

ANALYSIS OF APPROACHES FOR WOMEN EMPOWERMENT

Dr.L.C.Mallaiah,

*Department of Economics
B.B.Ambedkar Central University
Lucknow*

In history of womens' studies, which is not very long a variety of approaches have been adopted in order to understand womens' problems and find solutions to them. Such approaches range from how women are perceived in various cultures and historical settings, given their biological functions and what nature 'intended' them to do, to their decline in power and status vis-à-vis men in the complex social evolution, to a widely shared emphasis on the need to make women equal through the economic and legal route which treats them as individuals rather than those having the sole responsibility for looking after the family.

In recent years, womens' role in society has been indicated as an important subject of study. However, the debate on womens' studies is torn between whether to.

- a) Analyse womens' status within the existing schools of thought by "plugging in" a missing variable or
- b) Considerably the existing theories are analyzed and evolve new ones so as to permit the study of women in a fuller perspective.

Understandably, womens' status cannot be studied within a single discipline and requires a multi-disciplinary approach because of the multiple roles they have to perform. But many scholars tend to become prisoners of their own paradigms, which jaundice their visions and lead them to put forward strange and even absurd propositions.

In economics the principle elements of discussion are employment, occupational division of

labour, wage, on-job mobility, access to education, training division of indivisible work and intra-household disparity. The aim of the theories is to explain the existing status of women with respect to these and propose praxis if any.

NEO-CLASSICAL SCHOOL OF THOUGHT

The Neo-classical school of thought, which is also the most dominant school in the west, bases its explanation on the concept of utility subject to incomes and prices. Hence the neo-classical explanation for the increasing number of women going for paid employment rests heavily on the impact of income and prices on the behaviour of women.

The allocation of time by any individual is linked with the utility attached to it. Utilities are universal phenomenon for all individuals. Thus given that there are no conflicting utility functions, which is also a condition for an atomized society assumed by this theory, the society is sustained at a maximized state of welfare. The model is timeless class-less and applicable across all regions. Womens' participation in labour force is a function of total (dis) utility derived out of market work, leisure and homework. If the price of market work goes up with other things given constant, the labour participation rises. However, if the household income (meaning husband income) rises then the relative disutility of work increases and women tend to withdraw from the labour force. These are the inducing and non-inducing factors, which determine

the participation of withdrawal of women from the labour force.

Wages are determined by the marginal productivity principle. The equation of marginal productivity with wages set the labour market in equilibrium. The discontinuities in employment along with break in service for bearing and rearing children is the reason why women are unable to acquire skills otherwise acquired by men. This leads to gender specific wage differentials. Wage differentials are also attributed to the voluntary foresight of women in choosing jobs requiring lesser skills as they envisage service breaks and shorter lifetime work for themselves. Of course, the profit maximization instinct of the employers coincides with the women employees thought and they do not employ women in jobs requiring very high sophistication. The neo-classicists do not consider it rational as part of employers to discriminate against women per se on jobs as it would be against profit maximizing behaviour (Becker Mincer) articles in (Amsden 1980).

The 'new home-economics', which is the model of household behaviour in the neo-classical theory, explains marriage as a relationship between individuals to maximize utility. It is assumed that the total shared utility is higher than the sum of individual utilities. The division of labour within a household is derived from the marriage market equilibrium, determined by the equations of marginal productivity. Marriage is considered as a two-person firm with either member being an entrepreneur who hires the other at salary and received profits (Becker 1974). Women hire men since the latter earn more and the men hire women because they are superior nursemaids. The theory is a historical and social and assumes individuals to be completely dehumanized entities working for personal selfish benefits. Furthermore, the concept of power is completely separated (and overlooked) from economic behaviour. Policy actions, reforms and movements are by definition aborted, since the market is the dominant impartial allocation of resources (Amsden 1980). There is a circularity of

the logic presented since one is at best total that "women are as they are" nothing more nothing less.

INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

In recent years academic activities have been involved in attempting to develop methodologies to understand the reality of womens' oppression and exploitation and to integrate patriarchy into theory and theoretical models. These efforts at analyzing and integrating womens' exploitation and oppression into theoretical explanation have focused upon evolving an interdisciplinary approach.

