spring a wealth of 'gender-sensitive' interventions that are sometimes striking for their sheer insensitivity to local dimensions of difference. Harrison's (1997a, 1997b) work on understandings of gender and on men in women's groups in Zambia provides a compelling picture of the ways in which local men and women responded to well-intentioned 'gender-sensitive' interventions. Through selectively adopting particular aspects of the outsider-imposed gender agenda, alliances between some women and some men came to transcend donor assumptions of strategic alliances between women. Her analysis highlights the limitations of a focus on gender alone, in the absence of an analysis of the mediation of gender relations by other dimensions of difference, notably class. Crewe and Harrison (1998) cite examples from a variety of African contexts that show not only the engagement of men in women's projects, but reveal the ways in which some women's allegiances and interests were closely bound up with those of the men in their lives. They argue for a need to understand 'the differences as well as the similarities between women... [and] the complex ways in which alliances between women and men are created, sustained and undermined' (1998:171). As Goetz (1989) illustrates in an example from Guinea, projects that fail to recognise the importance of relations of interdependency between women and men can undermine women's livelihood strategies, as well as disrupt other dimensions of their social and affective relationships.

The issues raised here go deeper than simply making sure that men are not missing from the analysis. Rather, questions need to be asked about the underlying analytic categories that are being used and their utility in different cultural contexts. Kandiyoti notes 'the blinkering and distortion that may result from the importation of Western feminist concerns and units of analysis into gender and development writing', going on to argue that:

We may have to remain agnostic over the relevance and utility of the category of gender itself if it lessens our alertness and sensitivity to the myriad forms which social organisation and hierarchy may take and if it results in extracting men and women as social categories from the contexts in which they are embedded. (1998:146)

Much depends, however, on how 'gender' is defined. As Scott notes, 'real men and women do not always or literally fulfil the terms either of their society's prescriptions or of our analytic categories' (1989:95). But, she argues, 'gender' remains useful precisely because it is 'a constitutive element of social relationships ... [and] a primary way of signifying relationships of power' (1989:94). That dissonance, departure from and dissent with idealised representations of gender do not feature more in accounts of 'gender' in GAD does not entirely detract from the usefulness of the concept of 'gender' in signifying power relations. Nor does the failure to accommodate a significant proportion of 'gender relations' – from relations among men or women, to those relationships between women and men that lie beyond the bounds of heterosexual relationships – obscure the significance of gender difference in constituting social relations. But these missing pieces remain an important weakness, one that discourses on 'gender relations' and images of 'women' and 'men' in GAD further reinforce.

### 3 Beyond the 'Problematic Male'?

A 'women as victim, men as problem' discourse permeates GAD, found both in the framing of interventions associated with women and in discussions of how to deal with the issue of men. Another, equally oppositional, discourse runs as another current through GAD, positioning women as courageous, capable heroines, and men as rather useless and irrelevant figures who leach their energies and resources. Both of these discourses evoke highly selective images of women and men. Rarely do we hear about wealthy, older women using 'development' for their own projects, excluding younger, poorer women in the process (see, for example, von Bulow 1995). Nor do we hear much about women inviting men to participate in their projects (see Harrison 1997b), or sharing loans or earnings with men because they love them (see Kabeer 1999). Rather, women – and frequently women alone – become the deserving poor.

The 'women as victim, men as problem' discourse is particularly interesting in view of the issues it raises for refocusing GAD to pay more attention to men. The idea of 'women' conjured up in this discourse positions women as the universally poor and disadvantaged victims of male domination. As Mohanty's

(1987) critique of representations of the 'Third World woman' by Western writers so vividly demonstrates, these women are often presented as profoundly Other. As such, they are served up as objects of pity: downtrodden victims, abused by men, needy of our attentions, worthy of being 'empowered' by GAD. These images are used to justify acts of rescue. Doezema's (forthcoming) analysis of discourses on trafficking in women, for example, shows how the image of the 'Third World prostitute' is evoked by feminists who project their own wounded desires onto those they create as Other. The undeserving 'prostitute' is transformed into the 'victim of trafficking', often by shunting sex workers' own choices and agency out of the frame (see Kempadoo and Doezema 1998). Female-headed households are, similarly, cast as the poorest of the poor, abandoned by male providers and fending desperately for themselves, an image which the empirical work of Sylvia Chant (1997) and others has shown to be rather more partial than their evocative portrayal in GAD would admit.<sup>3</sup> The gender myths surrounding these issues are so sacred that they have their own, very potent, authority: silencing dissent, containing dissonance, maintaining orthodoxies.