The institutional approach to womens' studies draws its theoretical rationale not so much from market equilibrium, but from rigid/quasi-rigid structural institution in the society. Race, caste, gender, class, education, migration status or other similar characteristics contribute to formation of job rules, wage/earnings levels and the status of men women and children within a family or a society. (Rogers 1982)

Work in economics is generally equated with market work or paid, i.e., labour power, which has an exchange value without getting into the entire debate on the definition of "work". Neo-classical concept of "market work", "Market time" are not fully applicable either in subsistence economics or in relation to gender based division and majority of women work in the non-marked sector. They are classified as non-workers, non-producers and hence invisible which leads to underestimation of labour forces as well as the underestimation of their economic contribution.

To analyse to what extent housework functions as a wage subsidy for the market sector. The relationship between patriarchy and development thus assumes significance particularly in relation to the power relationship between men and women within the family. The family is a unit in which production and redistribution of income occur on the basis of material aspects of gender relation and division of labour resulting in conflict and change. The central instrument for maintenance of

patriarchy is occupational segregation, which reinforces the traditional division of labour. This leads to lower wages for women, who maintain their economic dependence on men-simultaneously; the domestic division of labour reinforces occupational segregation by weakening womens' status in the labour market. (Sinha 1980) In underdeveloped economies the primary production unit is the household where non-commodity characteristics are retained along with commodity production. It is necessary to incorporate both in theory and analysis the material basis of housework, which is an economic function integral to the systems. (Krishanaji 1980).

Higher entry at women in the market is associated with growing availability of womens' work. This is to show that women have no preference. Market decides what jobs they would do. However, the dichotomy between home and market work of women should not be carried too far since home is conditioned by the market. While the neo-classical maintains that in spite of the segmentation of labour market women get a wage equal to their marginal product, the institutionalists attribute the lower wage of women to labour market segmentation and sex typing of jobs. Division of labour by sex has always been there. At certain stages at economic development the rewards of specialization are equitably distributed between the sexes.

It has been found that even in the advanced stage of capitalism the differences between men and women cannot be explained merely by the differences in their productivity due to age, schooling or experience. Institutional economics maintain that sex inequality takes the form of job discrimination and not wage discrimination i.e., sex discrimination manifests in not unequal pay for equal work but rather an unequal job assignment. They also point out that sex typing of jobs is also the cause of higher unemployment of women.

The main point that emerges from the institutional standpoint is that the role of women is confined to certain sectors of the economy. It is the

market that imposes such a role so that they can be paid lower wages.

But this school has been criticized by saying that, the tools and techniques used by this school are similar to the neo-classical school and it has no methodology of its own. There is however, a better understanding exhibited toward feminist issues in this school than in the neo-classical school.

MARXIST SCHOOL THOUGHT

Marxist school takes a historical view of any social situation. It considers production and capital accumulation as fundamental social decisions. There are two broad streams of thought here. The first Marxist School of thought views womens' position within the process of capital accumulation and class struggle. The articulation of the relationship between land, labour and capital and their integration with the larger market system is central to the understanding of womens' status. Thus, splitting trade unions by genders, creating wedge between genders to break labour, homogeneity exclusion of women from market production or diffusing the contradiction between capital accumulation by the capitalists, which in turn directly or indirectly contributes to promotion of these processes. (Himmdweit & Mohun 1997).

The second school also referred to the Marxist Feminist School, understands history as a system of relations between men (Patriarchy) who dominate the women who are dominated. The Marxism in this approach takes form of rooting patriarchy in the material base rather than in the psychic one and thereby claiming to eradicate the sex-blindness of Marxist categories. Thus while not negating the fundamental contradiction between capital and labour, the Marxist-Feminist add yet another dimension to the system of contradictions and suggest a simultaneous struggle against class and gender exploitation (Hartman 1979)

All Marxist frames of thought however assert that a capitalist state will not and cannot accomplish what is necessary to end sex inequality

whether in the domain of market or family. It is observed in all the theories except the Marxist Feminist theory that women's question is dealt with well within their developed paradigms. Some allege that women are plugged in as a missing ingredient in the existing forms of explanations, which makes these explanations not very different from those already existing for other productive forces. The Marxist Feminist School has developed its formulations as if in vengeance against the male dominated society. Their appeal for unisex identification doing away with natural biological process and substituting them with chemical laboratories (Yaggar 1979) perhaps speaks of a call for a dehumanized society built of distrust between the sexes. Furthermore, while one can envisage doing away with a class-ridden society, it is difficult to envisage altering the biological structure of the human race.

THE CAPABILITIES APPROACH

Women often have no preference for economic independence before they learn about avenues through which women like them might not pressure this goal, nor do they think of themselves as citizens with rights that were being ignored, before they learn of their rights and are encouraged to believe in their equal worth. All of these ideas and the preference based on them frequently take shape for women in programmes of education sponsored by women's organizations of various types. Men's preferences, too are socially shaped and often misshaped. Men frequently have a strong preference that their wives should do all the childcare and all the housework – often in addition to working an eight-hour day. Such preferences, too are not fixed in nature of things, they are constructed by social traditions of privilege and subordination. Thus a preference-based approach typically will reinforce inequalities, especially those inequalities that are entrenched enough to have crept into people's very desires.

A reasonable answer to all these concerns-capable of giving good guidance to government establishing basic constitutional principles and to international agencies assessing the quality of life – is given by a version of the capabilities approach an approach to quality of life assessment pioneered within economics by Amartya Sen and by now highly influential through the Human Development Reports of the UNDP. The version of this approach argued here is in several ways different from Sen's; it is laid out as currently defended.

The central question asked by the capabilities approach is not, "how satisfied is this Woman?" or even "How much in the way of resources is she able to command?" It is instead, "what is she actually able to do and to be?". Taking a stand for political purpose on a working list of functions that would appear to be of central importance in human life, users of this approach ask: "Is the person capable of this or not?" They ask not only about the person's satisfaction to do (what her opportunities and liberties are). They ask not just about how those do or do not go to work enabling the women to function. The initiative idea behind the approach is two fold. First, that there are certain functions that are particularly central in human life in the sense that their presence or absence is typical understood to be a mark of the presence or absence of human life, second the core idea is that of the human being as a dignified person who shapes his or her own life rather than being passively shaped or pushed around by the world in the manner of a flock or herd animal.

At one extreme, we may judge that the absence of capability for a central function is so acute that the person is not really a human being at all, or any longer-as in the case of certain very severe forms of mental disability. But that boundary is of lesser interest than is a higher one, the level at which a person's capability is "truly human", that is worthy of a human being. The idea thus contains a notion of human worthy or dignity.

The approach makes each person a bearer of value and an end. Marx, like his bourgeois forebears, holds that it is profoundly wrong to

subordinate the ends of some individuals to those of others. That is at the core of what exploitation is, to treat a person as a mere object for the use of others. That is at the core of what exploitation is, to treat a person as a mere object for the use of others. What this approach is after is a society in which individuals are treated as each worthy of regard and in which each has been put in a position to live really humanly.

It is possible to produce an account of these necessary elements of truly human functioning that commands a broad cross-cultural consensus, a list that can be endorsed for political purposes by people who otherwise have very different views of what a complete good life for a human being would be. The list is supposed to provide a focus for quality of life assessment for political planning and it aims to select capabilities that are of central importance, whatever else the person pursues. They therefore have a special claim to be supported for political purpose in a pluralistic society (Nussabum 1999).

This approach points, one of the most effective ways of promoting womens' control over their environment and their effective right of political participation is to promote womens' literacy. Women who can seek employment outside the home have more resources in protecting their bodily integrity from assaults within it. Such facts give us still more reason not to promote one's capability at the expense of the others.

Among the capabilities, practical reason and affiliation stand out as being of special importance, since they both organize and suffuse all the others making them pursuit truly human. To use one's sense in a way not infused by the characteristically human use of thought and planning is to use them in an incompletely human manner. At the same time, to reason for one self without at all considering the circumstances and needs of others is, again to behave in an incompletely human way.

The basic intuition, from which the capability approach begins in the political arena, is that human abilities exert a moral claim that they be developed. Human beings are creatures such that,

provided with the right educational and material support, they could become fully capable of these human functions. That is they are creatures with certain lower-level capabilities (called here "basic capabilities") (Ibid 237) to perform the functions in question. When these capabilities are deprived of the nourishment that would transform them into the high-level capabilities, they are fruitless, cut off, in some way but a shadow of themselves.

Used to evaluate the lives of human who are struggling for equality in many different countries, developing and developed the capabilities framework does not look like an alien importation; it squares pretty well with demands women are already making in many global and national political contexts. It might therefore seem superfluous to put these items on a list; why not just let women decide what they will demand in each case? To answer that question, we should point out that the international development debates is already using a normative language. Where the capabilities approach has not caught on – as in the Human Development Reports of the UNDP – a much less adequate theoretical language still prevails, whether it is the language of performance satisfaction or the language of economic growth we need the capabilities approach as a humanly rich alternative to these inadequate theories of human development (Ibid 247).