In this discourse, 'men' become 'the problem', although solutions to address 'gender issues' rarely engage directly with them. When the category 'men' is evoked in GAD, it is often through negative stereotypes that come to fill a space that has been emptied of men in relational subject positions that are not directly associated with oppressive power. Whether as irresponsible individualists or as perpetrators of sexual and gender violence, images of men accentuate the very opposite of the cooperative, community-minded, caring woman. Acknowledging some men's marginality and powerlessness – in relation to some women as well as to other men – so undermines the oppositional version of 'gender relations' used in GAD that the category 'men' is kept pristine. In order to retain the loaded oppositions that are invoked in the equation of men with power, men who fall outside this frame are implicitly rendered residual to the category 'men'. This has the effect of displacing males who occupy positions of relative powerlessness within families or communities, whether some men who have same-sex relationships, male adolescents or men without jobs or money. Then they can be

redescribed in terms of other axes of difference without having to deal with the dissonance that the idea of a marginal man evokes.

As such, this has resonances with an additive analysis of sexism and racism that would hold that all women are oppressed by sexism, but some women are further oppressed by racism, and some women further oppressed by sexism, racism and heterosexism and so on. But it has an ironic twist. By removing gender from the picture, the opposition man:woman remains intact, unmarked by the disappearance of some of those who would have occupied the category 'male'. In effect, it becomes a 'subtractive analysis': subtracting some men so as not to destabilise the category 'men' and dislocate its association with potency and domination.

This is not to deny the realities of male privilege, nor the acts of domination in which some men engage, shored up by institutions that further entrench their prerogative. Yet in representing men-in-general in ways that focus only on the negative aspects of their interactions with women, the category 'men' clearly fails to encompass the spectrum of subject positions men occupy. As a result, it misses out on men's experiences of vulnerability and gendered powerlessness, whether *vis-à-vis* other men or women. Men-in-general remain 'the problem'. If 'gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power' (Scott 1989:94), then an absence of signification is in itself an act of power. This twist, then, becomes a convenient device that many advocates of GAD would wish to hold onto. For if it were possible to countenance empowering men within GAD, some would howl with horror and cry wolf.

#### **4 Men, Masculinities and Power**

Many of the arguments for including men in GAD pick up on the 'men as problem' discourse. Some make a case on the basis of harm reduction: if only men were involved, they might stop beating up women and squandering household resources as men-in-general do. Some reproduce narratives of 'male crisis' and 'role conflict', presuming at the same time that all men desperately wish to emulate particular styles of being a man and it is their frustration with their inability to achieve this that drives them into 'behaving badly'. Rarely do these

arguments actually engage with the core assumptions that lie at the root of regarding men-in-general as obstacles to efforts to improve women's well-being. For to do so would undermine the most sacred of all cows: the oppositional categories 'women' and 'men' that are so potent a framing device for development intervention in the name of 'gender'.

One of the foundational features of uses of the category 'men' in GAD is the association that is often made between men, masculinity and power (see Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994). This often extends to the assumption that that all men have power and, as a corollary, that all of those who have power are male (Cornwall 1997). While it is unquestionably the case that many men do occupy positions of power, it is one thing to name those subject positions and another to go on to presume that all men have access to these positions or indeed want to take them up.

Unpacking the category 'men' requires looking not only at the diversity of male identities and experiences that are squeezed out of the frame, but also at what takes their place. Structural advantage certainly provides men with opportunities to act the oppressor. Yet, Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) observe that the actual number of men whose characters fit what they call 'hegemonic masculinity' is very small, although significant numbers of men (and, it might be added, women) are 'complicit in sustaining the hegemonic model' (1985:92). Useful as the idea of 'hegemonic masculinity' is, it is often quite difficult in practice to work out which masculinity is 'hegemonic'; what is valorised by some might be, for others, hardly a way of being to admire, let alone emulate. Indeed, it becomes difficult to determine exactly what is 'hegemonic' about particular representations of maleness. What the concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' does make clear, however, is that placing all men into a single category eclipses the contested nature of gender identities and the spectrum of differences that exist within the category 'men' (Connell 1995). Superimposing particular, dominant, versions of masculinity onto men-in-general not only obscures those men whose behaviour and choices lie outside the 'gender norms' these idealised versions inscribe. It also entails treating masculinity as if it were singular and fixed, rather than as diverse and mutable

relational identities that are essentially unstable and potentially contradictory (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994).