Women all over the world have lacked support for central human functions and that lack of support is to some extent caused by there being women. But women, unlike rocks and trees, have the potential to become capable of these human functions, given sufficient nutrition, education and other support. That is why their unequal failure in capability is a problem of justice. It is up to all human beings to solve this problem. A cross-cultural conception of human capabilities gives us good guidance as we pursue this difficult task.

ECONOMIC APPROACH

A number of scholars had expressed their dissatisfaction with approaches, which merely criticized the traditional values, which supported

gender inequality and / or made legal provisions for womens' rights. Instead they wanted a change in "the established definition of womens' role and status. They also felt that such a fundamental change would come only as a consequence of a change in economic relationships. The three principle exponents of this view are Ivan Illich and Ester Boserup in the West and Vina Mazumdar in India.

Illich (1982) in his work *Gender*, made a distinction between gender and sex. Gender according to him refers to complementarity and sex to polarization, between human beings. Over the years the human condition changed in an unprecedented manner. When a transition took place from gender to sex. It gave rise to an "Economic Apartheid and Subordination of Women". Such degradation of women was made possible by the very nature of economic development in modern societies. And now so very entrenched are the disadvantages of women that an ordinary vocabulary conceptual tools and even moral sensitivity all of them with sexist bias, have difficulty in determining the exact nature of gender imbalance that has occurred (Ibid 127).

Boserup (1970) in her highly influenced work "Womens' Role in Economic Development" argued that economic and social development lead to the disintegration of existing division of labour in rural communities, migrations to towns and the emergence of new economic relationships between men and women which are not always to the advantage of the later.

Vina Mazumdar (1979) pointed out that even within the problems of women those of the upper and middle class received maximum attention. By way of illustration she maintained that the social and religious reform leaders confined their efforts to evil social practices, which are prevalent among the upper classes. The demand for the enfranchisement of women in India, after the First World War, as also demands of those classes. The demand for votes in particular, vainly created a hope that though such a provision women would be able

to set right their fundamental problems of inequality.

Muzamdar saw problem of women as basically a problem of their economic dependence. In that connection she quoted a passage from the Indian council of Social Science Research Advisory Committee Report, critical issues on the status of women, published in 1977 (Ibid .15). "Unless the economic and social utility of women is enhanced in the eyes of their family and nation by opportunities to take part in socially and economically productive roles, neglect of women will continue".

Muzumdar also felt that an historic opportunity was missed in the early days of Indian Independence when a number of problems plaguing women could have been dealt with. This is because at the particular time women had emerged as equal satyagrahic figures for independence. Not only that, the highly influential Mahatma Gandhi himself had underlined the need for the removal of economic disabilities of women. What was more, Nehru too made a Herculean effort, in the early years of Indian independence, to remove the various social disabilities of women by means of ambitious legislation. Somewhere down the road the mobilizations of women begun to falter and the momentum was lost.

Devak. Jain (1976) the humanist feminist scholar has argued that any goal for women development which is concerned with the broad framework of "imitating men" is bound to be unsatisfactory and that instead of making women mimic men, we should try to improve the status, power and authority and remove all those obstacles which are in the way of their fullest development within actual social situations. In doing so, she argued that we ought not to destroy their separate identity.

Krishna Ahooja Patel (1983) was more explicit in her emphasis on the need to recognize the worth of womens' work in monetary terms. Only its quantification and monetization as has been attempted in Switzerland will, according to her, give womens' work its due recognition.

The importance of the economic factor as the sole liberating and equating factor in isolation of other factors had exaggerated its effectiveness so far as the problems of women are concerned. In this connection, empirical evidence provided by Leela Gulat (1981) intensive case study of the "Poorest of Poor" working women in the outskirts of the city of Trivandrum is most telling. Those women, who had supplemented their family income and in some cases were the "Principal Earners" as their husbands were unemployed, neither rose in status within the social group to which they belonged nor did they acquire the preconditions of being equal with their men folk. As breadwinners they are no doubt important to their families. But that is as far as their relative economic strength had taken them. However, as women they were paid less for the work they did and "Started at the lowest rung of work hierarchy with no hope of "Vertical mobility".

Thus, in treating women as discrete and potentially economically productive units of society, such as the industrial worker, we tend to overlook the other and more vital aspect of her being. In practically all societies women are far more deeply involved in bringing up the family and therefore relating themselves in a complex fashion to a member of family, than do men. Their role within the family, as its mainstay, as rearers of children, as wives and mothers, forces them to give up or reduce their economic productive role outside home and to that extent they do not emerge from their unequal condition or periodically return back to it.

The problems of women thus force us to consider them against the background of a network of social relationships, attitudes practices and the manner in which all those constrain and prevent them from enjoying a fair measure of social equality with their men folk. Unless we consider such constraints within living and operational situations, our prescriptions for the amelioration of their problems will have very little meaning (Somjee Geetha (1989)

RADICAL APPROACH

The radical approach views womens' labour force participation in a historical perspective. Although they also say that womens' labour force participation outside the household was very much related to the family's budget requirements, yet they place greater emphasis on change in nature of the family. For example, during the last century, working daughters contributed to family's income. But gradually overtime, single working girls started keeping their wages for themselves, thus the old familiar values were replaced by new individual ones due to graded transformation of family, especially after the second world war, the number of married women offering themselves for paid jobs went up. This brings us to the radical approach, which focuses on material and political benefits, which capitalists derive from family. They consider that family survived because it served the interest of the capitalists and show that sex inequality in the market is based on sex inequality at home.

For the radicals the overthrow of capitalism is a pre-condition for liberation of women. More important nevertheless, is the overthrow of patriarchal family structure. The radicals see the economic independence and the so-called liberation of women in the advanced industrialized countries as an illusion. Although for many women the transformation of the family into industry centered patriarchal capitalism appears to be liberation, under patriarchal capitalism womens' oppression does not end, it only takes another form. This is evident in the advanced countries Varma (1988).

The labour market segmentation during the transition from competition to monopoly capitalism arises in response to the need of capitalists to divide and rule over working class. Even trade union sometimes pressurizes women to stay at home in order to restrict the supply of labour, occupationally segregate them. Hence class struggle and trade unions sometimes go against the interest of women.

BIOLOGICAL APPROACH

Proponents of biological view state that there are some fundamental biological differences, which not only distinguish women from men but also are also responsible for their secondary status and role in the society.

The approach followed the basic logic that women because of the childbearing function and lesser mobility stayed closer to home and assumed domestic roles. Males because of their greater muscular strengthened assumed the arduous roles such as hunting and farming and seized power in the society over which they have maintained their control till the present time. Society continues to believe that men should have roles outside their homes where they interact with other people hence their role has come to be regarded with value and more power because the only way to achieve political power and authority is the assumption of public roles and interaction with other people. While women should work inside (home) closer to kitchen because of their child bearing and rearing functions.

Stressing the biological differences between men and women on the basis of the sexual division of labour in society, Murdock suggest that biological differences such as the greater physical strength of men and the fact that women bear children led to gender roles.

But Ellis criticizes this approach saying that the problems of man and women cannot be question of comparative merits of the two sexes. Mankind is one. Men and women are two aspects of one essence. Therefore, the question of superiority or interiority of their sex does not arise. However, different they may be the two sexes are designed for each other and complementary to each other.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH

Biological fact is not enough to provide an adequate answer to the question of inferior status led participation of women. The task is to discover how

the nature of women has been affected through the course of history. People who believe in the anthropological quest begin with the assumption that human behaviour is largely directed and determined by culture. Thus, norms, values and roles are culturally determined and socially transmitted. According to this perspective Gender Roles are product of culture rather than of biology. The sexual division of labour is supported and justified by a belief and value system, which implies that gender roles are normal, natural, right and proper. One example is that boys are rewarded for their aggressive physical behaviour whereas girls who are aggressive or "Tom Boyish" i.e., climb trees (masculine character) are generally punished. Crying in a boy is frowned upon as being "sissy" or "being girlish" (feminine behaviour) thus it is culture that produces inequality and not biology. Many researchers have criticized biological theory of division of roles. Critiques of this perspective argue that biological determinism is insufficient to explain the subordination of women as it is based on simple brute strength. It would seem logical that as civilization progressed and physical strength became less important the position of women should have improved.