As is evident as soon as we take off the blinkers of the analytic categories we work with and look around us, the stereotypes evoked by the 'men as problem' discourse melt into a spectrum of ways of being a man. Seeing the relationship between men and power as contingent enables us to focus on relations and positions of power rather than render maleness in itself powerful and problematic. Particular individual men take up, and move between, a range of different subject positions in their everyday lives, positions that are inflected with and constituted by other dimensions of difference. They may be powerful in some interactions, but by being less powerful in others they are no less gendered. The very contingency of the association of men with power helps focus attention on the processes through which men and women actively negotiate gendered expectations that are embedded in many of the very social institutions that are so often regarded as sites of blanket oppression of 'women' by 'men'. Importantly, this also forces us to recognise that women may play just as troubling a part as men in reproducing inequitable gender relations. Seen from this perspective, the 'good girl/bad boy' (White 1997) stereotypes that pervade GAD discourse seem increasingly untenable.

The selective representation of men in GAD has entailments that go well beyond missing men as the objects of development assistance. It also leaves men stripped of social legitimacy to use their agency as men to turn their own sense of outrage against inequity or injustice into opportunities to work together with women who advocate for change. As Forrest (1994) points out, irrespective of other aspects of men's identities, men can claim privilege simply by virtue of being male: what Connell calls 'the patriarchal dividend' (1995:79). But the flip side of this is that the 'men as problem' discourse can leave men without any space to act. Men might cry 'It's not me! I'm not like that!' But by virtue of being male they are tarred by the 'men as problem' discourse as potential – if not actual – oppressors. As such they may be treated with suspicion as harbouring an intent to dominate, patronise or take over; their inclusion in GAD becomes, therefore, all the more contentious for those who

cling to biological essentialism to guard this terrain from male encroachment.

## 5 Missing Opportunities

What, then, can be done about these missing men? At the level of description and analysis, painting in the spectrum of ways of being a man and focusing on the complex relational dimensions of gendered power would brighten up the monotone of Man the Oppressor. This would help put paid to some of the grosser assumptions about gender and gender relations, enabling a more productive focus on relations and positions of power and powerlessness. What is clear, however, is that simply 'bringing men in' without a more fundamental reflection on what GAD is about or for is not going to solve the central issues at stake.

Much of the current engagement of men in GAD is as pro-feminists; those who advocate this kind of engagement emphasise activities like promoting gender equality or involving men as trainers in gender training (see Färnsveden and Rönquist; Levy *et al.* this issue). Men who become involved, then, become allies in pursuit of unchanged goals. Yet opportunities for men to engage with gender issues within development organisations appear limited by more than the masculinism that continues to pervade many of these institutions. The 'it takes one to know one' flavour that continues to characterise GAD can have the effect of alienating men: gender is simply not considered to be 'their' issue. And men, by virtue of their sex, are assumed to have questionable credentials and perhaps even questionable motives for wanting to engage. Pro-feminist or not, men are assumed to lack the sense of identification that women are assumed to have with other women, and their engagement may be regarded as a depoliticising influence, reduced merely to technical assistance (see Kajifusa 1998).

It is clear that mainstream development could benefit from understanding the complexities of gendered identities and expectations as relating to men as well as to women, but 'mainstreaming gender' is a potentially problematic strategy for ensuring a more subtle understanding of the dynamics of difference. As Kajifusa points out, language proliferates in policy documents that refers to 'men' as well as 'women', yet little clear idea emerges about

exactly how men might actually engage (see also Färnsveden and Rönquist, this issue). He argues:

Unless it is observed how men qua men actually are or can be committed to gender issues, gender mainstreaming will be limited to just a technical matter and fail to change the fundamental structure of gender inequality and inequity (1998:15).

An engagement of a different kind is implied by recasting gender not as a unilateral women's issue, but in terms of relations of power and powerlessness in which men as well as women may experience vulnerability, disempowerment and disadvantage. It requires moving beyond the underlying assumption in GAD that women-in-general are everywhere oppressed by men-in-general towards an appreciation of the complexity of gender and gender relations. It calls for strategies that move us beyond the essentialisms that underpin much of GAD, towards approaches that build on – rather than presuppose – identifications on issues that both men and women experience as problematic, as entry points for change. As Greig (this issue) suggests, violence is one such entry point, one that calls not only for a broader-based alliances between women and men for whom gender-based violence is abhorrent, but also for actively addressing – and redressing – representations and relations of gendered power.

Just because men are missing from GAD discourse, then, it doesn't mean that adding men – to policy documents or to projects – is going to make a difference. For maintaining the oppositional distinction between 'women' and 'men' on which much of GAD is premised would entail a continued refusal to acknowledge diversity, dissonance and difference within these categories. It would also continue to narrow the scope for alliances between men and women, closing off important spaces for change. A focus not on the abundant negativity associated with 'problem men', but on the spectrum of alternatives that exist in any cultural context may seem idealistic in the wake of persistent gender inequities. But such a strategy might enable particular attitudes and behaviours to be identified as problematic, without suggesting that the only option open to men is to 'give up' power that they themselves might have less experience of than

generalising assumptions would suggest. What is needed, then, is a move away from a zero-sum game, where women only gain if men lose: and away from the ready association of 'men' with problems, power and privilege. In development institutions as well as in the practical spheres of development work, ways are needed to more effectively challenge stereotypical thinking about what men – as well as women – are or do, as well as to affirm more equitable alternatives that this thinking can serve to obscure.

Clearly, there are strategic advantages to retaining the categories 'women' and 'men'; their utility is perhaps most evident in struggles around discrimination, inclusion and rights. What we do need to be careful about, however, is confusing strategic essentialisms with real men and women, in all their diversity. For to do so would deny the pluralist solutions that offer the greatest scope for optimism and for change, solutions that neither dissolve gender in what Pearson and Jackson term 'the acid bath of difference' (1998:6) nor reiterate the tired old dualisms that much GAD work continues to be based on. Rather than construct a stereotypical 'bad boy' (White 1997) and reconstruct patriarchal relations, a focus on dissonance and dissent with particular relations, positions or acts of power can provide a more productive arena for engagement. Through this can emerge a politics that can engage both men and women on issues of mutual concern: a politics of identification, built on the principle of equivalence (Mouffe 1992); a politics that addresses powerlessness, in all its complexity.

It is in so many ways much easier to cling to the old essentialisms. It is much easier to miss out the range of living men and substitute a cardboard patriarch for the otherwise vastly complex array of situational subject positions that men may take up in different contexts and in different kinds of relationships. It is easier to see 'gender' as about women and 'gender relations' as about oppressive heterosexual relations, and easier to create separatist spaces in which men are excluded by implication. But by so doing we would not only be missing men, we would be missing out on opportunities to make a difference.

## Notes

- 1 Recognising that many discourses and divergent positions make up GAD in theory and practice, I focus here only on what appear to be dominant strands of thinking within the field as a whole. Jackson and Pearson's (1998) excellent edited collection illustrates the sophistication, breadth and depth of current debates, which space precludes me from engaging with in more detail.
- 2 In a powerful article critiquing conventional thinking about female-headed households, Peters (1995) makes this point with reference to women.
- 3 An ironic inversion of these representations is of the female head as heroine, empowered to go her own way once she has access to resources – an image that manages to ignore completely the affective, cultural and symbolic dimensions of heterosexual relationships.