Criticizing the biological approach researchers observe that it is an error to assume that female is by nature sedentary whereas the male is by nature active and superior. Such activity differences do not exist between males and females and to a large extent these would seem to be secondary differences and not primary ones. Evaluation of culture as superior to nature is the basic reason for devaluation of women. Women are universally defined as closer to nature because their bodies and physiological functions are more concerned with natural process surrounding the reproduction of the species. Further, womens' social role as mother is also seen as closer to nature. They are primarily responsible for the socialization of the young. Infants and young children are seen as "barely human" (as one step away from nature) because their culture base is small compared to adults. Womens' close relation with young children

further associates them with nature. Since the mother's role is linked with family, the family itself is regarded much closer to nature as compared to the activities and institutions outside family. Thus activities such as politics, welfare and religion are seen as being away from nature and also as superior to domestic tasks. Finally women's psychological make-up is defined as closer to nature because women are concerned with childcare and primary socialization. They develop personal, intimate and particularistic relationships with others especially with their children. Following Levistraus, it is the men who exchanged in creating social bonds. Men benefit more than women from these social bonds and thus the division of labour between the two sexes is a hierarchal one.

The fact that traits such as aggressiveness, courage, independence, sexual activity, nationality, passivity and many others, which are considered either "masculine" or "feminine" are as lightly linked to sex as are the clothing and the manners that a society at given period assigns to either sex. (Sir, Henry Maine) was one of the early theoreticians who wrote about the natural superiority of man over women. His view is that the patriarchal system of authority was the original and universal system of social organization. The family was the original unit and the eldest male parent held supreme authority in the household. From the family, such authority had been extended into clans, from clans into tribes and so men always had been the rulers (Ibid 92). To conclude, the anthropologists emphasize that culture is the main determinant of unequal distribution of roles among men and women in work participation in any existing human society.

CULTURAL PERCEPTIONS

To be able to understand women in different cultural groups, first of all, it has to be understood, of how they are "perceived" in them, together with "ground rules" and "social maps" which such groups provide for women's roles and functions within them (Sheriley 1979).

Such "perceptions" in turn are shaped by societies view of the biological properties or natural endowments of "women" and how they, the different societies can use them.¹ Society's "perceptions" in other words, would lay down certain ground rules for governing women's activities, jurisdiction and relationships.

Such "perceptions" of women and the grounds rules defining their roles and relationships, were crystallized and imposed by certain cultural layers in specific societies and reinforced by reference to holy books. That is what happened in the Indian situation. The various *shastras*, the religious and philosophical texts, together with views and commentaries by saints and seers, provided a normative structure for women's place in society. Such a normative structure was further compounded by India's traditional hierarchical social organization and a prolonged period of social destabilization spread over nearly eight hundred years of almost continuous foreign invasions and conquests. In her case, therefore, the thick layer of her classical culture, together with historical experiences dictating their own concerns regarding the protection of women, created the bulk of problems for women in India.

The prolonged process of social destabilization also added to her inability to do anything about those problems. Such a situation reached its climax on the eve of the British entry into India. After that Paz Britannica provided an opportunity to her social and religious reformers to reflect, write and mobilize public opinion against a number of self-degrading social practices and customs involving the treatment of women. Women obviously were at the receiving end of the inhuman treatment involved in sati, purdah polygamy, child marriages and different forms of prostitution (Neera Desai 1977). The thinking and reform-minded individuals felt ashamed of what they, as a people, had done to their women folk. The arrogant colonial rulers and the supercilious Christian missionaries also reminded them, in their various ways, that in the ultimate analysis the treatment of women symbolizes the quality of a

civilization. Consequently from the early nineteenth century onwards, the treatment of women became one of the chief concerns of social and religious reforms, nationalist leaders, institutions builders, planners, policy makers and social workers. Given the immensity of the problems of women, much more should have been done than was the case.

In this respect, the leaders of social and religious reform movement made superhuman effort. Raja Rammohan Roy agitated against the practice of Sati, Iswhar Chandra Vidyasagar advocated widow remarriage, and Swami Dayananda Saraswati and Ranade strongly supported the demand for education of women. Maharshi Karve founded educational institutions for women (Paul Thomas 1964). Education of women and girls was strongly supported by most of these reformers as a means to their wider social emancipation (Sridevi1965). And so far as the educated girls were concerned, they continued to demand the traditional security along with modern education (Margarate).

CONCLUSION

A close look at the various theoretical approaches to study the issue of workingwomen shows that the role of women is an effect of market. The neo-classical's womens' behaviour and role as one of adjusting to the market forces, while institutionalist show that women have hardly any choice because it is the market which decides the work a women would do and thereby pays her a low wage by segregating her in the labour market. Radicals point out that the historical growth of capitalism has found different ways of exploiting women both in the family and in the market. Increase in the number of female-headed households further show how patriarchal capitalism, by giving women the illusion of liberation, actually exploits them. Thus there is a "reciprocal relationship between economic development and the development of the household."

Male domination is an age-old phenomenon. With the growth of interest and status of women these has been a concomitant proliferation of studies. Also efforts have been made to explain the subordinate position of women in society. A number of interpretations have been advanced to explain the low participation of women in comparison to men. Some biologists view that the division of labour between men and women has resulted from their physical differences. Womens' role of reproduction is responsible for the earliest form of division of labour and male supremacy flows from this division. Others believe that early societies had egalitarian relations and male supremacy arose with the growth of class societies. Still other asserts that division of roles between male and female had always included some amount of male domination.

Thus, there are divergent explanations regarding gender differences and participation of female in work force. Further there is a need of examining the relevance of the approaches in the present context.

REFERENCE

1. Amsden. A.H. (1980) (ed.) "The Economics of Women and Work", Penguin Books, (p.11)
2. Becker.G.(1974) "A Theory of Marriage" in T.W. Schultz(ed.) Economics of the Family, University of Chicago Press,
3. Amsden, A.H.(1980) Op.Cit., (p.111)
4. Rogers.G. (1982) "Migration and Income Distribution" WEPR, Working Paper, No.WEP, 2-21/W.P.(p.108)
5. Sinha S.P.(1980) Impact at Technological Development in Agriculture on Women in Rural Areas: A Two Village Profile in North Bihar, ICSSR, New Delhi.
6. Krishnaji.N (1980) "Critique" in employment Expansion in Asian Agriculture: A Comparative experience of South Asian Countries, 120-ARTEP, Bangkok.

7. Hartman H.I. (1979) "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism" Towards a More Progressive Union", Capital and Class, No.8.
8. Yaggar.A (1979) "Political Philosophers of Womens' Liberation", in S.B. Shop and N. Weinzwieg "Philosophy and Women" Wordsworth Publishing Company, Belmont.
9. Sen. Amartya (1980) "Equality of What" in S.M. Murlian (ed), "The Tanner Lecture on Human Values", Vol.I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
10. UNDP (1993) "Human Development Report-1993, United National Development Programme", New York.
11. Nussbaum. Martha (1999) Women and Equality: The Capabilities Approach: International Labour Review, Vol.38.
12. Illich, Ivan (1982) "Gender" Pantheon Books, New York, p.4-5.
13. Boserup Ester (1970) "Womens' Role in Economic Development"
14. Mazumdar Vina (1979) (ed.,) Symbols of Power: Studies in Political Status of Women In India, Allied Publishers, Bombay (p.ix).
15. Devaki Jain (1976) (ed.,) "Indian Women" Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broad Casting, GOI, New Delhi, p.XV.
16. Krishna Ahooja Patel (1983) "Womens' Work: Major Issues" in a seminar on Women, Work and Development" (pp.31-35).
17. Leela Gulati (1981) "Profiles of Female Poverty A Study of Five Poor Women of Kerala", Hindustan Publishing Cooperation, Delhi.
18. Somjee Geeta (1989) "Narrowing the Gender Gap", St. Martin's Press, New York (p.155).
19. Verma N.M.P. and "Determinants of Women Workers Participation: Resma Bano (1988) Notes on Some Interdisciplinary Controversies", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.34, No.1, July, (pp.88-89)
20. Shirley Ardener (1979) (ed.,) "Women & Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps", London Crom Helm. (p.11)
21. Neera Desai (1977) "The Position of Indian Women", Bombay: Vora & Co.,
22. Paul Thomas (1964) "Indian Women Through the Ages", Asian Publishing House, Bombay.
23. Sridevi.S. (1965) "A Century of Indian Womanhood", Rao and Raghavan, Mysore.
24. Margret L. Cormack (1961) "She Who Rides a Peacock", Asia Publishing House, Bombay.

Copyright © 2014, Dr.L.C.Mallaiah. This is an open access refereed article distributed under the creative common attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.