## References

- Bulow, Dorothy von, 1995, 'Power, prestige and respectability: women's groups in Kilimanjaro, Tanzania', *Working Paper* No. 11, Copenhagen: Centre for Development Research.
- Butler, Judith, 1993, *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, London: Routledge.
- Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell and John Lee, 1985, 'Towards a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society*, 14, 5:551-603.
- Chant, Sylvia, 1997, *Women-Headed Households: Diversity and Dynamics in the Developing World*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Connell, Bob, 1995, *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cornwall, Andrea, 1998, 'Gender, participation and the politics of difference', in Irene Guijt and Meera Kaul Shah (eds) *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Cornwall, Andrea, 1997, 'Men, masculinity and 'gender in development'', *Gender and Development*, Vol. 5, No. 2: 8-13.
- Cornwall, Andrea and Nancy Lindisfarne, 1994, 'Dislocating masculinity: gender, power and anthropology' in A. Cornwall and N. Lindisfarne (eds) *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*, London: Routledge.
- Crewe, Emma and Elizabeth Harrison, 1998, *Whose Development? An Ethnography of Aid*, London: Zed Books.
- Doezema, Jo, forthcoming, 'Ouch! Feminists' wounded attachment to the Third World sex worker', to appear in *Feminist Review*.
- Elson, Diane, (ed.), 1991, *Male Bias in the Development Process*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Forrest, David, 1994, 'We're here, we're queer and we're not going shopping: changing gay male identities in contemporary Britain' in A. Cornwall and N. Lindisfarne (eds) *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*, London: Routledge.
- Gatens, Moira, 1983, 'A critique of the sex/gender distinction', in J. Allen and P. Patton (eds) *Beyond Marx: Interventions after Marx*, Sydney: Intervention Press.
- Goetz, Anne-Marie, 1989, 'Misbehaving policy: a feminist analysis of assumptions informing a project for women fish-smokers in Guinea', paper presented to the Canadian Association of Africa Scholars Annual Meeting, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.
- Goetz, Anne-Marie and R. Sen Gupta, 1996, 'Who takes the credit? Gender, power and control over loan use in rural credit programmes in Bangladesh', *IDS Working Paper*, No. 8.
- Guijt, Irene and Meera Kaul Shah, 1998, 'Waking up to power, conflict and process', in I. Guijt and M. Kaul Shah (eds), *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Harrison, Elizabeth, 1997a, 'Fish, feminists and the FAO: translating "gender" through different institutions in the development process', in Anne-Marie Goetz (ed.), *Getting Institutions Right for Women in Development*, London: Zed Books.
- Harrison, Elizabeth, 1997b, 'Men in women's groups: interlopers or allies?', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 28, No. 3: 122-132.
- Jackson, Cecile and Ruth Pearson, (eds), 1998, *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, London: Routledge.
- Kabeer, Naila, 1999, 'The conditions and consequences of choice: reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment', *Working Paper*, Geneva: UNRISD.
- Kabeer, Naila, 1995, *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*, London: Verso.
- Kajifusa, Hiroki, 1998, 'Towards mainstreaming gender issues in development institutions: the possibilities and limitations of men's involvement in WID/GAD, unpublished M.A. dissertation, IDS, University of Sussex.
- Kandiyoti, Deniz, 1998, 'Gender, power and contestation: "rethinking bargaining with patriarchy"', in Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson (eds) *Feminist Visions of Development*, London: Routledge.
- Kempadoo, Kamala and Jo Doezema, (eds), 1998, *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance and Redefinition*, London: Routledge.
- Lindsay, Lisa, 1996, 'Putting the family on track: gender and domestic life on the Nigerian railway, 1935-1965', Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, 1987, 'Under western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses', *Feminist Review*, 30: 61-88.

- Moser, Caroline, 1993, *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training*, London: Routledge.
- Mouffe, Chantal, 1992, 'Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics', in Judith Butler and Joan Scott (eds), *Feminists Theorize the Political*, New York: Routledge.
- Nicholson, Linda, 1994, 'Interpreting gender', *Signs*, 29(1): 79–105.
- Pearson, Ruth and Cecile Jackson, 1998, 'Introduction: interrogating development: feminism, gender and policy', in Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson (eds), *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, London: Routledge.
- Peters, Pauline (1995) 'The use and abuse of the concept of "female-headed households" in research on agrarian transformation and policy', in Deborah Fahy Bryceson (ed.), *Women Wielding the Hoe: Lessons from Rural Africa for Feminist Theory and Development*, Oxford: Berg.
- Razavi, Shahrashoub and Carol Miller, 1995, 'From WID to GAD: conceptual shifts in the women and development discourse', *Occasional Paper*, No. 1, UNRISD, Geneva.
- Schmidt, Elizabeth, 1991, 'Patriarchy, capitalism and the colonial state in Zimbabwe', *Signs*, Vol. 16, No. 4: 732–756.
- Scott, Joan Wallach, 1989, 'Gender: A useful category of historical analysis', in Elizabeth Weed (ed.), *Coming to Terms*, London: Routledge.
- Strathern, Marilyn, 1988, *The Gender of the Gift*, London.
- Sudarkasa, Naira, 1986, "The status of women" in indigenous African societies', *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 12(1):91–103.
- Sweetman, Caroline (ed.), 1997, *Men and Masculinity*, Oxford: Oxfam
- Tcherzekoff, Sergei, 1983, 'The illusion of dualism in Samoa', in Teresa del Valle (ed.), *Gendered Anthropology*, London: Routledge.
- White, Sarah, 1997, 'Men, masculinities and the politics of development', in *Gender and Development*, Vol. 5(2): 14–22.
- Young, Kate, Cathy Wolkowitz and Rosalyn McCullagh, 1981, *Of Marriage and the Market*, London: CSE Books.